SITUATIONAL INNOVATION
THE EAST-WEST CENTER: A CASE STUDY

Everett Kleinjans
THE EAST-WEST CENTER is a national educational institution established in Hawaii by the United States Congress in 1960. Formally known as “The Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West,” the federally-funded Center is administered in cooperation with the University of Hawaii. Its 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.”

Each year about 1,500 men and women from the United States and more than 40 countries in the Asian/Pacific area exchange ideas and cultural insights in East-West Center programs. Working and studying with a multinational Center staff on problems of mutual East-West concern, participants include students, mainly at the post-graduate level; Fellows with research expertise and/or practical experience in such fields as government, business administration or communication; mid-career professionals in nondegree study and training programs at the teaching and management levels; and authorities invited for international conferences and seminars. These participants are supported by federal scholarships and grants, supplemented by contributions from Asian/Pacific governments, private foundations and other agencies.

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. The Center draws on the resources of U.S. mainland universities, and Asian/Pacific educational and governmental institutions as well as organizations in the multi-cultural State of Hawaii. Center programs are conducted by the East-West Communication Institute, the East-West Culture Learning Institute, the East-West Food Institute, the East-West Population Institute, and the East-West Technology and Development Institute. Open Grants are awarded to provide scope for educational and research innovation.
American educators have seldom been able to give a coherent explanation for what they were doing. Even when they did have a consistent theory, it often had little or no relationship to the actual results of their actions.

Jencks and Riesman, *The Academic Revolution*

I. Introduction

It may be possible that most educators have a skewed perception of what they are doing or why. The longer one is an administrator, the more one comes to see that we often do little more than muddle through. However, the challenge is to think as clearly as possible about the whats and whys of our activities in order to get perspective and direction.

I believe it wise to know a bit about the nature of the subject we treat, and this is certainly true of innovation. Furthermore, innovation is usually very specific as a response to certain circumstances and carried out within some rather definite limitations of time, place, money, purpose, and people. In this paper I would like, therefore, to make a few opening remarks on innovation and then to outline the emerging context in which innovation must take place. After that I will use my own
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institution, the East-West Center, as a case study of how one institution in a particular time and working within some rather well defined parameters has attempted to respond to the emerging world.

II. Innovation

Innovation is not new. Whenever progress was made in the means of tilling the soil, mass producing automobiles, or the conquering of disease, innovation took place. Without innovation we might 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 slippery concept. What is innovative in one time or place may be traditional in another. Innovation in a highly industrialized society may take quite different forms from innovation in societies that are less industrialized; in national, state, or provincial institutions and in international institutions. An open, pluralistic society is likely to produce more variety than a closed society. Not all institutions have the same goals or the same means of attaining those goals, nor do they need them. Thus, in a sense, each man can only talk about change in his own institution, for each has its own context, history, goals, and personnel. However there are enough similarities in our circumstances and educational systems so that the remarks made and examples used should be enlightening in spite of our differing cultural, developmental and philosophical backgrounds. One of the ironies of working in international cross-cultural institutions is that while we recognize social and cultural barriers to communication and understanding, we nevertheless talk and write to be universally understood.
What have we learned about innovation across time? Innovation usually assumes an active agent; someone innovates. Innovation generally implies a criticism of present conditions; the innovator is discontented. Innovation occurs more frequently in times of crisis than in times of relative tranquility. If most people in a society or institution are unhappy about the same set of circumstances, change may be widely advocated and accepted. When the innovative group is small, change is likely to be more difficult. When innovation is attempted, some will disagree, because it is bound to cost someone something someplace. Advance in one direction will require a choice among priorities and values. We know that innovation occurs most readily in the material aspects of a society or culture, least readily in its nonmaterial or spiritual aspects. It is comparatively simple to add a piece of technology to a society; it is difficult to change its system of personal relations, prestige, or mores. Urban dwellers seem more amenable to innovation than their country cousins.*

We also know that innovation is not good in and of itself and that some innovations may in fact be bad. The invention of means of waging chemical and biological warfare has not really benefited mankind. Finally, we know that innovation is not easy, even when people are crying for change. As long as human diversity survives, people will disagree about whether change is needed and about its scope, its direction, and its process.

Innovation in higher education presumes that something new is needed in the educational system. Certainly many changes are being attempted. Recently President Harlan

* This discussion based on Bernard Berelson and Gary A. Steiner. Human Behavior, pp. 613-619.
Cleveland 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: (1) Two thirds 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 serve from 25 to 150 students. Only six percent serve more than 100 students. (3) Most of the programs do not involve cooperation with other institutions. (4) Traditional teaching methods are the norm in the “non-traditional” programs. But (5) There is 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 numbers of people involved in most new programs. Whether the smallness of scale reflects lack of enthusiasm or internal political considerations (Cleveland reported that the most frequently mentioned difficulty in innovating 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. Too often small experimental programs wither and die for lack of institutional nourishment: they die from isolation. Most
institutions can tolerate a small innovation tacked on; few can survive fundamental reform without great trauma.

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.

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 organized for certain purposes, young people (or, for that matter, newcomers arriving after changes have been made)
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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.

We could ask ourselves, therefore, what kind of world we want, what kind of men we want, and then try to set up educational institutions to produce such men. In actuality, 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 have been formed or have won their freedom from colonial domination. However, this nationalistic trend leading to fragmentation and over-againstness is in many ways in direct conflict with a simultaneous trend toward world awareness. This trend toward world consciousness is inevitable, necessary, and desirable.

III. The Context for Innovation

There are several factors driving men toward a greater world consciousness. One is the realization that man now has the capacity to destroy all life on this planet, including his own. The generation of people who have grown up since the atomic age burst upon us have lived in the atmosphere of the “balance of terror.” Decisions made by the leaders of
the atomic powers affect all men on the planet, and a Mr. Nixon or a Mr. Brezhnev is, in a sense, president or premier of the world. These men must think in world terms. And in turn, people around the world have a stake in what these men think or plan or do and must express themselves intelligently. Both leaders and led are thus being forced to think globally.

Furthermore, men are beginning to see the limit on energy resources without which industrialized countries will not be able to continue to exist as they are, nor industrializing countries continue to develop. There may be, for example, new oil supplies along the western rim of the Pacific Ocean, but it will take a great deal of international cooperation on the part of many countries to develop these. The countries of the Middle East could shut down Europe in a matter of weeks if they refused to sell oil. Energy resources are thus a potential source of tension and even conflict. However, since each nation is dependent upon others for some form of energy, it appears that more people are beginning to realize that international cooperation is necessary for the attainment of national goals. No nation is any longer sufficient unto itself, and therefore the maintenance of good relations is imperative.

Also, we have now come to see the profound impact of men's decisions and actions as they trigger chain reactions of consequences. The solution to one problem usually is the genesis of another. Finding and choosing solutions means also deciding which difficulties we are willing to live with. A decision then becomes a matter of priorities, and priorities are based upon a whole set of values. Each culture or nation has a historically derived set of values which it tends to regard as universal, if not absolute. As these values confront each
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other across national boundaries, adjustments are called for, and there is the feeling that values are relativized. The relativization of values is threatening to many people; they would rather fight than switch. For these, and many other reasons, global sensitivity or world consciousness becomes a necessity.

With the speed of modern transportation and communication, not only do men’s actions have greater impact upon each other, but men are in contact with each other as never before. We often hear the rhetoric about our “shrinking” planet. The planet may indeed be “shrinking,” but contact with people from diverse cultures is an expanding experience. Through such contacts a person is exposed to new ideas, ways of thinking, believing, acting, and organizing reality. Cross-cultural encounters can enlarge a man if he comes to see that each culture, his own included, uses only a part of the human potential available to it, but that its activity is a very legitimate and viable expression of human life. Such recognition is the essence of a liberal education—liberal in the sense of free, free from one’s own cultural biases and blinders. Thus the development of world consciousness is not only inevitable and necessary, but highly desirable in and of itself. Without doubt man in the twenty-first century will have this greater consciousness. In talking about the history of science, Loren Eiseley has said:

The man who learns how difficult it is to step outside the intellectual climate of his or any age has taken the first step on the road to emancipation to world citizenship of a high order. (The Firmament of Time, 1969, p. 7)

The same can be said of stepping outside one’s culture. The desirable effect of learning about other cultures is that people
can become more truly human.

Besides the trend toward world consciousness, there is a very strong drive toward the technological society in one form or another. On the one hand, many of the leaders of new or recently liberated countries see technology as the cure for the poverty and misery of their people, and on the other see it as a source of power that will help them cope on something like equal terms with other nations. In other words, technology is seen as the means of achieving quality of life at home and equality of relations abroad. Modern technology has invaded all societies, and it seems impossible for the members of these societies to stop it, even if they wished to. They do not seem to want to stop it; in fact, the more they get, the more they seem to want.

The post-industrial technological society has two features which are important for higher education. First, it is a knowledge society; and second, it must be a cooperative society. The knowledge society is one which is basically dependent upon the knowledge industries as opposed to the agricultural or manufacturing industries. Another way of stating the contrast is to say that, rather than being either labor-intensive or capital-intensive, the knowledge society is brain-intensive. The distinguishing feature is that knowledge is the product of such industry, but it is also the input. Such a society depends upon such activities as information storage and retrieval, data processing, research and development, education, and mass communication. In other words, knowledge becomes the foundation of the economic development and stability of that society. By “knowledge” is meant both organized information and the ability to apply this information in certain circumstances. The great transition, therefore, is from
manual technology (used mainly in agriculture and manufacturing) to intellectual technology. This intellectual technology, or the ability to translate new knowledge and ideas into concrete form, becomes the dynamic of society.

"Knowledge" as normally considered by the "intellectual" is something very different from "knowledge" in the context of "knowledge economy" 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)

An essential ingredient in the transition to the knowledge society is good management, part of intellectual technology. The "green revolution" was accomplished by a combination of new technology and management—the putting together of teams of men with differing knowledges and skills to accomplish the increased production of food. One of the themes 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.

This suggests the second feature of the technological society, that is, that it depends upon cooperation. A simple example is the man with a job in Washington, D. C. who fails to put gasoline in his car and runs out of gas on Memorial Bridge leading into the capital. His small failure to
cooperate caused a huge traffic jam and made some five thousand people late for work. We all know how a strike in one industry, or even part of an industry, can affect a whole nation. The threat of a strike is a threat of non-cooperation, and thus has power. The technological society particularly requires the collaboration of knowledge makers and appliers. It depends upon specialists, but most of its problems cannot be be solved by any single specialty. The solution of problems takes the skills of men with many different specializations. Urban renewal takes more than architects and politicians. Lawyers, social workers, industrialists, and many more are needed. There must be a team approach. Each individual must contribute his knowledge and skills to the problem at hand. This kind of cooperation is dependent upon good human relations and a great deal of understanding. Without these ingredients societies will be in a constant state of disarray and may even come to a grinding halt.

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 of the areas. 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 concentrate on it in isolation from the things 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 and linguistics. Although this is a
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very legitimate and fruitful endeavor, it generally does not encourage members of the academic community to integrate their different pieces of knowledge and relate them to the values, aspirations, and needs of people in the society at large. If linguistics (which I use as an example because I am a linguist) is an end in itself and thus an ultimate goal, then all men should be linguists. At one level—that of disciplines—it can and should be an end in itself. In general, the universities have provided a good environment for the development of the disciplines. However, opportunities should be provided for the integration of linguistics into a larger, more comprehensive view of the world so that it can make its contribution to the kind of world we wish to create. Communities of scholars must be formed who are capable and willing to apply their knowledge to the solution of complex social problems. Each expert can make his contribution as he perceives the problem from his point of view.

It is application that is the test of the “truth” or validity of knowledge. Theory and practice must constantly 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 influence between the needs and problems of farmers and the knowledge of the laboratory researchers. This kind of mutual feedback system enhances the work of both. Failure to build in this kind of relationship between knowledge makers and knowledge users is probably the cause of our crisis. On the one hand, the concentrated effort of many scientists has produced our modern technological civilization. On the other hand, the same amount of concentrated effort has not been applied to exploring the consequences of its application. One set of men has done the
research, others have done the more “menial” work of application, and neither group has calculated the long-run effects. The result has been some unwise applications. The world does not really need more humanistic ideas or loftier ideals. But it does need people who have the desire and the talent to devise ways of translating good ideas or high ideals into workable schemes for ordinary human beings. This challenge implies the necessity to concern ourselves with the common knowledge of everyday life and to develop the skills of problem solving, decision making, and managing. We should attempt to develop solution-oriented people.

Ever since the Gutenburg press, 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. The writer perceives things from a certain point of view, he interprets his perception, and then he puts these perceptions and explanations into written form. Furthermore, because he most often writes up his “findings” rather than the processes unsuccessful and successful by which he came to them, he gives 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, someplace explored, 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 his book. In real life one can never get all of the information, and much of what he gets 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
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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 an atmosphere that is deliberately detached, men outside academia rarely can. Emotion is one of the primary facts which men of affairs must deal with in every day life. Solutions are never simple, if there are solutions to real problems. 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 university should teach people to look for their data beyond the lecture-library-laboratory circuit; to handle the rough data which come from dealing with real problems involving actual people. It is possible that such an educational process would produce people with educated emotions as well as educated intellects.

Equally important is training in real decision making. Not all the people who go through our institutions of higher learning will become decision makers or managers. However, the modern graduate, to say nothing of the citizen at large, is woefully ignorant of the decision-making processes—the number of constraints within which a decision maker works, the number of constituents who must be consulted, and the necessary deliberations at various levels of an organization or system. For those of us with such experience, the decision-making process is further complicated by the incompleteness and often the inconsistency of the data at hand at the time a decision must be made. We do not usually have the luxury of waiting until the data are complete and synthesized. Education which has not trained men to see ambiguity, to make decisions, and to accept responsibility for their decisions,
has not equipped them for life in modern society.

Not only is it necessary for modern man to understand and practice decision making; he must also come to realize that his decisions determine his future. The new depth of concern for the environment is a case in point. We now know that most decisions are choices between alternatives and that the choice we make will have consequences for our lives. The solution of one problem always seems to cause another. We have therefore become more future-oriented, out of necessity. If we are going to choose the kind of future we want, we must be able to foresee as clearly as possible the consequences of today's decisions and action. Therefore, education to prepare people for decision making must be future-oriented.

Furthermore, decisions are usually based upon a whole set of values which form "the normative component in the determination of action." (Jacob, *Values and the Active Community*, p. 4) Of course, men may not perceive their values because they have not taken the time to analyze their behavior. In fact, many people are extremely adept at concealing their values, especially from themselves. Regardless, just because the decisions of men affect their present and future environment so profoundly, the values upon which these decisions are made become powerful in a society. In our rapidly changing societies, values come under attack and begin to change. Or it may be the other way around, namely, that our changing values are the cause of our changing societies. The fact is that values have come to the fore as never before and it is imperative that our educational programs make people sensitive to values. The very acquisition and application of knowledge are shaped by our values and determine the quality of our
In a pluralistic world problems of scientific choice inevitably involve non-scientific considerations. Therefore, scientific choice will have to be based on an enlarged concept of scientific ethics... the ethic of ends is at least as important as the ethic of means... the first is ethically neutral, whereas the second is intrinsically ethical... [However] since all fields of science now generate devices and services that increasingly affect human life, scientists must develop ethics of ends in addition to their traditional ethics of means. Each field must possess not only technē--its technique--but also epistēmē--its philosophy. (Reason Awake, pp. 114–115)

The question of values has become paramount in all societies. Sensitivity to them is essential for our survival.

IV. The East-West Center—a Case Study

I would like to use the East-West Center as an illustration of innovation because it is being built upon the perceptions 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 knowledge and action, my best example of an attempt to innovate situationally 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 history of the Center, for no institution can be understood outside the social forces in which it was established and is maintained.

The East-West Center was established by an act of the United States Congress in May of 1960. In the legislation
the Secretary of State was empowered to provide for 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. The Secretary of State was further charged “to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific... through cooperative study, training, and research, by establishing [the East-West Center] 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...” 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 the University.

These features of this legislation and these arrangements 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 in America. The Center is one of the very few educational institutions established and supported by the Congress. In the United States institutions of higher learning are generally established and supported by the 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 precedents to follow—no predecessors or guides. It was free to depart from tradition.
The second unique feature is the set of goals given to promote better relations and understanding between peoples East and West. No other educational institution that I know of has these goals. 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 by whether or not it promotes good relations and understanding. When interpreted and practiced at their best, 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 is operated is 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. We should remain under the umbrella of the University, yet build and maintain a distinct identity of our 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 struc-

---

*In actuality, these goals go back to the original goal of universities, 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 Tréωu meaning faithful or trustworthy, and truth derives from Old English tréowuθ which is akin to Old High German getriuωida meaning fidelity or trustiness. Even in Modern English the superlative of true is truest which is but a short phonological step from trust. The point is that the goals of better relations and understanding give the Center a mandate to be personal in everything we do.
tured 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 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 adminis-
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tered by this Institute for several years, including the Translation Program, the East-West Center Library, the East-West Center Press, and the Conference Program.

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 time the writer arrived in the late 1960’s, it had become apparent that the Center had reached the upper limit of its creative potential. A new plan had to be drawn up and implemented. Somehow, content, 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 to be greater than the sum of its parts, is there a focus around which these elements could be rearranged in order to provide more dynamism?

The plan developed called for the integration of East-West Center activities around problems and reorganization into problem-oriented programs. Such programs were felt to be academic in nature and content but not copies of university programs. Whereas the university is organized around scholars from one discipline who work in departments presided over by chairmen, the Center would be organized around problems, with scholars from many disciplines in institutes presided over by directors. Whereas scholars in university departments are called a faculty and members are normally attached to a single campus, Center scholars would be called a team and members would be attached to other campuses, East and West. Continuity would be provided by the director and the staff
who are in residence at the Center. It was felt that this kind of organization would not only provide the identity and initiative that the Center needs, but also could enliven the entire academic endeavor on the Manoa campus of the University of Hawaii.

Furthermore, we defined a problem as the gap that exists between what is and what could be, or possibly what should be. Values are thus built squarely into our programs. We do not try to tell the rest of the world what their values should be, but the question of the values inherent in the problems is constantly before us. And since our programs attempt to deal with live data, i.e., real problems and actual people, these values must be considered seriously.

On July 1, 1970, the East-West 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, food processes, population dynamics, and technology and development. A category of open grants was retained to provide flexibility, allowing degree students and researchers to come to the Center whose interests are not directly relevant to the programs of the institutes.

Each institute brings degree students, non-degree students, professionals, researchers, and substantive staff members together to work on areas of common professional concern. As interests and knowledge are shared, cultural interchange develops at both the intellectual and social levels. 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 by Congress. Sec-

-21-
ondly, cultural and intellectual interchange becomes a basic element of each program, not merely an extracurricular activity.

The organization of the Center around problems of common East-West concern has provided it with the capability of relating to the emerging world of the fourth quarter of the twentieth century, to fill in some of the gaps of more traditional educational institutions, and to develop a better method of working toward its goals. Each of the activities the Center is engaged in is no doubt being tested or practiced at some institution some place. However, the matrix of dimensions built into the East-West Center may be our most innovative accomplishment. I would like to describe the many facets of our programs and relate them both to our goals and to the conditions discussed above.

The design of our problem-oriented programs enhances the emergence 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
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 actual 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 the very reason for which the Center was established. And it should equip men 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 men come to learn their interdependence and, when this is done across national and cultural boundaries, men’s minds are moved toward a world sensitivity, a world consciousness. This interdependence and interaction create a supranational 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 not often been practiced 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, men 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 response 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 men 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.

The international or cross-cultural character of our institutions has potential for strong epistemological impact. In his profound little book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962), Thomas S. Kuhn describes how scientific paradigms change. Normal science moves along on the assumption that the scientist knows what the world is like. This common assumption enhances cooperation. Along comes an anomaly which can no longer be accounted for within the old paradigm. After a great deal of research, the scientific community finally adopts a new set of assumptions which change the paradigm, shatter traditions, and generate scientific revolution.
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Led by a new paradigm, scientists adopt new instruments and look in new places. Even more important, during revolutions scientists see new and different things when looking with familiar instruments in places they have looked before. (p. 110) What a man sees depends both upon what he looks at and also upon what his previous visual-conceptual experience has taught him to see. (p. 112)

Different cultures have different ways of thinking about and perceiving reality. Thus, international and cross-cultural cooperation has profound implications for our world. On the one hand, people from different cultures working together are more likely to arrive at a scientific paradigm which will be more universally valid, and on the other they will be able to use this paradigm more effectively to make common cause in attacking problems. Gunnar Myrdal has pointed out the inadequacy of Western concepts and theories to the development problem of Asia. He calls the Western approach a biased approach and then goes on to say:

Economic theorists, more than other social scientists, have long been disposed to arrive at general propositions and then postulate them as valid for every time, place and culture.... For such confidence in the constraints of economic reasoning, there is no empirical justification... The very concepts used in their construction aspire to a universal applicability that they do not in fact possess. (Asian Drama, p. 16)

We can speculate that a new paradigm may in turn give the Westerner -- or the Easterner--a new instrument, so that he will begin to see new things when he looks into his own society.

Finally, within the problem-oriented program the learner is given the opportunity to participate in decisions, and to do
so cross-culturally. This helps people learn not only how decisions are made but also some of the dimensions of cross-cultural decision-making. With the increasing interactivity of the world, especially with the rise of the large trans-national corporations, misunderstandings are constantly generated. People in such situations must learn to practice restraint until they ascertain whether or not they have understood the message intended by the speaker. Much unnecessary emotional encounter can be avoided, and the possibility enhanced of maintaining understanding. In other words, people learn how to become solution-oriented.

The people involved in programs have to deal with the future. Depending upon one’s outlook on life, the future can be either apprehensive or hopeful.

The decade of the seventies is not likely to be smooth. While some nations seek technological advance, others are having to cope with technology’s runaway effects. All face the impact of major change and its unsettling consequences. Dare we hope that in such a time the efforts of persons of good will to surmount their differences in a resolute attempt to solve their common problems will make a difference? Things usually most need doing when they are hardest to do—when stress imposes simultaneously the stubborn resistance to, and the urgent necessity for, getting on with the attempt. In any case, it is our duty, in times of stress most of all, to carry forward the search for understanding.
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