THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY AND ITS FUTURE IN ZIMBABWE

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE PAPERS
THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY AND ITS FUTURE IN ZIMBABWE

International Conference Papers

Edited by:
Dr. N.T. Chideya
Dr. C.E.M. Chikomba
Dr. A.J.C. Pongweni
L.C. Tsikirayi, Esq.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The University is most grateful to:
The Carnegie Corporation of New York for their very generous contribution of US$40,000 towards the cost of the Conference.
The Nedlaw Investment & Trust Corporation Limited for making available to the Conference the use of their staff bus.
The Mayor and City Council of Harare for welcoming our international visitors.
The Zimbabwe Promotion Council for providing us with Conference folders.
# CONTENTS

**FOREWORD**  
by Professor Walter J. Kamba  

**General Introduction** by the Editors  

**Chapter 1**  
**Opening Speech** by the Prime Minister, the Honourable Robert G. Mugabe, M.P.  

**Chapter 2**  
**The University in Times of Change** by Professor Asavia Wandira, Vice-Chancellor, Makerere University  

**Chapter 3**  
**The Role of the University in Development: Some Sociological and Philosophical Considerations** by Professor Ralf Dahrendorf, Director, London School of Economics and Political Science  

**Chapter 4**  
**The Relationship between the University and Government** by Professor Hasu H. Patel, University of Zimbabwe  

**Chapter 5**  
**University Reform: Changing the University to meet new needs** by Dr. Herbert M. Murerwa, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Manpower Planning and Development  

**Chapter 6**  
**University Curriculum and Research** by Professor Deitrich Goldschmidt, Director of Max-Planck Institute, and Dr. Rukudzo Murapa, Dean of Social Studies, University of Zimbabwe  

**Chapter 7**  
**The University in the Third World: Comparative Perspectives** by Professor Philip G. Altbach, Director, Comparative Education Centre, State University of New York at Buffalo  

**Chapter 8**  
**The University: From this time on** by Professor Walter J. Kamba, Vice-Chancellor, University of Zimbabwe  

**Appendix 1**  
Conference Programme  

**Appendix 2**  
List of International Visitors
FOREWORD

by
Professor W.J. Kamha
Principal and Vice-Chancellor
University of Zimbabwe

This book is a record of the papers which were read at the Conference on the Role of the University and its Future in Zimbabwe, held on this campus in September 1981.

It was perhaps the most important Conference in the history of this University. It was attended by an impressive group of scholars from Africa and abroad, and Government leaders. The papers were highly scholarly, and the debate which followed each presentation was very stimulating and thought-provoking.

This collection of essays constitutes a book of readings for students interested in problems of university development in Zimbabwe in particular, and in Africa in general, and those interested in university reform and the politics of higher education.

I must, on behalf of the University, express my gratitude to the Carnegie Corporation of New York for making it possible for us to hold the Conference, and subsequently for enabling us to publish these papers. To the participants who contributed immensely to the Conference; and to the Organising Committee for a job well done, I, also, express my profound gratitude.
Introduction

The new nation of Zimbabwe was born on 18th April, 1980. Consequently, independence ushered in an era characterised by radical changes in all aspects of national life. Institutions and organizations of all types and at all levels had to look at themselves in the light of the new order. Indeed, the reverberations of Zimbabwe’s attainment of nationhood were to be felt at all levels of Society, including the University.

Developments during our first year of independence had a traumatic effect on the University and created a need for
(a) greater emphasis on the role of the University in National Development;
(b) greater communication between the University and Government, and between the University and the Community;
(c) the University to expand rapidly to meet the country’s needs.

It is axiomatic that the effectiveness of the University’s response to the above national goals inevitably depends on the ability of the University to discuss, examine, re-examine, criticise and investigate ideas, indeed, to redefine and refine its goals and objectives in the new order.

To this end, it was decided that the University should organize an International Conference which would
(a) focus the attention of the international community, as well as Zimbabwe, on the University;
(b) discuss the role of the University in the development of Zimbabwe;
(c) discuss the nature of changes which the University should implement so as to complement those changes that had taken, and were taking place in the Society at large;
(d) discuss the nature of the relationship between the University and Government and between the University and industry;
(e) discuss the nature of the international relationships which might develop in the future.

The Conference was opened by the Prime Minister of the Republic of Zimbabwe, the Honourable Comrade Robert G. Mugabe M.P., a scholar in his own right. Papers were given by such scholars of international repute as Professor Asavia Wandira, Vice-Chancellor of Makerere University; Professor Rolf Dahrendorf, Director of the London School of Economics and Political Science; Professor H.H. Patel, Head of the Department of Political Science at the University of Zimbabwe; Professor Philip G. Altbach, Director of the Comparative Education Centre at the State University of New York at Buffalo; Professor Dietrich Goldschmidt, Director of the Max-Planck-Institute of Educational Research in the Federal Republic of Germany; Professor Tibor Palankai, Vice Rector at Karl Marx University in Hungary; and Dr. Herbert Murerwa, Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Manpower Planning and Development, himself a former academic of note.

Several other people, both local and international, including Vice-Chancellors of several African Universities participated in the Conference.

Perhaps the highlight of the Conference was the installation of Professor Walter Joseph Kamba as the first black Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Zimbabwe on the 8th of September, 1981. The installation was symbolic of a new beginning; of a new chapter in the annals of the history of the University. Indeed, it was an historic event in the life of the University.

The theme of the Conference was “The Role of the University and its future in Zimbabwe”. All the papers and speeches touched on this theme in varying degrees. The debate which resulted from the presentations was of a remarkably high standard. If anything, one thing became very clear, that is, the question of the role to be played by the University is by no
means limited to Zimbabwe alone. It is an age-old question the world over. Thus the question to which various speakers addressed themselves was not whether or not the University had any role to play in society, but what role it had to play within the context of a given society, for example, in Zimbabwe.

The Prime Minister, in his opening speech, insisted that the University which had hovered in the outer space of foreign ideas, and practices . . . ‘should now effect a re-entry into the African atmosphere . . . and plant its feet firmly on our African soil’. He asked the University to review its curriculum, its institutional governance mechanisms, as well as its role in cadre-formation.

Professor Wandira, in his keynote address, ‘The University in Times of Change’ spoke of the ‘need for the University to recognise the changes that have taken place and to seek a new role, a new mandate, a new accommodation . . .’

As if to underline the controversial nature of the theme, Professor Dahrendorf disputed the view that a University should be relevant. In advocating an independent, ‘purist’ type of University he argued: ‘Who-ever demands from a University that it be relevant throughout, that it responds to external demands in everything it does, destroys by the same token the heart of academic inquiry’. But our counter-argument would be that the above position is only tenable in those countries (if any) which can afford such luxuries and in fact it is an exercise in idealism. As was to be shown in the ensuing debate, the question of relevance could not be ignored.

Professor Patel in his paper, “The Relationship between the University and Government”, made reference to the unequal partnership between the University and Government, with the University as the junior partner. He highlighted some of the controversial aspects in University governance, the impending Bill to replace the Royal Charter. In his conclusion, he reiterated Professor Mazrui’s advice that a University owes the government of the day neither defiance nor subservience but intelligent co-operation.

Professor Goldschmidt and Dr. Murapa, in their joint submission, “The University Curriculum and Research : Some Priorities” prepared at very short notice, gave a well-argued response to the Prime Minister’s call for relevance in curricula and research. They stressed the need for the University to consider curricula reform in such areas as subjects taught, vocation-orientated courses, improvement of teaching/learning methods, combination of theory with practice, duration of courses, development of teaching materials, and the consequent increase of staff and facilities.

Dr. H. Murerwa, in his paper “University Reform: Changing the University to meet new needs” showed how the imported model had failed to respond adequately to the needs of African countries. He discussed the potential role of the University as an agent for change particularly in the realm of high-level manpower development.

Professor Altbach, in his paper, “The University in the Third World: Comparative Perspectives” dwelt on the character of international intellectual/academic inequalities, on comparative aspects of university governance, university reform, politics and higher education, curriculum, expansion. Professor Altbach concluded: “Without question, the experience of others can be useful and the lessons of the past and other nations may help to broaden perspectives and inform policy decisions. At the very least, expensive errors might well be avoided”.

Professor Palankai, in his paper “University and Industry in Hungary” (not reproduced here) discussed at length the nature of higher education in Hungary. However, of interest to Zimbabwe, were these points: that the main objectives for the institutes and university of economics was to train professionals and experts for government and industry; that there was direct involvement of industry in university through membership of university governance bodies, through a system of honorary professorships whereby people from government, industry and research institutes participate in university teaching; direct involvement of the professionate in decision-making in government and industry; the requirement that all students should spend some time in practical situations; university participation in government initiated research; university participation in applied research sponsored by industry; university's own research into curriculum development; and, evening and correspondence education for those, who, for a variety of reasons, cannot attend university on a full time basis.

Professor Kamba, in his closing address “The University: From This Time On” outlined his vision of the University. Without being oblivious of some good work which had been done
in the past, he pointed out the areas in which there was need for change. He called for
greater co-operation and closer communication between the University and Government;
for greater relevance of the curriculum and research; for democratisation of university
governance structures; for lesser dependence on expatriate staff; and for greater
commitment on the part of all staff to the University of Zimbabwe.

GENERAL REMARKS
The Conference was, in the words of Professor Patel, the most important conference held
at the University in the last decade, if not over the entire period of its existence. It afforded
the University the opportunity of examining itself critically. The recurring sub-themes in all
the sessions were the need for the University to be relevant to its environment; the need for
certain reforms particularly in the area of university governance.
The Conference was held at a time when there was a great deal of talk about a new Act of
Parliament to replace the Royal Charter. As this book goes to press, the Act has not yet
been promulgated. However, the Principal and Vice-Chancellor has initiated several
reforms.
On 26th October, 1981, he issued a directive which effectively Zimbabweanised academic
appointments. The directive stated that non-Zimbabweans could be appointed only when it
had been established that no Zimbabweans were available. In effect, whenever a
Zimbabwean and a non-Zimbabwean with identical or similar qualifications were
competing for either academic or non-academic posts, the Zimbabwean should be
preferred.
On 13th November 1981, he announced that he had created a Working Party whose terms
of reference were: "to examine and make recommendations concerning the organization
and functioning of academic departments in the University, including the appointment,
term of office and role of heads of departments; and the nature and extent of departmental
participation in the appointment and promotion of academic members of a department".
On 12th January 1982, he announced that he had created a Commission under the
Chairmanship of the Vice Principal and Deputy Vice-Chancellor to examine the causes of
the high failure rate at the University in 1981. The findings are bound to have wide ranging
implications for the University in such areas as the quality of teaching, the learning
environment, student counseling services and the like.
These are only three of a number of significant steps which have been taken in the exercise
to realise the goals and objectives of the University in the new situation.

The Editors
CHAPTER 1
OPENING SPEECH
by
Cde. Hon. R.G. Mugabe, M.P.
Prime Minister of the Republic of Zimbabwe

I regard it as a very great honour, indeed a singular one, to have been invited to open this International Conference on the Role of the University and its Future in Zimbabwe. This Conference dovetails neatly into the Ministry of Education and Culture's seminar on the Past, Present and Future of Education in Zimbabwe, which ended today and which I also had the pleasure of opening ten days ago. The planners and sponsors of these two obviously related and complementary events deserve all the accolades they have won for their success in organising what in effect amounts to a sustained and unprecedented examination of the entire educational enterprise in our country.

But before proceeding, let me in my capacity as Prime Minister of this young Republic, welcome to our country and to our capital city all the distinguished guests and prominent scholars from other countries, near and far, who have come to participate in this Conference. We extend a very warm welcome to you all. We are confident that the deliberations of this Conference will be enlivened and enriched by your participation, for the wealth and diversity of academic experiences and intellectual traditions you bring with you to this Conference can only inject a broader dimension and perspective into these deliberations.

The international character of the Conference assures that discussion will not take place within too parochial a frame of reference. And as we are a young country with an equally young University, we look forward to deriving much of value from the contributions of those who are here representing older established institutions of higher learning around the globe.

To ask what the role of the University is in Zimbabwe or, for that matter, in any other country at a comparable stage of development, is at once to ask what the role of the University has been down the centuries. What the University reflects today in respect of its organisation and mission is, to a large extent, the image of its origins and history.

And while it is true that institutions and practices change, change is not synonymous with obliteration. Typically, change is a dialectical process. It is dialectical in the particular sense in which the new incorporates the old or, putting it slightly differently, in which the old gives way to the new but without itself thereby suffering complete liquidation or displacement. In this sense, the past is also the present. Not infrequently, in fact, the baggage of the past weighs so heavily upon the present that the elements of change appear at best imperceptible, at worst conjectural. It is then that, in given circumstances and in respect of social institutions, radical or revolutionary change presents itself as the only strategy for overcoming the oppressive weight of the past.

The Modern African University is a creature of colonialism and in varying degrees bears the stamp of that genesis. I would like to revert to this aspect a little later in my speech if I may.

The Mission of the University, as I understand it, has traditionally encompassed three main elements. Firstly, universities have put considerable emphasis on their role as teaching institutions, that is as centres for the advancement, dissemination, and communication of knowledge of all kinds. This function of the University is evidently crucial even today. Yet the teaching function, however effectively discharged, should not be seen in isolation from the substance of what is taught. We must therefore ask whether what the African University teaches has any measurable relation to the needs and interests of contemporary Africa. This is a matter I would like to return to in a moment.

Secondly, and closely related to the foregoing, universities have traditionally served as
repositories of knowledge. This role is expressed and manifested concretely through the physical assets without which no institution can deserve the name of a University - libraries, document depositories, archives, and computers. Clearly, the concept of a University as a repository of knowledge cannot be given a static connotation, in as much as the volume and variety of such knowledge is changing constantly. Old concepts, old “facts”, old “truths” are constantly being challenged, refined, up-dated or discarded altogether. This is as it should be for the true University is a dynamic organism, not a museum.

Finally, the traditional role of the University has included the aspect of research. Research extends the frontiers of knowledge and, where it concerns itself with matters of social significance rather than trivia, holds out the possibility of providing solutions to vexing societal problems. Research must, therefore, be at the centre of the University’s activities. But it must be socially relevant research. Practically all great advances in science have been made in the effort to find answers or solutions to practical problems. Hence, the belief that scientific discoveries are fortuitous or are unrelated to any practical social purpose must be rejected.

There are, however, two observations to be made in respect of the traditional “uses of the University,” to borrow a phrase from Professor Clark Kerr. The first is that, in defining and carrying out its mission, the University operates within the confines and constraints of a particular time, place, and above all, cultural milieu. If it is the function of the University to dispense knowledge, this process is necessarily coloured by, and is responsive to, a particular social context, a particular national reality.

As Raymond Williams has noted in his book, The Long Revolution: “It is not only that the way in which education is organised can be seen to express, consciously and unconsciously, the wider organisation of a culture and society, so that what has been thought of as a single distribution (of knowledge) is in fact an active shaping to particular social ends. It is also that the content of education, which is subject to great historical variations, again expresses, again both consciously and unconsciously, certain basic elements in the culture, what is thought of as “an education” being in fact a particular selection, a particular set of emphasis and omissions.”

The second observation to make is that the traditional functions of the University, laudable though they are, definitely require supplementation if the University is to constitute, as it must, a vital component of the institutional nexus that sustains our modern civilisation and propels it toward higher levels of development in the service of mankind. In this respect, and having regard especially to the African situation, we insist that the African University must not merely exist and operate in Africa. It must sink its roots into the African soil, from which it derives its sustenance. The African University can not be a mere carbon copy of alien institutions.

As the late President Kwame Nkrumah put it in 1956: “We must in the development of our university bear in mind that once it had been planted in African soil it must take root amidst African traditions and culture.” More specifically, the African University must be actively engaged in what the French refer to as cadre-formation, that is, the “training of the minds of men” and the extension of their skill horizons with a view to meeting urgent national needs. Cadre-formation, is, as I see it, the intellectual and emotional transformation of an individual in the positive direction which equips and enables him to play a constructive role, interacting both vertically and horizontally with the roles of other transformed cadres in the organised pattern of a society’s politico-socio-economic endeavours to grapple with its developmental problems.

Our own University, now twenty-four years old, should play a significant role in ensuring this transformative process, and yet in many crucial respects, it continues to bear the imprint of its colonial past. While efforts are being made to change this institution at the level of structures and provide a new definition of its mission in the new Zimbabwe, I cannot but observe that the change which has been brought about to date falls far short of the ideal which Kwame Nkrumah portrayed as that of an institution that transcends its foreign origins and identity, and becomes fully integrated into its socio-cultural environment.

We simply cannot brook for example, a curriculum that puts emphasis on the study of foreign peoples and institutions, while remaining largely silent on the history and meaning of the Zimbabwean Revolution. Moreover, studies in African sociology, geography, economics, history and other disciplines have had their curricula and content so designed
that in the majority of cases, they have served more the interest of imperialism and capitalism than the interest of Africa and the new social order of its territories.

The situation does not change because African scholars are engaged in the investigation of the problems of these studies, because they act nothing more than as a channel of academic imperialism. What problems are investigated and what paradigms are employed in their investigation are both matters of the utmost importance. In other words, the scope and orientation of our University studies must take into account, as a matter of duty, the scope and orientation of our socio-economic system and try to serve and, indeed, save it while taking cognisance of the world context in which it exists.

Further, we must surely question mechanisms of institutional governance and decision-making that eschew democracy and remain as living symbols of the racism and authoritarianism of the colonial era. This institution must, in other words, relate adequately, positively, and meaningfully to our society now caught up, as it is, in the throes of a multilised process of transformation.

I have referred to cadre-formation as an important function of the University today, but we must also understand that training people is one thing, imparting an appropriate and relevant orientation is another. Our universities will have failed us if their products turn out to be imbued with an individualistic, elitist, and reactionary outlook more suited to other social environments perhaps, but certainly fundamentally at odds with our circumstances, perspectives, and aspirations. We must at all costs ensure that the young women and men who come out of our institutions of higher learning have a socialist, people-centred orientation.

Individualists who put themselves first and society after, and would rather society served them first, are anathema to the society we wish to build. They constitute a dangerous intellectual bourgeoisie in our midst. We already have many members of this clan, and may the University save our society from the perpetuation of their clan. To achieve this, we must ensure that we do not perpetuate at this institution or any other like it, the tragic posture and image of the African University and the African student so graphically captured in Professor Joel Barkan’s book, An African Dilemma, wherein it is observed.

"The world of the African University student is a rarefied one, for he lives in a realm which less than one per cent of his countrymen of the same age ever see. His time is monopolised by an institution which is both physically and spiritually removed from the society which surrounds it. He attends class and resides on a campus that forms a self-contained community, segregated from the rural areas where he was raised, and often detached from the main urban centre of his country as well. With few exceptions, the University which he attends has not attempted to create its own identity and academic traditions, preferring instead to imitate those found in the land of the former colonial power. Even though his country has been independent for several years, many of his teachers continue to be white expatriates."

It cannot, in the light of this, be a surprise to anyone that we should demand that the African University shall acclimatise itself to the African environment. We insist that if the African University has hitherto, for whatever reason, hovered in the outer space of foreign ideas, and practices, it should now effect a re-entry into the African atmosphere and, if I may change the metaphor, plant its feet firmly on our African soil. In particular, we insist that our own University shall convert itself from a University in Zimbabwe into a genuine and authentic University of Zimbabwe. Its structure and procedures must be rationalised and infused with a democratic content. Its curriculum, while not confined to, must necessarily lay considerable emphasis on our national realities in all their diversity and interconnections. It must equip its graduates with the necessary intellectual tools to enable them to take their full part in the resolution of the problems we face as a nation. Indeed, as they pursue their studies in whatever field, our students must, as our friend President Mwalimu Julius Nyerere has put it, regard themselves as the people's "servants-in-training."

If I, in some ways an outsider, sound as if I am laying out a programme of University reform, the reason is simple. To paraphrase that famous aphorism about generals and war: higher education is too important a business to be left entirely to deans, professors, lecturers and University administrators. More pertinently, the need for change is clearly recognised in
the theme of this conference: the Role of the University and its Future in Zimbabwe. The key phrase here is its future. If, as an American, David S. Jordan, has asserted, "the true American University lies in the future," the same is even truer of the African University. More so than its American counterpart, the African University lacks a local identity and, barring a few exceptions, has not even begun self-critically to conceptualise and advance a theory of its purpose and function. A conference such as the present one is thus to be welcomed. It puts the spotlight on the University's capacity to put the spotlight on its environment to the advantage of our society.
CHAPTER 2
THE UNIVERSITY IN TIMES OF CHANGE
by Professor Asavia Wandira

BY WAY OF PRELIMINARIES

Let me first of all express my gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, for bestowing upon me the honour of delivering this first address to the Conference. I am well aware of the close comparisons often made between the recent history of Zimbabwe and that of Uganda, and between the state of the University of Zimbabwe and that of Makerere University. Our two universities share with others in Africa a history that goes back to colonial times, to the period of Special Relations with the University of London, and to membership of the Association of Commonwealth Universities. But our two Universities differ from many others in that the misfortunes of our political environment, have in recent years meant the isolation of our institutions from other universities. We share the effects and emotions of that period as well as the devastating effects of liberation wars. Further, we share the upsurge of hope on the part of our people upon the restoration to full international interaction of our countries. These special circumstances have of late meant that you, Mr. Chairman and many of your distinguished leaders, have shared platforms with Ugandans seeking the ear of the same sympathetic friends. On the grounds of our common history, I am glad to be here.

I doubt, however, if special circumstances alone can explain my present role at the Conference. I am not unmindful of the presence of so many academic leaders from the Africa Region. I am tempted to emphasize that their presence here suggests a vivid African presence. I am also mindful of the presence of so many of our friends from far beyond this continent, lending to this Conference the international flavour and stature the University of Zimbabwe deserves. I should like, on their behalf, to convey to you Mr. Chairman, our gratitude for the invitation to come here, to congratulate you upon assuming the duties of Principal and Vice-Chancellor of this esteemed institution, and upon your imagination in calling this Conference. Our presence here symbolises the brotherly comradeship of millions in the university world who admire Zimbabwe and her courageous and enthusiastic people. We salute the determination of your university to map out new directions for the future, a future filled with hopes of change and development.

Unfortunately, my privilege to speak now brings no immediate comfort or solution to the problems which your university may be experiencing in these times of change. The management of universities at any time — changing or non-changing — is not yet a perfect science, not even a science of alternatives. In your search for a role for the University of Zimbabwe in the years immediately ahead, I can offer no models of perfection. For, in spite of concerted efforts over the last two decades in Independent Africa, there is no agreed model or set of models for university involvement with the national economy or polity. Instead, there have been prolonged discussions followed by a growing realisation that the search for new models for the University of Africa cannot yet be ended. Nor can I escape from the necessity for me to suggest a model for Zimbabwe, by pointing-to a "World University Model", sometimes suggested by some scholars. There is not yet a globalized model whose idea and structure I would recommend you replicate in Zimbabwe. I must therefore ask you to treat me with the same tolerance that you would afford your economic advisers describing alternatives on the one hand and options on the other. Hopefully, you will not, like the famous industrialist in search of practical solutions, advise me to become one-handed. In mitigation, let me express the hope that the practical experience of Makerere University and that of other universities in our neighbourhood — which will form the background of my remarks — will throw some light upon your problems. Hopefully too, by speaking of the dilemmas I have witnessed at first hand in the institution-building and reconstruction in Uganda, I may be permitted to share a few worries and to ask if such worries could be avoided in your case.
II  BASIC ASSUMPTIONS.

Allow me at this stage to draw your attention to the basic assumptions behind this Conference.

(i)  Times of Change

There is first of all the assumption that major changes have taken place or are in progress; that a new disposition exists; that there is therefore a need for the University to recognise the changes that have taken place and to seek a new role, a new mandate, a new accommodation. Alternatively, it may be argued that the University can no longer operate as if changes did not take place and must in its own interest seek a new mode, a new metaphor. The time for institutional change is therefore now or very soon. Deliberate and sustained efforts must be made not only to change the university — so as to seek a new accommodation — but, and significantly, to throw the weight of the university behind change and, wherever possible, to tilt the balance of forces in favour of over-all change.

No one who has come to Zimbabwe, even for a few days, can fail to be impressed by the air of expectancy, the new confidence of the people and their enthusiasm for change. It is a joy to meet such people and an even greater joy to see their daily application to the search for change and development. A people that have reached the cross-roads and remained open to new ideas is a great asset for change, for they define a threshold situation which is the greatest opportunity for new leadership. Here in Zimbabwe, one is unavoidably reminded of the first decade of African Independence. A continent, hitherto regarded as conservative and hardly touched by change, spoke and acted as if change was a foregone conclusion. During that decade, the continent spoke with a distaste of colonial institutions, asserted independence and nation hood, stressed development and assumed the institutional irrelevance of all that was colonial and past. I do not say that all the assertions made during that decade were correct. Nor do I claim that good use was made of the opportunities of that decade. I must say, however, that it is not surprising if major changes in the political order in Zimbabwe, like similar changes elsewhere, should create a disposition in which the university feels obliged to re-examine its role and future. The very success of a major change in the political order sets precedent for and encourages thoughts of further change in other directions. Indeed the experience of effecting change in the political order can be used in at least suggesting change in other areas. In this regard, Zimbabwe seems singularly well poised for contemplating change. A nation once locked in the catastrophe of war, has learnt how to pull-back from the brink of self-destruction. The new Zimbabwe is fast re-applying its resources and energies to development in other directions. The material and technological foundation for a new society in Zimbabwe is fast being laid. In the re-direction of its resources, Zimbabwe has the advantage of a more advanced technological and industrial base, a larger pool of educated and skilled manpower and a national consciousness borne out of war, far greater than many an African country could count upon at the time of Independence. Above all, Zimbabwe has a determined leadership in all sections of society which is admired far and wide.

The main question that remains is whether the advantages that Zimbabwe has at this time of major political change, also suggest a fundamental change in the nature of society — its values, its spirit and its attitudes. We must ask this question because major changes in the polity and the economy do often lead to changes in the values, spirit and attitudes of a community. Sometimes, however, there can be cosmetic change in society. Those who study change must not therefore limit themselves to the polity or the economy. They must look further and more deeply. Only then can the desirability of major change in university be fully ascertained. Some assumption about the meaning of change in society is a prelude to the examination of change in its institutions.

Where, therefore, changes are assumed to have taken place or to be taking place, where the university is under pressure to change, the first responsibility of the university is to understand change, to take the lead in describing, analysing, and monitoring change, and to propagate its findings. Without proper understanding of change, there will be the danger of everybody talking about the same thing, without knowing its magnitude, effect or distribution. There will also be the danger that those less well-equipped to describe the magnitude of change will become the prophets of further change and will, if left to themselves, determine the directions of change — without adequate assessment.

In making this first suggestion as to the role of the university in times of change, I do not wish to say that the university is or should regard itself as the sole agent for spreading the
understanding of the meaning of change. I accept that there are other agents —
government, party, church, voluntary associations, mass media, etc. I do want to say,
however, that the university must be in the forefront of understanding, monitoring and
determination of what has happened and must keep the company of those who express
concern for change. Lack of involvement in this early and grassroots determination of
change, can only hinder the university’s own vision of its future role.

Indeed a future role there must be. Perhaps none more urgent than the University’s
determination whether or not to respond to change and, as I have stated, whether or not to
throw its weight behind change. Alternatively, university must determine whether or not
to engage in efforts to change the very meaning of change. This must inevitably involve
the university in direct dialogue, sometimes battle, with other institutions of society — about
what is desirable and most valuable in society and about the limits of what is envisaged as
change. I have no doubt that such a role could be a risky undertaking, especially for the
leaders of the university. However, I do not envisage a satisfying role for a university, if all
that a university will do, is to receive and respond to change. I do not envisage a satisfied
university which merely regards itself as the victim of circumstance, the victim and slave of
change. Ultimately, it is the university that loves and cherishes change that can remain at
the centre of it — and to love and cherish are not possible without some contact, real or
imaginary.

I also wish to say that while discussion at this Conference must necessarily centre around
university, it has to be borne in mind that the university is not the only institution that
should accept, cherish and love change. It would be wrong not to stress that change affects
other institutions of society: Government — notions and structures of government; party;
civil service, the judiciary, church; industry — a whole host of institutions and bodies are
affected by and in turn affect change. I emphasize this wider context of change, because all
too often those who criticize university for not changing fast enough, do far too little to set
the example of change in their own backyard.

Let me now turn to the second of the major assumptions behind this Conference.

(ii) National Consensus.
The work of this Conference would be greatly eased if it could be stated that national
consensus about the meaning of change has been or is capable of being achieved soon.
Again, one is compelled to stress this aspect because the time-lag between the birth of a
new polity and the establishment of national consensus has sometimes been filled with
agonies whose very existence inhibits further change.

Universities like to feel that they are non-partisan national institutions — open to all
without discrimination on grounds of sex, tribe or belief and towering above all these
particulars, to propagate the universal. If, however, universities must seek a major role in
the changes and particulars of their time, they need to be re-assured that they are not
supporting one group of men against another, that the changes sought have general
support and will endure the test of time, at least the time it takes to change institutions. It is
wasteful to start changes at university which must be abandoned before their time of
fruition. And the sense of insecurity which results in such circumstances, will necessarily
encourage the maintenance of the status quo. It would therefore be helpful to university, if
there was national consensus as to the major changes sought by society. Let me again
remind you of the first decade of African Independence; full of assertions about the value of
independence, national unity and development. It was also a decade followed by a growing
difference as to the meaning of these very notions; the meaning of independence, from
whom and by what mechanisms. Arguments persisted as to the basis and apparatus for
national unity. Consensus about the meaning of development became eroded (Wolfe,
1978). The contribution of universities to the development of their nations remained a
moot point (Court 1980). And so, lack of consensus on these important notions, inhibited
change. Its establishment and maintenance would have been important to the formulation
of concepts helpful to changes in the University.

Again, it may be argued that one possible role of the University in times of change lies in
encouraging national consensus, acting as catalyst in the establishment of the common
understanding of major issues affecting society. In this regard, it is with some nostalgia
that one recalls the role of Makerere in the first decade of Uganda’s independence. While
places for public debate became fewer and fewer outside the University, Makerere
remained an island of refuge, a platform where government and opposition leaders argued
in the open, before mature and critical audiences, the major issues affecting Uganda
society. Again with some nostalgia, one must add that in many modern democracies, party platforms and even Parliament have ceased to be the chambers for mature, non-partisan, national debate. The quest for power has come to dominate strategy and debate. Many nations are the poorer for lack of a platform where academics, politicians, senior civil servants and ordinary people can debate national issues outside the power structures. Can universities in the new nations of Africa offer this platform? Do we need specially created institutions, like the Australian National University in Canberra, before we can expect this role to be discharged by universities? What options has a university got in the parameter of the one-country-one-university (Wandira 1978)? Fortunately, the situation in Zimbabwe offers some hope. Here, as I have observed, a leadership has emerged and demonstrated a unique capacity for realism. Such realism increases the chances of establishing consensus, taking account of national realities and laying a practical basis for moving the nation forward. As part of that realism, I would make a special plea for the University of Zimbabwe to be allowed to play host to all manner of ideas, to examine those ideas and to arrive at consensus through vigorous interchange, in which persons in and outside the university will freely participate.

Perhaps I should add that my description of the desirability of national consensus, the dangers of its absence and my admiration of the way the Zimbabwe leadership has sought to establish it here, should not be read to mean that the university as an institution must at all times feel duty-bound to follow, support, preserve or promote the existing consensus. I am all too well aware of the internal contributions which beleaguer universities and prevent them from achieving and maintaining consensus on any issue — university or national. The many estates of the university are often at logger-heads. Within each estate, conflicts between groups and individuals exist. The most common state of the university is one of dissensus, not consensus. No one should be surprised if some persons on campus — staff or students — were not agreed about what is commonly accepted as national consensus or if they wished for freedom, within the framework of the law, to work towards a transformation of the elements of that consensus. A quiet university may be rather nice to have and may cause leaders fewer headaches. This, however, is not necessarily the most interesting or exciting place to work and learn in. A national institution set aside for the sharpening of the mind must surely do better than this.

It remains for me to emphasize that there is no freedom without responsibility. My plea for a university at the centre of, sometimes upsetting, the national consensus must be immediately qualified. Institutions and individuals, be they academic or not, working in delicately balanced societies, bear great responsibility when considering whether or not to act in contradiction of national consensus. There are times in the affairs of men, when greater service to society lies in silence, when the articulation of the things that bind men is more important than in the propagation of those that divide them. Should that time ever arise in Zimbabwe, the responsible use of knowledge by university men will exercise the very conscience of the institution.

(iii) University Capacity for Change

Permit me now to briefly turn to the third assumption underlying this Conference: namely, that the University of Zimbabwe must develop the capacity to change and to handle change. Such capacity would enable the university to absorb change, to take in new ideas and to adopt new operational models. The hope is that there would develop within the institution itself a dynamism and will to master change, to marshall existing and future resources and to apply them in the pursuit of new objectives. The University would thus avoid a situation where there is more talk about change than change itself.

I need not emphasize the frustration of an institution which wants to change but lacks the capacity or will to do so. Even more frustrating is the situation of a university told to change by national leaders, but denied the resources to do so.

Every existing university seeking change, starts off with a heritage of its own — the plant, the staff, the limited funds, the teeming and restless body of students, the existing curriculum, traditions of the university in general, notions as to what is proper in the university world, the self image of the university etc. It must also reckon with existing notions governing resource allocation to the university and within the university. For instance it will find that many financing arrangements for the university reflect out-moded concepts such as 'payment by results', 'cash on delivery' and, not infrequently, 'cash long after delivery'. Consequently, many a university is faced with constant cash-flow crises and threats of curtailment. In Africa, unlike in Britain or Canada or Australia, these crises do not arise out of falling student population dictated by demographic patterns of their
countries. They coincide with the unprecedented influx of students of all ages, forced upon the university before the university is ready for them. The management problems involved in keeping universities open, attending to their frequent crises, as well as maintaining some dialogue with the rest of the world, are often enough to exhaust the energies of academic leaders most enthusiastic about change. Indeed to preserve those energies and to ensure freshness of mind, academic leaders need regular retreats — in the same way as religious leaders retreat for prayer and contemplation. So much for the poor state of universities called on to change!

Given the constraints under which universities operate, it is important to recognise that building the capacity of the university for change will most probably mean an increase in its resources, a re-definition of the use and deployment of resources, a re-examination of the relationships between men, buildings and materials, the search for academic structures and mechanisms that are more responsive to new needs and that ensure the continued production and productivity of the institution. (I shall have more to say about the problems of achieving these operational ideals). In addition, building the capacity of a university for change means building new concepts of what universities are or should be. The problem of the university which seeks change, lies in how to build an adequate fund of ideas and resources that will enable it to transform itself. The problem is made all the more difficult by the fact that basic changes in university often take time and painful application before they bear fruit. Poor nations sacrificing an ever increasing percentage of their resources to support one university, are anxious for a quick return. Can they afford to pay the cost university reforms will demand? One possible answer lies in the history of the university in Africa. In the last two decades of African development, the dilemmas created by resource scarcity on one hand and the demand for university change and returns to investment on the other, have led to a forced examination of the contribution of the university to development. The hope has been that a university contributing to development will have a more thriving economy to support desirable change at the university. What has not been answered is: What comes first, university change or economic change. The African sentiment was for changes in both at the same time. It is therefore important to examine the emerging "developmental model" of university in Africa.

III THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IDEAL AS A CONCEPT OF UNIVERSITY CHANGE.

(i) Pursuit of Relevance.
Let us then examine in the first instance, the expectation over the last two decades of African Independence, that universities would make a direct contribution to the economic well-being of their nations and the transformation of their societies. Colonial models of the university and their operation were rejected as being irrelevant to the burning national issues of development, and universities were expected to oblige by changing themselves. An era of conflict between the ideals of the emerging societies of Africa and their inherited institutions had set in. So perturbed were African universities themselves that they spoke of creating a new African university. They emphatically declared: "The truly African university must be one that draws its inspiration from its environment, not a transplanted tree, but growing from a seed that is planted and nurtured in the African soil". (Yesufu 1973: 40)

The response to this call for social and economic relevance differed from university to university, and from country to country. By and large, however, no university seemed to have escaped the pressure for change. Areas of response included closer links with government through consultancy services and committee work; emphasis on manpower development and the greater vocationalisation of the curriculum; the use of the local environment in teaching and research; attention to research in specific problems and the establishment of specialised research institutes; multi-disciplinary approaches to research and teaching; work-study programmes, community - involvement and outreach programmes to sensitize students to community problems; national service as an instrument for correcting values and attitudes and for generating new skills; and more flexible admission policies to improve access to the university (Court 1980: 657). Of equal concern,was the building of sizeable cadres of indigenous academic and administration staff (Wandira 1978: 86). Conference after Conference examined university involvement in the training of development activities, while university acceptance of a greater role in non-formal education was seen as an essential part of its development strategy.
All in all, therefore, the concept of what universities could do to enhance social and economic relevance, greatly expanded. So too did the scope for relevance itself.

(ii) Expanding scope for university involvement
In trying to comprehend development which universities were supposed to enhance, many universities found themselves faced with an endless agenda. First, development meant for institutional planners, the increase in the size of universities and an increase in opportunities for university education. Departing colonial regimes had to be replaced. Industrial and managerial manpower was urgently required. There was pressure to expand secondary and higher education. More was better. Universities had to open their doors in a hurry. Then came the need for special kinds of development: entrepreneurial and management development; technological and scientific diffusion; agricultural modernisation; rural development; urban re-development; environment. Soon the dictates of social justice and equality called attention to special groups: minorities, neglected majorities, women, children, the handicapped, and, in more modern jargon, marginal and peripheral groups. The important thing for me to say is that each new emphasis, each new aspect of development, left a new responsibility for university, a new opportunity for it to find relevance.

(iii) Diminishing resources.
Unfortunately, the favourable climate for universities to increase their involvement with the development process, did not coincide with a favourable financial climate in most of the countries of Africa. In a continent starved of all forms of development, the competition for the diminishing cake of the state has been fierce. University budgets have not grown as fast as has the pressure on university to offer additional services. An uncomfortable gap exists between conceptualisation as to role and function on the one hand, and the material base for change in university. Even in oil-rich Nigeria, the temptation has been to expand the university system as a whole, while leaving each individual university as short of funds as would not be suggested by the increased wealth of the nation.

In many African countries the increased pressure on university resources has meant an absolute deterioration in the living and welfare conditions of staff and students. In some instances, the material support for teaching and learning at the university, leaves much to be desired. Water under the financial bridges of universities has dried up.

The diminution in national resources available for university education, has in the 1970’s been followed by a regrettable pull-back in the commitment of external donor agencies to university institutional development. The same agencies that had led the way in calling for relevance, now find themselves unable to support institutions anxious to be relevant. The university in Africa has not only ceased to be the ‘ivory tower’. It is no longer a place of luxury and economic comfort. As the tempo of inflation increases — academic communities dependent on fixed incomes and grants — are passing into the poorer sector of their society.

What are the consequences of this diminishing resource base of the University? First and foremost, that while universities are rich in what they want to do or ought to do, they are poor in their means. Secondly, the impoverishment of the university decreases their WILL for change. The very idea of change is a liberal idea. Comfortably supported university communities can be counted on to be tolerant of change. The great question then is whether poor countries can afford to support a liberal university, anxious and engaged in change?

(iv) Which way, Zimbabwe?
Where does the University of Zimbabwe fit in all this? Clearly, there is need for the University to define its role in the development of Zimbabwe. Clearly also, it starts off from the advantage of knowing what its neighbours have attempted. The conceptual problems that beset the early days of de-colonisation need not unduly exercise the University of Zimbabwe. On the outside and seeing its campus — buildings, laboratories, workshops, libraries — and talking to its staff, the University looks comparatively well-endowed and preserved. Zimbabwe has already demonstrated a remarkable capacity to tap international resources to its advantage and the strength of the Zimbabwe economy, the end of hostilities, should help to build up resources for the University. Above all, a large number of Zimbabwe academics scattered all over the world during the war of Liberation should in due course want to come home.

Here, then, is a University with some capacity for further change. This is not to minimize the challenge of change to the University of Zimbabwe.
By and large, the University faces the same and increasing number of tasks as have faced other African universities on diminishing budgets. Already the University has had to accept unusually large intakes and is under pressure to show firmer links with the polity, the economy, and with other sectors of education and the social services. Like other universities in Africa and elsewhere the University of Zimbabwe faces the hard prospect of increasing its role and responsibility in a cost-conscious world.

IV THE OPERATIONAL IDEALS OF UNIVERSITY

Given the extra-ordinary pressures under which universities in the developing world appear condemned to work, it is important for them to have a clear perception of what makes universities tick. I say this because in the quest for relevance and in times of rapid change, it is all too easy to emphasize relevance at the expense of excellence, and to forget that that which is relevant must also be well done or otherwise it ceases to be relevant. In the light of my own personal observation and involvement with universities in a state of change, I should like to mention four essentials — to which you can add during this Conference.

(i) The maintenance of good learning
First of all, I now believe that it is essential to maintain universities as places of good learning and good teaching, places where the extension and examination of knowledge is both possible and prized. It seems trite to say this. Indeed, many might be surprised that I choose to mention it at all. Let me explain. Universities strive to mark the mastery and extension of knowledge by appropriate awards, status and promotion. However, more and more there is a growing number of persons in the university who prize these symbols of university success for other reasons. Individuals in search of social justice, equality and the extension of job opportunity will seek university labels for other than their scholarship. Similarly, manpower planners, employment agencies and politicians anxious for their targets will look askance upon delays in manpower production even on academic and professional grounds. Internally, there is the perpetual body of student — and teacher — politician whose priorities in the university lie outside the narrow paths of scholarship. I do not wish to mention the young woman student in search of a husband. Both internally and externally, the university system can come under pressure to ‘pass’ the student and to ‘make’ the successful teacher-politician a professor. Additionally, as resources become scarce, there is real danger of inadequate investment in learning and the extension takes priority over the qualitative aspects of expansion. When that happens there is real danger that both staff and students become mere consumers of learning — satisfied with knowledge and skills developed by other scholars and unable to experience the real excitement of new learning and commitment to scholarship. A university can hardly exist without such excitement and the whole hearted pursuit of learning.

(ii) Continuity
Secondly, at a time of rapid change it is important never to lose sight of the need for continuity of good research, teaching and learning. Yet continuity is what rapid change sometimes first threatens, because in the minds of some people it is necessary to destroy in order to build. Scholarship and excitement built up over the years may suddenly become lost. Departments with a good reputation become mediocre. In a situation of rapid change of staff, those who examine are different from those who teach and students excited by a new engagement with a scholar cannot find him to continue their interaction. Even the mundane task of record keeping in the university becomes difficult. It is vitally important that universities give attention to mechanisms for the management and maintenance of learning and scholarship from one change to another.

(iii) The productivity of scholars.
Related to good and continuous learning, is the problem of the productivity of the individual scholar and the individual department. Rapid change and the uncertainty of change impose heavy burdens on individual scholars. Over time the achievements of scholars from day to day and the factors that mitigate against success might be analysed. In this regard, it is not enough to look at the total production of scholars in a department or over a stated period. One must look more closely at what is happening to each scholar over shorter and shorter periods of great difficulty given present university systems of rewards and incentives, and of sanctions against poor or inadequate output.
(iv) **Cost-coverage**

At a time of financial cut-backs, there will of course be pressure to achieve good learning and teaching at lowest cost. Universities will need to convince their financiers that they are efficient and responsible users of scarce resources, that they are cost-conscious and cost-effective. For this reason, a university which does not already have a scheme or unit for the improvement of learning and teaching and for the improvement of institutional management, must of necessity give thought to its establishment. Further a university must give serious thought to ways and means of raising funds from non-traditional and non-government sources. In this way, universities can maximise resources available to them as well as their more economic use.

The operational ideals of a university then call for good and continuous learning, productive and scholarly individuals, and the efficient use of scarce resources available to it. In the traditional operations of the university these ideals reinforce each other and tend towards stability rather than rapid change. A university that wishes to preserve these ideals in a situation of change therefore needs to give special consideration to the dynamics of change in the university.

**V DYNAMICS OF CHANGE IN UNIVERSITY**

We have so far considered the forces that occasion fundamental changes in the university. We have suggested that changes in the political, social, economic and moral order may well call for changes in the university. Indeed, the university itself may be instrumental in the definition of a new order and in the establishment of consensus about that order. However, these considerations must be balanced against resources available for change and against academic and professional considerations. Public accountability — which is necessary and proper — must be balanced against academic and professional accountability which is also necessary and proper. In the end, it is this balancing that will define the nature of the institution to be born out of the pressures of change. Similarly, it is the identification and handling of issues resulting from the tensions of change that will determine the atmosphere and flavour of the institution that results.

Permit, therefore, to end by saying a word or two about two managerial considerations which frequently determine the flavour and dynamics of change in university.

(i) **Conflict over ideals.**

As a prelude, I should perhaps emphasize that I do not see university change as a matter of 'stages of development', a movement from one static position to another and heralded by periodic development plans. I accept that in times of change all fixed values come under pressure and may well yield and become unstable themselves. There is then constant need for review, revision and, sometimes, complete change of direction. Forces interacting in the arena of development do not always produce a clear linear progression of change. What is taken to be political necessity or industrial and practical reality may cease to be so. Yet academics by their training are conditioned to respect constants and to generalise on the basis of repetitive or cumulative evidence.

In a situation of frequent change, therefore, there is a strong likelihood of conflict and tension among academics on the basis of ideals and their perception of those ideals or between the academic community and persons or bodies outside the university.

The managerial problem is how to provide for the resolution of conflict on campus while at the same time allowing for the expression of legitimate dissent. Alternatively, the problem is how to steer the university through change, lending it that vision and sense of direction necessitated by the times, without killing legitimate dissent or minimising the divergence and diversity of expression characteristic of an active and healthy campus.

Here, I would like to suggest that the first quality a university must cultivate at a time of change, is tolerance. Uniformity of views or blind flattery of authorities should never be expected of those who are learning the responsible selection and use of knowledge and of criticism. This means that government leaders may have to accept and tolerate juvenile academic debate on campus — which is totally harmless — and to resist rushing in with the police on the first appearance of student or staff dissent. In turn, the university community needs to learn the distinction between academic and responsible debate, and outright political opposition and sabotage. The one calls for tolerance and accommodation. The other invites suspicion and sometimes sanctions.

It is often suggested that conflict on campus is caused by lack of national commitment on
the part of the academic community, that if there was greater commitment to, for instance, national development and ideals, there would be fewer conflicts with government and other outside agents and that, therefore, selection and admission to the university of those who teach or learn there, should be based on some monitoring of this commitment. Where these special arrangements are made, it is argued, "the university no longer stands apart from the government but is one component of a triangle with the Party and its planning and policy committees as another and the government as the administrative arm forms the third" (I.C.E.B. 1975: 19). And, government need no longer fear that opposition elements on campus will wreck the ship of state or university. The temptation for government to close the university now and again in order to enforce political conformity may disappear, leaving the university free to enjoy freedom within the system.

While these suggestions must command the attention of the Conference, it must nevertheless remain an obligation to examine how far conformity may by itself prejudice the very purpose of the university. The challenge to universities in the 1980's "is to convince their governments and national populations that their contributions to national development lies not in the extent to which they can conform to certain material and intellectual prescriptions, but in their ability to demonstrate that above all the process of development requires the kind of trained minds and thinking society that universities are uniquely equipped to promote" (Court 198 : 657).

(ii) The danger of obsolescence
The university teacher and researcher practices a noble and honest art — that of the brokerage of ideas, skills, and determinants for selection. His ultimate aim is to instil in the student the desire to search for choices of his own, to make independent judgements of his own. His assumption as a teacher is that real freedom exists and the rules of choice are known and well respected. It may therefore be legitimately asked whether if he is not to be forced into conformity, there is a limit to his scholarship. Is commitment to scholarship the sole criterion of his worth? And can there be such a thing as irrelevant, obsolete or dangerous scholarship? If, as we have argued, the rapidity of change renders values, choices and rules variable, are academics and scholars liable to make and set choices which cease to be popular and soon pass out of vogue? The businessman or the politician who makes the same kind of choice, suffers financial loss or rejection by his electorate. What should the academic suffer? When, for instance, the historian chooses to sing the praise of notorious Idi Amin, should he be dismissed from university service on the liberation of Uganda? Or should he be protected from the wrath of academics returning from exile? What process of renewal and rehabilitation should universities prescribe for their apparently obsolete academic staff? Are the normal and traditional processes of staff development, establishment, review or even disciplinary proceedings, adequate for this purpose? Or should extra mural considerations govern staff retention and improvement?

Apart from the obsolescence of staff, there is the possibility of obsolete plant, equipment, books and materials. Modern building technology allows for flexible partitions so much so that the volume and area of teaching and research space can be altered as needs change. Unfortunately, heavy equipment, books and teaching materials are less easily changed once bought. Yet, ideally a university should be constantly reviewing its equipment and materials, and will need to do so once involved in change. The corollary is that it will be necessary for universities to find ways and means of minimising wastage and disuse of equipment once the process of change is begun. More systematic and less wasteful methods of resource control and renewal will have to be devised. This is an area of management in which many universities are not fully developed. Perhaps I should add that it is not past the ingenuity of universities to devise systems for the renewal of their staff and plant. Equally, it is possible for universities to avoid situations in which they as institutions are threatened with wholesale obsolescence. No modern society has yet reached the stage of doing away with all its university institutions: this is a case of the prophets of doom in Deschooling society. Some departments, some colleges, even individual universities, have at times of doom or national catastrophe, been closed. Nowhere, however, do we find efforts to declare the university system as a whole to be irrelevant or obsolete. This is a tribute to the adaptability of the university as an institution to changing times.

I am confident the University of Zimbabwe, whose ancestors go back to ancient times to the mystique of the ancient nation-state of Zimbabwe as well as to the beginnings of modern universities in Bologna, has as good a chance as any other university, to steer a course someway between obsolescence and loss of structural identity. In seizing that chance, it can re-shape and re-define its role in the future of a nation we all love and admire.
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CHAPTER 3

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY IN DEVELOPMENT: SOME
SOCIOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

by Professor Ralf Dahrendorf

From the point of view of the practical man — whether he be politician or administrator, businessman or whatever — universities are curious institutions. On the one hand, he needs them. If he has not been to a university himself, he would like to have been; in any case, he feels that universities add an important dimension to the knowledge which he applies. On the other hand, the practical man resents universities. He has found that those who came from them had to be retrained almost from scratch in order to deal with real things; moreover, universities are a nuisance. Strange things are said in them. Students and teachers alike behave in "objectionable" ways. If only they were exposed more to the issues and concerns of real life...

This conflict of views and of feelings is probably even more pronounced in developing countries. But make no mistake! It is there in Britain and America as it is in India and Zimbabwe. Moreover, the conflict has very real sources. It expresses what actually happens in universities. Nothing is more characteristic of universities than the tension between the requirements of theory and those of practice. Actually, "theory" and "practice" are rather highfalutin' words for what is meant here. What is meant is that universities need a degree of detachment, a protected free space, even a glass bowl, to do their teaching and their research, whereas the practical man never has such protection.

Universities must have time; indeed, time is of the essence for their enterprise. It is not just job creation if a research officer applies for an extension of his grant; the timing of research results cannot be predicted exactly, however eager the government department or business management which has asked for them is to have them. It is not a waste of time either if universities have long vacations; both teachers and students need time to give their best and to absorb things properly. Turn a university into a knowledge factory and you have lost its very essence.

You may be surprised to hear such remarks from the Director of the London School of Economics; and indeed I shall retract a little as I go along, not because I am a Director of LSE, but because the subject demands it. But first of all, let me introduce what is perhaps a surprising witness for my position. Sydney Webb, the Fabian founder of the London School of Economics, a lifelong Labour politician, a radical reformer and socialist. By his own account, he was challenged quite early on about LSE. Was it not a Fabian, a socialist, institution? But he was not to be moved from his convictions, not even by his Fabian friends, such as George Bernard Shaw, who accused him of misusing Fabian funds by creating a "mere" academic institution. "I said," he wrote a few years after the foundation of the School in 1895, "that, as he knew, I was a person of decided views, radical and socialist, and that I wanted the policy that I believed in to prevail. But that I was also a profound believer in knowledge and science and truth. I thought that we were suffering much from lack of research in social matters, and that I wanted to promote it. I believed that research and new discoveries would prove some, at any rate, of my views of policy to be right, but that, if they proved the contrary I should count it all the more gain to have prevented error, and should cheerfully abandon my own policy, I think that is a fair attitude."

Fair indeed! What is more, Sydney Webb would have had to abandon his decided views a long time ago, if LSE was his standard. Even in his lifetime the Economics Department was dominated by Lionel Robbins and Friedrich von Havek, hardly socialists they; and Harold Laski has always remained an exception, if an influential and distinguished one. Not one of my predecessors as Director was a socialist; and the first Director, appointed after all by
Sydney Webb, became a Conservative MP. What this shows is not only the multifariousness and unpredictability of the London School of Economics, but above all that Sydney Webb was overly optimistic even in his own terms. Knowledge and science and truth do not prove or disprove, political persuasions. I am not here advocating the overly ascetic position of Max Weber who thought that the teacher on his rostrum should never under any circumstances express value judgements. This is not only impossible but also undesirable, and in any case unnecessary if there are opportunities for discussion. But Weber was right when he said that however many scientific theories you heap on top of each other, they do not prove or disprove your convictions. Just as Neil Armstrong’s televised shuffle on the moon does not disprove the beauty of Sappho’s poem about the setting moon, so the economic theories of Milton Friedman or Friedrich von Hayek do not disprove the intention to finance a job creation scheme, or even to nationalise industries. Nationalization may be undesirable; but that is in itself a value judgement, and remains this however any allegedly scientific facts and theories are adduced to back it up. There is a science of values; science itself may be regarded as a value; but none of this bridges the gap between what we are trying to find out and what we believe. *Rerum cognoscence causes* (the motto of the London School of Economics, if you pardon my mentioning LSE for one last time), that is to say, discovering the causes of things is a human endeavour of its own unique and important kind.

This is an argument against — to use a fashionable word — “relevance”. Whoever demands from a university that it is relevant throughout, that it responds to external demands in everything it does, destroys by the same token the heart of academic inquiry and communication. In its core, universities are distinctly irrelevant; at any rate they do not intend to respond to external needs, nor should they do so. They are detached, and they are uncomfortable. By asking questions — all questions with no holds barred — they become of necessity a critical ferment in their environment. If universities start obeying the powers that be, they deteriorate rapidly and turn either into producers of cadres with blinkered and streamlined minds or simply into second-rate institutions which serve nobody and achieve nothing. The freedom to ask outrageous questions and to teach only what appears to be true is fundamental to the life of a university. Whoever destroys it, may as well cease to have universities at all.

But what if one ceases to have universities? Why are universities necessary? Why in particular does one need them in countries which have to concentrate all their energies and resources on creating a decent standard of living for all? Are universities not a luxury which the rich can afford but which has little relevance for the poor? These questions take me to the centre of my subject and to a few comments which are all born of the same fundamental conviction.

The first comment has to do with development. Development is a curious, even an objectionable, concept. Unintentionally perhaps, it seems to imply that there is one royal way to progress, and that all that is necessary for the rest to take this way is to untold the slumbering talents within them. If this is implied, then development is a very misleading concept indeed. There are many ways to improve human life chances, and no one example in the world in which we are living is a model for all. Per capita income is highest these days in Kuwait — but where would Kuwait be without oil? Per capita income is very high also in Switzerland — but how does one imitate centuries of peace and the unique consensus of the people? America is still regarded by many as a model — but do we really want the rat race, the crime, the suicides, the violence, along with the wealth? Britain is not quoted as an example very often any more; yet Britain has many an advantage over the rest. In a recent article in *The Guardian*, Michael Manley talked about his younger days in London: “I loved much of my six years as a student in London. The intellectual life of the university was full of stimulus but was unforced and unregimented. It seemed to be predicated on an unwritten assumption that if you would go to the trouble of enrolling in a university you must have reasonably adult intentions.” This too is a comment on our subject, and one which we shall bear in mind. But here, Manley’s next sentence is even more important: “I found, at another level, that the British have a genius for creating a neighbourly environment, even in one of the biggest cities in the world.” Manley goes on to deplore the apparent inability of the British to extend their neighbourliness to their black compatriots — a very serious subject indeed! However, his main point is well taken: Britain may have missed the bus to wealth; at any rate, she may have sunk to the relegation zone of the first division of economic success, but Britain has nevertheless remained a rather agreeable country to live in right to the present day.
For the subject of development, these observations have a number of consequences. There are two things — two values, to be sure — which apply to all countries. One is the rule of law. Certain fundamental human rights are no less valid in the Soviet Union than they are in the United States of America, no less in India than they are in Britain. These include the inviolability of the person habeas corpus freedom from arbitrary arrest and the like as well as a fundamental freedom of expression. The other general value, which is not to be confused with the rule of law, is the guarantee of elementary citizenship rights for all. By citizenship rights in this sense I mean not only equality before the law and equal rights of political participation, but above all a decent standard of living; and since we are very far from this indeed, we must probably settle for the time being for the satisfaction of the basic needs of all (to use World Bank terminology). Since both the rule of law and a decent standard of living are universal needs and entitlements, safeguarding them is an international responsibility. So far as the rule of law is concerned, I often wish the UN Charter was taken more seriously; so far as basic needs are concerned, I wish the rich countries would recognize their responsibilities. The fact that both these are pious wishes must not mean that we tire in our efforts to see them realized.

Beyond the moral and economic essentials, however, there is no one royal way ahead. On the contrary, every country, every culture will have to find its own path. The examples of rich countries which I have given show that this was in fact the case in Europe and America, to say nothing of Japan. There are as many industrial cultures as there are industrialized countries, despite the apparent ubiquity of Coca-Cola bottles and Hollywood films. As more countries move forward economically, there will be more variants of modernization. Indeed, one of the discoveries of recent studies is that countries are well advised to try and build on their strengths rather than copy the structures of others blindly. Imposing institutions is not only painful, but very often ineffective. I would even include political institutions in this statement. No doubt you have noticed that I have not mentioned politics in my list of essentials. I have my preferences; but I would regard it as wrong to force them on others. Perhaps I can return to this point at the end of my lecture.

This, then, is the background of the work of the university in a country which is seeking its way forward. The conclusions which it suggests are both clear and important. On the first I have dealt already: the right to unfettered inquiry, and to teaching what to all intents and purposes is true, is a part of the rule of law. A country which does not have a university which enjoys academic freedom is quite likely to miss elementary liberties as well.

So far as basic needs, or a decent standard of living is concerned, the role of the university is more complicated. The picture of universities which I have drawn so far is clearly somewhat idealistic. Universities do more than just advance the frontiers of knowledge and allow students to take part in the process. They also impart the canonized knowledge of earlier generations. They train people. Here, universities in developing countries have a delicate task about which I speak with hesitation, because it cannot be my job to tell how to run your affairs. In my experience, however, it is important even in the training of professional people not to forget the cultural context in which they operate. It has undoubtedly added much to legal training in Britain, especially at the Bar, to have so many students from abroad; yet one wonders whether the attempt to apply English common law to different cultural conditions really makes sense. After all, it does not even work in Scotland. More generally, it seems to me that universities in developing countries have two jobs to do so far as training is concerned. One is to make sure that those whom they educate are aware both of abstract knowledge and of the concrete conditions to which it applies; this is a translating job. It requires the translation of existing knowledge to specific conditions. The other is to make sure that those subjects are given prominence which have an application to local conditions; this is a selection job. Most universities in developing countries cannot possibly teach all subjects. Even if one insists that they should teach some which are strictly "irrelevant", there remains the task of selecting particularly important ones and making sure that they are well represented.

Perhaps I can summarize what I have in mind here by drawing on my own experience, albeit an unhappy experience, which concerns what was the University of Malta. When I was first invited to help turn the University of Malta — with its 300 years of history an ancient place of learning in the Commonwealth — into one that made its contribution to the development of the country — I found a strange situation. The University had become ossified in its ancient ways. These meant that it was an appendix of the professional classes of Malta. Parents liked to send their children to do a bit of law, or medicine, or
theology — the three medieval faculties, as you undoubtedly realize. Government even permitted a little bit of the arts, such as English, and more recently Maltese. But there was no modern science to speak of, and no social science at all. There was no awareness of Malta’s peculiar problems, such as the need for desalination in order to get pure water, or the interest in Mediterranean cultures, or concern with law of the seas, or the economics of tourism: one could go on listing such concerns. Thus, my objective was to help introduce new subjects, and gradually to give the University a place in the whole community, and not just in one of its classes. I talked about bringing the University into the 20th century — but of course as a university, that is within the confines of the rules of the game of higher learning and all that goes with it.

The Prime Minister of Malta is not known for his patience, nor is he a Sidney Webb with respect to knowledge and science and truth. He wanted the University to be immediately relevant to the country’s needs; indeed he did not want students at all who were detached from the community as a whole. He therefore invented the notion of worker-student. He forced enterprises to finance young people who spend half their time at the “university”, and forced students to spend half their time on jobs. He also, consistently as it were, abolished the newly established social sciences with their inherently critical spirit again. He did not want any protests from within the “university”. The Rector, who did not budge, was sacked; many members of the faculty left; parents who could afford it sent their children abroad. The “university” was merged with a technical college. To all intents and purposes it has ceased to exist. You cannot see my manuscript, but if you could you would notice that the last few times I mentioned the word, university, I have put it in quotation marks: today, there is no university without quotation marks any more in Malta.

Why this makes the country poorer, I have tried to indicate earlier. Here, another point is worth making. It has to do with that vexing concept of university autonomy. Without doubt, university autonomy has sometimes been used to defend the indefensible; it is a convenient peg on which to hang many an alibi for failure and inaction. But then, most values can be abused like this. Despite all abuses, it remains the case, that universities simply cease to function if governments try to run them more or less directly. The jobs of translation and selection have to be done, but if both are imposed by impatient ministers of education, they will be done badly, if at all. What is necessary is something that is hard to describe. Despite the detachment and the glass bowl of academic life which I have tried to defend, the boundary between universities and the surrounding society has to be permeable. Both sides have to perceive each other, though neither side must try to dominate the other. Such mutual perception has to have an effect. A university like that of Malta before the reforms is indeed an expensive luxury. There was a need in Malta for appreciating the world around, for translating traditional teaching as well as research subjects of obvious importance to the surrounding community. But both translation and selection should have been done by the University itself. A little gentle nudging cannot be wrong; quite often, a university council with lay members can do the job, and at times, a parliamentary committee can help; but nudging is not doing, let alone forcing to do. Unless universities are allowed to take all academic decisions on academic grounds, they go down the dark road of the University of Malta.

The argument presented so far has one consequence which you will not like, but on which one may as well be candid. A university in a developing country which teaches professional people in the old and the new professions, and does so with a view to local needs, and which concerns itself in both research and teaching with certain subjects for which it is favourably located, is in a certain sense not a “complete” university. It does not have everything, that is teaching and research in the whole range of subjects which could conceivably be offered by a university, and which is perhaps offered by the Sorbonne, or Oxford, or Harvard University. But then, few universities in the rich countries are truly complete, and those which are, are either tolerably crowded like Paris (as the Sorbonne is characteristically now called), or in themselves differentiated into incomplete parts, like Oxford or Harvard. Completeness is an unnecessary ambition; what matters, is quality. A university which offers everything, but fails to stand out in anything is certainly a much sadder sight than a first-rate institution with a limited range of subjects or intentions. Places like the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, or the great American undergraduate colleges are quite rightly the envy of the world. It is presumptuous of me to make any recommendations to a University which has itself by now a distinguished tradition and which knows best what to do; but perhaps it will be accepted if I say that what matters is to do well what one is doing, not to do everything.
There is one further argument in favour of such self-limitation, and that is the international nature of the university world. I doubt whether there is a more effectively international community than that of university teachers and students. While businessmen when they travel are faced with clients or suppliers or competitors, and professional people with numerous obstacles erected by national tradition and pride, to say nothing of politicians who almost invariably assume a negotiating posture when they leave their home countries, academics including students find friends. Scholarship is by its very nature international. There is no German physics and no Soviet biology; and when both were tried, they merely turned their authors into a laughing stock of the rest. Despite all translation and selection that goes on all over the world, both students and teachers can often be transplanted without pain — and so it should be. For the internationalism of scholarship is once again under pressure today. Along with the galloping protectionism in trade, and a spreading tendency to look inward politically, there is an attempt by governments to close borders for universities in the world. Whereas at Harvard and the other "Ivy League" universities of the United States, a student pays $10,000 for tuition as well as room and board, fees alone are, in Britain, anywhere between £2,500 in the arts and £5,000 in medicine to which some £3,000 at least have to be added for living. This is a scandal. It is also a sign of shortsightedness. It is above all an assault on the very freedoms by which universities lived. Openness for the world is a part of university freedom. Deliberate attempts to close universities to outsiders are no better than other measures to curtail the freedom of scholarship.

The relevance of such developments for me, subject is evident. Already, there are dozens of students from Zimbabwe in Britain who cannot afford to continue. Most of them are postgraduates. The Government of Zimbabwe has, understandably, decided to limit its support for postgraduates severely. At the same time, an international division of labour makes sense by which the richer countries offer postgraduate courses which could not be offered at the same level in the universities of the poorer countries. But of course, offering such courses involves a special responsibility. It means that these courses have to be accessible. Indeed, it is hard to think of a simpler way for a rich country to assist progress in the poorer countries than by inviting students from these countries to come to universities. What is needed is not high fees, but a generous scholarship programme. Dare one hope that, with the help of the Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference in Melbourne, and the North-South Conference in Cancun in Mexico the British government will at last see the light?

There is an academic point in this connection which I once again raise with hesitation, and with a plea for not misunderstanding my intention. When Fritz Schumacher, the author of Small Is Beautiful, advocated the greater use of what he called "Intermediate technologies" in developing countries, he did not meet with much public approval in the Third World. (I emphasize "public approval", because privately there may have been rather more understanding.) People felt insulted by the implication that while the rich countries should continue to engage in high technology, something rather less advanced was good enough for the poor. If this was meant, it would indeed be hard to defend. There is no reason at all why microprocessors should not be used as widely in developing as in developed countries; indeed the introduction and application of modern technology may well be one of the tasks of translation which universities in developing countries have. But it is a task of translation. Somehow or other technology has to be related to people's customs and beliefs. It is no good throwing modern technology at a traditional environment.

The Ford Foundation (of which I have the honour to be a Trustee) has had many an experience in this connection. There are Indian villagers who are used to carrying their goat milk to the nearest market place, but who can only carry so much which means that enough remains for their children and for themselves. If you give them a car to transport the milk, the probability — and more often than not the reality — is that all the milk will be sold, transistor radios and the like will be bought and the village children will be badly fed, even underfed. In other words, there is a context to be considered, a social context which is as important as technical progress. The Ford Foundation and World Bank together have come to appreciate that population control is by no means primarily a matter of the availability of contraceptives. Improving the education of women is at least as important. Once again, it is not gimmicks, but wider social and economic developments which matter. Once this is appreciated, technology falls into place, and it is quite likely that it will often be fairly simple technology, "intermediate" if one likes the word.
The application to universities is not just one of underlining the concept of translation which I have introduced earlier, and of emphasizing the usefulness of the social sciences. It is also another point which you may find it harder to take. It seems to me entirely right that universities in developing countries should have spent much of their time in the past on undergraduate teaching. This is not only the first need, but it can be done at a level of quality which bears comparison with the best. But of course it is not the end of the story. Beyond undergraduate teaching, in the fields of research and postgraduate training, there are three ways forward. One is the international community, and notably postgraduate study abroad and the exchange of teachers. We need more of it and not less. The second is the selective development of research in subjects which are of particular importance locally, indeed where local experience can inspire and advance research. Research developments are of course always also developments in postgraduate training.

Then, thirdly, there is the need for more co-operation between developing countries, with developed countries involved wherever necessary. There is a place for a chain of research and training centres around the world which enable countries with limited resources to establish their own division of labour and at the same time reap the benefits of research elsewhere. This is what the United Nations University is intending to do. Its new Rector, Soedjatmoko, is an economist with a rare understanding of the cultural needs of developing countries. He is not likely to make the mistakes of technocrats. Moreover, being an Indonesian himself, he knows the growing pains of development well. He has already drawn the attention of his Board to the strategic needs of research and postgraduate training. I would hope that the UN University will increasingly become a kind of reference point for the universities of developing countries. I have gone over a great deal of ground in a necessarily general and often more allusive than conclusive manner. I hope it has nevertheless become clear how important in my view the role of universities is in developing countries. It is a general role in so far as all universities share certain values and objectives; it is also a specific role in so far as universities exist in very special circumstances in developing countries. Before I finish my address, let me return for a moment to the central theme of my remarks, and to the loose ends which I left with respect to politics in developing countries.

Whether one accepts the word, development, or not, most of the countries of the Group of 77 are going through rapid and painful processes of change. Quite often, it is uncertain where this change will lead, though one hopes that it will enhance the life chances of as many people as possible. Suffice it to say that this country like many others has embarked on a process of movement which embraces all its institutions, and above all its people. On the whole people do not like movement. They would like to be at the end of the road, but the road itself means sweat and grime and pain. This is a strange circumstance for democratic politicians. They know where they want to take their countries, but they cannot really hope to maintain the support of their citizens. Is it wrong to assume that this is one of the reasons why leaders of developing countries almost invariably find it difficult to maintain democratic institutions? Indeed, does it not appear as if developing countries can remain democratic to the extent to which they do not make progress, whereas progress tends to ride roughshod over democratic institutions?

If this is so, if there is even a grain of truth in this unhappy suggestion, universities find themselves in a very difficult position. They have to defend their autonomy and the fundamental freedom which their work both requires and symbolizes; but they are also called upon to make their own contributions to the great social changes around them. Here, the outsider cannot easily give sensible advice. Indeed, he stands full of admiration before those who have taken on responsibility for a university. Clearly, both demands, that for freedom and autonomy, and that for a contribution to the national process of development, are justified. Equally clearly, they may well be incompatible at times. Academic detachment and political relevance do not go well together. What is required therefore is a balancing act, or better perhaps, a combination between the confident defence of academic freedom and sensitivity for the justified needs of the community which sustains universities. This is not easy; but it can be done — especially if the powers that be appreciate that whatever dents are made into the institutions of democracy, the rule of law and all that goes with it, including the freedom to teach and to do research, are sacred.
CHAPTER 4

The Relationship between the University and Government

by Hasu H. Patel

Introduction

It would not be untrue to suggest that the conference on the role and future of the University of Zimbabwe is the most important conference held at this University in the last decade, if not over the entire period of the University’s experience. The conference involves academics from outside of Zimbabwe, but more importantly involves the direct participation of, on the one hand, academics of the University and, on the other hand, Ministers, including the Prime Minister, and civil servants in Zimbabwe. This type of conference is an appropriate and highly significant forum to begin the necessary dialogue between the University of Zimbabwe and the Government of Zimbabwe. Hopefully, there will be other forums in which to further pursue this dialogue, involving an unequal partnership (UZ being the junior partner), because only with an on-going dialogue can the university play and continually redefine its role not only in relation to the academic community but also in relation to Government and society at large.

In addition, this conference has been planned to coincide with the installation of Professor W.J. Kamba as Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Zimbabwe. The installation of the first black chief officer of the university is the other momentous event in the history of this University. Therefore, it is right and proper that the University and Government and society wish him all success and accord him all support in the tremendous burden which now rests on his shoulders in navigating this university in the era of independence, particularly since more than likely his role within the University will involve “interventionist radical change with consensus.”

This brief paper deals with the role of a university, the Colonial university, UZ/Government relations, and suggests some structural/curricula changes, although not in an exhaustive manner.

The Role of the University

There is a vast literature on the role of a university. It is the intention of this paper to discuss the role of a university with a selective use of literature in order to highlight what appears to be essentially two models which are sometimes seen as mutually exclusive and sometimes seen as complementary. The models may be classified as the “purist” and the “utilitarian” models.

The “purist” model emphasizes matters such as the pursuit and transmission of truth and knowledge, rationality, and a value-free disposition. For example, Jasper states that, “The university is a community of scholars and students engaged in the task of seeking truth,” and that “The university is the corporate realization of man’s basic determination to know.” Shils argues that “The discovery and teaching of cognitive truth is the distinctive characteristic of the academic profession.”

This “purist” view of the role of a university has also been incorporated as their own vision by many an African university largely because many African universities, in the contemporary period, have their origins in a western tradition. As Mazrui notes, “As for the African university itself, it is too rationalist for reasons connected with its western ancestry. The ethos of western university systems puts a special premium on a form of rationality which aspires to neutral universalism. To be ‘scholar’ and ‘scientific’ are, in western terminology, sometimes interchangeable. And to be scientific includes a stance of detachment.”

However, in spite of the western ancestry of contemporary African universities, African leaders and universities have engaged in a re-examination of this “purist view of the role of
a university in Africa; as a result of this re-examination, what might be termed a "utilitarian" view of the university has emerged. For example, Nyerere has argued that while the pursuit and extension of knowledge by a university is very important not only for a particular society but for all humanity, nevertheless, there must be priorities particularly in poor countries:

For I believe that the pursuit of pure learning can be a luxury in society; whether it is or not depends upon the conditions in which that society lives...... when people are dying because existing knowledge is not applied, when the very basic social and public services are not available to all members of a society then that society is misusing its resources if it pursues pure learning for its own sake . . . the purpose of establishing the university is to make it possible for us to change these poverty-stricken lives.6

Nyerere accepts that the purpose of a university is to seek the truth. However, while academics should seek the truth without consequences to themselves, nevertheless, they should not seek the truth regardless of any consequences to the society at large. Thus, he suggests that the university has a dual responsibility, i.e., the expectation from the university is both "a complete objectivity in the search for truth, and also commitment to our society — a desire to serve it".6

Analogously the question of the role of the university has also animated African scholars. The 1972 Accra Workshop of the Association of African Universities was an important attempt to deal with the question. The Accra Workshop dealt with a whole range of issues. The conception of the African University which grew out of that deliberation, while it did not reject the essential components of the "purist" model nevertheless, tilted heavily in favour of the "utilitarian" model, i.e., the university of Africa "could not in the name of academic freedom be permitted to be indifferent to the prevailing poverty and squalor...... (and its new definition would be one).... which would signify its commitment, not just to knowledge for its own sake, but to the pursuit of knowledge for the sake of, and for the amelioration of the conditions of, the common man and woman in Africa".7

The above two models, that is the "purist" and the "utilitarian" may be differently seen as models of intellect and utility or as models of "knowledge for its own sake" and "knowledge for change". At first appearance they suggest mutually exclusive perspectives, but this would be a false impression. The difference between the two models is really one of tilt and emphasis because as indicated in the above quotation the "utilitarian" model does not deny the legitimacy of the pursuit of truth by universities. However, what it does deny is the legitimacy of the pursuit of truth for its own sake without any immediate and deliberate utilization of that knowledge to alleviate the multifaceted problems encountered by the African societies of which the universities are a part.

Of course it is very difficult to quantify, in economic terms the benefits which accrue to the society when compared with the large amounts of funds which are expended on African universities. A most immediate way would be to measure the production of graduates in relation to financial input, But this would probably show up the high unit cost of output. A university in Africa as elsewhere has an important function in providing, as best as it can, the necessary manpower requirements of the country. Nevertheless, the university in Africa as elsewhere is an investment in the future, not only in terms of manpower requirements but also in terms of curiosity, creativity and knowledge. A society which does not invest at least some of its resources in curiosity, creativity and knowledge will be the poorer in non-quantifiable terms, even though the thrust of a society's expenditure, particularly in developing countries such as Zimbabwe, must be in areas which have an immediate and direct relevance for eliminating inequalities in the society.

The Colonial University
An exhaustive history of the former University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland and the former University of Rhodesia is beyond the scope of this paper.8 Rather, some important dynamics in the past of this university will suffice to highlight some of the achievements, shortcomings and contradictions.

The first student intake of University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, armed with the Royal Charter of 10th February 1956, began in 1957. One of the Royal Charter's important provisions reflected the preponderance of the view of the British Government and a small group of liberal whites who were interested in a non-racial university education not only for the then Rhodesia but also for the then Central African Federation; the establishment of the University was a reflection of the supposed non-racial hopes of the Federation itself.9

The non-racial provision is enshrined in section 4 of the Royal Charter which states that
"No test of religious belief or profession or of race, nationality or class shall be imposed upon or required of any person in order to entitle him to be admitted as a member, professor, teacher or student of the University College or to hold office therein or any advantage or privilege thereof." The inadequacies of the federal idea were to be exposed by African Nationalists. The victory of the Rhodesian Front in 1962 and the demise of the Federation in 1963 effectively exposed the tenuous link between the University's principle of non-racialism and the dominant racist society in which it was to operate; thus the University has been rightly described by Murphree as an "anachronism". While the University has maintained the principle of non-racialism and has been instrumental in producing thousands of graduates, nevertheless all has not been well at the University. Initially the University accepted segregated residences for students but after a year the residences were desegregated, although before this occurred there was a great deal of humiliation for Miss Sarah Chavunduka, an Arts student at the University. Thereafter, Dr. Bernard Chidzero's appointment as a Research Fellow in Political Science was not proceeded with after it became known that he was to marry a Canadian woman.

Over the years, there have been many crises at the University, for example, in 1966 and in 1973, which really reflected the political tensions as between black and white both off-campus and on-campus. Particularly since UDI in 1965 the University could not but reflect the division in the society at large. Birley wrote in his 1966 report,

On the one hand, very many of the Europeans are in the frame of mind to regard progress towards a multi-racial society as a prospect to be feared; on the other, the Africans look forward to the possibility of social and political advances which seemed impossible a few years ago. The number, on both sides, left, as it were, in or near the middle has inevitably decreased. The College cannot expect to be unaffected by this process. Not only is it more isolated in the midst of Rhodesian society than it was before, but it is itself more divided. It could not be expected to escape altogether from this process of polarisation within its own walls.

Certainly, it could be argued that during the UDI years there were great pressures to constrict the University's control over its own affairs. Murphree isolates the following pressures, (i) increasing dependence of the University on local government funding, (ii) utilization of detention/deportation and prohibition of entry of staff and students, (iii) channelling of scholarships, (iv) denial of access to research data, (v) veiled threats of intervention in university affairs.

However, Chideya and Sibanda have offered a corrective to a possible impression that but for the RF the University would have progressed much better:

However, in a sense the term 'non-racial' is misleading in so far as it gives the impression that were it not for the hostile attitude of RF Government, all would be well within the University. As already stated, a university being a social institution has to reflect the social ethos of the larger society. The struggles, attitudes, fears and animosities in the larger Rhodesian society were indeed reflected on the University campus.

For example, as far as academic staffing policy was concerned there were perceptible University and non-University constraints. Firstly, in the colonial period immigration policy was decidedly in favour of whites and it was very much easier for non-citizen white academics to come into the country and be given work/residence permits. This meant that when the University recruited expatriate staff invariably they were white and therefore recruitment from the "Third World" has been largely non-existent. Secondly, the colonial authorities had the power to deport or deny entry to those expatriate whites they felt were a potential or actual nuisance; this was used on a number of occasions, for example, the deportation of Ranger in the early period, and the deportation/denial of entry in the 1970's of particular members of the Department of Political Science (for example, Maguire, Good and Dixon). Thirdly, it has been noticeable for some time that in some quarters at the University there has been a bias in favour of education/degrees from and advertising of vacancies locally and in UK/South Africa and for interviews to be conducted largely locally or in the UK. All these factors combined to ensure that expatriate recruitment was largely from the UK/South Africa with some input from USA/Canada.

Black members of staff and some non-black members of staff have for some time been disaffected because of the above and related reasons, for example, a general non-African and western orientation of the University, the fact of white domination of the Council and
the Senate, the issue of Africanization of the curricula and administrative and academic staff, particularly at the senior levels, etc. The rather slow pace of Africanization has been a recurring bone of contention which simply illuminates the long presence of what might be termed structural discrimination (although it should be noted that during the UDI years some highly qualified black academics were unwilling to return home because of the perceived illegitimacy of operating in a UDI environment and because of perceptions of possible victimization from the colonial regime). Printed evidence of this may be seen in the publications of, for example, Chideya and Sibanda, Pongweni, Chideya and the "Black Caucus".

Chideya and Sibanda have argued that the gradual Africanization of University staff since 1976 has been the result of three factors, (i) the deteriorating security situation since 1976 made it difficult to recruit expatriate staff and some white staff left because of the call-ups, (ii) there was pressure from a few University staff to gradually localize, (iii) there was pressure from the African members of staff.

As a result of consultations with a newly-constituted Principal's Ad Hoc Advisory Committee, the then Principal, Professor Craig, produced a document entitled 'The University and Constitutional Change' in June 1977. The document indicated that "a policy of vigorous Africanization and localization would be pursued at least with respect to new permanent posts and dismissals". However the impact was considerably lessened in another section of the document which suggested a policy of localization "possibly beginning at the Teaching Assistantship or graduate student level necessary to manage larger student numbers, but also bidding for higher establishment posts".

Subsequently, in July 1977, I submitted a paper to the Board of the Faculty of Social Studies and then to Senate which argues, among other things, for a policy of declaring all or a majority of posts as local/indigenous posts, a "conduct system" for relatively young graduates, and increased relationships with "Third World" institutions; there was no question that the implications were that University staff composition at all levels would reflect the black majority in the country.

The "Black Caucus" manifesto of February 1978 was another landmark document in the struggle to ensure that university staffing properly reflected the black majority in the country. Arguing that "in post-independent Africa, the role of the University is connected with the consolidation of hard-won political independence and the wide variety of expectations of the African masses with the socio-economic and political benefits of independence", the manifesto presented a vigorous case for Africanization of curricula, administrative staff and teaching staff. In pursuance of this the manifesto rejected the Principal's suggested policy of localization from the bottom:

A policy of Africanization should be pursued at all levels:

(i) We reject the ambiguous and meaningless concept of 'localization' of staff used in the Principal's paper. The concept has been abused in certain departments by employing and promoting resident whites at the expense of qualified blacks.

(ii) We also reject the Principal's suggestion that such Africanization should begin at the bottom, that is, at the Teaching Assistantship level ... There are many qualified Africans here and abroad who are willing to take up senior positions in the University. The problem is not one of shortage of manpower.

(iii) In order to effect a policy of complete restructuring and re-orientation of the University it is essential that many senior positions be Africanised without delay. We know from experience and from personal knowledge of the persons now in senior positions that many of them would resist changes. Therefore, if no changes are made at the top the recommendations both in the Principal's paper and in our paper will never be implemented.

In terms of teaching staff, the position at the university, as of 24 July, 1981, was that out of 353 established teaching posts, 77 were vacant. 66 were held by black Zimbabweans, not counting the fact that 14 black Zimbabweans had left the university for Government service and that 3 black Zimbabweans had been offered posts but had declined the appointments. Of the 66 black Zimbabwean staff only two are Professors and Heads of Departments! Thus there is no question that there is a long way to go to meet the demands of Africanization, especially of senior academic posts, contained in the "Black Caucus" manifesto. A complicating factor is that it is my impression that perhaps a majority of white staff at the University are either Zimbabweans or dual nationals (I shall return to this point later in the paper).
In terms of Africanization of the university, a related issue is the black/white student ratio. In the first year of the existence of the university there were indeed very few black students on campus. And it was not until 1976 that black students outnumbered white students. For some time government scholarships for black students were largely in "teaching subjects" and the teaching profession was the main employment outlet for black graduates of the university. But "outside funds" (for example, WUS Scholarships) were critically helpful in diversifying the subjects/disciplines studied by black students; this, together with growing output at the form VI level from black secondary schools, helped increase the number of black students. Additionally, the "take-over" in 1976 reflects, in part, the call-up system which increasingly affected non-blacks. When blacks were being called up many black students left the country and the "Black Caucus" declared that it would ignore the call-up. Sometimes crises on campus resulted in a drop in black student intake, for example, the crisis of late 1973 resulted in well over a hundred students being detained. Thereafter some were barred from campus and others left the country. The full-time student registrations by race for selected years are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>African</th>
<th>European</th>
<th>Asian/Coloured</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Registry, UZ.

Thus one may generalize to the effect that while the university maintained the principle of non-racialism and often defended it internally and sometimes externally, nevertheless, the pace of Africanization seen in terms of student intake and staff appointments has, for a variety of reasons, been quite slow. This has been a cause of much tension and suspicion as between black and white; this tension and suspicion remains even though over the years there has been co-operation and intermingling as between black and white.

In spite of these major shortcomings the University has been able to maintain a degree of autonomy and academic freedom (dealt with later in detail) because, as Murphree has suggested, of a number of factors, i.e., significant sources of independent financing, pragmatic considerations relating to the provision of certain categories of skilled manpower, a monopoly position as the sole viable employer and agent of academic expertise necessary for university education, the Charter and the legitimacy factor.

The Relationship between the University and the Government
April 1980 was indeed a watershed in the history of Zimbabwe. The successful transformation of the colonial State into a vibrant independent State marked one terminal point in the struggle of African nationalism to obliterate the negative components of the past and move towards a decidedly positive future for the people of Zimbabwe. The particular methodology of Liberation, i.e., the Armed Struggle, delimits the type of Liberation which has swept the country. The African nationalist movement's revolutionary methodology had been built on the conjunction of a radicalized leadership and a radicalized population. Therefore it is to be expected that the process of radicalization will continue after independence of April, 1980.

This radicalization is evident in, for example, the strategic goal of a socialist transformation of society, which is being translated in particular policies or tactical goals such as the emphasis on worker participation and a more equitable distribution of resources which emphasizes distribution without unduly upsetting existing private sector activities, the provision of a more equitable pattern of education, health and housing, generally the mobilization of the country for the benefit of the common man and woman of Zimbabwe. In such a profound reshaping of social, economic and political relations in Zimbabwe few, if any, individuals, groups and structures will remain untouched. Therefore the "wind of radical transformation" will also blow in the corridors of the university. The context of the University has decidedly changed from one of a racist society to that of a liberated society.
and just as independence is now liberating the society from the shackles of its racist past, so will the university be liberated from its colonial past.

A Zimbabwe University Bill is to be presented to Parliament in the near future and the University community is awaiting, anxiously in some quarters and eagerly in other quarters, the publication of the Bill. And it would be logical to assume that the process of liberating the University is likely to be guided by the same policy if “radical change with reconciliation” which has animated the Government of Zimbabwe in the variety of policies which it has promulgated and carried out since independence.

In the wider society this policy of “radical change with reconciliation” has meant that, for example, there have been no “War Crime Trials” as in post-Second War Germany and Japan, those with “colonial mentalities” are being persuaded to change direction not only for the benefit of society but also for themselves (a process of liberation of the colonizer from himself/herself), the wounds and divisions of war are being healed by a process of integration of former adversaries in areas such as the police, the army, the civil service etc., the RF remains in parliament with parliamentary privileges for free speech, which free speech the RF so visibly denied to those who now form the Government, and at the very top, i.e., in the formation of Government itself, the overall perspective is glaringly highlighted by a Coalition Government involving the majority ZANU (PF), and the minority PF and white membership. Thus it can hardly be that by the measure of significant objective criteria a veritable miracle has occurred in Zimbabwe, and that the prophets of doomsday scenarios will have had to bring out their “slide rules” to understand what went wrong with their projections.

Therefore, in line with this policy of “radical change with reconciliation” it would be reasonable to assume that, internally, the University will have to undergo radical changes while contrary forces within the University, i.e., the progressives and the reactionaries, reconcile for a better future, and, externally, in the University’s relations with the Government, the University acknowledge and pursue, the national development goals and the Government considers the University as its partner rather than its adversary, with the Government knowing full well that it is the senior partner and the university realizing that it is the junior partner. And just as the power-sharing at the Government level is a policy based on the twin pillars of magnanimity and pragmatism, so it would be reasonable to posit the view the partnership between the Government and the University would be based on the very same pillars of magnanimity and pragmatism.

It is an objective fact that in Zimbabwe or any other country no university can exist without the blessing and support of the Government. This may be a statement of the obvious and the banal, nevertheless it needs to be stated and acknowledged. As Jasper notes, “The state has easily the upper hand over the university and can in fact destroy it”. Thus there is the glaring fact that the Government, as the “Executive Committee of the State”, has at its disposal the powers of coercion, namely physical force; even if the university had its own police force it would be no match to the coercive capabilities of the Government.

The second important resource at the Government’s command is the legal one. With its preponderant majority in Parliament, the Government can enact Bills which, having passed through Parliament, can constrain the University, even against the University’s wishes.

The third important resource of the Government is that it has the “power of the purse”. As of now the Government contributes more than 90% of the University’s budget and any non-Zimbabwean funding, outside of minor amounts, must be channelled through the system of priorities as defined by the Government. Thus the Government is able to develop priorities which the University has to follow. Of course, there is nothing in the Charter, as presently constituted, which says that the Government must be the major financial backer of the University and, theoretically, the university could be funded largely by non-Governmental and non-Zimbabwean sources. However, it is quite unlikely that the Government will allow the university to be, for example, so privately endowed as to leave it areas of “financial openness”.

A fourth major resource at the command of the Government is the fact that it is democratically elected by the people of Zimbabwe. The basis of its legitimacy rests in the will of the people while the University is not elected by the people and cannot claim any such legitimacy. Since the budget of the university goes to Treasury through the Ministry of Education, there is no question that in very important respects the Minister of Education and Culture is the “financial overseer” of the university, and whereas the Minister is
elected by the people, the Vice-Chancellor is appointed by the Council of the University. Further, while the Prime Minister is also elected by the people and is, in a very real sense, the leader of the people, the principal and Vice-Chancellor is leader of only a tiny segment of the people, i.e. the University. Thus there is no question that in power terms there is a basic structural inequality and therefore in any serious contest of wills and in any confrontation the University is bound to lose. It is this structural inequality which should portray the relationship between the University and the Government. But in spite of this structural inequality there is no reason to suppose that a partnership of unequals is not possible indeed it is the only mode of relationship which will benefit both the University and the Government.

However, it would not be untrue to suggest that it is quite possible that the Government views the present University with a mixture of perceptions. Firstly, it is quite likely that the importance of the University in the life of the country is not in doubt, i.e., its role in providing, as best as it can, the necessary high-level skills, as an institution of higher education in Zimbabwe which has some measure of international prestige etc.

Secondly, it is likely that the Government has little pride in and much deal of suspicion of the University as it stands. This likely lack of pride and great suspicion may indeed result from a perception that the University as presently constituted may want to divorce itself from the Government and the society at large, i.e., how far and in what manner the colonial university can truly become an African university in terms of structures, incumbents, and attitudes and orientations of staff and students, — in sum, the Zimbabweanization, and, in particular, Africanization, of the curricula and administrative and academic staff, and how far the goals of the university can be harmonized with national developmental goals and particularly with the strategic goal of a socialist transformation of the society.

Of course, the University of Zimbabwe Bill may overtake any internally generated reforms by the university. However, we at the University can still think of changes which would help the realization of the kind of partnership with the Government which has been presented here.

For example, in terms of goals, the University could possibly do no better than adopt the goals of an African university formulated at the 1972 Accra Workshop; these goals were (i) pursuit, promotion and dissemination of knowledge with emphasis on practical knowledge useful to the generality of people and thus locally orientated and motivated, (ii) Research — both fundamental and applied — with priority in research into local problems which ameliorate the conditions of life of the rural poor, (iii) providing intellectual leadership — particularly against the backdrop of illiteracy and where other functionaries may be inexperienced, the university needed to diffuse knowledge but with intellectual honesty, simplicity of language, and a non-patronizing attitude in a two-way communication process with the ordinary man and woman in the country, (iv) manpower development — with production of graduates who were not deficient in professional and practical skills, with the university producing not only high-level manpower but also participating in planning, organization, curriculum development and superintending of institutions for training middle-level manpower, (v) promoting social and economic modernization — in arresting divisive and centrifugal tendencies arising from situations of ethnic multiplicity and low levels of economic organization; thus the university, i.e., academics, administrators, research workers and students, promote social cohesion and set examples in democratic institutions, and become extension workers helping small-scale trader, artisan and farmer in improving their lives, (iv) promoting intercontinental unity and international understanding — pursuing research and disseminating knowledge and taking all necessary steps to emancipate Africa from the shackles of ignorance, and break barriers of artificial isolation arising from colonialism, and barriers of language and cultural separation; the university must rediscover Africa and provide the proper intellectual and enlightened foundation for Africa’s image in the world and promote the ideals of the Organization of African Unity and continental rapprochement and international understanding. A firm acceptance of the above goals would put the University firmly on the side of the “utilitarian” model of a university discussed earlier.

The University should also seriously look at certain structures for changes which will better place the University in terms of Zimbabweanization, and particularly Africanization, and democratization. After all, even though Zimbabweanization is a principle of the Government, nevertheless, in, for example, the Public Service, there is the constraining and liberating factor of the Presidential Directive. The University does not have a Presidential Directive but even in its absence the University could take some meaningful
steps. Secondly, in the wider society the principle of democratization has been seen in the general elections of April 1980, in the elections to Municipal and District Councils, in the idea of worker committees and in the emphasis on equality between the sexes. The University could analogously effect its own steps towards democratization.

Firstly, the Council of the university; in terms of the statutes, membership of the Council is composed of: (i) the Principal and Vice-Chancellor, the Deputy Principal and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, and other Vice- Principals — as of now there are three, of whom two are black, (ii) 9 members appointed by the Government of Zimbabwe — as of now there are five vacancies, with 4 in post of whom 3 are black, (iii) 7 academics appointed by the Senate — all are filled of whom 3 are black, (iv) 9 appointed by various outside bodies — all are filled of whom 3 are black and 1 is Asian, (v) on invitation of the Council, 1 or a maximum of 2 — by convention only 1 is filled by nomination by the Students Representative Council with the proviso that the nominee must be a graduate student — the office holder is black, (vi) 2 appointed by the Council — both are white, (vii) 2 persons distinguished in the University world, appointed by Council with concurrence of the Senate — both are white.\(^{33}\)

Theoretically, in order to effect Africanization, the different kinds of membership could remain the same as present. However, besides the issue of Africanization, there are the factors of the adequate level of participation of the Government, and democratization. A broad mathematical perspective, which would take account of the partnership between the University and the Government, and the interests of the wider community would result in a rough balance of forces, i.e., one third Government members, one third academic members (not counting the two or three main officers of the University), and one third outside bodies, which should include one representative each from the Senate and the House of Assembly and the trade union movement all of which at the moment are unrepresented on the council. Additionally, the provision for distinguished academics and student representation should remain, but the workers at the University should be on the Council and there should be determined efforts to have adequate representation of women.

The question of membership of the Senate and any change of "complexion" in it is governed in large measure by the "complexion" of senior academic staff on campus. In terms of the Statutes, membership of the Senate is composed of: (i) the Principal and Vice-Chancellor, the Vice-Principal and Vice-Chancellor and any other Vice-Principal, (ii) Deans and Deputy Deans of Faculties, (iii) all Professors and Readers, (iv) all non-Professorial and non-Reader status heads of academic departments, (v) the Librarian (vi) one representative each from all faculties who is a full-time lecturing staff and is elected by the faculties, (vii) members of staff appointed by Council after consultations with the Senate.\(^{34}\)

Given the fact that most senior academic staff are white, the majority of Senate membership is white. Thus if Africanization of the Senate is to be effected it can only be done through a system whereby the university rotates headships of departments and, in addition, adopts the American system of designation of staff, which would mean that an incumbent in any academic post could rise "in his/her own line" to full professorship. This combination of two factors would democratize departments from the "bottom", and would also help in Africanization of Departments and the Senate, at least over a reasonable period of time; an additional factor which could influence this process is a revamping of the criteria used for initial appointments to temporary and permanent staff. The merit of combining these three factors would be that the principle of Zimbabweanization would be married with the principle of Africanization, just as it has been done by the Government. It is my impression that the majority of white staff at the University are either Zimbabweans or dual nationals. If I am correct, and if one wants immediate Africanization, then the simplest solution would be to ask everyone to resign and reapply; but this would send such shockwaves of demoralization through the University as to put its efficiency at risk at least in the immediate term. Additionally, this may well raise some legal questions, and in any case would make the treatment of staff at the university so different in comparison with the treatment of staff of for example, the Public Service, as to make the transformation at the University a special case. My solution may take a little longer and may mean that some staff may have to wait a while longer, but at least it has the merit of opening up the staff distribution system at the University with disruption kept as much as possible to the minimum. Perhaps there may be other formulas which may have greater merit but the above suggestions regarding the Council, the Senate, and the Departments are offered, for what they are worth, as bases for starting the dialogue for "radical change with consensus". Some of the above-mentioned changes at the Departmental level have been
proposed by various members at the University but progress has been slow, in part because the university has moved slowly and in part because the university has been awaiting the Zimbabwe University Bill since 1980.

An additional factor to be taken into account in the process of Africanization, married as it is with the Government's policy of Zimbabweanization, is that there must be definite programmes of staff development. Yesufu has commented on the question of "staff localization and development" as follows:

To the extent that localization is often hampered by unavailability of highly qualified nationals, a policy of indigenization of staff should include programmes to recruit young first degree holders as graduate assistants, and awarding them fellowships, scholarships and study leave, to enable them to undertake postgraduate work for higher degrees.\(^5\)

The university has made some attempt in this regard but a full-scale programme of staff development will require additional finance from the Government or other sources.

As stated, Africanization of the curricula has been often asked for by the "Black Caucus" and, as Mazrui has noted, indeed has been one of the major pressures of African nationalism after the gaining of independence in many an African country.\(^6\) Of course, the University already offers a variety of courses on Zimbabwe and Africa in many departments, for example, in Political Science, Economics, Sociology, African Languages, History, Literature, and in Education, Africulture, Medicine, etc. Recently, the offering of a course on Government and Politics of Zimbabwe in the Department of Political Science and the subject "The African Experience" in the Faculty of Arts, initially through the Department of History have considerably helped matters. Nevertheless, much more could be done, but again this would require a great deal of finance from the Government as the preponderant financier of the University. Additional departments can and ought to be created if the University's function in preserving and promoting African culture is taken seriously by the University and the Government. For example, as Pongweni has argued, there is urgent need for a department of Music, and a Department of Fine Arts at the University;\(^7\) to these one should add the disciplines of Dance and Drama. In such Departments and other related departments financial provision for appointing musicians, dancers, dramatists, writers, painters, sculptors, film-makers, designers, oral historians, etc., even if they do not have academic qualifications, would make a world of difference to the ability of the University to meet its task in helping to preserve and promote African culture and would be in the interests of the Government and the society.

Further, there is urgent need for what one might call a "Foundation Course" which should be compulsory for all students at the university. The "Foundation Course" would focus on the developmental problems of Zimbabwe in particular with perhaps some analysis of the region from both the socialist and non-socialist theoretical perspectives. Initially, one could mount such a course in the first year and then see whether such a course should be offered over more than one year. This course may appear to some as an "ideological course" but that would not be the intention, rather the intention would be for students at the university to know something about the developmental problems of their own country through the prism of relevant ideologies, i.e., both socialist and non-socialist.

If Ajayi is correct in his view that "the idea of the university is tolerated but not truly accepted in Africa, either by the masses who pay taxes, or by the political leaders who dispense the taxes. If the universities succeed in achieving greater relevance, the mass of the people may move from toleration to understanding and acceptance",\(^8\) then it is suggested that if the above-mentioned suggestions, or some better ones, are followed by the university then the university will be much better placed than in the past in relation to the Government and the society.

However, one should add a note of caution because universities cannot be expected to perform miracles. As Kwapong has observed:

In the atmosphere of approaching independence, they were indeed accorded great indulgence and respect and generally high hopes and expectations were entertained about them and they were credited with almost magical qualities and near-miraculous powers for independence... A decade and a half later no one today expects these universities in Africa to work miracles.\(^9\)

Further, there are special problems associated with what Wandira has described as "the one-country-one-university institution". To some extent Wandira disagrees with Ajayi's view that the idea of the university is tolerated but not accepted in Africa. He writes:
The university became the symbol of independence no less than the flag, the national anthem or the aeroplane. Africa firmly accepted the belief that the university was a vital institution for the sustenance of independence and development. The legitimacy of the university as part of the national apparatus could no longer be questioned. Next to government itself, a university is the most essential instrument in a country seeking to enter the modern world. Next to government it has the greatest concentration of expertise and talent which can be put to the service of that nation’s development.40

Notwithstanding this special position of the university in Africa, the limitations upon the “one-country-one-university institution” are very real:

It cannot share its burden of service to society with another university or institution of equal size and standing . . . Government is also the university’s main source of finance. Uneasy sensitivities sometimes exist between university and government. Situations sometimes arise when what the university does and says is immediately heard in the corridors of power and may be weighed against political and security considerations . . . The resources of the one-country-one-university institution are usually very limited. Academic departments are small and the university as a whole is small . . . In most cases the university is totally dependent upon government financing. With this comes strict governmental supervision of university finance and the general management of the university. As most innovations must, in the end, cost money, the university can only innovate as fast as government or external donors will allow.41

Thus there is no question that if the university is expected to Africanize curricula and staff and in the process engage in innovations, which it ought to do, then considerable financial backing will be required largely from the Government. This financial input will need to be greater if, as the university expects, the student intake will be about 5000 in the next five years, if not in the next two years (as I suspect); this will further strain the already strained situation in terms of additional staff, offices, lecture theatres (especially large ones) which are required even as of now without some of the innovations suggested above.

Further, if the university’s links with the outside world, especially with the “Third World”, are seen as important, as I do, then there is a problem of permission and finance, i.e., since the legitimate changeover of the Immigration Promotion Board to the Immigration Control Board Zimbabweans must receive first preference in appointments at the University. This is quite correct and indeed it might be added here that for some time the Department of Political Science has been involved in the struggle on campus for the Zimbabweanization and Africanization of posts and that outside of the Department of African Languages the Department of Political Science is the most Zimbabweanized and Africanized department on campus. Nevertheless, even though expatriate staff may be appointed after permission by the relevant departments of the Government, the fact remains that, especially in some disciplines, there is a very good supply of highly-skilled Zimbabwean African academic manpower. Thus there is the virtual impossibility in some Departments of the ability to appoint specialist persons even from Africa, and the “Third World” generally. Therefore unless special funding is made available to the university, for visiting appointments, there is great danger that the University will become incestuous and insular because the University will not be able to engage in the essential Zimbabwean.Zimbabwe and the “Third World” interchange.

Finally, I turn to another major element in the relationship between the University and the Government, i.e., the question of academic freedom and autonomy. Universities in Africa, as in many other places, are caught in a paradox because while they may be funded largely by their taxpayers’ money through their governments they also tend to be quite firm about the need to have academic freedom and autonomy. This is quite evident in, for example, Ajayi’s view of the university in the African and developing situation, which is:

. . . the idea of a group of scholars and students living together as a community, financed by the public, claiming a large measure of autonomy to regulate its internal affairs, and claiming that such autonomy is essential for its proper functioning and well-being.42

Ajayi recognizes the fact that:

No government, taking seriously its responsibility for developing its human and material resources, can ignore the development of higher education. Higher education is an expensive facility . . . The position in most African countries is
complicated by the struggle for power between various group interests... university appointments become part of the resources of the new nation which, like appointments in the civil service, armed forces, police or public corporations, affect the relative importance and balance of the various peoples making up the nation... This means some degree of government involvement in the planning, development and control of universities.  

Therefore inevitably the university in Zimbabwe must expect some degree of control by the Government. The question is what kind of control which may or may not be compatible with the idea of university autonomy. Here I have indicated some kinds of structural changes, for example, at the level of the Departments (and consequentially the Senate) and the Council which would have the twin merit of, on the one hand, significant changes at the university and, on the other hand, allowing for autonomy of the university and obviating direct control by the Government. The suggested one-third participation by the Government on the council would mean that the Government would be involved in the highest body of the university; of course, as noted earlier, representatives of the Government are already able to sit on the Council but here I have suggested an increase from approximately 20% representation to approximately 33% representation. Additionally, the question of public accountability which Ajayi refers to is decided taken into account by the suggested addition to the membership of the Council of two representatives from Parliament, one each from the House of Assembly and the Senate, because ultimately it is Parliament which will enact the legal instruments under which the university will operate and it is Parliament which will vote the necessary funds which the Government will request from it.

Ashby suggests that academic freedom may be defined as:

that freedom of members of the academic community, assembled in colleges and universities, which underlies the effective performance of their functions of teaching, learning, practice of the arts, and research. The right to academic freedom is recognized in order to enable faculty members and students to carry on their role.

In his study of various African universities, Ashby concludes that academic freedom, used in the above sense, has not been curtailed, although there have been assaults on university autonomy. To some it may also appear that universities may "want to have their cake and eat it too", and in a real sense this is true. It may also be suggested that somehow there is something obscene about universities clamouring for or defending their academic freedom when the mass of the people may not have adequate education, health, housing, income and wealth, etc., and in a real sense this is also true. Further, it is also true that we academics may sometimes use issues of academic freedom to mask other motives and behaviour; while we academics proclaim that we are involved in learning, truth and knowledge, or as I have earlier stated it in another way, in curiosity, creativity and knowledge, nevertheless, we would do well to remember that we are not always motivated by the pursuit of learning, truth and knowledge, that sometimes we invoke this pursuit as an attempt to camouflage our individual and corporate privileges, that sometimes we are more animated by our own biases, prejudices and passions rather than by rationality and intellect, that sometimes we choose a university career, because we may be better at no other profession and/or because the university environment may afford us a less taxing, more prestigious and economically beneficial life-style than other environments.

However, even granting all these and other deficiencies in ourselves, I would argue that the relationship between the university and the Government should be based on a greater, rather than lesser, measure of autonomy and academic freedom, with the proviso that the university more emphatically sees its role in terms of the "utilitarian" model suggested earlier, which while emphasizing "knowledge for change" does not neglect "knowledge for its own sake". Analogously, we academics should have no difficulty in accepting Marx's dictum "The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it"; 46 the "utilitarian" model of the role of a university emphasizes the idea of change and the fact that before one can change the world one needs to understand it, or if you will, one needs to philosophize about it.

On this need, both to understand the world and to change it, there surely cannot be, or ought not to be, any disagreement between the university and the Government? After all the university is in important respects a "house of intellect" and so, I admit, is the Government, whether based on Shil's definition of an intellectual as "all persons with an
advanced modern education and the intellectual concern and skills ordinarily associated with it"\(^\text{46}\) or on Mazrui’s definition of an intellectual as “a person who has the capacity to be fascinated by ideas, and has acquired the skill to handle some of those ideas effectively”\(^\text{47}\). Indeed many have commented on the fact that the Government is the most highly educated Government in the history of this country, and there is no question that the Government is indeed a “house of intellect”, most visibly personified by the generally acclaimed intellectual qualities of the Prime Minister himself. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the two “houses of intellect” (with many individuals and Departments, on either side, already engaged in consultations, meetings, co-operation, etc.) would be better placed for the kind of partnership I have discussed earlier, which partnership would recognise the role of the intellectuals; after all it was Lenin who noted:

The teaching of Socialism, however, has grown out of the philosophical, historical, and economic theories that were worked out by the educated representatives of the property classes — the intelligentsia. The founders of modern scientific Socialism, Mark and Engels, themselves belonged by social status to the bourgeois intelligentsia.\(^\text{48}\)

Of course Lenin is not used here to justify “bourgeois” activities but rather to emphasize the role of intellectuals. And yet, one must recognize that sometimes there may be differences of views between the university and the Government, because the latter is more deeply involved on a day-to-day basis in solving the various developmental problems of the country and whereas the university, while it may be heavily assisting the Government, will nevertheless have a less direct responsibility, for both success and failure, than the Government. Additionally, not all academics and students may necessarily agree with the tactical equations or goals made in the immediate term. Further, because of the “questioning” environment of the university, academics and students may have views substantially different from those of the Government.\(^\text{49}\) But here again both sides in the partnership need to acknowledge that, as Mazrui notes “What a university owes the government of the day is neither defiance nor subservience. It is intelligent co-operation”\(^\text{50}\), or as Yesufu observes “The African university should, in normal circumstances, therefore, accept the hegemony of government. But the relationship should not be one of master and servant as such... The relationship between the university and government should be one of mutual accommodation, respect and positive co-operation”\(^\text{51}\).

Differences of views between the University and the Government ought not to lead inevitably to confrontation. The changes in the Council suggested earlier should help matters but if they prove to be inadequate then it would be useful to set up a permanent committee with equal representation between the University and the Government with a neutral chairperson. Possibly this committee should be a mediating/advisory body which would try to resolve differences, for example, policy questions, legal interpretations, and any “emergency” situations, and generally allow time for a relatively dispassionate consideration of areas of disagreement, and submitting its views/reports to both the Council of the University and to the Minister of Education and Culture.

CONCLUSION

This paper attempts to put forward some ideas on a possible relationship between the University and the Government. It has been argued that a serious self-appraisal of our role would involve our tilting more decidedly in favour of the “utilitarian” model, which could imply the kinds of changes in attitudes, structures, curricula, etc., suggested here, which would keep a proper balance between “knowledge for its own sake” and “knowledge for change”.

Of course, ideas presented here may well be overtaken by the Zimbabwe University Bill, nevertheless, it is still important for us on campus to think seriously about such matters and it is hoped that this important conference is not the first and last of such dialogues between the University and the Government.

Further it is argued that even though at times the University and the Government may have differences of views, there are many factors which indicate that there is no reason to suppose that the University and the Government cannot be allies in the consolidation of our hard-won independence and in jointly tackling the immense developmental tasks which lie ahead. The essential components of the relationship between the University and the Government lie in a partnership of unequals, based on mutual respect, trust and co-operation, because, as Ashby notes:
"In Europe universities have stood for continuity and conservation; in Africa universities are powerful instruments for change. They must, therefore, go into partnership with the State, and for this purpose they require a fresh constitutional pattern."
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CHAPTER 5

University Reform: Changing the University to meet new needs

by Dr. Herbert M. Murerwa

Introduction

The legitimacy and mission of the African university has been challenged over the years not so much because the University is of foreign origin but rather because of its failure during the last few decades to adapt itself to the challenges of development faced by African countries.

This paper will discuss possible areas of university reform in Africa in general and more specifically in Zimbabwe. It is presented in two main parts. Part I tries to show that the imported 'model' has failed to respond adequately to the needs of African countries; notwithstanding the adaptations that have been made in terms of governance and learning content. Part II of the paper discusses the potential role of the university as an agent of change, focussing principally on the role of the university in the process of cultural transformation and the development of high level manpower.

The University under Colonialism

It is important to note, at the beginning, that some of the oldest Universities are to be found on the African Continent. I refer to such universities as Quarawiyyine in Fes Morocco which was founded in A.D. 859, and the University of Al Ashar in Cairo, Egypt, founded in A.D. 972. In Central Africa the University of Sankore in Timbuctoo had considerable reputation as a centre for Muslim scholarship.¹ The colonisation of West and Central African led to the establishment of the newer universities in the 1920's such as Makerere College in Uganda founded in 1922; the Gordon Memorial College and the Kitchener School of Medicine in Khartoum in 1924 and the Achimota College in Accra in 1927. Almost fifty years earlier Fourah Bay College had been established in Sierra Leone.

The orientation of the African university had always been of central concern to African Academies and educators, among them Dr. James Africunus Beale Horton, Edward Blyden and Rev. James Johnson of Sierra Leone and J.E. Casely Hayford of Ghana. These men spearheaded the demand for an African University that would preserve an African Culture and racial personality in order to restore self-respect among Africans: an institution that would "leave undisturbed our peculiarities.² These demands fell on deaf ears. Colonial authorities argued that such a university would be of little value, since the priorities of African development included the development of teachers, doctors, engineers, etcetera. At any rate, such colonial degrees would have little value in terms of recognition unless they were based on the standards of the metropolitan country.

This is essentially still the main argument today: that, in spite of all the changes that have taken place in the African university to date, the University remains the clearest manifestation of cultural domination.³ Others have denied that African Universities perpetuate cultural dependence and argue on the other hand that African universities have been a potential force for liberation; that graduates from these universities provided the leadership for the African Nationalist Movements that eventually led their countries to independence.⁴ That the desire for independence was as a result of the values of liberty and freedom taught in these institutions. This line of argument is dismissed by Martin Carnoy who argues that there is little evidence that European education did teach the value of Liberty and freedom from European colonisation. He observes that it is more likely that Africans continued to resist colonisation despite European schooling.⁵ The story of West African resistance to the Europeans in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries is one of local and widespread fighting by uneducated tribesmen who valued their independence not only from European domination but also from other Africans. Formal schooling
produced a new elite who could deal with the European. This elite attained the leadership of masses of people already opposed to European occupation and jurisdiction. These elites then translated what had been tribal and group resistance to the Europeans into “nationalist resistance.”

Mazrui, on the other hand, argues that because of the imported structure of the African university fundamental changes are really not possible and therefore the university is still capable of being at once a mechanism for political liberation and an agency for cultural dependency.

The main argument is that the African university’s links with the metropolitan system has deeply affected the priorities of African scholars. For example, the association with the mother institutions made it impossible to change the curriculum. Modern universities in Africa, with a few exceptions, started as branches of European universities. Makerere College in Uganda, the University College at Ibadan in Nigeria, the University Colleges in Lagon, Ghana and our own university had their roots in London. Entrance to these universities was on the basis of the requirements of the University of London and the University of London approved the syllabuses and examinations. Even examination questions had to be forwarded to London for criticism and revision.

This state of affairs made it impossible for African branches of the university to determine their own direction and implement the innovations that were needed in order to make the African university more relevant to the African environment. Mazrui observes that in West Africa: “Greek, Latin and the history of Greece and Rome formed the core of the humanities. For many years no African Language, not even Arabic, could be studied at university level.”

African music is another area which was neglected by African universities. In part, colonialism and the spread of Christianity contributed to this neglect as African dance patterns were considered to be primitive and sexually suggestive. While westernised Africans were not openly hostile to changes that were being introduced, they in fact, easily accepted imported varieties such as ball-room dancing and so on.

In some African universities, however, changes have occurred and African music and dance have been given their rightful place on the curriculum. In Tanzania, traditional music and dance (ngoma) are now considered important art forms and are taught in primary and secondary schools as well as at the university.

Another factor that has tended to inhibit the radical transformation of African universities is the subtle influences of the financial sponsors of University programmes. Edward Berman in his analysis of the role of African universities showed that these foundations shared mutual concern for controlling development in third world countries to promote American economic interests. The main foundations often acted in concert “to support educational projects and development models which would bind foreign nationals and their institutions to the dominant values of the American Corporate State.”

These values hold that radical politics are detrimental for economic development and political stability:

“In short, the measured and gradual development of African Nations serves the best interest of World stability and, at the same time, provides an international context within which the major American foundations play crucial roles in developing national politics. This involvement has the further advantage of binding leaders of the new nations through the aegis of foundation-sponsored educational institutions, so political doctrines which at the very least, are not overtly antagonistic to state-supported capitalist development.”

Berman further showed that to facilitate this, foundations identified and supported only those institutions which showed a willingness to adhere to the broad policy and guidelines of donor organisations. In some cases, carefully selected foundation representatives were placed in key departments, while African nationals were sent for advanced graduate studies in U.S. universities, the overriding assumption being that these “Universities would play important roles in the creation of the leadership which would help sustain the orderliness of economic growth.” The result of this can easily be anticipated, African universities become infected in what they do and continually ask: What will the donor say? Some observers have argued that constraints that inhibit the performance of universities may also be imposed by governments which use their ‘financing’ role to enable them to dictate the programmes universities should undertake in the national interest. It must be noted that the government is in a very different position from the foundations in that the long term interests of a National University are not antagonistic to
those of government.
The point that should be made, however, in respect of this last point is that the extent to which a university can be innovative is essentially determined by the resources made available to it by both the government and donor agencies. The more flexibility the university has in the management of financial resources made available for its use the more creative it is likely to be.

This brief discussion has attempted to highlight only a few of the problems that confront the African university. Our university is emerging out of entirely unique circumstances which are very difficult to generalise about, in relation to other African universities. The following section will attempt to focus a little more closely on how our own university could re-define its role and mission in order that it may respond more positively to the needs and aspirations of the nation.

The University and National Development

This part of the paper will focus on the role of the university as an agent for social and cultural transformation in society. It will also discuss the importance of the university in the development of high level manpower.

There is no doubt that a fundamental re-orientation in outlook is required if a university is to foster cultural transformation in society.

Universities in Africa have become established as out-posts of Western culture and their students almost entirely dependent on such culture. African universities need to disengage from over dependence on Western models if they are to provide the social and cultural environment needed to evolve an African identity and personality.

The old questions by Blyden and Hayford are still very much alive today, but they have taken new forms. It is now demanded of the Universities that they become an integral part of the African social, political, economic and cultural environment. African universities should make up their minds as to which culture should be transmitted to the students.

Sir Arthur Lewis has observed that "Western universities have no doubt that their task is to promote Western music, Western painting, Western literature and so on. As the Western University spread into India, one hundred and fifteen years ago, it also assumed that it should promote Western Culture in India although India has its own superb traditions of music, painting, sculpture, architecture and so on."

In view of the total alienation of the African during the long period of colonialism in Zimbabwe, it is not unreasonable that we now should demand that our university promote the teaching and development of our own artistic traditions.

This bias in favour of African culture could be reflected in greater emphasis being placed on the study of African languages, history, philosophy, literature, music and dance.

However, we are not advocating a purely regional approach to our University curriculum; but we are advocating a distinct African bias so that our University, to use Wandira’s words is one that is recognisably part of the African social and cultural environment.

It is acknowledged that there is something to be learned from the experience of the Romans and the Greeks. Human achievement, whatever its geography is indeed part of our heritage also. I agree with Lewis when he observes that:

"The cultural gentleman who neglects the opportunity of benefiting from all nationalities of aesthetic experience is the poorer for doing so."  

We are not proposing a withdrawal from world culture, this would be highly undesirable. After all we are intimately linked with the rest of the world in our efforts to develop and modernize. We are indeed part of a world culture. It is acknowledged that modernity is here to stay; the objective should be to decolonise it. What is desirable is that African universities should move away from excessive Eurocentrism and move towards both increased Afrocentrism and increased internationalisation.

With regard to the role of the university in developing highly skilled manpower, there is no better way for the university to express the practical relevance of its mission than through the development of people with the knowledge and skills to develop the country. The university should become the focus of training and development at the highest level in fields such as medicine, engineering, agriculture, administration, law, accountancy, etcetera. The efforts of the university in this regard should complement the efforts of government and therefore consultation is necessary in determining national needs in terms of high level skilled manpower.
A proper distinction should be made between skills taught at the university and those taught at lower level institutions. I am not sure that the university is the proper place for the study of such subjects as family planning or interior design unless they are provided as extra-mural studies. My own view is that such studies should be undertaken by lower level institutions.

Above all, the training provided at the university should be relevant to the needs of the country. It would not serve the country to educate persons who were so highly specialised that they could not be utilised in that country.

In this respect, I would like to suggest that the learning of students be structured in such a manner as to enable them to acquire some practical experience on the job as part of their training. Such practical experience could be organised during the vacation period or on a sandwich course basis. This would enable students to gain full appreciation of the environment in which they will work. Thus their training would combine both theory and practice which could undoubtedly contribute to more effective learning.

At this point I would like to endorse the idea of a National Service programme for the university students. This would enable them to participate fully in the life of the community. The future leaders of Zimbabwe need to have a full understanding of the aspirations, frustrations, constraints and limitations of the people and communities they will serve. They will be able to return to their studies with greater confidence and a more realistic appreciation of the scope and requirements of the development process. I have no doubt that with experience such as this, university students would become less alienated and thus much less elitist.

Conclusion:

In a country such as Zimbabwe, where there is only one university, it is imperative that such a university's curriculum be relevant to the development needs of the country. Compared to other institutions, the university often has the greatest concentration of expertise and talent and this must be harnessed for the national good. In Zimbabwe, colonialism was finally crushed through war but its cultural, social and economic manifestations still remain. Our university should be a vehicle for dynamic change and not for conservatism. Wandira has observed that the university must pursue a cause that is relevant to development by establishing and maintaining close contact with agencies and institutions involved in development such as governmental, social, political and religious bodies.

However, for the African university to be innovative and creative, it must have some degree of autonomy. This is necessary if it is to remain objective and fulfil its role as a critic in national affairs. It must also be provided with the resources necessary to carry out its programmes. In turn the university has a responsibility to society. It must pursue knowledge that has some practical application and not merely esoteric knowledge nor knowledge for its own sake. It must conduct research into local problems with the aim of improving the quality of life for the ordinary man.

It will be some time before the African university is finally able to remove its shackles. Our own university in Zimbabwe will need to chart its own direction in order that it may respond more effectively to the challenges of development. As the only university, it has a tremendous responsibility to provide the kind of academic leadership which reflects the broad aspirations of the people. It must provide young Zimbabweans with the knowledge and skills which enable them to participate fully in the political, cultural and economic life of their country and above all ensure that they become the vanguard of the ongoing economic revolution and consolidate the revolutionary gains of the past.
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CHAPTER 6

THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM AND RESEARCH: SOME PRIORITIES

Professor D. Goldschmidt and Dr. R. Murapa

"The full value of university activity can only be obtained when the university and the society it serves are organically linked together. New nations establish their own universities because they need a type of higher education appropriate to their problems and their aspirations. This is not to deny that much knowledge is international... But the kind of problems which are examined at a university... do and should vary according to the background of society and the anticipated requirements of the students."

(Nyerere on the occasion of his inauguration as Chancellor of the University of Dar-es-Salaam, 29th August, 1970)

THE universities have three main tasks: education, research and consultation. Before we discuss these tasks or functions let us be clear about five underlying or guiding principles specific to an African university in a new state starting its own independent development.

1. National relevance: Education, research and consultation must be of direct relevance to the development of the country. Curricula and research have to be designed correspondingly. The development of the subject areas must be done consistently with careful manpower planning and with proper regard for personnel and available facilities and for research needs. Education must be an instrument for the promotion of national integration; hence it is necessary that all ethnic groups be represented in the students' body and in the faculty or academic staff.

2. Social identification: The modern University has come to Africa as an institution of the northern part of the world — more specifically the western world. It is, however, true that prior to the onset of colonialism distinguished universities existed in the northern and western parts of Africa, e.g. Egypt, Timbuktu etc. The challenge in Africa is to get the University to achieve a social identification with the people it serves. This is one of the major tasks before the University of Zimbabwe. The university must demonstrate that it belongs to the society and that it is not removed from it. The teachers, doctors, engineers, economists and administrators it produces must be instilled with a sense of social identification with the society at large. They must be in a position to identify and appreciate their nation's problems better than their foreign counterparts. In this sense it is necessary that localization takes place in due course. This is not to advocate isolation or parochialism. Indeed, faculty members should be able to go to other countries for further education and training but must be in a position to resist the temptation to fall prey to the brain drain to countries which are more advanced economically and scientifically.

3. State hegemony: The African states are extremely short of means for education. According to UNESCO, in 1978, seven African states spent less than 10% of their budget on higher education; thirteen states gave 10% - 20%; six states gave 20% - 30%. These figures indicate the extreme need for qualified and well trained personnel in African States. They also underly the great need to have manpower planning as a government responsibility and to foster a close working relationship between the government and the university. Government has an obligation to insist that the university must play a major role in meeting national manpower needs. In this respect, the academic staff is expected to co-operate with the government in a consultative capacity.

In Africa, the university is a national institution to be financed from the national budget. Government influence is therefore more direct on the African university than it is on many western universities.
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"The general view was that whatever the position in the more developed countries, the university in Africa occupied too critical a position of importance to be left alone to determine its own priorities... The Government too by virtue of its position of leadership in the task of planning and execution of economic and social programmes, seems the best placed to determine the priorities for the universities. The African University should, in normal circumstances, therefore, accept the hegemony of state government."


Echoing this view, Prime Minister Mugabe in his address opening this conference stated: "Higher education is too important a business to be left entirely to deans, professors, lecturers and university administrators".

4. Academic freedom: In addition to the principles of national relevance, social identification and state hegemony, there is the principle of academic freedom which must be preserved. But it is academic freedom of a particular type i.e. one whose parameters are defined by the preceding three principles. If these three principles are accepted, then the basis for responsible academic freedom exists. Within this framework the specification of curricula, the standards of examinations, the execution of research projects and the publication of textbooks as well as the research results must be the responsibility of the university members. Furthermore, the faculty members must have the right to nominate candidates and select candidates for academic appointments. Yesufu concludes his report by saying:

"Academic freedom is a freedom which African universities must defend all the time."

5. International Communication: While there is great need for the African university to develop a specific identity, caution must be taken not to allow the African university to be too provincial and too utilitarian. The African university must continue to be a member of the international science community. Where Governments are concerned about their international prestige, efforts must be made to ensure that the university remains respected by the international science community and not to be seen as simply an institution under the administration of a given ministry. The university must continue to pursue communication with its international counterparts. Such communication normally manifests itself in the form of:

- foreign support for buildings and equipment,
- training and research partnerships with foreign universities and institutions,
- foreign visiting lecturers and professors. In a short-term or even long term perspective, it may be very useful to keep about 10% foreigners in teaching and research (not administration) in the faculty. These should normally be experienced senior people who no longer harbour career interests. Likewise, Zimbabwean members of staff should go to foreign universities on temporary assignments,
- training of the post graduates at foreign universities in cases where they cannot receive the appropriate training of their own country.

We now come to the point of defining priorities of the development of (a) education by appropriate curricula and (b) research. We shall deal with education first as this seems to be the most urgent demand on the university at present. We should not however forget that teaching and research at university level should never be separated from each other completely.

For the development of curricula, we should like to make nine points:

1. Weight must be put on subjects which are directly relevant to the development of the country (including basic subjects needed for education in specific fields like mathematics for engineers, chemistry for doctors, physics etc.). It is safe to assume that in a developing country like Zimbabwe the university must provide the following:

   (a) basic fields such as human and veterinary medicine — agriculture,
   — engineering (food and chemical processing, production and processing of raw materials, mechanical and electrical engineering, architecture, maintenance etc.)
   (b) fields for further development of the administrative socio-economic and cultural system; law, teacher training, administration, town and country planning etc.
   (c) humanities and social sciences i.e. philosophy, political science, economics, sociology,
8. Development of teaching materials: Textbooks and other scientific literature are needed. The greater need however is to ensure that the content of such textbooks and literature is of relevance to Zimbabwe and Africa. Too often, African universities depend on textbooks not only written from a eurocentric perspective but which also focus on issues of little relevance to Africa and the specific countries. Unfortunately, this tendency is encouraged by transnational publishers such as Longman, Oxford University Press, Heinemann, Praeger etc. whose major concern is the markets. Furthermore, local publishers shy away from publishing such material because the relatively small market would make the price unreasonably high. Perhaps one way to get around this problem is to have the university establish a modern off-set printing shop as one of its own enterprises. Once the problem of publication is solved, the onus falls on the academic staff to provide the necessary manuscripts. It is a task that must be accorded the highest priority for which time and money must be found. The University would do well to facilitate the employment of teaching assistants so that lecturers can have the necessary time to do research on and publish material of relevance to their teaching and the country. There is also need to develop or acquire other teaching materials including video tapes, demonstration materials etc.

9. Attitude: To implement the foregoing suggestions it is necessary to command broad based support from the academic staff as a whole. A modern and growing university such as the university of Zimbabwe situated in a setting of tremendous social change requires that the teaching staff be sensitive and responsive to the emerging environment. There must be more awareness on the part of the faculty members of the dialectical problems they face. A large segment of the staff members may have consciously or unconsciously subscribed to the culture and values of the old order. There is, therefore, a need for a revolutionary attitudinal change in order to adapt to the new socio-political and cultural order. Inter-disciplinary staff seminars may be used as instruments to facilitate such changes as they help to develop some kind of a dialectic of cultural transition from a eurocentric to an afrocentric perspective. Knowledge and concepts can be more easily understood and internalized if they can be linked to one’s own upbringing.

Having made these fairly general points concerning the developments of future curricula, we should like to make four more specific points about the dialectics of cultural transition.

1. Language: The contents of science and arts as taught in most African universities have been developed nearly exclusively in the west and the medium for transmitting that knowledge has been European languages — largely French and English. This has not always allowed for total communication. Instead communication has rather been limited to technicalities of the particular subject. Such communication cannot always achieve an all embracing mutual exchange of questions, reactions and ideas. This is true in such fields as humanities and social sciences but it is equally true, if not more so in medicine, natural sciences and engineering. Yet there is no gainsaying the fact that in a country such as Zimbabwe — at least for the foreseeable future — English will remain the medium of instruction at the university. Our intention, therefore, is simply to alert faculty members of the cultural context in which they operate and the limitations in communication imposed by the use of a foreign language — English.

2. Learning: In addition to the cultural factors, there are economic factors which may compromise the ability of students in an African University to acquire knowledge with the same facility as their counterparts in European settings. Poor housing conditions, lack of adequate transport, health facilities, public media etc cause difficulties that can hamper the ability of students to achieve their optimum capacity in learning. Efforts have to be made to develop methods of learning how to learn under those circumstances.

3. The Social Groups: Without adhering to romantic concepts about the coherence of African families there is little doubt that traditional life in Zimbabwe and Africa in general has always encouraged co-operation and communal work. The socialist ideology that Zimbabwe has opted for reinforces this concept. Academic work, on the other hand, usually puts weight on individual achievements and has the tendency to isolate people from each other. This is particularly true where students have to pass competitive examinations. One should be aware of the fact that this individualization is alien to most work situations into which the graduates will eventually find themselves. Team work on projects — possibly even interdisciplinary projects — should become important elements of the curricula.

4. Man and Nature: The African university student — particularly one who comes from
the rural area (mostly the majority) — experiences two concepts of the world i.e. the African world with all its traditions and customs and the so-called modern world built on science and technology. The task for university education in Africa is to harmonize these two world views and experiences. Can bridges be built between traditional and modern (usually western) concepts? (e.g. in Medicine, appropriate technology etc.)

Finally, a word concerning research. We have already in passing, touched on this issue but it is necessary that we comment on two more general points.

1. Priority must be on those research projects that are likely to make a direct and immediate contribution to national development. In other words, research which may well serve the general progress of science but would promise little or no direct results for the development of the country should be given a low priority rating. The national agenda is too pressing and the resources too limited to allow the luxury of research for its own sake. This does not necessarily mean that every one must concentrate on so-called applied research. There is also fundamental research which nevertheless has profound implications for Zimbabwe e.g. in humanities — history, geography, cultural anthropology, medicine, biology, politics, economics etc.

2. In view of the urgent needs of the country and of the scarce resources short term research i.e. of not more than five years duration should have priority over mid-term or long term projects. Efforts must be made to resist the temptation of falling prey to international funding agencies who normally would fund only those research projects consistent with their own list of priorities (cf. Ziman, J. *The Patterns of Research in Developing Countries*, Minerva, Vol. 9, 1971).

The most urgent need for immediate research comes from the university's primary task of education. Research has to be done for the development of curricula, for the development of teaching materials (including textbooks as mentioned earlier) and in the interdisciplinary field of the dialectics between scholars with different cultural backgrounds. A new and relevant perspective — afrocentric — has to be brought to bear so that the eurocentric features in arts and sciences can be recognized and seen in their specific and limited validity.
CHAPTER 7

THE UNIVERSITY IN THE THIRD WORLD:
COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES

Professor Philip G. Altbach

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to point out some of the insights from comparative higher education that are relevant for universities in the Third World. This discussion is predicated on the idea that it is possible to learn from the experiences of other countries but seldom possible to successfully copy directly from overseas models. Thus, it is intended to raise consciousness concerning problems and possibilities rather than to point to overseas models that may be immediately applicable in a Third World context.

One cannot escape several basic realities concerning higher education in the Third World that produce problems and inequality in the international system. Universities are part of an international system and cannot escape this reality. And this system is largely controlled by the industrialized nations. Further, Third World universities are linked to metropolitan institutions by historical tradition and organizational models. There is today no viable indigenous Third World institution of higher learning that functions in the modern sphere. Those few indigenous examples, such as the Al-Azhar in Cairo, are linked to the preservation and transmission of traditional knowledge, in this case Islamic studies. Despite efforts in China, Tanzania and other countries to create "indigenous" academic models, institutional patterns, pedagogical techniques and, perhaps most important, the basic structure of knowledge, is Western in origin. Thus, one of the main themes of this paper is the international historical and contemporary relationship between universities.

Third World universities also face a number of problems which, while evident in industrialized nations as well, are particularly difficult in the context of social and economic development. Questions such as the appropriate relationship between the university and the state and the related issues of accountability and autonomy, the issue of expansion and how to deal with it, the adaptation of curricula and pedagogical elements to meet local needs, and especially the establishment of academic norms and traditions appropriate to a Third World society. Third World universities also face serious problems in obtaining needed resources. The competition for scarce financial resources is very sharp, and the needs of other segments of the education system must also be met in a period when higher education has been criticized for its elitism and questioned as to its direct contribution to economic growth. Building up the necessary academic infrastructures is also difficult — and increasingly expensive. Laboratories, generally requiring expensive imported equipment have become more complex in order to keep up with scientific advances. Books for libraries, again largely purchased overseas, are an increasing financial burden. And perhaps most important, obtaining adequately trained academic staff often requires hiring expatriates, whose influence on academic institutions is important and largely unexplored. This paper will explore how some of these crucial issues have been dealt with in other Third World nations as well as in industrialized nations.

HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS

As Eric Ashby has documented, universities in the Third World, almost without exception, stem from Western models and reflect a complex historical development which has been primarily influenced by these non-indigenous traditions. With the exception of a few countries such as Thailand and Japan, the historical roots of universities are colonial, and
a complex nexus of relationships between indigenous demands for higher education and the policies and orientations of the colonial context. Reality is much more complex than the colonial power simply dictating the nature of higher education in the colony. Conflicts within the colonial administration and changes in policy influenced the development of higher education, as did the demands of indigenous groups. As Ashby points out, the British altered policy concerning the expansion of higher education after the Indian Mutiny of 1858 and this had implications for Africa. As a practical result of this change, higher education in British African colonies expanded much more slowly than it did in India. It is, of course, true that the basic higher education model was that of the colonial power, although with significant variations. In general, the colonial power did not export its best institutional models. Most colonial powers limited the expansion and scope of higher education in their colonies and as a result when independence came, post-secondary education was very limited. The curriculum was biased toward the arts and little scientific or technological training was available. Institutions were generally quite small. A considerable percentage of those in the colonies obtaining higher education did so in the metropole. The French were even less interested in the expansion of higher education in the colonies than were the British, and the Belgians virtually forbade post-secondary education in the Congo.

Zimbabwe’s higher education development does not significantly differ from this general model. Institutions were kept quite small (and in Zimbabwe, Africans had little access to existing institutions in any case), the curriculum was limited, and the academic models followed were strictly British. Even after the end of formal colonial status, the British influence on higher education remained dominant. The historical models chosen by non-colonized non-Western nations show some interesting variations. The Japanese, as the major nation that has independently attained the status of a major industrial power, based this development in part on education. They carefully examined alternative educational models, and finally chose to adopt the German model in the late 19th century. The Japanese chose wisely, since the Germans were then building up their own industrial base in part stimulated by the applied research done by the universities.

The major German innovation was emphasis on research combined with the growth of the doctorate as a research degree. Other nations also followed the German pattern, including the United States, which was at the time also building up its industrial and technological base. The fact that the Japanese, and the Americans, were free to choose their own academic models was quite helpful in ensuring that their emerging academic systems met their needs as effectively as possible. It is also significant that both the Americans and the Japanese used models which had been basically pioneered elsewhere and did not attempt to build an entirely new academic model — although the American "land grant" concepts was a significant innovation in defining the role of the university in broad societal terms and in stressing the importance of applied research and practical assistance to industry and agriculture.

The relevance of this historical excursion is clear: the colonial experience had a great deal to do with the kind of university which was built in the colonies and it is clear that while there was an interplay between colonial demands and official policy, the basic orientation of the emerging higher education system reflected the needs and biases of the colonial power. Further, in no case has a newly independent formerly colonized nation dramatically rejected the academic system it inherited. While some countries, like India and Nigeria have expanded their higher education systems and in some have built new institutions which have different models, their basic academic systems remain virtually unaltered. Even the more radical nations do not seem to have made essential structural alterations in academic institutions. While technical and scientific education, and in a few countries, research has been stressed, there probably remains an over-reliance on the liberal arts in most Third World nations. Thus, the legacy of the colonial past remains strong in such important spheres on the basic models of university organization, the curriculum, textbooks, and orientations toward academic life.

THE INTERNATIONAL NETWORK: ANATOMY OF INEQUALITY

Just as Third World universities are deeply affected by their colonial roots, they are also part of an international academic community which, at base, places Third World institutions at a distinct disadvantage. The international academic prestige structure stresses the roles of the major knowledge producing research universities in the
industrialized nations, and particularly in the United States, Britain and France. All other institutions look up to Oxford and Cambridge, Harvard and Chicago, and Paris. These institutions establish the norms of academic life. They produce top scholars who then reflect institutional values when they attain positions of power elsewhere. The prestigious institutions are able to obtain research funds and thus are the producers of new knowledge. Their definitions of what is appropriate knowledge and research tend to set the standard.

There is also an international knowledge system which works to the disadvantage of Third World nations. Not only is the bulk of the world’s research produced in a small number of metropolitan institutions, but the major means of dissemination are controlled by the metropolis as well. Without question, the predominance of English, and to an extent French, as the international media of communications give an advantage to the major English-speaking nations. The editors of the most prestigious scholarly journals are located at the major universities in the industrialized nations. The major publishing houses are generally located in New York, London and Paris. Most knowledge producers are located in the major Western universities and all but a tiny part of worldwide research expenditures are spent in these institutions. Further, the academic systems of the industrialized nations are large and relatively affluent. Thus, they constitute the major market for scholarly material and the producers naturally orient their products, be it a research project or a scholarly book, toward the major academic market.

The concentration of “intellectual power” is, in many ways, awesome. The major metropolitan institutions attract the best students and faculty, including many from the Third World who may, temporarily or permanently, become part of the “brain drain.” They receive the bulk of the research funds. This concentration of intellectual and financial power permits these institutions to establish the basic norms and values of the research enterprise. These institutions tend to dominate the network of scholarly communications as well, either through journal editorships or through the fact that a large proportion of published scientific materials originate from these institutions. They constitute a “center” of international academic life and much of the rest of the world, including such wealthy industrial nations as Holland and Belgium, are clearly at the periphery. In a sense, this center-periphery relationship is an inevitable by-product of the inequalities in knowledge production and distribution which have been cited here. Industrialized nations have many motivations for their foreign involvements in the field of education. But as an American educator and former Under Secretary of State has pointed out, education and culture are a “fourth dimension” of foreign policy. Most industrialized nations have sought, through their assistance programs, to maintain or enhance their influence in the Third World. The French have concentrated on maintaining the international role of the French language, the Americans on exporting their own model of higher education, and the British on maintaining links to the Commonwealth. While much foreign educational assistance may have a strong element of altruism and in general academic institutions and individual professors who work overseas are largely devoted to the betterment of the Third World, basic foreign policy interests lie behind a significant part of academic assistance programs.

Third World nations must understand the implications of foreign assistance programs, and for that matter of the conscious borrowing of academic models and programs that takes place on a large scale. Most developing institutions and academic systems cannot do without external assistance of some kinds, and given the nature of the international knowledge network, relationships between the industrialized and developing nations will continue on an unequal basis. But there must be an awareness of the basic nature of the relationships as well as the implications of particular assistance projects.

The role of the expatriate teacher and administrator in the Third World is one that has received little analytic attention but is of considerable importance. Without question, expatriate teachers, advisors and sometimes administrators are necessary to provide needed skills and knowledge. But expatriates bring more than specific skills. They also reflect their own academic values and orientations. Their commitment is not completely to the country and institution in which they are working. The nature of the expatriate academic population also deserves some attention. Policies toward expatriates differ in the Third World. In most countries, permanent appointments are not available, although an individual instructor may remain as long as a decade at a single Third World institution. In some countries, such as Singapore, expatriates are watched very closely. In others, notably in the Middle East, expatriates tend to come from other Third World nations (such as Egypt and Pakistan). In some nations, expatriates are offered permanent appointments
on a basis similar to indigenous staff. In most instances, expatriates are paid at levels substantially higher than local staff, and this cannot but cause some tension. Without question, expatriate teachers are part of the complex relationship between the industrialized and Third World nations. They are the individual transmitters of both knowledge and also of the values and norms of the Western institutions. It is clear from this discussion that the relationship between the industrialized nations and the Third World are essentially unequal and that it is important to fully understand the complexities of this relationship and for Third World nations to maintain as much control over their dealings with external academic institutions and governments as possible.

AUTONOMY AND ACCOUNTABILITY: GOVERNMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE THIRD WORLD

One of the most perplexing problems for universities everywhere is the appropriate relationship between higher education and the state. Even in the industrialized nations, there is a sharp debate concerning this topic and there is considerable disagreement. But there is a basic acceptance of the basic governance structures of the university and, with some exceptions, respect for the concept of academic freedom in its traditional sense. That is, there is widespread agreement that the professor has the right to speak his or her mind in the classroom and, in general, to write on public issues and to hold unorthodox political or social views. There is also general agreement that internal academic governance should remain in the hands of the academic community and that decisions concerning such matters as curricular change should be left to the academics.

But there has been considerably more controversy in the West about other key academic questions. In several countries, notably West Germany, France and the Netherlands, major reforms were imposed on reluctant universities by government authorities as a result of the turmoil of the 1960s. In Britain, fiscal crisis has substantially threatened the autonomy of individual universities and of the venerable University Grants Committee and has inserted government directly into academic decision making. In the United States, the public universities have been subjected to increasing scrutiny from the state governments in financial terms which have, in some instances, spilled over into the academic sphere. Governmental regulations concerning such matters as racial desegregation in higher education, facilities for handicapped students and affirmative action hiring programs for women and minorities have all intruded in some respects on the traditional autonomy of academic institutions.

In addition, there has been an increasingly strident demand for "accountability" in higher education — for governmental authorities, as the main agencies funding higher education, to measure and monitor the expenditure of funds. Many academics have argued that there is a very thin line between accountability and direct interference in academic decisions and processes. In general, government has won the battle although efforts to reach a solution that will provide a reasonable level of accountability and at the same time maintain academic autonomy continue. As financial problems become more serious, it is natural to expect that conflict between academic institutions and external funding authorities will grow more serious.

However threatened in the West, academic autonomy is in a more precarious position in the Third World. In many Third World nations, there is no pretense at viable autonomy for academic institutions. In Singapore, for example, the university is considered to be an arm of the government and is expected to follow governmental policies without question. While there are also some fetters on the individual academic freedom of the professor, there remains considerable freedom in this area. In many Third World nations, political loyalty is expected from the academic community, and those who violate accepted standards of political discourse are often dealt with harshly. Hard pressed governments, fearing political unrest on the one hand and under pressure to achieve quick economic and social progress on the other, often look to universities as both a threat to stability and as a potential contributor to development. Thus, universities are often given little autonomy to make their own decisions and set their own goals.

While one might defend the traditional concept of institutional autonomy and argue that the best universities are those that are permitted to set their own goals, it is clear that academic institutions can function without basic autonomy. Universities in the Soviet Union have long functioned with reasonable effectiveness despite very limited autonomy and little academic freedom. Yet, it is the case that the most distinguished universities in the world are institutions which have basic institutional autonomy and in which the
academic community — notably the faculty — maintains basic procedural and substantive control. They are also institutions which are relatively free of political fetters and controls. One of the key problems in the Third World is the lack of a clear agreement on the role of the university and on the basic structure of governance. Because institutions of higher education are relatively new, because they are not indigenous, and because they were established in many instances by external groups whose concerns were not necessarily those of the indigenous population, universities remain fragile institutions. And it is the case that it is relatively easy to destroy an academic institution although it is quite difficult to build an institution of quality. Thus, it is necessary for Third World societies to agree on a basic "academic constitution" that can provide stability for the institution as well as guidelines for acceptable norms of behaviour for those within the university as well as for government. The academic community, both teachers and students, must recognize that the state in many Third World nations, is fairly fragile and political activism must be tempered by this realization. Governments, for their part, must recognize that a university is not just another government bureau, that the intellectual needs of an institution of higher learning are special and that such institutions are often hard to control. There must be sufficient autonomy permitted so that universities can govern themselves in a basic internal sense. Both government and university must recognize that Third World institutions have special responsibilities for nation-building and for economic development.

It is easy to articulate a need but difficult to provide specific guidelines concerning how to develop a working relationship between governments anxious for stability and development and universities, which by their nature are often unruly and difficult to govern. A useful first step is mutual understanding of the needs and constraints on both sides of the equation. Governmental authorities must understand that universities are fragile institutions which have some rather special traditions and needs. Academic institutions, for their part, must be aware that they are part of a polity and that they can and should play an active role in the process of development.

UNIVERSITY REFORM

Academic institutions everywhere are criticized from many quarters for their unwillingness or inability to change to meet the changing needs of society. Students pressured universities to become more "relevant" during the turbulent 1960s and governments repeatedly pressed universities to permit greater fiscal accountability, revamp the curriculum so as to meet immediate needs, admit more students and in general help to contribute to immediate national needs. Academic institutions have been quite slow to change and, more often than not, have resisted reform pressures from wherever they have come. 21

There is general agreement that universities are among the most conservative of institutions, even when a significant portion of the academic staff may be radical in their social or ideological views. This conservatism stems from a number of sources. Senior academic staff wish to preserve their often quite considerable power and see, with considerable justification, that many of the reform proposals of recent decades would limit this power. 22 The faculty also is the direct heir to the basic tradition of the university, and as such it is often reluctant to favor radical change. Traditional academic values — such as freedom of inquiry, a commitment to quality teaching and the preservation of a widely accepted and carefully developed curricular structure — are often seen as detrimental to rapid institutional change. This is probably true — but at the same time there is much to be said in defense of these values. The academic profession also suffers from considerable inertia. Traditional patterns of academic governance do not lend themselves to rapid change.

It is possible to design and implement change in universities from outside, and in fact, this is how many of the reforms which were promulgated in Europe in the 1960s were implemented. But it is also possible for the academic community to sabotage these reforms, particularly when they are designed without a detailed understanding of the way in which academic institutions function. Indeed, many of the European reforms have not been successful, in considerable part because they ignored the nature of the university and its historical traditions.

As noted earlier, Third World universities inherited a foreign academic tradition. In this sense, it is easier to make changes since the traditions are not deeply entrenched, but there is a danger of destroying a fragile institution at the same time. The challenge is to
permit the growth of academic traditions while at the same time ensuring that important national needs are met. It should be kept in mind that universities cannot do everything and that their direct role in national social and economic development may be fairly limited. Higher education has often expanded very rapidly in Third World nations, and this has resulted in almost every case in a lowering of standards. Further, expansion has not generally been in the fields in which it is most needed, such as in science and technology. Rather, the growth has been in the liberal arts subjects and in such professional fields as law. Academic staff have been stretched by expansion, facilities and resources overused, and problems of unemployment for university graduates have occurred. Thus, expansion should be carefully planned — often a difficult task in nations where newly enfranchised and articulate urban groups create powerful pressures for expansion. Generally speaking, Third World universities have expanded rapidly but have not basically reformed either their structures or curriculum. In many countries, old colonial academic traditions have been exchanged for newer, perhaps more useful, American or in some cases Soviet academic models. New institutions devoted to management, technology and the like have been established alongside the traditional universities. All of this has been at great cost and it has engendered considerable confusion in a bifurcated academic system. Even in the most energetic and reformist — or revolutionary — Third World countries the academic system has changed, in its basic structure of governance, relatively little. The Chinese, for example, have followed several different paths to modernization, and in each case has included higher education in the equation of development. In each case, there were major problems, and the Chinese are now trying yet another path to academic progress, and it remains to be seen how this new approach will work. India, which has the world's third largest higher education system (after the United States and the Soviet Union) has not basically altered its colonially-inherited university system although it has added on a variety of separate institutions, from agricultural universities on the American model to high-quality technological institutes patterned after institutions in West Germany, Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union. While these new institutions have, in general, been successful, the large majority of Indian students study in outmoded institutions which have declined in quality as a result of rapid expansion in the post-Independence period. There is no generally successful Third World university reform. Even countries with centrally-planned economies, such as Cuba and China, have not claimed much success in developing institutions of higher education that have been successfully harnessed to the goals of social and economic development. Countries like India, Nigeria and the Philippines have rapidly expanded their higher education systems, but most agree that the results have been mixed. Unanticipated consequences such as shortages of qualified staff, limited funds so that quality could not be protected, and un- or under-employment of graduates have resulted from this expansion.

The challenge of reform remains. It is clear that Third World nations do have special needs which universities can help meet. The training of skilled manpower, scientific research that is geared to development needs, the fostering of a curriculum and publications that contribute to national awareness and other programs can be part of a university. Yet, a means of funding new programs and a way of convincing the academic community that these new programs are in their own interests as well as of national importance must be developed. There is as yet no blueprint, unfortunately, and each institution will have to think creatively about solutions. Negative examples from the annals of comparative higher education abound, but constructive alternatives are few.

POLITICS AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Questions such as autonomy and accountability, university reform and others are inevitably linked to politics. In the Third World especially, academic decisions are almost necessarily political decisions because of the closeness of the university to the government, and the necessary expense of most academic developments. Further, universities are key political institutions, particularly in societies in which other political infrastructures are not well developed. Segments of the academic community, most dramatically the students but also academic staff from time to time, are directly involved in societal politics, often from an oppositional viewpoint. The university community, because it is a center of intellectual ferment, publication and debate is indirectly involved with politics.
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The challenge, of course, is to somehow recognize the necessary political involvement of the academic community, attempts to insulate the university as an institution from direct political strife, and convince all of the participants in the academic community to keep political activism within appropriate boundaries.26 The most dramatic — and sometimes violent — manifestation of academic political participation is student activism.

Students in the Third World have overthrown governments, and have very often constituted a key segment of the political opposition. They have, for a variety of reasons, been less effective in direct political activism in Africa than in such countries as South Korea, Turkey and Thailand, where they have been instrumental in toppling governments. Yet, African students have also been active and are key political actors in such countries as Zambia, Nigeria and elsewhere.27 The reasons for the effectiveness of student political activism in the Third World are not difficult to understand. Students often act as a conscience and articulator of the urban segment of the population. Students are easy to mobilize, and they are exposed to varied ideologies and political views. Further, students in the Third World often expect to take part in societal politics as a prelude to their direct participation as adults. Students in many Third World nations, particularly in those countries which had an active national liberation struggle in which students participated, give student politics a certain legitimacy (as opposed to the industrialized countries, where students are not expected to participate in politics).

The lessons from a comparative study of student political activism and the governmental and university responses to it do not yield many directly relevant guidelines. In a sense, political activism is a normal part of academic life in the Third World and must therefore be taken seriously by academic authorities as well as public officials. All too often, the specific demands of students are not seriously considered. It is important to pay attention to the ideological perspectives and programs of students, since they very often reflect societal concerns or at least problems within the universities. Because the students are among the few articulate segments of the population, they are in a way a barometer for larger groups. Academic authorities must, of course, ensure the normal functioning of institutions of higher education and while there are no panaceas for campus order, a combination of clear guidelines for acceptable behavior and a willingness to listen carefully to student demands and where possible to take these demands seriously may help to ensure relative order on campus. It is particularly important to keep the university as an institution separated from political demands and campaigns even where students, and perhaps segments of the academic staff may be politically involved. It is also important for the university to impress on governmental authorities the legitimacy for free expression of ideas and even for dissent.

Academic staff in many Third World countries are politically involved. Intellectuals and those with the expertise to function effectively in a modern society inevitably gravitate to the university.28 This means that intellectual ferment of all kinds — from cultural commentary to ideological theorizing — takes place in the universities and that the academic community is a center of dissent as well as of expertise. Academics are often used by government in policy making positions and for expertise. This trend can go so far as to involve so many qualified professors in government service that the universities themselves are short staffed, as has happened in Indonesia. Academic institutions often directly provide political leaders, and examples of professors serving as prime ministers, cabinet members and more often as “non-political experts” in government service are common in the Third World and frequent in industrialized nations as well.

The university’s political role is complicated and generally crucial in the Third World. It provides, at the same time, expertise, opposition, and ferment. On occasion, it directly participates in political activities. Much of this political involvement is inevitable in societies which have only limited expertise and in which political consciousness is in the hands of a small proportion of the population. The challenge is to recognize the inevitable role of the university and at the same time protect its institutional and intellectual autonomy.

CURRICULUM

Curricular patterns of higher education differ greatly from country to country, and even within nations. Traditionally, it has been the prerogative of the academic community to develop a curriculum and the teaching programs to support it. Indeed, one of the hallmarks of the early universities was autonomy to develop a curriculum and to certify that students had fulfilled the requirements for academic degrees.29 In the Third World, curricular
patterns were generally imposed from the outside due either to direct colonial rule or to the adopting of foreign academic models. The challenge for Third World universities is to develop a curriculum that reflects development needs and the particular circumstances of the country.

No Third World nation has successfully discarded the basic Western organizational patterns of the university, and relatively few have made major curricular innovations. The problems are immense. Not only does tradition weigh heavily, but most academic staff were trained using Western curricular models. There is a lack of textbooks and other teaching materials for innovative programs. Curricular reform is often expensive. And the academic community is often under great pressure to "produce" graduates for national development. Thus, there is little time, money or inclination to break with tradition even where it is recognized that established patterns are at least partly irrelevant.

But the curriculum remains a virtually unexamined aspect of Third World higher education that urgently needs attention. In a sense, higher education is only as good as its teachers and the curriculum. The tremendous demands of growth have, for the most part, meant that both the teaching community and the curriculum have been ignored. There is no doubt that a curriculum designed for students in Britain or the United States may not be strictly relevant for Nigeria, India or Zimbabwe. Consideration of this important element of the higher equation is only now beginning. Efforts in a number of countries may be useful to study before undertaking major curriculum reform. The development of the institutes of technology in India and their curricular planning may be useful. The various Chinese experiments with work-study and other curricular innovations may also be useful. Efforts in Tanzania and Cuba at making higher education more relevant to national needs are worth consideration. It is, in the last analysis, surprising that so little has been done in the area of curricular innovation and reform in Third World higher education.

CONCLUSION

This essay has considered some major themes relating to Third World higher education in the 1980s in an effort to indicate how these universities fit into an international framework and what the experience of other countries can contribute to understanding and then dealing with specific problems. The experience of other countries seldom yields directly applicable solutions to problems. Indeed, the history of "institutional borrowing" has not been a particularly happy one, due in large part to the forced nature of the transfer of institutional models during the colonial period. The international intellectual situation is one of inequality and resolutions of UNESCO will not basically change this anatomy of inequality. An important first step is to understand the nature of the inequality and to work to minimize it in terms of national academic planning.

The challenges facing Third World universities are not unique. They are in many respects related to the problems found in many industrialized nations, and there are many similarities among Third World nations themselves. Indeed, there is an immense need for Third World nations to learn from their own experiences, to develop regional networks and to communicate among themselves. It is unfortunate that the relatively few examples of direct regional co-operation, such as the University of East Africa and the University of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland did not prove successful. Thus, while there is probably relatively little that can be directly applied, broader perspectives, and even the examples of failures of particular policies can be instructive.

What, then can be learned from the comparative study of higher education? Some general themes can be discerned from this essay.

- The curriculum has, in the Third World remained one of the least frequently examined aspects of the higher education enterprise, yet there is widespread agreement that change is needed.
- Student activism is widespread in the Third World despite the fact that activism is at a low ebb in the industrialized countries. Countries have dealt with student political activism in different ways, and there may be useful lessons. It is important to understand that student activism is probably an inevitable factor in Third World higher education.
- Universities are almost by definition involved politically in the Third World. Individual academics, interest groups and others are engaged in politics in countries where the political structures are generally not fully developed.
- The path to university reform is a difficult one, and in few countries has academic change been very successful. In this regard, the examples of failures in many countries may be instructive.
In almost all Third World nations, public and governmental expectations for higher education have exceeded performance, in most likelihood because these expectations have been unrealistic. A careful examination of the practical contributions of higher education to development must be a part of realistic planning.

Expansion has been a hallmark of higher education development in almost every Third World nation. This expansion has had different implications in different contexts and policies have varied from country to country. It is important to look at the nature—and the results—of expansion.

The experience of those Third World nations which achieved independence early or which were never under direct colonial rule—countries like India, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, Ethiopia and the nations of Latin America, may be instructive for the newer Third World nations. Some of these nations may provide useful expertise to assist in the development process. These are but a few insights which the study of comparative higher education can bring to the problems and challenges faced by Third World universities. Without question, the experience of others can be useful and the lessons of the past and other nations may help to broaden perspectives and inform policy decisions. At the very least, expensive errors might well be avoided.
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CHAPTER 8

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZIMBABWE: FROM THIS TIME ON

by Professor W.J. Kamba,
Principal and Vice Chancellor

Over the last four days I have sat and listened and I have had a little time to reflect on the outstanding and well-argued papers that have been delivered and the high standard of discussion that we have witnessed at this Conference. I will not attempt to deal with individual contributions or individual comments made during this Conference. The University of Zimbabwe has had the opportunity of looking at itself critically, I hope, in the context of the broad Government thinking as articulated by the Prime Minister, and also with the benefit of national participants from outside the University and international participants we have been provided with an international dimension and experience. There can be no doubt that we stand to benefit enormously from this vast wealth of ideas and experience. If we can translate this wealth of ideas and experience into something concrete in our search for a new identity, then posterity can rightly regard this Conference as a major landmark in the history of the University marking the watershed between the past and the future. We are deeply indebted to all the participants at this Conference.

The Conference is on "The Role of the University and its Future in Zimbabwe". The core of the theme of the Conference is change. To focus on change is not to be oblivious of some of the good work of the past, after all the need for change is because of the past and the present. The focus of the Conference has been dictated mainly by the fact that it is with change that this institution will be preoccupied right now as a matter of urgency and for a long time to come in the future. We are treated to a masterly and penetrating analysis of change by Professor Asavia Wandira in his keynote address on "The University in Times of Change".

The University of Zimbabwe was conceived and established in a particular political social and economic context. It operated since its creation in a particular socio-economic and political context. The vision and perspective of those who were concerned with the planning, was the future and operation of the University in the context of what they knew, what they were aware of, in the country of Rhodesia then. The University is in essence a social institution and those who work and study in it are members of society at large and some of the conflicts that occurred in the University in the past were in fact a reflection of the conflicts in the larger community. As indicated at the opening of this Conference some 18 months ago this country and the world witnessed a dramatic political change. We are seeing what many delegates have described as an unprecedented transformation of the social and economic context in which the University exists and operates. And the questions which we must ask are: Is the role of the University as conceived in the past its proper role in the Zimbabwe of today and tomorrow? Are the internal structures of the University, is the orientation of the University as a whole and of those who work in it, geared to cope with the unprecedented situation that exists? Change in the University is not change for its own sake; it is necessary change; change which should have occurred yesterday.

The University of Zimbabwe is the only University in the country. It is therefore the focus in the country of university education in general. The University dates back to the 11th February, 1955 when the University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was founded as a non-racial institution to serve the whole of the then Federation comprising Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland. It enjoyed a special relation with the University of London, whose degrees it awarded until it became the University of Rhodesia in 1970. Similarly the medical school established in 1963 was affiliated to the University of Birmingham Medical School whose degrees it awarded also until 1970. At independence this year, the University assumed the new name of Zimbabwe. When the University
College commenced, there were eight faculties: Arts, Agriculture, Engineering, Commerce and Law, Education, Medicine, Science and Social Studies. Special mention should be made of the existence of the Institute of Mining Research which, as the name indicates, is essentially a research centre. The University College opened with a total of 68 students, 60 of them were whites and 8 were Africans. The white students remained in the majority until 1976 when the proportion changed and today the proportion is something like 70% black students and the rest, white and others.

Thus the University of Zimbabwe, as universities in almost all former British dependencies in Africa, is an importation from Britain. We imported the British model with all its essential attendant elements. Historically in Britain in particular and in countries of the western cultural tradition in general, the primary two-fold aim of a University is research and teaching. For a very long time the almost exaggerated emphasis on the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake as the main function of a University elevated the University to an ivory tower almost detached from the community in which it existed, observing society from up there. The rapid and intensive social, economic and political change, and the gigantic technological advances the world over during the last decades have led to a shift of emphasis and re-ordering of priorities and to a new relationship between the University and Society. Universities in the western world have had in varying degrees to come down to earth to play, and be seen to play, a role in the development of the community.

In Zimbabwe, prior to independence last year the forging of a close relationship between the University and the community, and between the University and national development, was inhibited by the nature of the social and political environment in which the University existed and operated. The University was in a sense an anachronism. Established by Royal Charter as a formally non-racial institution, it was at odds with dominant white Rhodesian politics. It was attempting to carry on in a society which was organised and ordered on a racial basis. This tension between the University and its social and political environment distorted its role in the community and the country. The University was not an integral part of our society. But now with the dramatic political change and the concomitant socio-economic change, I referred to earlier, and with the destruction of the society organised along racial lines, there is a need for a new orientation — a need for a radical orientation on the part of the University. The dramatic development must surely have an equally dramatic impact on the present and the future of this University and on its role in the development of the country. It must now have its feet down on Zimbabwean ground. It must have a new ethos, and, as I said earlier, it must be rooted in the new reality of Zimbabwe. To say this, is not to deny that it must also be conscious of the international dimension. There is therefore an urgent need for the University of Zimbabwe to play a more active and meaningful role in the development of Zimbabwe, and for the realisation of this contribution, there must be closer communication between the University and the government, between the University and the public at large and the need to work out effective means, effective machinery for such communication. It is also essential for the University to expand and expand rapidly to respond to the country's scarce resources. The country is, therefore, entitled to expect returns which contribute to the social, economic and cultural development and general welfare of its people.

Development embraces the challenges caused by the search for national and cultural identity, by the problem of poverty and the need for social adjustment and the problems of economic progress. Let me perhaps elaborate a little. Zimbabwe is, in a number of ways, a developed country. In the past the focus has been on a small economic sector at the expense of the large sector. Alongside what is a relatively small and highly sophisticated sector is a large underdeveloped or rural and peasant sector. This emphasis must have affected the role of the University in that context. These two sectors must now be integrated. As a result of the focus of Government policies on rural development, Zimbabwe desperately needs not only high level and highly skilled manpower, but also men and women who are well-equipped to contribute to the rectifying of this imbalance between these sectors of life and economy. The University has a vital part to play in the education and training of such young men and women. The University must be relevant in terms of its social context, in terms of the content of its curricula and in terms of the needs of the country, or to put it slightly differently, in terms of its contribution to national development.

In regard to the social context, surely there is an interaction and inter-connection between the social and cultural context on the one hand and what is taught, how it is taught, who is taught, and by whom it is taught on the other. While it is true that there are certain subjects whose content is of universal validity, the effectiveness in transmitting the knowledge
The University must provide leadership in the area of research and should aim to place more emphasis on applied research, research directed towards issues that affect ordinary men and women. The University must now take a more active role in identifying and investigating development problems. There is already work in progress but some of this work is handicapped by the lack of funds.

The realisation of these objectives will, to a large extent, depend on the structures of government, and within the University, on the orientation of the staff, on their dedication and commitment to the University and its objectives and to the development of Zimbabwe. Staffing policy and practices must now be geared to the needs of the country. We cannot afford to waste our human resources. Without pre-empting what the Government proposes to do in its Act of Parliament to replace the Charter, departmental government needs to be reformed, and reformed quickly in order to ensure effective participation by all its members to the activities of the department and University. And I say, we must harness all available resources.

Democratization is not democratization for its sake. It is an instrument which if well used will certainly enhance the efforts of the University, the reform of departmental organizations will certainly affect the composition of Senate which is the supreme academic body in the University. The composition of Council, the supreme governing body is a University. The composition of Council, the supreme governing body is a matter for Government in its proposed Act. The fundamental issue is that the structure of the government of the University must be such as will enable it to realise effectively the objectives that I have indicated.

Service to the nation should cease to be an idea to be duly noted on rhetorical occasions. It should be an existential reality for the graduates, for the faculty and for all those who labour within the University. The teaching in the University should be such that it produces independent thinkers with the creativity to tackle problems. The last thing education ought to do is to adjust anybody to the appearance of a society which will not be there by the time he has become adjusted to it. The only constant variable in modern society is change, and change is accelerating at such a rate that a number of major cultural revolutions will take place in one's life time. Consequently, it is no longer functional to define the purpose of education as simply the transmission of culture. It must be the production of lifelong learners. The problem for educators is that of designing an educational system not for a known future but for life in a world characterized by continuing change and a rapid obsolescence of knowledge.

In the search for national cultural identity the University has therefore an important part to play in providing a sound intellectual foundation and leadership. It must act and has the human resources to act as a source of new ideas for the promotion of social cohesion. It must also show by example how social problems can be resolved. In this context it is absolutely important to emphasise that those who are committed to this ideal, have an enormous part to play within the University.

I have indicated that communication between Government and University is essential because the effectiveness of the University's contribution to national development, depends on the ability of teachers and students to discuss, evaluate, examine, re-examine, criticise and investigate ideas, and our analysis and evaluation of issues must be such as to make available to policy-makers material which will provide them with a number of possible options. We must be capable of providing the kind of information which will be at the disposal of all those engaged in the process of Government. This means we must promote effective understanding between the University and government, and also effective understanding between the University and the community. But of course for the University to do this it must enjoy a substantial degree of autonomy, autonomy which is compatible with the realisation of these objectives; autonomy which leaves it with means to be an effective institution to provide the policy-makers with a number of options.

I have clearly indicated that the University needs to expand if it is to meet the needs of the country. The total of enrolment of students in 1980 was some 2,240. This was comparatively small for the needs of the country. The University of Zimbabwe must therefore grow rapidly in terms of numbers, but more cautiously in terms of the range of disciplines. As a result of the political settlement at the end of last year, the intake was 800 and this was double that of the year before. The intake this year was of the order of 1,100 and the total number of students this year is some 2,525. The University will be growing at an alarming rate. We expect to reach the figure of some 5,000 the next 3 years. The increase in the student intake in the first year at the secondary school level, as I indicated at the opening, is a frightening one with the figure shooting from 20,000 to some 100,000 qualified students.
seeking entrance to the University. This is an alarming rate of growth. I would estimate that a reasonable-sized University should be something of the order of 6,000. If we go beyond that, that would be the time for considering the establishment of a second University.

I have said that in terms of the range of disciplines, it is important that we proceed cautiously. We are reasonably well covered by the faculties that we have now. As our number one priority right away we wish to establish the Faculty of Veterinary Science. We have been carrying out extensive campaigning and negotiations and the indications are that we might have our first year intake in March 1982. Veterinary Science is essential to our cattle industry, not only if we are to compete in the outside market but also if we are to sustain production for internal needs. There are a number of other disciplines which are knocking at the door: mining engineering, and metallurgy. We will try what we can to establish these as soon as we can.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to emphasise here another point which I made at the opening, that is the effectiveness of the University’s contribution to national development will depend to a substantial degree on the quality of the products that we turn out. It is essential that we produce good doctors, good engineers, good lawyers, good administrators. To do otherwise would be failure on our part to discharge our responsibilities and would in fact be a disservice to the country. I will again remind you, Mr. Chairman, and the audience that we must be wary of the outside expert who offers advice which may adversely affect the quality of our products, and then let us turn to him for his expertise. One of the characteristics of the third world country is its incessant dependence on foreign financial assistance and expertise. We have no desire to be condemned to the status of a third world country in perpetuity.

If independence is to mean anything, we must overcome importation of academic and technological expertise. We cannot achieve this unless the quality of our products is such that they can hold their own in the wider—world. The development of the University is dependent on the support of all those who work in it and the support that it receives from the Government and from international colleagues. Its development is also dependent on the availability of resources that will make this institution, the good institution it ought to be and the good institution which it must remain and to enable it to make fundamental contribution to the needs of the country.

Mr. Chairman, before I sit down, I must take this opportunity to say a few thank yous to various people who have played an important role in this Conference: To the Prime Minister for opening the conference and providing us with his thoughts on the part of Government regarding the future of the University; to the President, Comrade Banana, for attending the Installation Ceremony on Tuesday; and also to members of the Diplomatic Corps for attending the Installation Ceremony; to our International Visitors for their participation and contribution in the Conference; to the Mayor of the City Council of Harare for welcoming our guests and for attending several of our functions; to all the participants who have contributed to lively debate on the issues confronting our University; to Nedlaw group for their support; to Miss Mazoe for flowers, to Mr. Platt and his staff; to the Department of Culture in the Ministry of Education and Culture for the magnificent show that we witnessed last night; and perhaps most importantly to the Carnegie Corporation, without whose support the Conference would not have been made possible; but lastly but not least to the Organising Committee that has worked day and night to make what I should like to believe has been a successful Conference.
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0830 University Reform: Changing the University to meet new needs.
Speakers will consider ways in which the University itself might reorder its priorities and organization so as to provide effective leadership in society. Problems of implementation of ideals will also be discussed.
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1430 Higher Education: Some Comparative Perspectives, with emphasis on Third World Countries.
What can we learn from the experience of other people in other lands regarding university development?

Chairperson     Dr. C.C. Mutambirwa, Senior Lecturer, Department of Geography, University of Zimbabwe.
Paper by
Professor Philip G. Altbach, Professor of Higher Education and Social Foundations of Education, SUNY/Buffalo.

Discussants:
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0830 The Relationship between the University and Industry.
Speakers will consider ways in which the University and Industry can co-operate in research and in a variety of extension activities.
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Professor T. Palankai, Vice-Rector, University of Economics, Hungary.
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Closing Session

1100 The University of Zimbabwe:
From this time on.
by Professor W.J. Kamba,
Principal and Vice Chancellor.

1145 Closing Remarks
Comrade Dr. D. Mutumbuka, Minister of Education and Culture.

Chairperson: Professor P. Makhurane, Vice Principal and Deputy Vice Chancellor-Designate, University of Zimbabwe.
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