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Needed for the 1970’s:
An Educational Policy for the Social Sciences*

By Claude S. Phillips, Jr.

A remarkable irony is becoming apparent in American education: it may not have the ability to reform itself in the realm of intercultural education. The irony stems from the fact that the need for reform is apparently agreed on by many people concerned with the question, while on the contrary there appears to be no organized, and little open, opposition to the need. Yet intercultural concepts are still struggling for acceptance at every level of American education. How can this situation be explained?

There is no gainsaying the effort to influence intercultural education. Indeed, the massiveness of the effort in the last twenty years almost defies comprehension. Conferences, studies and reports fill countless volumes. Organizations of all kinds have been created to further intercultural understanding, such as Education and World Affairs, the Institute of International Education, the International Studies Association, Experiment in International Living, Community Ambassadors, Crossroads-Africa, friendship associations, and world tours. Universities and colleges have set up international studies programs and overseas projects involving both faculty and students. They have special research programs on their campuses and many have

* A version of this paper appears in the daily issue of the Congressional Record for July 15, 1969, pp. H5968 - H5972.—Ed.
joined together in consortia for international cooperation. The U.S. government has entered the field with far-reaching programs such as the Fulbright-Hays Act, the National Defense Education Act, the Higher Education Act, the International Education Act and the Peace Corps. Foundations have poured millions of dollars into intercultural activities. Private citizens' groups have been formed for foreign policy studies or support of the United Nations. "Neglected" languages have been introduced even into elementary and secondary schools at various places. The list of efforts at intercultural education is almost limitless.

The impact of these efforts has been so meager as to be startling. Conferences are still being convened to study the problem of how to incorporate intercultural studies into the educational system. The overall effect so far has been so small that 90% of the students in Liberal Arts colleges as recently as 1964 still graduated without a single course which dealt with Non-Western cultures. While some outstanding efforts at intercultural studies have been made in some schools, colleges and universities, the total impact is almost negligible. Furthermore, the International Education Act has not been funded, and probably will not be funded by as much as one dollar. AID programs are gradually being reduced without any public debate on alternative policies. The foundations have begun a drastic cutback in their support of international studies. Let us face the facts: International studies have had little measurable impact on higher education, less on secondary and elementary education, and practically none on the general public.

There is a real irony in the failures to date, an irony which stems from the very processes we used to combat parochialism and ethnocentrism. We set up area studies programs, created new courses with international or area foci, instituted overseas projects and seminars, facilitated faculty and student exchanges, welcomed foreign students and encouraged increased research in foreign areas. We created interdisciplinary programs established new faculty dialogues and enriched student alternatives. We benefitted from foundation grants and U.S.

---


2 Karl W. Deutsch notes with dismay that the present retrenchment constitutes a "partial intellectual disarmament in international affairs" at the very time when the United States is entering a "period of increasing vulnerability and lessening control of world affairs." Surely, he concludes: "It will take more—not less—knowledge, skill and competence for the next generation of American leaders to cope with these international problems of the 1970's and 1980's. To reduce the intellectual source of this knowledge now, by cutting back on international research, might prove to be a truly fateful decision—a national decision that should not be taken lightly or as a result of absentmindedness." "The Coming Crisis of Cross-National and International Research in the United States," *AGLS Newsletter*, Vol. XIX, no. 4 (April 1968), pp. 2, 3.
government support. We established new journals, formed new professional organizations and set up new consortia. Considering the massiveness of the effort, we must be chagrined that the impact has been so small.

This is not to suggest that there have been no successes, for there have been. Entrenched international and area programs now exist in the curricula of numerous institutions of higher learning and the overseas involvement of colleges, universities and individual faculty members is at an all-time high. But the expectations, say 1955, have not been realized. We expected that a world perspective would gradually permeate the academic world: that faculties would see their disciplines in the context of universal manifestations and that the educated man—surely still the purpose of higher education—would reflect an intellectual awareness of the universal human condition. Were our expectations unrealistic, or did we proceed by the wrong means?

Since the expectations are clearly justified, I think we must look at the means we employed. What we did was to make international studies an addendum to what already existed. We did not demand that the curriculum, the faculty and the departments be universalized but only that universalistic patches be added. This has resulted in the grand anomaly: The majority of faculty members in the social sciences and humanities still teach the majority of courses which deal overwhelmingly with United States and European cultures, while a minority of such faculty are permitted to teach a minority of courses dealing with the other two-thirds of the world’s cultures. Perhaps the patchwork route was the only road open to us in the 1950’s and 1960’s. But our concern must now shift from the past and present and concentrate on the challenge of the 1970’s and 1980’s.

What of the Future?

We have a good idea of some developments over the next seventeen years which must become part of the context in which we plan. In May 1967, the U.S. Bureau of the Census projected college enrollments to 1985, based on four different scales (with 1967-68 enrollment gauged at approximately 6,237,000). The most conservative scale projects a 1985 enrollment at 9,695,000 and the most generous scale projects it at 11,846,000.3 In 1967, the Commissioner of Labor Statistics reported that there were 265,000 full-time college teachers. By 1975, he said, we will need 275,000 new college instructors: 100,000 just to handle the increased enrollment, and 175,000 for re-

---

placements of those who die, retire or resign. While the quality and supply of college teachers may be improved in the years immediately ahead, the Commissioner said, “nevertheless, it is likely that the number of well-qualified persons available for teaching positions will continue to be insufficient to meet the demand in many subject fields through the 1970’s.”

Also in 1967, admissions officers for graduate schools anticipated a “flood” of graduate applications in the years ahead, and asserted that the nation’s graduate schools are simply not prepared to meet such an increase.

These figures tell us at least three things about our future: (1) enrollments will continue to rise at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; (2) there will be an accelerating demand for fully-qualified professors; and (3) the universities which have been supplying the professors will probably not be able to meet the demands of the mid-1970’s.

These challenging statistics only tell us part of the future. There are trends in the universities of which we must be aware. One trend is the increasing autonomy of departments. Departments now largely control the higher education process. They determine their own curriculum, select their own colleagues and establish standards for admitting students, all largely independent of any concern for a definition of the university. In most social sciences and humanities courses one-third of the students are future teachers, but few departments even concern themselves with this fact. Few departments coordinate their activities with others in the same division, much less with other divisions. Programs for majors and minors are designed for the minority who will go to graduate school. The role of the department in the liberal education of students is almost totally ignored. The trend of departmentalism, as Charles Frankel has noted, will “produce a breed of intellectual leaders who cannot speak to one another, or to other men, across the walls of their specialties,” men who will be “learned experts who are barbarians.” One historian has attributed

the present student unrest directly to departmentalism: "the undergraduate, hemmed in everywhere by narrow compartments, feels fragmented and frustrated," because scholars "prefer to provide definitive answers to small questions rather than tentative answers to important ones."9

Two other trends closely related to departmentalism, are in faculty mobility and increased research. The former means that professors place their greatest loyalty on their discipline rather than their university. The second trend often means increased research on increasingly narrow subjects and concomitantly less teaching by live scholars and more teaching by T.V. and graduate assistants.

Another trend is in the direction of increased financial support to higher education from the U.S. government. If the past is any guide, this means channeling even more of the valuable time of needed professors to the filling out of unbelievably long forms, countless interim reports, reams of correspondence, and numerous expensive telephone calls. This tells us nothing about the standards and criteria which will be established for any increased support. But one trend in this direction may be gleaned from the suggestion of the President of the Carnegie Corporation that the United States Government select certain universities for special attention as "national universities."10

This is clearly a call for preferred treatment for the wealthy, so-called elite, universities to the neglect of others which are just as committed to the purposes of the American university.

There are trends also in the direction of inter-university cooperation, the Associated Universities for International Education providing merely one example. The potential for such cooperation has hardly been explored, especially in the realm of budgeting, specialized programs, true sharing of faculty and even in defining the increased potential of aggregations of universities.

There are other trends which will challenge the programs and purposes of the universities of the 1970's. We live in an era in which exponential curves are shooting almost straight up, in population, in knowledge, in technology, in communications, in urbanization, in powers of destruction, in conflict, in nationalism, and in social change. But the curve in understanding, in tolerance, in accommodation, in learning to live together, is almost a straight horizontal line from the time of Buddha to the present. Here I refer to world-wide trends which challenge the social sciences and humanities in ways which they have hardly begun to consider. Our nationalistic and parochially Western European focus has even led us to neglect our own changing

---

culture and practically to ignore the significance of change on the world scale. And I have not even touched on other world-wide trends for the 1970's, such as overcrowding, unprecedented starvation, civil wars, revolutions, air and water pollution, transportation congestion, wasted resources, increased exploitation of resources, political and economic frustration, and undreamed-of conditions resulting from a world in which every culture seeks to accommodate itself to every other one. The universities, I submit, have hardly begun to face these realities in the definition of an educated man.

Finally, it seems quite likely that some time during the 1970's the United States Government will establish a National Social Science Foundation. Stimulation for such a foundation has resulted largely from the fact that Federal Government support for the social sciences has declined from 24% of research funds in 1938 to less than 5% in 1968. Opposition to such a foundation, however, stems from a general public contempt which believes that "social scientists are not scientists at all but deal in intuition and vague, unfounded generalizations, or are 'proposition mongers,' a threat to policy makers."¹¹ The creation of a National Social Science Foundation will, I believe, reduce the contempt simply because possession of money always reduces contempt. But the challenge remains: what kind of social science research will be supported? Will the social scientists continue to view the social world from the narrow confines of a discipline, or will they seek first to establish a science of human living systems in which disciplines provide specialized knowledge which can be integrated into the universal perspective?

How Can the Challenges be Met?

It would be quite easy for me to suggest grand solutions which would require nothing less than the destruction of the present system of higher education and the substitution of some other, presumably superior system. Thus, as some people have done, I could suggest that future college enrollments be reduced to some earlier figure; that undergraduate professional schools be abolished; that departments be recombined into divisions; that professorial specialists not be hired; that majors be eliminated; that research be punished rather than rewarded; that teaching loads be increased and class sizes decreased; and that Federal funds be rejected as an insidious effort to influence education. I could suggest these things, but I would be irresponsible in doing so. Why? Because the universities have developed the way they are in response to very real social and technological pressures which no other institution has been willing to meet. Specialization has

resulted from the remarkable increase in knowledge and this has led to departmentalization. More, not less, research in the social sciences is called for because we have only begun to understand how human living systems are created, persist and change. Basic knowledge about cultural systems must be expanded even as the magnitude of the problems associated with contemporary existence expand. Furthermore, funding for such resource must come from some source and if not from governments then from some place else. We must meet the challenge, not by destroying the university but by rationalizing it.

The weaknesses in the universities are nevertheless quite real. Most high school graduates enter college with no knowledge of the cultural world in which they live. Knowledge of their own culture is admittedly weak, so we repeat in college the courses they had in high school. This constitutes their so-called general education and we then send them on to their majors, which in history, political science, economics and sociology means more United States and some European culture. Anthropology does deviate from the pattern but neglects the great cultures of Asia and the contemporary complex cultures of the world. Students graduate from college with almost no increased knowledge of their cultural world. The largest single block of them become school teachers who repeat the cycle of ignorance. Most of the remainder go to work or enter professional schools, their formal cultural education ended. A few go on to graduate studies but even in the social sciences only a fraction will be involved in intercultural studies. Armed with Ph.D.’s, and a narrow specialization, they become the new college instructors.

Steven Muller, Vice President for Public Affairs at Cornell University, has pungently described the results. The undergraduate curriculum, he points out, is increasingly pre-professional, the courses are as narrow as the graduate seminars which the instructor had a few years before, and “the relevance of undergraduate courses to the world’s and society’s problems is not usually a major consideration in the determination of curricula.”12 He then exclaims that it is no mystery why students are beginning to revolt, and laments (rightly, I believe) that they attack the administration when in reality it is the faculty which is to blame for the state of affairs.

The college of liberal arts and sciences is in chaos. More accurately, the social sciences and humanities are in chaos and it is no accident that student discontent is aimed directly at these two divisions. “Relevancy” has become the key word as students seek some explanation for man’s seemingly unnatural drive to destroy himself. Nevertheless, it would be dishonest for us to pretend that relevancy can be added by new courses in Afro-American History or the Politics of

12 Steven Muller, “The Administration-Faculty Impasse,” Current, August 1968, p. 18.
Poverty. Such courses may be better than nothing but they have the same weaknesses of all specialized courses: they involve only a few students and add little to the liberal education role of the university.

The crisis is upon us, but I believe it is fruitless simply to suggest solutions that will destroy the university or solutions which can only work in some other university system. On the other hand, some bold action is called for. Furthermore, we who are in intercultural studies, I believe, have begun to point the direction and can be leaders in the necessary reforms. Consequently, I would like to propose three courses of action which meet the crisis, which work in the present system, and which are in the realm of possibility.

1. The social sciences must be universalized.

It is clear that the social sciences must begin to put their house in order, and that that is the challenge of the 1970's and 1980's. (I restrict my remarks here to the social sciences, but the humanities face a similar challenge.) The main characteristic of the social sciences since World War II is that they have become more and more scientific. This has greatly enhanced our knowledge of social processes and social behavior. However, the increasing emphasis on technique has had two unfortunate results: it has led to rigid departmentalism, and it often fails to convey a sense of relevancy at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. In view of the impact of science on all our lives, it is difficult for me to imagine that a scientific approach could be taught in such a way as to be irrelevant and I suspect the irrelevancy stems from the departmentalism rather than science.

My call for universalism is based neither on utopianism nor violent revolution. It is based on trends already present in the social sciences, trends which will modify but not destroy departmentalism, trends which have a built-in relevancy. The trends I refer to are those which intercultural studies have imposed on the social sciences. Although I noted earlier that our impact has been small, I must now suggest that we have succeeded in challenging and destroying the theoretical base of the traditional social sciences. Our constant concern with Non-Western and developing areas forced social scientists to look, but when they looked their ethnocentrically-based theory began to crumble. Social scientists found that social systems could not simply be classified as democratic or dictatorial, capitalistic or communistic, traditional or modern, stable or unstable, literate or pre-literate, advanced or backward. Social scientists began to be aware of the fact that Non-Western peoples—with different histories, different technologies, different ideologies, different social systems, different natural and social environments—simply could not be understood by the terminology and tools used in the study of Western man.

At the present moment, disciplinary attempts to find a universally valid theory are largely frustrated by those who still insist on a
Western-based model which is nationalistic and parochial. But this is now a rear-guard action, because a new universalism is on the way and we must simply throw our support behind it. The beginnings of the change are seen in the universalistic and seminal works of scholars from many disciplines: such as Leslie A. White, Julian Steward, Marshall Sahlins and Elman Service from anthropology; Gabriel Almond, James S. Coleman, and David Easton from political science; Clarence Ayres, Kenneth Boulding, and Robert Heilbroner from economics; Daniel Lerner and Talcott Parsons from sociology; L. S. Stavrianos and William H. McNeill from history; Donald T. Campbell from social psychology; Alfred Emerson and Anatol Rapoport from biology; and Norbert Wiener from mathematics.13 These people (and others like them) have this in common: that they are concerned with total living systems and with scientific explanations of how they function. From their works come the language of the future: ecology, eco-system, systems analysis, cultural evolution, input-output analysis, simulation, game theory, macro-analysis, cybernetics, and cultural adaptation. Gone is the sterile theory of cultural relativism and the narrow focus in both space and time. The new perspective

13 Following is a selected bibliography of one item from each of the scholars named:
Leslie A. White, The Science of Culture (New York: Grove Press, 1949);
Julian H. Steward, Theory of Culture Change (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1955);
Gabriel Almond and James S. Coleman, eds., The Politics of the Developing Areas (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960);
David Easton, A Systems Analysis of Political Life (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965);
Daniel Lerner, The Passing of Traditional Society (New York: The Free Press, 1958);
Talcott Parsons, Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966);
starts with the origin of hominids, two or more million years ago. Primates became human when they became cultured. They became cultured biologically when the new brain was able to symbol; they became cultured technologically when the energy in nature was captured in the form of tools and techniques; they became cultured socially when group-living took on rational rather than instinctual form; and they became cultured ideologically when they sought explanations for behavior.

What this means is that, finally, the social sciences are becoming scientific—and relevant! Oddly enough, some people regard this as a contradiction. The scientific aspect of physics, or chemistry, or medicine, they say, is obviously relevant, but it is the scientific aspect of the social sciences which make them irrelevant. While the charge is partially understandable, especially where departmentalism has succeeded in building almost impermeable walls between and among the disciplines, nevertheless, I submit that a new relevancy is resulting from the universalism which is coming.

Part of the evidence for the new relevancy sounds cold and statistical, and therefore irrelevant to some people. Fallout, insecticides, air and water pollution, population growth, crowding, social unrest, technological innovation, transformation of values, urban pathology, mass education, rural mentality, the heavy hand of the past, leadership roles—how can such terms be relevant? Because they deal with the human condition, not the Western, not the Non-Western, but the human condition! Drop-outs in New York, school-leavers in Lagos, humanities college graduates in Calcutta are humans caught up in cultural conditions. Farm mechanization in Iowa, Tanzania and Japan is a technological condition rooted not only in a local cultural situation but in a universal storehouse of knowledge which knows no imaginary boundaries. Social mobility, economic opportunity, group loyalty, vested interests, ethnocentrism, receptivity to new ideas—those are terms by which cultures are analyzed whether we are dealing with England, Romania, Syria or Thailand. What I am saying is that the nationalistic social sciences are dead and we ought to insist that they be buried. As Simon Kuznets has observed: "There is no national physics, chemistry, or biology, and there should be no national economics or sociology." And if a universalistic concern for the human condition cannot be made relevant, on any campus on any continent, then we clearly are not teachers.

At the risk of boring you, let me indicate just a few of the exciting findings which a universalistic, scientific, systems-analytical approach is exposing. It is becoming more and more clear that cultures possess

---

14 This at least seems to be the argument of Billington, loc. cit., p. 53.
people rather than the reverse. The Black Action Movement, riots in Watts and Chicago, student discontent throughout the world, nationalism, rural conservatism and many other group behaviors are better understood as reflections of common characteristics which possess such groups than as simultaneous erratic behavior of a group of unrelated individual wills. It also appears that technology operates on laws of its own and as it changes it even affects the value system and social structure. What a valuable concept for studying any culture, whether Western or Non-Western! It now appears clear that democracy requires a set of historical and social pre-conditions. If this is so, then what profit is there in condemning states for being non-democratic which have none of the pre-conditions? It now appears clear that the nation-state can no longer fulfill one of its prime purposes, namely, the protection and security of its people. As one scholar has noted, if out-group hate was essential for uniting nations before the atomic age, some other kind of social conditioning is necessary for the future. It is clear that exponential curves in technological growth and population expansion cannot continue. A finite sphere is not infinitely exploitable and it cannot hold an infinite number of anything, much less people who must have some breathing and living room. Finally, to use Boulding’s useful phrase, it seems clear now that man is entering an era of post-civilization, with an impact far more swift, and results far more constructive or far more destructive, than the era of civilization. I could also point out the overwhelming evidence that all cultures are biological living systems bound to the natural world and that, to cite Ames Hawley, “human ecology might well be regarded as the basic social science.”  

Now it is quite clear that a true universalization of the social sciences will modify area studies as we have created them. In other words, the addendum we forced on traditional social science structures becomes obsolete by its success. A true intercultural perspective will not divide human social systems into neat geographical boxes. Departments will continue to analyze the particular constellation of functions which separated them historically, but those functions will be characteristics of human living systems. Intercultural studies will be functional not national. They will seek explanations of political or economic or social behavior in ecological contexts in which the Indian or Kenyan or Mexican example will be just as appropriate as the American or French.

Area studies need not disappear, for specialists in depth—with command of the necessary language and the minutia of data—will be necessary. But specialization will be built on the intercultural base and not in isolated pockets which neglect all other variations. We will

know we have succeeded in universalizing the social sciences when institutes for American studies and European studies join the area programs as adjuncts to the main curriculum. The main curriculum will then treat of universal man, of an understanding of how human social systems function anywhere, of an awareness of the cultural determinants of the varieties of social systems in the world. Area studies—including American studies—will permit some specialization for the educated man, a specialization built on the base of a universal perspective.

We who are in inter-cultural studies have already led the successful attack on departmentalism. Departments can still exist because specialists in political, economic, social and historical phenomena are still needed. But no longer can the political scientist who knows only the United States make any claim to understanding human political systems. Without an understanding of the varieties of political systems he has no basis even for judging the one he claims to know. But to understand the variety of political systems, he must also understand the cultural setting in which they occur, not only the local setting but the universal milieu in which it functions. The same is true of the other departments. Suddenly the picture is clear and frightening: we have pointed the way, but who among us is qualified to lead? This brings me directly to my second recommendation for the 1970's.

2. *Administrators must be forced to define the social sciences in the university.*

Having defended the thesis that the social sciences must be universalized, I now must face the uncomfortable fact that professors have neither the ability nor the will to do the job. Departmentalism is so entrenched that a professor who attacks it endangers his professional career. Let me illustrate by noting a history department which is rather proud of its international dimensions. There are 35 full-time faculty members in the department. Two of them teach the Soviet and Baltic area, two teach Latin America, one teaches East Asia and one teaches the Middle East. None teach the Pacific area, South Asia, Southeast Asia or Africa, and there are no courses with a world perspective. The remaining 29 teach Western Europe and the United States! The pattern is easily duplicated in other departments and is probably replicated on all our campuses.

Now the point is that a department which is overwhelmingly staffed by Euro-Americanists cannot reform itself of its parochial incest. Its narrowly-trained staff can no more think in universal terms collectively then it can individually. Log-rolling tactics seize departmental deliberations and, with the most serious solemnity, the majority replicates itself in hiring new staff and breaks the curriculum down into special courses to satisfy the peculiar interests of its majority members. Thus a political science department will have specialists in
Euro-American political parties, interest groups, election procedures, legislative process, executive process, public administration, constitutions, judicial process, public law, municipal administration, municipal law, local government, foreign policy, international relations and the history of Western political thought. If it is bold it will hire one political scientist to teach the politics of all Asia, one for all of Africa, one for all of the Middle East and one for all of Latin America. Chances are, however, that some continents will be left out even in this scheme. One chairman of a political science department who had four specialists on neglected areas (one on the Slavic area, one on Southeast Asia, one on South Asia and one on Latin America) out of 20 staff members complained that this department was becoming top-heavy with people who neglected Euro-American studies! Furthermore, even when a sop is thrown to universalism, the department still may have no one who deals with politics as a universal characteristic of human societies.

The first pressures for universalizing the social sciences came from statesmen who were made painfully aware of our cultural ignorance in World War II. They were joined by natural scientists who were shocked by the implications of a world made tenuous when the nuclear age was born. This was followed by the pleadings of a few lonely scholars in the social sciences (and humanities) for reform, scholars who were regarded by their traditionally trained colleagues as a little odd and possibly even anti-Western if not anti-American. These scholars have had little impact on most campuses, as we have noted; but where they have had success, the credit is due equally to administrative personnel who were not shackled to the built-in bias of departmentalism.

Now we are getting down to the crux of the issue. A dominant myth of United States universities is that faculty members ought to define the university. Furthermore, administrators are regarded as necessary bureaucrats who by accepting a deanship or vice presidency have in reality resigned from the intellectual community. Bureaucrats, of course, are to be criticized, made fun of, and ignored as much as possible. I know all of the abuse which is heaped on deans and vice presidents and at one time contributed my share of the criticism. I now charge that the faculty treatment of administrators is dysfunctional. The dysfunction stems from the fact that solutions to an intolerable situation are effectively blocked by faculty attitudes. Departmentalism proscribes the departments from effective reform and equally proscribes the division of social sciences from defining its proper role in a university; and conversely, contempt for bureaucrats proscribes the administrators from rectifying the situation.

Some bold voices are beginning to be heard on this problem. John Percy Miller, Dean of the Graduate School at Yale, makes the follow-
ing pungent observation, equally applicable to undergraduate as graduate programs:

Guiding the direction of the social sciences within a university poses serious administrative problems. An optimum use of limited resources requires some central direction. Much may be accomplished by encouraging related departments to develop complementary or reinforcing strengths. For example, where the economists are strongly interested in economic development, economics, as well as the other disciplines, will gain strength if political science, sociology, psychology and history are developed in ways that reinforce the interest in economic development. If the administration wishes to maximize the fruitfulness of its resources, it will not relinquish responsibility for choosing areas of strength to the departments. The administration has a special responsibility for nurturing developments that fall between departments and for coordinating the developments of related social science disciplines. Needless to say, this requires the use of the budgetary and appointment processes as tools to implement the broad strategy.17

Equally pungent is the observation attributed to Sidney Hook:

Without administrative leadership, every institution, especially universities whose faculties are notoriously reluctant to introduce curricular changes, runs down hill. The greatness of a university consists predominantly in the greatness of its faculty. But faculties . . . do not themselves build great faculties. To build great faculties, administrative leadership is essential.18

Yet a third voice is that of Steven Muller:

Armed above all with the power of the purse, central administration can rearrange fossilized academic hierarchies; rebuild or abolish weak departments or entire colleges; create new faculties, departments or interdisciplinary centers; and in general enforce a continuing review and revision of established academic structure and performance. At its best, central administration therefore provides academic leadership of a very high order, by provoking and promoting self-renewal within the faculties. At its worst, central administration fails at this task and allows free reign to the inherent conserva-

tism of faculty establishments that all-too-quickly relapse into near-feudalism.19

The issue is now clear. As faculty members we must cease our dysfunctional (should I say immoral?) behavior in favor of applying our own systems analysis to the very institution in which we live and move and have our being. We must cooperate with administrators as the only method for putting our house in order. We must, furthermore, demand that administrators assume the obligation thrust on them. Many administrators are content if relative peace is maintained. Others are reluctant to move because they do not themselves have a clear vision of the social sciences. This is due partly to the fact that some administrators are not trained in the social sciences, some are too narrowly trained in a particular social science, and some have been administrators too long and allowed the dynamic developments of the social sciences to by-pass them. Whatever the reasons, the challenge of the 1970's is that vice-presidents and deans of the academic affairs, liberal arts and sciences and graduate schools must begin to rationalize the social sciences. I can think of nothing which will support our position more, strengthen the hand of administrators more, and expose the theoretical weakness of departmentalism more, than for every dean to require a written statement from every social science chairman entitled: “The Role of My Department in the Social Sciences, in the Purposes of a University and in the Liberal Education of Students.”

Now it must be clear that I am not calling for reform for reform's sake. I call for a reform that stresses the essence of a scientific social science, namely, that its base for generalizations must account for all variation in human history and in all cultures. And I call for a relevancy which stems from a universal awareness of inter-cultural relations from the village and urban level to a world of nation states.

Considering the trends I have already outlined above, this call for reform is not an idealistic statement of some principle incapable of fulfillment. The decade of the 1970's will present vast new opportunities for new faculty, new curriculums, new financing and new inter-institutional cooperation. We can close the decade with more of what we already have or with almost wholly new, and relevant, social science divisions. Ours is the only theoretical attack on the status quo, and the status quo has no theoretical justification apart from the natural accretion of specialized interests. Now is the time to move. Administrators and faculty members who demand that the social sciences become scientific and relevant, who demand that the definition of the educated man must include an awareness of the cultural world, can lift the social sciences to a new and revered place in universities.

19 Muller, loc. cit., p. 13.
This leads me to my third recommendation for facing the future, a recommendation which is bold but I believe responsible.

3. We must begin to train our own professors.

I base this recommendation on two assumptions. The first assumption is that the present Ph.D.-granting institutions will not increase their advanced graduate enrollments enough to meet the demands of the mid-1970's. This means that they will largely keep or exchange their own graduates and the rest of us will be left without fully-trained staff.

The second assumption is that even if the present Ph.D.-granting institutions produce enough professors to fill our needs, they will still be trained as they have been. One of the causes of departmentalism is the narrowness of graduate training. An extreme example of this is a colleague of mine who did not have one single course outside his field of economics between his B.A. and Ph.D. While this case is extreme, most graduate departments still permit study in other departments only to the extent necessary for strengthening a particular focus. If undergraduate training were truly universal, this weakness could be overcome. But undergraduate courses are also overwhelmingly specialized, which reflects how narrowly the professors were themselves trained. We cannot universalize the undergraduate curriculum until we get professors who can and will think in universal terms, and we cannot get such professors until we train them.

On my campus, our young Ph.D.'s are almost unanimous in claiming that they know nothing about disciplines other than their own. We have great difficulty in staffing such a simple general education course as Man and Society. And it is almost impossible to staff a course entitled Introduction to the Non-Western World. If we find a person trained in Asia politics, he knows nothing about Africa; if trained in African history, he knows nothing about Asia; if trained in Middle East economics, he knows nothing about East Asia or West Africa.

Now I submit that we can train a man in a universal perspective without destroying his identification with a particular department. Surely a political scientist can be trained to understand that politics is a universal characteristic of human living systems. Surely an anthropologist can be trained to understand that modern complex societies also have cultures. Surely a sociologist can be trained to understand that families are universal and that a knowledge of their varieties is as valid as knowledge in depth of a particular form. But the catch is now apparent: once a potential scholar gets outside his Western focus, his advanced training requires that he understand something of the total milieu. The political scientist who wants to know Asian politics must understand something of the history, the diversity of family forms, the role of authority, the religions and the technologies of Asia; and if he wants to include Africa, he must understand yet
a different constellation of family, authority, animistic and tribal forms. But I submit that a training which provides such awareness can also produce a political scientist who will be a better political scientist than one who focuses only on the Euro-American systems and has never been forced to comprehend his discipline in its various manifestations. And the same is true of other disciplines.

I submit further that the training can be just as rigorous as in traditional programs, including the theory and methodology of a particular department. These could be accompanied by seminars with a universal perspective in the major department plus similar seminars in other departments. Political, economic, sociological, cultural and historical data would be presented in universal contexts. Dissertations with a broad perspective can be as valid as ones with a narrow focus. Why cannot future scholars be trained to think in terms as bold as Boulding's *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century* or Stevrians' *The World Since 1500* or White's *The Science of Culture*? As generalists these people are necessarily masters of specific data and more. But those who are masters of specific data only are merely technicians and may or may not become scholars.

Only when we get professors who are universalists can we hope to modify the undergraduate curriculum to serve its former and proper objective: namely, the liberally educated man. Historically, the educated man was "liberated" as he became aware of his environment, including the physical world, the social world and the world of philosophy, art, literature and religion. Historically, also, that world was limited to European cultures. Today the demands for liberation are just as valid but involve, in Whitehead’s phrase, "the whole round world of human affairs." Only when social science professors view the whole round world as their proper province will the curriculum be modified so as to impart it to students. To recapitulate, we must begin to train such professors if we expect to get them. Consequently, graduate education must be considered here even though the undergraduate college of the future is our main topic.

Furthermore, I see some excellent opportunities for institutional cooperation in the training of new professors. Most of the universities represented here are not yet bound to traditional graduate programs which characterize the elite universities and we may seriously consider innovative ways to develop complementary curriculums and the sharing of students and faculty. We might even agree to establish panels from consortium members to administer preliminary examinations and the defense of dissertations. We might even agree to hire each other’s graduates to eliminate “inbreeding” which presumably everybody but Harvard abhors.

Now I know the fears related to offering non-traditional doctorates. I know the reverence which is held for the elite universities. But I sub-
mit that we are also engaged in the educational enterprise. I submit that this group of Mid-Western universities concerned with intercultural education has already begun to innovate. We are already moving away from the traditional. We are already challenging the system which has created the dysfunctional (and immoral) situation in which we find ourselves. And we are already engaged in some new approaches which are as theoretically and as professionally valid as others.20

I would wish that the elite universities would take the lead, since they harbor the innovators I mentioned earlier. But their innovators seem to be very lonely. Perhaps our vision, being somewhat removed from the traditions and politics of these schools, can give us a clearer perspective of what must be done.

In the beginning, I suggested that the universities do not have the ability to reform themselves in the matter of providing an intercultural education. I have suggested that the main reason is departmental myopia and until that is rectified only piecemeal patches are possible. But patches will not reform liberal education. I have also suggested that increased student enrollments, new faculty members, and possibly new sources of funds offer us some opportunities to try to innovate. If we try and fail, then dysfunction will have prevailed. If we do not try, we join the dysfunctionalists.

I have not attempted to spell out the details of an intercultural undergraduate curriculum. Perhaps I should have. But I felt that the theoretical and scientific problems had to be faced first. I have tried to be responsible. I would prefer to see some other solutions which are equally convincing. Perhaps the ensuing discussion will prove my present conclusions wrong.

20 Note Clark Kerr's observation, which is also a direct challenge to us, that precisely the universities represented here will be the innovators of the future. "If there are to be new departures," he said, "they are most likely to come on the campuses of those old, private universities which have prided themselves on control of their own destiny, and on the totally new campuses of the state universities in America and the new public universities in Britain." "Conservatism, Dynamism, and the Changing University," in Eurich, op. cit., pp. 317-18.