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I. The Beginning

The Asian Workshop on Higher Education was the first of its kind in Asia. It was convened in response to the need increasingly felt by Asian universities and colleges for a thorough examination of the role of higher education in national development at a time of unprecedented advance in science and technology.

A group of scholars and university administrators, constituting the Planning Committee for the Workshop, was brought together in November 1968 in Hong Kong, under the auspices of the Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities of the U.S.A., to discuss the idea of a workshop on liberal arts education for Asian institutions of higher learning. The conference was held from 5th to 12th November, 1968 at this University. After careful consideration, the Committee came to the conclusion that such a workshop would meet an urgent need of universities and colleges in this area. Dr. Choh-Ming Li, Vice-Chancellor of the University, was elected Director of the Workshop, assisted by Prof. S.S. Hsueh as Associate Director and Mrs. Lilian Chang Lee as Executive Assistant.

The Planning Committee comprised:
Dr. J.W. Airan, India
Dr. John M. Bevan, U.S.A. (Chairman)
Dr. Cicero D. Calderon, The Philippines
Dr. Kiyoko T. Cho, Japan
Dr. Choh-Ming Li, Hong Kong
Dr. Samuel H. Magill, U.S.A.
Dr. O. Natohamidjojo, Indonesia
Dr. Tae Sun Park, Korea
Mr. Kentaro Shiozuki, Japan
Dr. Eva I. Shipstone, India
Dr. Amrik Singh, India
Dr. Augusto Tenmatay, The Philippines
Dr. Mark Thelin, Taiwan
Miss Margaret Valadian, Australia

With its theme "A New Man for A New Society: Universities and Colleges as Agents of Change", the Workshop not only provided an effective forum to exchange experience and to promote mutual understanding and co-operation, but much more importantly, to stimulate action in participating institutions in such areas as administration, curriculum, student services, methods of instruction and long-range planning—all in order to produce a new frame of mind among the educated in the modernizing process of contemporary Asia.

The importance of the subject and the seriousness of purpose led the Planning Committee to urge the chief executive or his executive deputy of each invited institution to head a team composed of administrators and scholars including one senior and one junior member of different major disciplines. With the generous assistance of the Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities, the Workshop brought together more than 100 participants representing 20 universities and colleges in Asia. Individual educators from other countries were invited to attend; overseas educational organisations and foundations were also represented.

II. The Concept of the Workshop

The central purpose of the Workshop is to provide an opportunity for intensive study and discussion of ways and means for improving the quality of liberal arts education at the undergraduate level, and thus to stimulate action on the part of the participating institutions. There are all too few opportunities for faculty and administrative officers in Asian higher education to join in serious consideration and unhurried discussion of the large issues of the educational policy—the issues which transcend a single discipline, a single institution, a single country. The hope of the Workshop is to foster such discussion and to invite outstanding scholars in the field of higher education to play a major role by bringing their experience and research findings into the heart of the Workshop discussions.

A basic assumption of the Workshop is that every institution of higher learning must work out its own destiny by defining its problems, setting its priorities, and solving its problems in the light of its own traditions and resources. It follows that much of the emphasis of the Workshop falls upon the problem statements drawn up in advance by the participating institutions. Yet to isolate the educational discussion of a given institution from the rest of the academic world would be parochial in theory, unrealistic in fact, and grossly wasteful of academic talent. A second assumption of the Workshop, therefore, is that the sharing of insight and experience which is possible when twenty or so institutions participate in the give-and-take of a residential Workshop can help each of them to resolve local problems in the light of new wisdom and perspective.

In sum, the Workshop endeavors to bring together theorists, activists, administrators, and scholars and to do so in a setting free of the inhibitions of a single institution and free of the competing distractions of everyday campus life.
All discussions will not be rigidly structured, but rather be left to the inclinations of the participants.

III. The Opening Ceremony

More than 100 scholars and administrators from 20 universities and colleges from 10 Asian countries attended the Workshop. Besides the two universities in Hong Kong, the participating universities and colleges were from India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, The Philippines, Singapore, Taiwan, Thailand and Vietnam. These institutions include: Bangalore University, Fergusson College, Isabella Thoburn College, Madras Christian College and Wilson College, India; Satya Watjana Christian University and University of Indonesia, Indonesia; Yonsei University, Korea; University of Malaya, Malaysia; Silliman University and University of the Philippines. The Philippines; University of the Ryukyus, The Ryukyus; Nanyang University and University of Singapore and University of the Philippines; Tunghai University, Taiwan; Chulalongkorn University, Thailand; University of Saigon and Van Hanh University, Vietnam; University of Hong Kong, The Chinese University of Hong Kong and Baptist College, Hong Kong.

The Workshop was officially opened on 18th August by His Excellency the Governor Sir David Trench. The opening ceremony began at 10.00 a.m. at Benjamin Franklin Centre, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin. Sir David Trench addressed the scholars and administrators from various Asian universities and colleges after Dr. Choh-Ming Li had delivered his opening statement.

Dr. Choh-Ming Li's Opening Statement

The institutions of higher education in Asia are now facing two sources of tremendous pressure from without. Any solution that is extreme in nature will change the entire outlook and character of these institutions.

With the population explosion, the pressure of student numbers is mounting and will continue to mount. A large class is not by definition worse than a small class. It depends on the teacher, the students and the subject taught. However, it can be safely said that increased student numbers will debase the quality of teaching unless careful provision is made.

Another source of pressure is the clamour for more technical education than liberal education. Facing a fast-expanding and developing economy, community leaders often ask the institutions of higher education to turn out more doctors, engineers, architects and accountants so that they can be readily absorbed by various sectors of the society to relieve the acute shortage of manpower. That we need more highly trained people to run a sophisticated economy of a formidable dimension, there can be no doubt. Following this urgent need, the community tends to look at liberal education with reservation. Liberal education, so the argument goes, is a luxury we can ill afford. The present and primary task of a university is to train specialists and not to flounder in the residue of Western elitism. The answer to this type of reasoning, therefore, is not simply that we should strike a delicate balance between liberal education and technical education, because it attacks the very foundation of liberal education.

The crux of the problem is whether the technocrats alone can fulfill the role of our future leaders. To leave the leadership entirely to technocrats is too narrow a view which will eventually create detachment instead of concern. The scientists and technicians tend to remain in a state of incommunicado and the effects on the society will be more divisive than cohesive. In view of recent developments in regional and global affairs, it is obvious that our future leaders must possess the capability to make quick and important decisions in a highly volatile society. Further than that, these new leaders must possess vision, flexibility, a harder realism and a greater compassion for his fellow human beings.

If the institutions of higher education fail to continuously produce leaders well steeped in liberal education, we shall find ourselves caught short in the crucial issues in the near future. Liberal education calls for the understanding of human values and the universities must not be entrenched in a programme which over-emphasizes “intellectual competence and microscopic specialization at the expense of humanistic excellence and the skills of being a human being”. Instead, we should have a small core programme in the curriculum and leave ample room for the students to make selection so that the students may become more all-round and preoccupied with the quality of life. We need also a new conception of an all-round man, or a new Renaissance man, who prefers to be morally involved with local and global affairs rather than to know everything under the sun. The core and selective courses might, for example, include:

- Computers
- Mass Communication
- Behavioural Sciences
- International Finance
- Public and Business Administration
- Urban Development
- Contemporary Fine Arts
The courses are not merely pragmatic in nature but are part of our current social developments. They all have relevance to regional affairs as well as international interaction. For example, the devaluation of a currency will create panic all over the world, and set up a chain reaction in international trade and the balance of national budgets. The aim of "international education" is, therefore, to give students better ears, better sensitivity and make them aware of what their relations are and should be with the rest of the world.

A corollary to the new concept of liberal education is that we may need new teachers, at least, new methods of teaching. The liberalizing of the liberal arts is to open new horizons to the students. To fall in the pattern of rigid and formalistic teaching—instructions, briefs and gathering of more facts—will defeat its own purpose. In any way, civilization cannot be "passed on" to students. Students react as people and in the process they criticize, remodify and change the civilization. So in a university the young not only learn from the old, but the old also learn from the young. In teaching the students, the teachers are also taught. The civilization takes a new shape in the university. In this sense the university is a place for re-defining a cultural heritage. In this sense, also, the university provides a programme of courses that are relevant and dynamic at the same time.

It is well said that if we do not plan for and worry about the future, we shall face immediate repercussions. The main concern of the university is to go further than our present priorities and face problems of the future. One of our main tasks is to prepare our future leaders to deal with matters in the next decade or the next generation which we can only dimly see and perhaps cannot see at all now. In achieving this, the only course is to strain for humanistic excellence. It is only in the growth and maturing of the individual to his fullest dimension that our crucial priorities in both present and future can be met with confidence.

Ladies and gentlemen, I now have the pleasure to introduce to you His Excellency, Sir David Trench. As Chancellor of the two universities in Hong Kong, he has been singularly instrumental in fostering higher education and the training of leaders for the generations to come. And he is sympathetic to innovation and experimentation. It is, therefore, appropriate for the Workshop to have Sir David officiate at the opening ceremony.

His Excellency the Governor
Sir David Trench's Address

My first duty today must certainly be to welcome you all to Hong Kong.

It is a very great pleasure to us, of this quite young University, to see so many representatives of the universities of Asia sitting here in this, the first of our purely University buildings on our new site.

Most of your parent institutions are a great deal older than we are, and I assure you we are very sensible of the honour you have done us by coming here.

You have chosen a very broad theme for this Workshop and I think wisely.

It will enable you to range freely over subjects which are certainly of the very greatest importance to the Universities of this whole area.

And surely we now find ourselves at a critical point in the history of university development: at a time when thoughtful re-appraisals of the structure and role of Universities, and of some of the basic assumptions of recent years on which so much rapid expansion has been founded, are most necessary.

For we have to admit, sadly, that all is not quite as well as it might be with the university world. Somewhere, and I speak particularly of the Universities of the West, something does seem to have gone rather wrong: and we would do well in this region to try to locate the reasons for these upsets before it is too late.

Before considering therefore, as your theme requires, how best the Universities can change society, I fear we must recognize that at this moment in time, they face in many parts of the world something of a problem of convincing society that they can improve themselves: and not necessarily by ever larger doses of the mixture as before.

For I am afraid society is not likely to continue to find academic opinions altogether persuasive if they derive from a system which appears itself to be in some degree of disarray; and, very unfair in many ways though it is, that undoubtedly is society's impression of the general state of the University world today.

Temporary Phenomenon

But this trouble in the Universities is, I am sure, a temporary phenomenon; a phase to be gone through; and it is up to all of us who have the future of the Universities very much at heart to find
solutions by critical self-examination and whatever remedial action is needed. In the meanwhile, the Universities obviously can, and will, continue to play their part in shaping the society of the future, as they have always done in the past.

So far, I have spoken as a member of this University. May I now change hats and offer you a few thoughts, as a public official, on how academics can best exercise their influence in public affairs.

In the past, perhaps, the University was expected to be an indirect agent of change. It stood apart from the main stream of national life, and concentrated on the educational task of producing men who would be capable of leading society into new and, hopefully, better ways. Nowadays there is a tendency for the don to claim a more active role. Far from leading cloistered lives among their books, academics sit on government committees, act as consultants to industry, give expert advice in the Press and on TV and radio, direct surveys on urgent social problems, and seek in many other ways to make their presence felt outside the academic field.

A greater degree of personal involvement is no doubt right, but the nature of this involvement, if it is to be effective, needs thought.

Specialised Knowledge

Certainly the Universities should be able to provide an available store of specialised theoretical knowledge on all major subjects.

There is much sense in the Universities being the repositories of a common pool of objective, accurate knowledge, on which all who need it can draw.

But it is one thing to impart knowledge and rather another to offer advice: and the more modern tendency of gratuitously offering it opens up pitfalls.

It is simply that telling another man how to do his job is always a risky business, unless one can really comprehend every facet of his problem.

Moreover, offering advice may tend to lead to expressing strictures when that advice is not wholly accepted.

This can be even more dangerous. The University specialist does need to be careful to remember that those who seek his co-operation are responsible people also, and are not likely to want to reject his views without reasons which will seem good to them, even if he himself is not altogether in sympathy with those reasons.

Usually objection arises from practical consideration not appreciated by the giver of advice. To fail to give full weight to this is liable to lead to an erosion of mutual confidence and esteem.

I would suggest then that there is much to be said for the somewhat detached don, willing to impart what he knows and ready to help where he can, but careful not to involve himself too far or too incautiously.

This is not an easy role to play.

Many people will ask more of him; many—particularly from the mass media—will seek to entice him into no doubt lively but essentially sterile debate; or use him in one way or another for their own ends, unless the don is watchful and curbs the very natural desire of the enthusiast to join into an argument on one side or the other.

Contrary Views

The kaleidoscopic pattern of practical policymaking to-day has, inevitably and quite rightly, as one element in the process, a care for public opinion as best it can be distilled from what can be close to a babel of voices airing contrary views.

Very many of these views are unavoidably based on half-knowledge, half-truth, tendentious argument or special pleading. But it is counter-productive to join in the chorus: for the voices which finally do most to shape society are those which speak seldom; but when they do speak, speak from authority and carry conviction by their careful avoidance of anything in the nature of doubtful argumentation or appeals to emotion.

It is these voices which are most clearly heard above the rest in the places where policy is finally made.

Finally, you will notice I did not say shape ‘a new society’, as does your theme.

To say this, conveys something of an assumption that what is new is necessarily good, or that what exists must necessarily be changed.

I hope your Workshop will not accept this premise without challenge.

Dr. Li, in his over-complimentary remarks about myself, referred to me as an innovator. I am certainly not averse to trying new methods; but it is an urge I have learnt to suspect in myself, and to hold somewhat in check.
Must the West be Followed?

Improvement is something for which one could search constantly, but entirely new methods need to be introduced very circumspectly. In particular, need we here in the East necessarily feel we have to follow all the recent innovations of the West? Are they all necessarily wise and beneficial?

And if we are considering changes, should we not be careful to review also the traditional ways of the older civilizations of these parts, and consider whether we have not abandoned, or over-modified, some of them too much already?

Let us have the courage to change back if necessary, and not think there can be no change except in the direction of what is wholly new or currently fashionable.

To give one example, are we so sure that the modern tendency to concentrate all higher instruction into the Universities, to the near exclusion of other methods of training for the higher professions, is sound?

In the past, lawyers, for example, were trained on the job by lawyers, engineers by engineers, accountants and business men by their own kind. The Universities have subsumed much of this work of instruction: although the professions must still turn the student into practical lawyers, engineers and so on even after graduation.

For the higher professions there are certainly advantages in this dual system: a sound theoretical basis is assured the student, and undoubtedly there were deficiencies in the old system. But should we not stop at a handful of the higher professions?

It is not credible to me that all forms of higher career training would be improved by a spell of University instruction, and I believe the Universities would do well to examine proposed new courses critically and be certain that they would really be effective in turning out better trained men.

As a corollary, open support for other forms of training, and open resistance by the Universities to the idea that only a BA after one's name entitles one to claim to be fully educated, would, I am sure, be a source of strength to the University system in the long run: just as the contrary assumption has, I believe, proved damaging.

For it is the student who has set his heart on a degree, believing it to be sole portal to a successful career, but who finds at the end of it all that he is still unfitted for employment at the status-level he has thought would be his, who becomes the distrustled and critical student.

I believe the Universities should now make some endeavour to correct the generation of expectations from a University training in the young public's mind which cannot be fulfilled. At the same time, these same ideas have swollen the Universities to the point where severe strains are inevitable.

All these problems I am sure you will be considering in the days to come, and I wish you every success in your deliberations.

I am sure this first Asian Workshop will prove the desirability of further gatherings of the same kind in future.

And now, of course, it remains only for me to wish you all once again a very happy stay.

It has been, I repeat, a pleasure to welcome you all here; and to declare, as I now do, this first Asian Workshop open.

IV. The Keynote Speaker

Mr. Tarlok Singh, a distinguished scholar, author, economist and administrator, was the keynote speaker of the Workshop. Mr. Singh is Honorary Fellow of London School of Economics and Political Science, Fellow of the Institute for International Economics Studies, University of Stockholm, and Visiting Senior Research Economist, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, U.S.A. Formerly he served as the Private Secretary to the Vice-President of the Interim Government and later to the Prime Minister of India during the period of 1946-47.

On the opening day, the theme of the Asian Workshop on Higher Education, 'A New Man for a New Society: Universities and Colleges as Agents of Change', was clearly defined by Mr. Tarlok Singh in his keynote speech on 'Modernization and Educational Policy'.

The following is an outline of the speech:

1. The theme of the Asian Workshop on Higher Education has education at its core, but bears on the entire process of change — social, economic, technological and political — which now engulfs various cultures and economies in Asia. In looking at education at the present time, in fact we bring under purview the whole of society, the past equally with the future.

2. In many of the countries in Asia, there has been greater advance in the past two decades than in the preceding five. However, social change and development have fallen behind economic development as seen in the aggregate and, for a variety
Of reasons, inequalities have increased. The growth of population in the past twenty years and the prospects of growth in the next thirty have profound influence on all aspects of life, specially on education.

3. There are marked differences in levels of development in education as between different countries in Asia, but these are less important than the more general problems of improvement in education and their correlation with economic and social change. Frequently, high numerical levels obscure low standards. Higher education continues to be a source of privilege. In every country, levels of education, levels of economic development, and the elements of social change which are put through or delayed, intersect at many points, and should be seen as one composite reality.

4. If we consider conditions in Asia, after two decades of evolution, we see that, despite difficulties, most countries have made significant progress towards national consolidation and enjoy advantages which were not available before. At the same time, the inadequacy of the earlier forms of nationalism as a basis for economic and social reconstruction, and the need to go beyond national frontiers in our thinking and to enlarge the world of experience and understanding on which we are able to draw, have become increasingly apparent.

5. On the educational aspects of development, two notable gains of the last two decades are the common commitment, at least in principle, to provide education for all, and the beginnings of co-operation between universities and institutions of higher education in Asia.

6. Issues of policy relating to higher education may be said to fall into three groups:

(a) the purpose, content and scale of education,
(b) educational relations and administration, and
(c) social pre-conditions.

Under (a), arising from the scale of education, attention is invited to the findings of the study of the world crisis in education undertaken at the International Institute for Educational Planning in Paris. On the subject of purpose and content, three complementary goals, to which universities and institutions of higher education might relate their specific function (the training of the young at an important stage in their lives and the preparation of the greater part of the elite leadership of the future) are suggested. These are: (i) to produce ‘the complete citizen’ as the Greeks understood this notion; (ii) to turn out technical, scientific and professionally trained personnel; and (iii) to train young people, not so much as specialists, but as activists of change, who are equipped and motivated to lead. The courses to be taught and the balance between the humanities and the sciences follow the goals to be achieved. In this connection, attention is drawn to Whitehead’s notion of ‘dominant emphasis’ in relation to the literary curriculum, the scientific curriculum, and the technical curriculum.

Five issues of policy are proposed under the head, ‘educational relations and administration’, and five more under the head, ‘social pre-conditions.’

7. Finally, after referring to one recent attempt, based on a comparative view of history, to define the critical problems in modernization, and another to specify the ‘modernization ideals’ underlying planning and economic development in South and South-east Asia, attention is focussed on the implications of the relationship in many Asian countries between the modern, organised sector and the unorganised, household sector. It is pointed out that this relationship has at present the effect of enlarging economic and social inequalities within society. Universities and institutions of higher education now mainly serve the organised, modern sector of the economy and have not yet reached out or applied themselves to the problems of the unorganised sector. This limits the quality and range of their contribution to society and to the pace and content of modernization.

8. For higher education in Asian countries to serve as the agent of change such as will encompass the people as a whole and to produce the outlook which the new society of tomorrow in our best conceptions calls for, fresh thought has to be given to the nature of the economic system, the economic institutions, and the relations in the future between the organised and the unorganised sectors. The construction role of education, specially of higher education, in Asian countries, in modernization and in economic and social transformation is intimately related to the building up of unified economies and integrated societies. They are in fact two sides of the same basic task.

9. There is considerable scope for co-operation between countries in Asia through their universities and institutions of higher education. Specific proposals could be evolved, for instance, for common forums for exchange of experience, for co-operative research programmes, for exchange of teachers, research workers, students and university administrators, for expansion of library resources, and for the translation of important texts and documents.
V. The Seminars

The Asian scholars and administrators played a very active role during the two weeks Workshop. They participated enthusiastically in the six seminars, which were grouped into two on the following topics:

**Group 1**
The Relevance of the Humanistic Dialogue in the Academic Programme
A. The Humanities
B. The Social Sciences
C. The Natural Sciences

**Group 2**
D. The Role of the Student
E. The Role of the Teacher
F. Innovation and Experimentation

Six outstanding scholars had been invited to be leaders of the seminars:
A. The Humanities
   Prof. Slametmuljana
   *Professor of Malay Studies, Nanyang University, Singapore.*
B. The Social Sciences
   Prof. Hla Myint
   *Professor of Economics, London School of Economics and Political Science.*
C. The Natural Sciences
   Dr. Wah Kim Ong
   *Lecturer in Chemistry, University of Singapore.*
D. The Role of the Student
   Mr. Kentaro Shiozuki
   *Secretary for University Teachers Work in Asia, Japan.*
E. The Role of the Teacher
   Prof. Cesar A. Majul
   *Dean of Arts and Sciences, The University of the Philippines.*
F. Innovation and Experimentation
   Prof. Hahn-Been Lee
   *Dean of Graduate School of Public Administration, Seoul National University.*

VI. The Lectures

Three lectures were given during the second week, followed by discussions after each lecture.

*The University in Relationship to Traditional Culture (an outline)*

By Prof. Wang Gungwu
*Professor of Far Eastern History, Australian National University, Canberra.*

*The Conventional Dichotomy: The Western University in Asia*

It is frequently argued that the modern university is a product of western traditional culture and that culture was in turn modified by the university. Therefore, a close and meaningful relationship exists in the West between the university and traditional culture and there is really a great gap between the culture the society wants to have transmitted and the values which the university stands for. Even the rate of changes and progress was always regulated by the interaction between the university and vital sectors of the community. If the society changed too slowly, the university has often led the way; if the university was slow to respond to new social needs, the society sometimes shook it up and prodded it along.

In Asia, the traditional university did exist, but it was mainly set up to study, enrich and glorify traditional culture. It has now been replaced by the modern university which was modelled mainly on the university in the West in order to help the Asian countries to modernise. Thus by definition the modern university is a challenge to the traditions which are standing in the way of modernisation. Traditional culture tends therefore to be seen as totally opposed to progress, incompatible with science and technology, and therefore something more or less obsolete.

*The Logical Alternatives*

It is possible to imagine several different positions for universities to take with traditional culture.

Firstly, complete rejection of traditional values. This position is based on the idea of the university as a functional institution, not different in kind from technical institutions, only bigger, better and of a higher standard. It can exist under at least two very different sets of conditions:

(a) when the society itself rejects traditional culture and is in the grip of revolution;

(b) when the society believes that traditional culture is a matter for the home, the
temple, the primary and secondary schools at most, but not at an advanced level of training.

Secondly, the university concentrates on modernisation but pays lip service to traditional culture. This is possible when traditional culture is weak, or when the drive towards modernisation is strong (the modernising elite being stronger than the traditional elite in every way), or when there is a deep gulf between the independent modernising university and a still traditional society.

Thirdly, the university tries to give equal weight to both the task of modernisation and the responsibility of preserving and rejuvenating traditional culture. This can occur either when the modernising and traditional forces in a country are well-balanced, or the ruling elites are convinced that there is no conflict between tradition and modernity. This may also be influenced by the view that it is the modern university in the West which keeps traditional culture alive and there is no reason why Asian countries could not also achieve this.

Fourthly, there is the position that the university is primarily a transmitter of tradition, but while being true to the tradition can also respond to the needs of the time and give increasing attention to the study of science and practical knowledge. This position is found where traditional groups are still in control in most fields and are convinced that material advances will destroy the structure of society if primacy is not given to the continued development of traditional culture.

Finally, the view that there is nothing wrong with the traditional university, which is the bearer of traditional culture and the symbol of the continuity and the organic unity of society's ideas and institutions. The concept of progress is looked at with scepticism and science and technology accepted only in so far as they did not contradict or threaten to undermine the essence of traditional culture.

The Historical Position of the Modern Asian University

- The earliest traditional western university in the Philippines and its modernisation;
- The earliest modern universities in India and Japan;
- The earliest modern universities in China, Korea and Thailand;
- The first modern universities in Southeast Asia;
- The post-independence universities in Asia.

There are many kinds of universities in Asia, serving different functions and playing different roles, ranging from those which pay no attention to traditional culture to those which are entirely devoted to traditional culture.

Is there a case for making all universities the same?

Is there a better case for having a variety of universities in each country?

Is there a case for rejecting altogether the first and fifth positions described briefly above, and steering all universities towards positions two, three and four?

Is it true that some traditional cultures are more alive and dynamic than others, and therefore universities have the responsibility of growing in harness with the living traditions and at a speed the culture of the society determines?

* * *

The University in Relationship to Social Structures

(an outline)

By Prof. Kasem Udyanin,
Dean of Political Science
Chulalongkorn University, Thailand.

Social Structures are important to education, especially higher education. The words “Social Structures” include political, economic and social structures. Some social structures are not amenable to particular university organisation, well fitted to some societies and therefore, those responsible for formulating principle and administration of higher education must adapt particular university pattern to suit social structures. For example, if the economy of one society is inferior to that of the other, the university curricula as well as its quality will probably have to reflect this difference. It can also be seen that social structures have an influence on university. For instance, if a society is in need of having a certain number of technologists, technicians and skilled workers, any attempt to overconcentrate on producing theorists would absorb an undue proportion of national resources. A society may also need to change university organisation through changing time.

What is higher education must first be explored. University is neither a big school nor a place for indoctrination. Nor is university a school devoted
entirely to producing technologists or scientists. It should be a place to build up elites as well as producing scientists. Here we come to the problem of how to create an appropriate balance between these two groups. We must never forget the importance of university as a centre of scholars with a heritage of knowledge as well as a duty to social development. It is, therefore, necessary to consider national policy in conjunction with the number, size, curricula, quality of teaching and learning of universities in that society. Universities of various countries cannot follow the same pattern. We must synchronize university education with other levels of education. Therefore, the determination of other levels of education must also take into consideration status and form of university and, in turn, the form of university must be compatible with political, economic and social factors.

Why did I mention politics? This seems to me necessary because if a society decides on a particular political policy, university cannot afford to become an 'ivory tower'. For instance, my country is a constitutional monarchy, the form of university must be in conformity with the constitution and the administration with the King as leader of the nation. If the politics of decentralisation is practised, the university has also to be decentralised to the extent appropriate to the circumstances university as well as its professors must be relevant to society. Is the university simply a place for new knowledge and old theories? Has the university any responsibility to society and culture and what about its role in developing ethics and even physical education?

Looking at the question this way, many problems follow: what should be the suitable period of time at the university? 4-1-2 or 3-2-2. It would be rash to conclude that a three-year degree program offers less to students than a four-year degree program. What could be compared is the difficulty and the content of subjects involved. Should we begin specialization at the master's degree level or at the first degree level? What about doctoral research: research in depth or research in dimension? Whether it should be 30 hours or 12 hours per week has something to do with social structures. If sufficient textbooks are not available, 12-16 hours a week hardly seem adequate. Should the university be residential or non-residential? What type of college systems do we prefer: American or British?

Number of university professors presents a difficult problem. How could the university keep its professors? (at the time when outside offers are very tempting). The increase in the quality of university professors, their income and compensation as well as other educational material are all limited by social structures. To what extent should university degree, professors and higher education be given social recognition?

To produce university graduates is an important policy concerning social structures. In an industrial society or an affluent society, there is a great need for the university to produce technologists and scientists, in order, firstly, to supply increasing industries with necessary man-power and secondly, to avoid a social problem arising from unemployment. Therefore, university education of from 4 to 8 years seems to be a way of solving problem of unemployment. Or after the end of a war, veterans are brought into the university to alleviate unemployment problem.

Principal university disciplines include humanities, natural sciences, social science and applied sciences including technology. To increase (or reduce) and persuade students to choose various disciplines is largely determined by social structures, which mean the formulation of development policy in stages.

Whether a society should have state or private universities or colleges of denominational institution depends on its policy with reference to its social factor. University functionaries from Governing Board, Rector, Dean to junior faculty members—how they should be organised—depend entirely on custom, tradition and social structures.

With regard to culture, it begins with the form and personality of university as an institution. How far should university and culture be closely related? To what extent should culture be taught? How far is it necessary to preserve social custom and tradition including cultural heritage?

University should be responsible not only to its students but also to successive social relationship at all levels. It can therefore be said with certainty that the university has close relationship with social structures. University students act as binders to this relationship. A good university must be in conformity, and not incompatible, with social structures, and it needs no fear of being old-fashioned because it is different from other universities.

If we now know the meaning of a university together with the fact that it must be closely related to social structures, it is therefore of imperative necessity that there exists a plan for university operations which does not contradict societal norms and social change.
The Decision Making Process
(an outline)

By Prof. Chihiro Hosoya,
Dean of Law
Hitotsubashi University, Japan.

I. Recent University Disturbances in Japan

A. Recent situation:

Universities in Japan have recently had serious student problems. On the campuses of the majority of the government-sponsored universities there have been blockades of buildings, barricade strikes, the occupation of class rooms and other disturbances. As a consequence, these universities have been forced to stop normal teaching activities. A similar phenomena can be found in many private universities.

B. Forms and causes:

These disturbances have taken various forms in different universities. And the problems which led the students to bring about the disturbances are also varied. In spite of these differences, certain similarities in the recent university disturbances throughout Japan: strong feeling of the university students against authority, against the Establishment and against control from above. Also there is another common element: the intensified struggle for the leadership among the two major student groups—Yoyogi (Japanese Communist Party) group and anti-Yoyogi group (New Left)—and finally they share willingness to employ violence.

C. The University Bill:

Out of a concern with the university unrest, the Japanese government made a decision to strengthen its control over the university through new legislation, and, in disregard of strong opposition efforts, railroaded it through the Diet. With the passing of the Bill at the Diet, it is said that the university disturbances are entering into a new stage.

D. The case at my university:

With the barricade strike carried out as a form of the student movement in support of international anti-war day on the 21st of October last year, the wave of the university disturbances passed over our campus. The radical student group which led the strike raised the question as to whether the faculty accepted the strike or not. Then, in December our Faculty Senate for the first time had a mass bargaining session with the leaders of the autonomous student group on the subject of the election of the faculty staff responsible for student problems. Since then the Faculty Senate has had a number of mass bargaining sessions and meetings with both the Yoyogi group and the anti-Yoyogi group. In spite of our efforts to maintain channels of communication with these two opposing student groups, the anti-Yoyogi group finally occupied the main building on the 17th of May on the pretext that we had refused to continue talks with them. Subsequently, a plenary student meeting adopted a resolution on May 20th supporting the strike against the University Bill which was to be placed on the agenda at the Diet. In such a fashion, student unrest has developed and increased in intensity at my university.

II. Problems Related to the Decision-Making Process in the University

A. Organs:

One of the most important questions raised by the students—as well as by some of the faculty—during the period in which the disturbances have intensified at our campus has related to the decision-making process. During our negotiations with the students and in their published pamphlets, they have brought up several problems concerning the decision-making process.

For example, they have asked: Who is empowered to make the final decisions on important matters at our university? Is the Faculty Senate (Hyogikai), which consists of three representatives from each faculty (including the dean), the supreme organ for making decisions? What is the relationship between the Faculty Senate and each faculty or how is the decision-making power divided between them? These were the students' questions, and they called on us to clarify.

There are some regulations which set forth the function and role of such organs as the president, Faculty Senate and faculty. In reality, however, the working of these organs has been governed by custom and implicit agreements; and has not always followed the wording of the regulations.

In any case, it has been taken for granted that those who participate in making decisions on important matters, except for the budget, are limited to faculty members. This is called the self-governing formula of the faculty; and this formula has invited sharp criticism from the student body.

B. Communications:

The students have demanded the right to be informed immediately of decisions made by the faculty. We had agreed to give information to them whenever we reached any decision relevant to the students. But the students have demanded to know
more than this. The failure of the Faculty Senate to give the information immediately to the students when the president expressed informally his intention to resign to the members of the Senate, produced discontent among the students and escalated the trouble last February.

C. Openness of the decision-making process:

The interest of the students in the decision-making process is not limited to this. They have demanded further that they be informed of the decision-making process itself. They have asked to know whether particular major decisions were reached unanimously or by a majority vote. They were anxious to be informed of the substance of any minority opinions and the names of those who supported the minority. They have advocated open Faculty Senate and faculty staff meetings; and, as the means to achieve this goal, they have demanded access to the minutes of those meetings or the right to send their representatives to the meetings to observe the entire decision-making process.

D. Rational reasoning:

The students have always argued that the faculty has to explain the rational reason underlying particular decisions, on the assumption that since the university is a place where the rational judgment governs everything, we must provide a logical explanation for our decisions. They always ask: “Why did you make this decisions?” It is rather difficult for us to answer this question, because our decisions are often reached in a complex way, through the dynamics of the group decision-making process; besides, we have to take into account such irrational factors as personal feeling, custom, tradition, and power relations.

E. Participation in the decision-making process:

Criticism to the past procedure that only the faculty staff participates in making decisions in the university has led to the students' demand for a right of participation in the decision-making process, on the grounds that they also are members of the university. The students have pointed out several forms of participation. (i) Creation of a council where student representatives would be able not only to express their views, but also to have a vote, as an equal partner, when deciding important matters. (ii) Establishment of the right of the student body to negotiate with the faculty on relevant problems. (iii) Granting of veto power to the student body concerning decisions made by the faculty.

These are problems raised by the students in our university in relation to the decision-making process. A similar situation exists, I believe, in other universities in Japan.

III. The University as a Decision-Making system:
A Comparative Study

A. Two models:

We can imagine a decision-making system in which every one has the veto power over decisions. This system could be called the “Unit Veto System.” Another decision-making system could be one in which a single person monopolizes decision-making power. This system could be called the “Hierarchical System.” These two systems represent the two most extreme. The system which exists in the real world can be placed somewhere in between. For example, the institution of the military represents a system which is close to the “Hierarchical System”, but does not represent the “Hierarchical System” itself. The Government and Business are less hierarchical than the military institution as a decision-making system. As compared with these institutions, the university system should perhaps be placed closer to the “Unit Veto System.”

B. University model:

Having observed that the university is unable to react rapidly to student disturbances and to take effective steps to accommodate the different views within the faculty, one cynical observer pointed out that there were two hundred executive directors in the university. It is true that it takes a great deal of time to reach any important decision in the university, simply because we have made it a rule to build consensus among the faculty members, who have their own individual views. We adopt a majority rule in some cases, but generally, in case one of the faculty sticks to his position in disregard of the majority opinion, it can easily create difficulty in reaching a decision.

C. Two forces operating in the opposite direction:

Taking into account that the university system is inadequate for coping with the current situation, the government decided to transform the university system in such a fashion that decision-making power would be concentrated in the hands of the president.

In other words, the government has intended to move the university system in the direction of a “Hierarchical System.” The University Bill is designed to pursue this purpose.

On the other hand, within the university there are forces operating in another direction, which are pulling the university system closer to the Unit Veto System. These forces can be detected both among the students and among the faculty.
IV. From Closed System to Open System

As I have already mentioned, there is an increasing demand among the students for opening up the decision-making process. Although it might be said that there is a general tendency to move from a closed system to an open system, there are several points to be considered before taking action.

If we are to adopt an open decision-making system, there would be some good effects. For example, the suspicions of the students toward secrecy of the decision-making process would be dissolved. And their desire for obtaining complete and immediate information about the decision-making process would be satisfied. Yet at the same time, we have to consider certain negative effects which the open system would create. The open system would make it much difficult for the faculty to accommodate conflicting views at meetings and to reach a compromise. There is a danger that the decision-making system itself might be dysfunctional, because individuals would tend to stick to their own position. Meetings, as a result, would become a sort of forum in which decisions would be most difficult to reach.

V. Conclusion

VII. Other Activities

In addition to attending the seminars and lectures held during scheduled sessions of the Workshop, individual participants devoted several afternoons and evenings in study and research of the position papers submitted by individual institutions and other material reflecting new developments in their respective fields. A Library and a Common Room, especially set up at the Benjamin Franklin Center, were made available to the group for this purpose. Institutional teams and members of the respective seminar panels met in small discussion groups to gain further insight into the various problems included on the Workshop agenda. Case studies on the following subjects were keenly discussed by many of the delegates at three evening meetings:

1. The Chinese University of Hong Kong and the Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning
2. Student Problems in Japan
3. Bangalore University, Yonsei University and Silliman University

Participants took time out from their work sessions to visit Chung Chi College, New Asia College and United College, where they toured the campuses and were entertained by performances of the students. Visits were also made to the University of Hong Kong and Hong Kong Television Broadcasts Ltd. A tour of the New Territories, a cruise around Hong Kong Island to enjoy the view of the “Pearl of the Orient”, followed by dinner at Aberdeen, highlighted the extra-curricular activities of the Workshop delegates.

VIII. The Closing Ceremony

On August 30th, at the end of the 2 weeks of discussions, seminars and lectures, the 6 seminar leaders with Professor S.S. Hsueh as chairman, presented reports on their respective subjects. No definite conclusions were reached, rather suggestions were put forth relating to the immediate problems and priorities of the universities and colleges and ideas advanced for programmes of action for improvement and innovation.

During the closing ceremony, the keynote speaker, Mr. Tarlok Singh, brought to the attention of Asian scholars and administrators the recommendations contained in the reports of the seminars. He also summed up the various aspects and topics discussed during the Workshop:

1. Differing conditions and common problems
2. Modernization and the role of the university
3. Social and political background: opportunities and constraints
4. Undergraduate study: content and emphasis
5. Teachers: role and development
6. Students in the educational structure
7. Reform and innovation
8. Co-operation and interchange

Dr. Choh-Ming Li, Director of the Workshop, delivered a closing statement following Mr. Tarlok Singh’s speech.

Closing Statement by Dr. Choh-Ming Li

The workshop technique has been tested elsewhere before. As far as Asia is concerned, this is the first time that a workshop of such a scale has been held. In this sense, it was an “innovation and experimentation” in itself. The theme of the
Workshop was, as everybody knows, “A New Man for a New Society”. In practice, it may well be: “A New Man for a New Conference.”

The basic technique of the Workshop can be summed up as follows. First, the keynote speaker set the tone. Then the six seminars discussed the problems related to their fields. The leaders of the seminars steered the discussions to seek out the problems and gradually unfolded the possible solutions. In the first week, the leaders wisely refrained from imposing their personalities on the seminars and encouraged the delegates to air their personal philosophical views on the subject. This might have caused some anxiety, as the focus of attention could not be found at once. It was, nevertheless, necessary for the general participation of the delegates to speak their own mind. But before long, the seminars began to settle down and issues began to emerge that cried out for solutions. Each institutional team got together by themselves and raised problems and proposed solutions for implementation. After the regular seminars, small groups held informal presentations in the afternoons or evenings, which helped the seminars to reach successful conclusions.

To use a musical metaphor, the keynote speech was the theme, the seminars were variations on the theme, some being a little harsh while some being melodious, and the lectures served as harmony. The three lectures reached across the lines of the seminars and tried to embrace and unite them. At first, there was a little hesitation, groping and reaching for the hand. Then came the adjusting, tuning and warming up. Finally, the Workshop turned out to be a nicely synchronized and orchestrated effort, as was so well demonstrated in this morning’s reports by the six seminar leaders.

An evaluation of the complete results of the Workshop is difficult to formulate at the present moment. The programmes of action, as so aptly presented by our keynote speaker in his brilliant summing-up, are not expected to be implemented by every institution. The solutions may vary, depending on the size, nature and the faculty number of the individual institution concerned. Whether it is private, state, national or denominational has a lot of bearing on the outcome of future implementation. The programmes of action, however, are expected to be taken seriously. Even then, if a few ideas out of many can be carried out and put into effect, everyone of us will be justified to feel rewarded. Such an evaluation can only be made one or two years from now. For the present, we must confine ourselves to the question: what have we achieved? As an innovation, the Workshop is no longer new, since its technique has now been tested and found to be practicable. As an experiment, it is, at least, partially successful. For one thing, there is the tremendous enrichment of personal experience. For another, the very fact that for the first time in Asia more than twenty colleges and universities got together for two weeks is an event, the impact of which cannot but be felt directly and indirectly throughout the region. That the mass communications media of Hong Kong, which is a very practical-minded city, have devoted full and intensive coverage of the Workshop indicates the force of the impact.

This leads us to consider the future prospects of the Workshop. This kind of technique is being watched not only by Hong Kong and other parts of Asia, but also by other regions. It will be studied carefully as a pilot case. It is hoped that the proceedings of the Workshop will be collected and published as a record as well as an example. The future of the Workshop, in the final analysis, depends on our follow-up more than anything else. We must find out to what extent the programmes of action will be implemented and why and how. We must also find out how much of the solutions to the problems can be applied. This, again, depends on how hard we work in the next two years. The day a student graduates from a college or a university and receives his diploma is called the commencement day. In the same sense, the Workshop does not conclude today, it merely commences.

As Director of the Workshop, I would like to express my deep appreciation for the conscientious efforts and invaluable contribution made by the keynote speaker, Mr. Tarlok Singh, the three lecturers and the six seminar leaders. Together, they went out of their way to make the Workshop really hum. Speaking more personally, I may add that Mr. Singh’s wise counsel and hard work have been a tremendous inspiration to all of us. A note of profound gratitude must be expressed to those whose bold vision has led them to finance this project and who therefore are really the ones that made this Asian Workshop possible. Thanks are due to my colleagues at The Chinese University who have rendered their service and help to the Workshop in addition to their routine load of work. The students’ help has also been eminently satisfactory.

Finally, may I be allowed to say a few words as host of the Workshop. “The role of the host” is not an easy one. No matter how hard we worked and how carefully we checked, there must have been some details which have been overlooked. But then we could always count on your good will and cooperation. “The role of the participant” is much more difficult and strenuous. Each of you had to exercise patience and forbearance because of the
inconvenience and the inadequacy of facilities. Each of you had to display a rare wisdom not to accomplish any dramatic during the Workshop. For all this, we are extremely grateful. Since the Workshop is yours, any success achieved during the Workshop is also yours. A Chinese poet once said: “Sorrow at parting often overwhelms one’s soul.” The sorrowful feeling at parting is sweetened by the assured knowledge that next time when we meet, something positive will have been achieved, because as agents of change, we have only one direction to go, that is, change for the better.

IX. The New Beginning

Many participants took the opportunity at the conclusion of Dr. Li’s remarks to express their satisfaction with and to enumerate the benefits they derived from attendance at the Workshop. They described the Workshop as a unique experience which had given them personal inspiration as well as a clearer insight into their various problems. There was general agreement that the combination of formal talks and informal discussions had produced fruitful results and promoted mutual understanding which would have been difficult to achieve otherwise. The consensus was that similar Workshops should be continued, preferably once every two years.

Now that a clearer insight has been gained into the problems of higher education in Asia, it remains for the individual institutions to initiate programmes of action designed to resolve existing difficulties. As agents of change, it is incumbent upon the universities and colleges in Asia to devise means of overcoming present obstacles and to strive for a “New Beginning”. The success of the Workshop will depend in large measure upon the aggressiveness with which approved programmes are implemented.
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然後逐漸引出可能的解決方法。在第一個星期，負責人儘量避免表達個人觀點，以免影響小組討論的討論內容，並鼓勵各組員發表意見。這樣做也許會使組員暫時找不到討論中心，因而感到不安，但却可以達到使大家表意見的目的。

小組討論會不久後即開始有了具體方向。每一單位學校的成員均自行開會，提出問題並提供解決辦法。在小組討論會後，通常在下午或夜間，各小組的組員自由聚集，討論各種問題，更使小組討論會容易於達到具體的結果。

如果用音樂名詞來作譬喻：不妨說主題演講詞像一首樂曲的主題，小組討論會是主題的變奏曲，有些變奏曲比較雄壯，有些比較優美。學術演講會則像和聲，企圖將小組討論會合在一起。

起初，大家有點猶疑、在暗中摸索、躊躇；然後大家漸漸遍應、校準、試奏；最後，整個專題會議合奏出一首樂曲。這一點可以從刚才六位小組討論會負責人的報告看出來。

目前我們還難對專題會議的成果加以估價。剛才主題演講人辛泰洛先生在他出色的總結報告中所提供的計劃，我們不能要求每一所大學都付諸實行。解決問題的辦法也不是一成不變的，要看每一所大學的規模、性質及教職員而定。而且大學的性質是私立的、國立的或受教會資助的，都會影響到各種措施的實施。可是專題會議所提供的計劃將受到重視。只要這次專題會議所提供的許多意見中有一部分為人所採納及加以應用，就能使在兩年以後才可加以估價。現在，我們只能這樣想：如果這次專題會議達到甚麼目的？在新專題會議一方面來說，用香港及亞洲各方面的觀點來看，而且大家覺得可行的，便可以這樣問：究竟這次會議達到甚麼目的？

事實上，不但香港及亞洲各地，其他地區也在注意這種方式。這次的專題會議將成為一個先例，我們希望將來將會有更多的專題會議，現已有計劃成立一個專家組織，華南及華北大學聯合會，專門研究這個問題。

在「團結」方面來說，至少已獲得部份的成功。一方面，在專題會議中，所有參加會的代表在兩星期的時間內，都是以各自的民族意識為基礎來討論問題的，另一方面，二十幾所大學人員雲集在一起，參加這樣長的會議，不是一件簡單的事，對亞洲地區一定會產生直接或間接的影響。這次專題會議的影響力，可以從香港的電視、廣播電台、中英文報紙的詳細報導熱烈反應看出來，尤其因為香港是一個非常現實的地方。

新階段

在李卓敏校長致閉幕詞完畢後，各參加該專題會議的代表均對本屆會議表示滿意，認爲獲得有益之經驗，同時對各項問題亦有進一步之認識。專題會議以演講會及不拘形式之討論會交替進行，更能產生具體的結論及形式之不同的認識，並能產生具體之結論及形成之討論會交相進行。各組員亦認為此次專題會議實應繼續舉辦。下次再見面的時候，我們一定會見到一點具體的成就。大學既然也是社會改進的工具，我們就只有向前邁進，改革社會。

新階段在李卓敏校長致閉幕詞完畢後，各參加該專題會議的代表均表達對本屆會議的滿意，認為獲得有益之經驗，同時對各項問題亦有進一步之認識。專題會議以演講會及不拘形式之討論會交替進行，更能產生具體的結論及形式之不同的認識，並能產生具體之結論及形成之討論會交相進行。各組員亦認為此次專題會議實應繼續舉辦。下次再見面的時候，我們一定會見到一點具體的成就。大學既然也是社會改進的工具，我們就只有向前邁進，改革社會。
在騷動期間,日本大學生提出多項問題,其中一項與大學决策程序有關。一橋大學學生曾及敎務會是否為最高之決策機構,因通常除財政預算外,該校所有重要政策,均由大學教職員決策。在學潮中,該校學生要求大學當局以每一項決議通知學生,而大學當局則表示僅可公開有關大學之具體情況,相信其他日本大學情形亦相類似。

決策之制度可分為兩類:『單位否決權制度』及『高階層決斷制度』。此兩種制度代表兩種極端,難以付諸實現。因各種制度代表大學教職員因各持己見,故需較長之時間,以達成重要之決策。

日本之大學現正普遍面對兩股壓力:来自政府及學生。鑒於最近學潮之難以控制,日本政府已將大學之制度予以變更,使決策權力歸於校長,因此大學之制度趨向『高階層決斷制度』。惟一部份日本學生,則欲使大學轉向『單位否決權制度』。

任何公開之決策程序,務須進行之。惟注意其利弊。一方面,學生因決策程序之外,決策權力歸於校長,因此大學之制度趨向『高階層決斷制度』。惟一部份日本學生,則欲使大學轉向『單位否決權制度』。

閉幕禮

閉幕禮

結論

在休會之際,校長致閉幕詞。李卓敏校長演說詞

以專題會議方式討論問題,已經在別處嘗試過了,但在亞洲地區,這樣大規模的專題會議,卻是首次舉行。因此,這次專題會議已成為討論之場所,而結果無法達到任何定論。二者之間失衡,因此需要調整。
大學與傳統文化之關係（摘要）

八月二十五日（星期一）

主講人：坎培拉國立澳洲大學遠東歷史學科教授王賡武教授

現代化之大學為西方傳統文化之產物，但同時亦為阐揚之機構。西方之大學與文化密切相關，並為現代社會之發展起著重要作用。現今，許多大學已採用現代化之手法，重新闡釋傳統文化之價值。

以往亞洲大學之歷史背景，主要以學習及發揚傳統文化為宗旨。目前，現代化之大學已漸漸取代傳統大學之地位。在現代人心目中，傳統文化常被認為過時及妨碍進步，不合於太空時代。因此，大學對傳統文化可能採取以下五種不同立場：

一、摒棄傳統之價值，視大學與工業學院相同，規模較大，水準較高。理由為：（甲）社會摒棄傳統文化，本身正在改革中。（乙）社會人士認爲傳統文化只能應用於家庭、廟堂及中小學校內。

二、以現代化為主，對傳統文化只作形式上之保存。理由為：傳統文化力量微弱，而現代化趨勢非常迫切。

三、對現代化與保存傳統文化應同樣重視。理由為：國內之現代化趨勢與傳統文化相平衡，而政府領袖相信傳統文化可與現代化相容。

四、以傳達傳統文化為宗旨，惟在傳達文化過程中，為應時代之需要，設立科學及實用學科。理由為：政府領袖主張保存傳統文化，並相容。

五、以保存傳統文化為原則，對進步之觀念反持懷疑之態度，科學與技術唯有在與傳統文化不相矛盾時方能接受。

亞洲地區有以上各種不同類型之大學，各有其歷史背景，作用及任務。是否所有大學均應屬於同一類型？每一國家是否應有各種不同類型之大學？亞洲各國是否應放棄第一及第五立場而採第二、第三、第四立場？以上各問題值得有關人士深思及探討。

大學與社會結構之關係（摘要）

八月二十六日（星期二）

主講人：泰國朱拉隆功大學政治學科主任邬岡教授

（Prof. Kasem Udyanin）

社會結構對大學之關係非常重要，所謂「社會結構」，乃指政治、經濟及社會各方面之結構而言。負責策劃高等教育人士，應設立適當之大學，以迎合社會之需要。大學之組織亦應隨時代而革新。

大學並不僅為一龐大之學校或灌輸傳統文化之機關，其主要之作用乃為培育領袖及科技人才，而在此方面，大學之規模、負荷、課程及教學方法，均須考慮。故在制定大學之數目、規模、課程及教學方法時，亦需考慮之。

社會結構之大學之關係非常密切。大學常受社會結構之影響，故大學之組織亦應隨時代而革新。

大學應對學生負責，亦應對社會各階層負責任。因大學應為社會與社會之橋樑。一所大學必須與社會之標準及趨向相配合，並能與社會打成一片。大學之組織又與社會風俗、習慣、標準及文化息息相關。

決策程序（摘要）

八月二十七日（星期三）

主講人：日本東京一橋大學法律學科主任細谷千博教授

（Prof. Chihiro Hosoya）

日本之大學最近常閙學潮，因而若干大學被逼停課。大學生騷動之原因有二：學生對大學當局不滿，及日本共產黨學生與新左翼學生之鬥爭。日本政府鑑於目前學潮之情況，已制定了大學法例，由國會通過，加強大學當局之權力。
主題演講人

亞洲高等教育專題會議主題演講人辛泰洛先生
（Mr. Tarlok Singh）

辛泰洛先生於專題會議之首日發表演講，以闡明該會議之主旨︰「新人物新社會，大學為改進社會之工具。」講題為：「現代化及教育政策」。下文為其演講詞之撮要：

高等教育部會之討論中心，當然為教育。然討論此問題時，應包括各方面之變遷，因社會、經濟、工藝以及政治之變遷均與教育有關。亞洲國家近年在各方面長足之發展，惟社會之變遷與發展不及經濟之變遷與發展迅速，故只考慮高等教育部會之發展，將使大學及高等教育機構之變遷，獲得更多機會接受高等教育。社會變遷及發展之速度，足以影響大學及高等教育機構之變遷。亞洲國家將會性質之變遷，為大學及高等教育機構之發展基礎，故大學及高等教育機構須為大學及高等教育機構之發展基礎，為大學及高等教育機構之發展基礎，為大學及高等教育機構之發展基礎。
世界許多地方所面臨的問題，是如何使社會相信它們可以自己改進，而改善的辦法也不一定要依照從前使用的藥方而加強它的成份，我以為社會可能不會再像以前那樣對學者意見認為有勸服能力，如果這些意見來自一種本身似乎也失去秩序的機構。在很多方面，這樣想法似乎是十分不公平的，這些學者當中有些人曾經出現在這樣的機構，而他們的學術著作和創作也往往被社會認為是失敗的，沒有實用性。在社會對今天一般大學情形的印象中，這種想法似乎是十分不公平的，因此我們必須肯定大學應該在社會中扮演一個領導的角色，而不應該成為社會的一個附件。

過去大學被視為改進社會的間接媒介，它雖然超然地站在一國生活的實際活動之外，致力於造就能夠領導革新社會的人才，但在今日來說，大學學者卻充當了比較活躍的角色。他們出現在各個層面上，從政府委員會或擔任工業顧問，到電視、電台及報章上提供意見，調查急需解決的社會問題，並以其他各種方式把他們的影響力推廣到學術範圍之外，涉入於多種事項，無疑是正確的趨向，但所參加活動的質和程度卻值得深思，因為惟有如此才能收效。大學應該可以供給各種主要科目的專業知識。把大學當作一個客觀的、正確的知識總匯，凡有需要的人，均可自其中取用。這是大學應該具有的角色，但不應該是大學的全部角色。

政策的決定，在今日萬花筒式的決策過程中，自必重視從許多相反的意見中所選擇出的民意。這些意見有很多是不明智的，或反對的，反對的往往也是有道理的。但我們必須避免任何有疑問的爭論或情感動員，因為這樣會對那些重要的問題產生負面影響。我們常常可以找到需要改進的事物，但完全新方法的施行，都必須非常謹慎。尤其值得懷疑的是我們東方國家，是否必須採納西方國家近幾十年所發生的變革，看看我們是否曾經輕易放棄了它們或者把它們過份改變，因而得不償失。如果情勢需要的話，我們應有勇氣恢復原狀而不應該認為除了向全新或趨時的方面發展之外，便沒有向其他方面改革的可能。

舉一個例來說，現代傾向把一切高級訓練集中大學裏辦理，幾乎將有關高級專業訓練的其他方法排除殆盡。從前，律師、工程師、會計師及商人，是由律師、工程師、會計師及商人在職教他們的。大學已經包攬了大部份的訓練工作。雖然專業人員仍須經雙重訓練制度，但是否僅限於若干高級的專業呢？我不相信一切形式的高級職業訓練是可以經由大學訓練而提高的。我相信如果大學以批判的態度檢討推薦的課程，及確定那些學科真正有實用性的，那雙重訓練制度纔可以在我們的社會中得到真正的改進。如果我們在大學訓練課程中，不能採納這種批判的態度，那我們的社會改進任務將會更難。
感謝李卓敏校長之開幕詞

亞洲的高等教育機構正面對著兩股巨大的壓力。

人口激增及經濟壓力：社會對高等教育機構的需求及政府的預算限制，使得這些機構必須尋求新的解決方法。

另一方面，社會重視通才教育，忽略專才教育，使得大學在訓練未來領袖的過程中，需要考慮到這些壓力。

香港的高等教育機構必須在這些壓力下，尋求創新與實用的方法，以應付未來的挑戰。

香港高等教育機構的責任是培養未來的領導人才，並提供有價值的學術研究，為香港的發展作出貢獻。

香港高等教育機構需要面對的問題是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的挑戰是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的未來是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的使命是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。

香港高等教育機構的目標是，如何在不斷變化的环境中，保持其獨立性及領導地位，並在變革中保持創新和實用。
籌備工作

亞洲高等教育專題會議之主旨為：在現代社會，大學乃為改進社會之工具。參加是次會議之大學，除有機會交換意見以促進彼此之了解及合作外，主要之目的乃在行政、課程、學生輔導及合作外之重要之大學通才敎育，以及長遠計劃各方面，採取積極行動，使大學在現代化之過程中產生新人物並造成新風氣。因此，專題會議特別強調，凡參加之高等教育機構，在專題會議閉幕後，將須根據參加之高等教育機構之代表所獲邀請之提案，進行實行。

開幕典禮

參加亞洲高等教育專題會議者，有亞洲十一個大學之代表，共計一百餘名敎師及行政人員，來自下列各大學：印度之邦加羅爾大學、法嘉遜大學、杜邦大學、馬德拉斯基督敎大學；印尼之薩雅華傑那大學及印尼大學；韓國之延世大學；馬來西亞之馬來亞大學；菲律賓之斯理文大學及菲律賓大學；琉球羣島之琉球大學；星加坡之南洋大學及星加坡大學；台灣之東海大學；泰國之朱拉隆功大學；越南之西貢大學及萬行大學；香港之香港大學、香港中文大學及浸會書院。

該專題會議於八月十八日上午十時，在沙田本校范克廉樓開幕，由港督戴麟趾爵士主持開幕禮。李卓敏校長先致開幕詞，隨後由戴麟趾爵士發表演講。
香港中文大學

亞洲高等教育專題會議

一九六九年八月十八日——三十日