

WORLD CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century Vision and Action

UNESCO, Paris, 5-9 October 1998

VOLUME IV

Thematic Debate:

Mobilizing the Power of Culture

Note of the UNESCO Secretariat

The present volume is part of the Proceedings of the World Conference on Higher Education (Paris 5-9 October 1998).

Volume I :	Final Report
Volume II :	Speeches and Lectures
Volume III :	Reports of the Commissions
Volume IV :	Thematic Debates
Volume V :	Plenary Speeches
Volume VI :	Listing of Titles of Individual Documents.

Documents are archived in the original language of delivery or in one of the language versions provided by the author. Copies can be obtained on request from the Division of Higher Education, UNESCO. Some documents are available in printed form only.

Note du Secrétariat de l'UNESCO

Le présent volume fait partie des Actes de la Conférence mondiale sur l'enseignement supérieur (Paris, 5-9 octobre 1998).

Volume I :	Rapport final
Volume II :	Discours et exposés spéciaux
Volume III :	Rapports des commissions
Volume IV :	Débats thématiques
Volume V :	Discours en séances plénières
Volume VI :	Liste des titres des documents individuels.

Les documents sont archivés dans la langue originale du discours ou de l'une des versions transmises par l'auteur. Les copies peuvent être obtenues sur demande adressée à la Division de l'enseignement supérieur, UNESCO. Certains documents ne sont disponibles que sur papier.

Nota de la Secretaría de la UNESCO

El presente volumen forma parte de las Actas de la Conferencia Mundial sobre la Educación Superior (París 5-9 de octubre de 1998).

Volumen I :	Informe Final
Volumen II :	Discursos y Ponencias Especiales
Volumen III :	Informes de las Comisiones
Volumen IV :	Debates Temáticos
Volumen V :	Discursos de la Plenaria
Volumen VI :	Lista de Títulos de los Documentos Individuales

Los documentos han sido archivados en el idioma original de la intervención o de una de las versiones entregadas por el autor. Para obtener copias de los mismos mande su solicitud a la División de la Enseñanza Superior, UNESCO. Algunos documentos sólo están disponibles en papel impreso.

Introduction

In organizing the World Conference on Higher Education, UNESCO's goal was to create favourable conditions for a sweeping debate and to increase awareness of the principal issues in this important field.

The Thematic Debates were organized in parallel with the Commissions and the Plenary sessions and so constituted one of the selected frameworks for reflection and for deepening discussions.

Planning the Thematic Debates included the participation of some fifty representatives of NGOs and IGOs, as well as a number of resource persons and UNESCO staff members.

Each working document was prepared under the coordination of a leader with the contribution of partners chosen by the Secretariat from organizations already cooperating with UNESCO.

Working documents of the Thematic Debates were taken into account in preparing the Conference's principal working documents and in elaborating drafts of the Declaration Framework for Priority Action. This synergy marked the entire preparation phase.

The 12 Thematic Debates were regrouped into three large themes:

Higher Education and Development

- *The Requirements of the World of Work*
- *Higher Education and Sustainable Human Development*
- *Contributing to National and Regional Development*
- *Higher Education Staff Development: A Continuing Mission*

New Trends and Innovations in Higher Education

- *Higher Education for a New Society: A Student Vision*
- *From Traditional to Virtual: The New Information Technologies*
- *Higher Education and Research: Challenges and Opportunities*
- *The Contribution of Higher Education to the Education System as a Whole*

Higher Education, Culture and Society

- *Women and Higher Education: Issues and Perspectives*
- *Promoting a Culture of Peace*
- *Mobilizing the Power of Culture*
- *Autonomy, Social Responsibility and Academic Freedom*

The introduction to each Debate was given by the author of the working document. This was then completed by input from the panel members.

Each Debate produced a synthesis report representing the results of the discussions and the recommendations made.

The general coordination of the preparation and organization of the Debates was undertaken by the Division of Higher Education, UNESCO.

Volume IV of the Proceedings of the World Conference on Higher Education regroups for each of the 12 Debates:

- The Working Document;
- The Synthetic Report for each Debate;
- The interventions of the panel members.

With regard to the thematic debates on students and women, contributions which were addressed to the Organizing committee and judged relevant were also taken into account.

Thematic Debate

Mobilizing the Power of Culture

Leader. Culture and Development Coordination Office (CDC)

Working Document drafted by. Prof. Rex Nettleford
Vice-Chancellor
University of the West Indies
Jamaica W.I.

in collaboration with:

- ❖ Council of International and Educational Exchange (CIEE)
- ❖ European Association for International Education (EAIE)
- ❖ INTERARTS
- ❖ University of the West Indies

and

the UNESCO SECRETARIAT

Contents

Summary	7
Panel	8
Preface	9
Synthetic Report	11
Working Document	13
Speeches:*	
Mobility in Higher Education: Cross-Cultural Communication Issues Dr Gisela Baumgratz-Gangl, (France)	18
African Cultures as a Basis for Sustainable Development S. Exc. M. Nouréini Tidjani-Serpos, (Bénin)	28
University and the Cultures of Education Dr Hilary Callan, (The Netherlands)	30
Cultural Policy and University Change Prof. Eduard Delgado, (Spain)	34
The Role of Anthropology in Multicultural Education Prof. E. L. Cerroni-Long, (USA)	41
Culture: Proposals for a Debate Prof. Nabil El Haggat, (France)	47

*Authors are responsible for the choice and the presentation of the facts contained in signed article and for the opinions expressed therein, which are not necessarily those of UNESCO and do not commit the Organization. The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of this authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Summary

The 1990s have been marked by very considerable and rapid change as national cultures have been drawn into new global inter-connections. There are new challenges, new risks, new uncertainties and new struggles. The issue though is not just one of adopting new policies, but one of re-conceiving policies so that they are effective in an environment of inter-dependence and are effective at a time in which the imperatives of promoting better mutual appreciation between cultures, of eliminating stereotypes and of forging peace between people is of supreme importance.

In this scenario, universities too need to play a different role, because young people must be able to build meaningful connections with their inherited cultures as they increasingly find it hard to adapt to the values which drove the cultures of yesterday. So it is time to re-examine our educational systems and formulate new ways of addressing the needs and aspirations of young people in a rapidly changing world. Our paper examines how universities can fulfil this role. Their curricula and methodology are key tools by which they can achieve their objectives. Their role should be to articulate cultural policies in a world where cultural diversity has emerged as a crucial social factor and they should be capable of developing co-operative strategies which involve higher education and ensure that cultural heritage and values are preserved. They must be able to broaden the context in which education is imparted, without focusing primarily on technique. Universities must revamp their educational agendas so as to be able to inform young people about "other cultures" - those of the past as well as those different from our own.

PANEL

Chair: Prof. Rex Nettleford, Chancellor, University of the West Indies, Jamaica

Representing the

Director-General of UNESCO:

Mr Hernán Crespo-Toral, Assistant Director General for Culture

Rapporteur:

Mr Eduard Delgado, Director INTERARTS Spain

Panelists:

Dr Gisela Baumgratz Gangl
Council on International
Educational Exchange
France

His Excellency
Mr N. Tidjani Serpos
Ambassador
Permanent Delegate
of Benin to UNESCO

Dr Hilary Callan
Executive Director
European Association
for International
Education
The Netherlands

Prof. E.L.Cerroni-Long
Prof. of Anthropology
Eastern Michigan
University
USA

Prof. Nabil El-Haggag
Vice-Président
Université des sciences
et technologies de Lille
France

Mr Y.R. Isar
Director
Culture and Development
Co-Ordination Office
UNESCO

Resource Persons:

Sr Antonio Gallo Armosino
Universidad Rafael Landivar
Guatemala

Dr Andrea Karpati
Associate Professor of Education
Eotvos Lorand University
Hungary

Preface

In its report, *Our Creative Diversity*, the World Commission on Culture and Development identified some of the cultural challenges facing higher education in an age of unprecedented inter-connections between cultures. Thus it underscored the imperatives of promoting better mutual appreciation between cultures, of eliminating stereotypes and of «constructing the defences of peace in the minds of men» are inescapable. In a time of highly accelerated change, the maintenance of meaningful connections to inherited cultures has also become even more problematic. It is time therefore to re-examine educational systems and formulate new ways of addressing the needs and aspirations of young people.

In the chapter of its report devoted to 'Cultural Heritage for Development', the Commission stressed how important it was for each society to forge more meaningful connections between its historic heritage and contemporary life. The Commission argued that making better connections between past and present requires the participation of a series of intermediaries between the state and the 'public', including 'universities and research institutes able to provide scientific knowledge and an understanding of the significance of the heritage... . Without proper understanding of the values and aspirations that drove its makes, an object is torn from its context and our understanding of it is inevitably incomplete. The tangible can only be interpreted through the intangible.'

In another chapter devoted to children and young people, the Commission addressed the imperatives of intercultural education and observed that 'the young also need to be initiated to the notion of complexity, to the complex workings of personalities and cultures, to the multiplicity of forms and means of expression, to the infinite diversity of individualities, temperaments, aspirations and vocations.' Only through a clear understanding of this complexity can they apprehend the notion of interrelatedness. Citing David Hamburg, President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the report stressed the need for education 'to convey an accurate concept of a single, highly interdependent, worldwide species -- a vast extended family sharing fundamental human similarities and a fragile planet. The give-and-take fostered within groups can be extended far beyond childhood to relations between adults and to larger units of organization, even covering international relations.'¹

The *Mobilizing the Power of Culture* debate was intended to break new ground in both of the above directions. To the inspiration provided by *Our Creative Diversity*, was added the need to build better connections between education and culture in general -- not least in the programming and programme implementation of UNESCO itself -- as had been stressed by Professor Rex Nettleford at a meeting in 1996 of the Organization's *Culture and Development Steering Committee*.

Finally, the pertinence of this ambition was confirmed at the Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development (Stockholm, 30 March - 2 April 1998), which underlined the nexus between education and culture in various ways. Suffice it to cite two of the policy objectives of the Conference to governments in the *Action Plan* it adopted: 'promote new links between culture and the education system so as to ensure full recognition of culture and the arts as a fundamental dimension of education for all, develop artistic education and stimulate creativity in education programmes at all levels' and 'promote education conducive to the mastery and creative use of new information technologies among the younger generations as users and producers of messages and content, and give priority to education in civic values...'

1. David A. Hamburg, York, "Education for Conflict Resolution," in *Individual Development Over the Lifespan*, Prof. David Magnusson ed., Stockholm University, 1994.

The three sources identified above provided the background against which the organizers formulated the following five questions as a framework for the panellists:

- How well do educational systems inform young people about «other cultures» - those of the past as well as those different from our own?
- The arts are taught with too much emphasis on technique: how can arts education be broadened to include the various contexts in which art forms originated and flourished?
- How can meaningful intercultural education be made part of university education in the context of today's globalized information flows and Cyberspace?
- What are the kinds of research or other academic activity that universities can undertake to fill these lacunae?
- Can some methods be identified to enable universities to work more closely with museums and antiquities departments to build better awareness and understanding of cultural heritage?

These and other questions were in fact addressed by the panellists and in the ensuing free discussion. The main lines of argument which emerged during the debate are synthesized in the brief overview that precedes the panellists' papers (adapted versions of their previously submitted written texts). The two core questions that emerged were how universities can articulate cultural policies in a world where cultural diversity has emerged as a crucial social factor; and what sort of co-operative strategies they may develop to fulfill that mission.

Synthetic Report

1. The debate took place in the afternoon of 8 October 1998 in Room XI and was organized by the Culture and Development Co-ordination Office. The debate was chaired by Professor Rex Nettleford, Vice-Chancellor of the University of the West Indies and included the following panellists: Dr. Gisela Baumgratz who directs the INTERMED programme at the Council on International Educational Exchange; Dr. Hilary Callan, Director of The European Association for International Education; Professor E. L. Cerroni-Long, Professor of Anthropology at Eastern Michigan University, USA.; Mr. Eduard Delgado, who was also the Rapporteur for the debate and who is the director of INTERARTS, a global cultural policy observatory based in Barcelona, Spain; Professor Nabil El Hagggar, Vice-President of the University of Lille, France and Professor Nouréini Tidjani-Serpos, the former Permanent Delegate of the Republic of Benin to UNESCO.
2. The Director-General was represented by the Assistant Director-General for Culture a.i., Mr. Hernán Crespo-Toral. In his welcoming remarks, Mr. Crespo-Toral pointed out, despite the tremendous progress in technology, human beings are still suffering from shocking inequalities and development is inequitably distributed throughout the world. What then has been lacking in our approach to human development, in our approach to reducing the inequalities existing within our societies? Unfortunately, the development policies in vogue today are the ones which neglect the essence of the human being. Before presenting the panellists, Mr. Y. R. Isar, Director of the Culture and Development Co-ordination Office, sketched out the origins of the themes which had been tabled for this debate, as they had emerged from the work of the World Commission on Culture and Development and its report, *Our Creative Diversity*.
3. The ensuing debate underscored the need for a new commitment to culture on the part of universities throughout the world. This is particularly important with regard to the promotion of intercultural learning and understanding and to meeting the cultural challenges of globalization. Universities themselves are, as Dr. Hilary Callan put it, 'theatres of cultural transformation and self-reflection.' However, the connections which exist between culture and education are very weak. It should be the responsibility of universities to introduce the young to the complexities of cultural interactions and thus forge a better understanding of inter- and multi-cultural issues. In this respect, universities ought to play a more active role in deepening young people's awareness of cultural identity, both individual and collective, as well as of cultural values. But, why is this important? The answer to this «why» was provided by Prof. Nettleford who said that «we must guard against the threat of homogenisation by holding on to what we have and yet being human».
4. The imperative of preserving and even developing this role of universities in deepening young people's awareness of cultural identity takes on a new dimension at a time when mere instruction and specialization increasingly replace humanistic education in the true sense of the word. Rigid boundaries between the disciplines do not prepare students for the multi-cultural world of today and do not teach them to utilise their creativity, knowledge and intellect to tackle the ever changing problems of a shrinking globe. Teaching, instruction, knowledge, awareness, reflection; all of these come together in a university. However, it seems that these concepts have lost their meaning. Universities are losing their ability to promote democracy and citizenship. This too must be one of the concerns of universities, as Prof. El Hagggar pointed out.
5. The various disciplines taught in a university must work together in order to promote human progress; however we need to fight for this because there exists a constant tension between the world of cultural expression and creativity on the one hand and the demands of the marketplace on the other. The resources available to universities are very limited and institutions of higher education prefer to promote

education in science and technology while neglecting education for expression and creativity. Mr. Eduard Delgado pointed out the dangers of ignoring these tensions. If these trends are not reversed, we will not be able to counteract the forces of skewed globalization. At the same time, universities should not only be concerned with global problems, but should also concern themselves with what transpires at the local level. For it is only by the diversity of experiences at the local level that society overall can be enriched.

6. However, Prof. Tidjani-Serpos posed a very pertinent question. He asked how universities (in the African context) could develop while integrating the values of foreign countries in the education that they imparted. It is essential that universities incorporate these, else globalization will succeed in destabilising the uneasy harmony which exists in our societies.
7. One of the recurring threads in the debate was the role of universities in inculcating the willingness to comprehend and in developing a strategy of cultural curiosity. Its role in making explicit the implicit, which would enable a better understanding of the 'self' so as to be able to understand the 'other'. This would facilitate adaptability in multicultural situations and develop intercultural negotiating skills. As Dr. Baumgratz said, «culture is a creative endeavour we all face in partnership». If the university cannot fulfill this role, then it is unfortunately reduced to a factory which churns out specialists but leaves out the human being in the process.
8. Prof. Cerroni-Long introduced a note of caution in the debate, on the one hand, education is leading to a loss of culture and a loss in the traditions of the people. On the other hand, it is leading to a new homogenised culture, which however does not lead to harmony. She reiterated that the diversity of cultures should be stressed in the education of the youth, because if culture is taken away from education, then future generations will be seriously and irrevocably impoverished.
9. Universities and the culture sector share a responsibility to foster critical and creative self-awareness in all societies. Universities should take the challenges of culture as lying at the very heart of universities and thus assume the responsibilities of offering a culturally informed education which is broader and more inclusive of the different disciplines. They should also promote interactivity and creativity so as to unleash the creative imagination. Universities have a special and very important role to play in cultural conservation and production by making known other views. They can also instill intercultural sensitivity by way of which the homogenising tendencies of globalization can be counterbalanced.
- 10 Perhaps the most indispensable role of universities is that they are the vital medium whose power can be mobilised to establish the link between education and culture to students and people. For all these reasons, UNESCO should envisage programme activities to mobilize 'the power of the university' as a factor of cultural conservation and development.
- 11 The presentations of the panelists were followed by nine interventions from the floor. One of the points raised was how universities can develop in the global age without renouncing their values and their identities. Another concern was the delinking of education with culture and how this can and is creating a catastrophe. There was also a suggestion that a space for the present discussion be created over the internet, so as to be able to continue this dialogue. One speaker recommended that the papers presented at this debate be edited, published and widely distributed by UNESCO. She also recommended the vital role which culture could play in distance learning, namely in the conservation and transmission of local cultures, in identifying alternative learning styles, in bridging values and in promoting a more equitable sharing of knowledge. Finally, one of the participants succinctly summarised the whole debate, by posing three questions: How can we mobilize the power of culture? Why should we mobilize this power? In what context can the power of culture be mobilized?

Working Document

Universities: Mobilising the Power of Culture A View From the Caribbean

Rex Nettleford
Vice-Chancellor
University of the West Indies

For two-thirds of the world a university exists strategically as a development resource for the peoples and countries of that world and serves its clientele through education and training in disciplines critical to tenancy of a diverse, competitive world in which science and technology (including communications technology), culture and society and the demand for life-long learning are inescapable variables in the equation of survival and beyond.

Such a remit in places like the Caribbean is informed by the cultural diversity engendered by accidents of history and today, by the power of galactic transmission via satellite. This now dictates acts of discovery, through the exploration of lived reality, of new and appropriate ontologies, new and appropriate cosmologies and, by extension, new and appropriate epistemologies. The globalized world which is Planet Earth places humankind in a «cross-roads civilisation» akin to that of the ancient Mediterranean where Greece, Rome, Egypt and the Orient met and later the Iberian Peninsula where Arabs, Jews and Iberians Europeans mingled to great creative effect. Such a «civilisation» offers directions for research, analysis and explication forged in the crucible of such cross-fertilisation.

The wider world like the two-thirds developing part of it is too textured and contradictory a civilisation to entrap itself into a mono-dimensional definitional framework. The university as an agency of higher learning and of creative discovery has a real responsibility to prevent the latter and to sustain the former while pointing directions to continuing development without fear of social disintegration.

It is against such a background that a university like the University of the West Indies serving the Commonwealth Caribbean region has embarked on what is called the Cultural Studies Initiative, the aims and objectives of which speak to the growing awareness of arts and culture being a point of power in the shaping and sustenance of society.

A University must of course first understand that it benefits most when the feeder sources for its undergraduate population are themselves enriched by traditions of exercise of the creative imagination.

A child learns the meaning of process and is better able to relate to effort, if he/she is encouraged to create a poem or a song, act in a play, make up a dance, sing in a choir or play an instrument in an orchestra, as a normal part of his/her education. The discipline that underpins the mastery of the craft, the demands made on continuous recreation of effort and application, the challenges encountered on the journey to excellence, the habits of realistic self-evaluation, the capacity for dealing with diversity and the dilemma of difference whether in the performing arts or in key branches of sports (themselves belonging to the family of performing arts) constitute excellent preparation for **learning to be** (the stuff of ontology), **learning to know** (the substance of epistemology), and **learning to live together** (the essence of the creative diversity which characterises Caribbean existence and is about to overtake the entire world) - all of which must serve the individual throughout his or her life.

It is the opportunity to exercise the creative imagination from an early age that is likely to ensure safe passage throughout that life. And the educational process in all its modes - formal and informal, curricular and co-curricular - provides an excellent channel through which all this can flow. Adaptability, flexibility, ready code-switching, innovativeness, and a capacity to deal with the complexity of the complexity are all attributes of the creative imagination which provide yet another route to cognition other than the Cartesian rationalism we have inherited. For if we **are** because we **think**, we also **exist** because we **feel**.

The separation of these two states of experience into irreconcilable wholes is part of the binary syndrome of a tradition of intellectual discourse and epistemological reductionism which constitute an expensive luxury for any people who have survived these past five hundred years on the basis of their creative diversity and a multisourced reality in everyday living.

The world's universities need to take a look at the long haul of human history and locate their different societies where they appropriately belong - that is on the trajectory of human **«becoming»** via that process of cross-fertilisation which entitled ancient Egypt, ancient Greece, renaissance Europe, Iberian Spain during the times leading up to 1492, the Americas of modern times as well as Europe of the immediate future which promises that promontory of Asia a challenging dose of multiracial multiculturalism. Part and parcel of this is the phenomenon of unity in diversity.

One here speaks culturally to a totality of human experience and not simply a little parcel of dance, of music, of drama, of verse-speaking or of literature. One speaks, as well, to a totality of meaningful articulations of environmental integrity, the cause, occasion and result of one's culture (the teaching of science would do well to start with this rather than with the computer). It is the bifurcation of knowledge into science and **«the rest»** that has served to misguide many among the educated in the two-thirds world and irresistible for a more textured millennium already upon us.

It is now conceded in large measure that both capitalism and apocalyptic socialism, in their would-be purest of forms, have been basically **a-cultural** in their approach to development. Neither has had a place for the specificities of experience culturally determined over time and among particular sets of people. Development, it was felt, had to be scientifically determined over time and pursued universally according to immutable laws, whether of the market or on the basis of unrelieved class conflict. Any invocation of cultural particularities and differences has been considered reactionary or revisionist. And although popular cultural expressions have been tolerated, they have been obliged to appear, in both dispensations, as an ornamental folkloric element only.

Many who have abandoned this position have drifted indiscriminately towards another panacea - the culture of technology. But the task of education has to be to ensure that the source of technology - science - finds a central place in the process without prejudice to the Humanities. An editorial of 1995 from a reputable First World newspaper put it better than I ever could. And I share it by way of warning to all who are willing to immolate themselves on the altar of the new panacea:

«The technology card has often been a useful one to play. Yet it is no basis for a social vision. What matters is not that all pupils have access to a laptop, but how they use them. Fibre optic technology does not teach children how to spell or add up. Nor does it necessarily teach adults how to be better citizens... In the midst of this new political vogue, it is worth remembering that technology

is not an end in itself but one means among many. The celebration of technology does not excuse politicians [and I may add teachers] from the duty to spell out their plans and principles. The hardware is important; but it is the software that counts.» [**The Times**, London, October 6, 1995].

Perhaps it is culture that really counts at this time in the important pursuit of all levels of education defined on traditional lines but adaptable to the changed and changing circumstances of the contemporary world. I see teachers and the institutions of learning in whose name they labour as major contributors to, and

principal facilitators of, the cultivation of the kingdom of the mind with rank shoots of creativity sprouting from the exercise of both intellect and imagination, and these in turn working in tandem to produce a self-reliant, self-respecting, tolerant, enterprising and productive community of souls.

Such is the motive force behind the Cultural Studies Initiative in place in a Caribbean (developing region) university. As the university with a major responsibility for the honing of human resources of the region, it was set up to serve, The University of the West Indies recognises that it must take the lead in developing a cadre of persons, grounded in a sensitive understanding of their own history and cultural heritage, who can articulate and infuse this understanding into the society at every level. Their research will form the basis of a new approach to education, with changes in the curriculum which can create the building blocks for a just and more humane Caribbean society.

Some of the fields being researched under the Cultural Studies Initiative are: Ethics Governance for the 21st Century, Creativity and Empowerment, the Media and Cultural Expressions, Heritage Tourism, Culture and Health, Cultural and Social Capital and Caribbean attitudes to authority, justice, citizenship, work, etc. Hopefully, the findings will be able to provide the governments of the region with research data which can inform decisions being made on matters of economic development, and to ensure that the policy makers of the region are aware of the interlocking which exists between an understanding of one's culture and the possibilities for economic growth.

The findings will also lay the foundation in the University of the West Indies for an ongoing programme of Cultural Studies which will underscore, through strategies to be developed in all the Faculties, and through a study of the curricula, the fundamental importance of a sensitive understanding of one's culture to the enhancement of the quality of life and dignity of the human being. The ultimate goal is to empower every child, and to ensure a clearer understanding of the real purpose of a university which is to empower, enliven, enrich, and generally make the community in which it exists a better place, allowing the society to which it relates to see with new eyes and new minds.

The threatened destruction of the fabric of Caribbean society (still in formation) presents a major challenge to the University. Development in all its forms is the goal of all Caribbean leaders, but this can only be accomplished in an atmosphere of safety, and with a population grounded in respect for itself and for humankind. It is becoming more and more evident that no lasting development can be guaranteed in a society where a large percentage of the population feels under-valued and with little sense of self-worth.

The Cultural Studies Initiative is intended to address the underlying problem through a diagnosis of the root causes, an analysis of these causes, and recommendations for a new dimension to the education process, both in the schools and through public education for the wider society, so that every member of the society can feel valued and capable of making a contribution. This will relate to current urgent social problems of drug-trafficking, violence and urban criminality as well as the chronic/endemic ones of under-productivity, unemployment and the lack of will for self-reliance.

The two areas that suggest themselves in implementing any such initiative are Research and a Programme for Artists in Residence. The combination of research findings and one-on-one contact with creative minds that have established themselves over time through the integrity of their own unique efforts could bring a new dimension to the academic life of the university - a dimension that will contribute to the concept of education in its very best sense, as against certification which too often characterises institutions of higher learning transformed into degree factories.

The University of the West Indies (UWI) has a unique role in the Caribbean with a clearly defined mandate to act as a catalyst for regional development. The region comprises some 13 territories served by the UWI with close associations with such neighbours as Surinam, Cuba, Santo Domingo, Haiti, Colombia, Venezuela, Mexico and Central America and the French and Dutch Antilles as well as Puerto Rico, the American Virgin Islands and the British dependencies of Cayman Islands and Turks and Caicos Islands. The

1996 Conference on Caribbean Culture hosted by the University and attended by some 500 registrants, highlighted the great need for an understanding of Caribbean heritage as the basis for any hope for economic growth and social development. Here was an example of a university mobilising the power of culture.

Since then a Research Fellowship Programme has been established at the University of the West Indies. The objective is to develop a cadre of persons, grounded in a sensitive understanding of their own histories and cultural heritages, and who can articulate and infuse those understandings and research findings into social and economic policy-making at every level as well as into designs for social living.

Specific areas being considered are:

- ❖ Information in the way in which people connect economic activity to other aspects of their life and culture, their normative, ethical and spiritual beliefs and their aspirations for themselves and their fellow citizens.
- ❖ Studies in the role of Gender relations in Caribbean social transformation.
- ❖ Studies of local and regional networks for the purpose of developing mechanisms for regional and local decision-making in the development of cultural industries and other productive sectors, e.g., the economic scope and potential of popular music, cultural tourism in the African Diaspora, dance, literature, carnival; analysis of the economics of the international entertainment industry and the scope for increasing Caribbean participation in the value chain.
- ❖ Culture and entrepreneurship: attitudes and behaviours of different sections of the population to: business as an occupation, savings and investment vs. consumption, long vs. short-term investment, capital accumulation, risk taking, innovation, science and technology and different kinds of economic activities.
- ❖ Strategies and mechanisms for designing more efficacious systems of economic and social management, especially at local and regional levels as well as economic potential of the Diaspora as a source of capital, entrepreneurship and technology.
- ❖ The encouragement of the creativity of ordinary people and the specification of methods of realising this creativity for social/cultural/economic development.
- ❖ Culture and work: attitudes and behaviours related to work, employment, self-employment, work-related discipline, types of work (e.g., manual, clerical, intellectual), labour relations, co-operation, teamwork, flexible production, employer attitudes and values towards training and skill upgrading.
- ❖ The development of planning methods which return human-kind to the centre of all planning activity.
- ❖ Everyday understanding of economic concepts such as savings, investment, unemployment, wages and salaries, prices, economic development, inflation, the market and how it functions, devaluation and their relation to cultural phenomena.

This is a mere beginning but one that hopefully will help bring into the mainstream of research in the academy, a greater appreciation of the centrality of cultural variables in the development equation and the paramount importance of the human being in the development process everywhere. Universities that ignore this imperative in their remit are not likely to enjoy safe conduct into the third millennium.

Strategies for Future Action

Culture and Knowledge:

According to culture a central role in intellectual life and not a peripheral one. This implies encouraging universities to acknowledge and actively incorporate the culturally situated nature of the entire teaching, learning, research and service functions of the university.

Inculcating Respect for People and their Heritage:

The curricula of universities should instil in their students a respect for other communities, the heritage and the environment as a precondition for building a harmonious society. The subjects covered in the curricula could include culture and identity, culture and human rights, culture and the environment, cultural heritage and the role of the artist.

Community Cultural Service:

Provide opportunities for voluntary or community work with a strong cultural component. This could be a part of the compulsory university curricula by substituting for credits or internships. This approach would help to build inter-generational solidarity and also serve as a source of self-expression and creative production.

Universities as Brokers:

The international dimension of universities and their role as 'brokers' of intellectual communication and exchange needs to be encouraged.

Universities and Cultural Industries:

Studies of local and regional networks for the purpose of developing mechanisms for regional and local decision-making in the development of cultural industries and other productive sectors, e.g., the economic scope and potential of popular music, cultural tourism, dance, literature, etc., need to be encouraged.

Economics and Culture:

Universities should be capable of providing information of the way in which people connect economic activity to other aspects of their life and culture, their normative, ethical and spiritual beliefs and their aspirations for themselves and their fellow citizens.

Creation of a Network between Universities, Museums and Archives:

To start a process of establishing a network between universities of a region in order to promote understanding of the history, culture and science of the region. A further possibility would be to introduce the museums and archives of the region into this network. If universities were linked together in such a system and backed by government support, much of human knowledge would be readily available to all, not just university students.

A Cultural Mandate:

A university education should be, as part of its mandate, a culturally informed education giving students a knowledge of the 'other' which in turn makes possible a fuller understanding of the 'self'.

Research Issues:

Issues of research and pedagogy related to culture and society and to the broad cultural responsibility of universities needs to be encouraged.

Mobility in Higher Education: Cross-Cultural Communication Issues^{2 3}

Address by: Dr Gisela Baumgratz-Gangl
Director, Intermed Programme
Council on International Educational Exchange
France

Introductory Remarks

From early 1989 to late 1991 I was working on a project «Foreign Languages in Higher Education» with financial support from the Robert Bosch Foundation in Stuttgart and the European Cultural Foundation in Amsterdam⁴. In developing the concept of the foreign language as the medium for learning we found ourselves drawn into investigations into the status of foreign languages in international university programmes as well as into the need to define the qualitative dimensions of mobility of university students in the context of increasing professional mobility in Europe. Professional teaching and learning are processes of transcultural or intercultural communication. Even neighbouring countries in Europe, such as Germany and France - and, indeed, the various types of universities within these countries - differ widely in their respective disciplinary and subject cultures. In addition, the teaching and learning situation as well as the students' and lecturers' views regarding their own professional and social position are determined by aspects of institutional and organizational cultures. All these factors were taken into account. We found it to be of crucial significance that the teaching and learning of foreign languages takes into consideration the specifics of organizational and subject cultures, whether in the context of subject-based reading in the foreign language or, more particularly, of guest lecturers' classes and students' studies abroad. This requires an awareness on the part of lecturers and students of the need to relate their own university culture to that of the foreign institution.

Intercultural Communication

To begin with, I would like to define the concept of intercultural communication bearing in mind that national stereotypes of behaviour (Knapp 1992) are not particularly helpful to individuals and groups looking for orientation in trying to cope with unfamiliar situations.

What is needed is a mapping out of *relevant* cultural dimensions of a *social communication situation* involving individuals or groups of different national and/or cultural origin and different forms of socialization who meet at a certain point in their personal biographies in order to realize or contribute towards the achievement of certain general social, institutional, organizational, group and personal aims (Baumgratz 1990).

The establishment of the Internal European Market and the European Union as envisaged in the Maastricht Treaty have created new framework conditions for our approach to foreign languages and (national)

² Dr. Baumgratz's intervention during the thematic debate drew primarily on this paper which appeared in the *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 28, No. 3, 1993.

³ Translated by Gisela Shaw, Bristol.

⁴ The project was located at the European Institute of Education and Social Policy in Paris and involved a number of German and French colleagues from various institutions of higher education as well as media support by the *Ecole Supérieure de Commerce de Paris* (ESCP), the Audio-Visual Media Centre (AVMZ) of the University of Wuppertal and the *Rechner- und Softwaretechnik GmbH* (RST), Essen.

cultures. This, in turn, justifies a change of perspective towards 'intercultural communication' in a new social environment, i.e. the Europe of the twelve. It also makes the concept of '*intercultural communication*', originally associated with the problems of integration encountered by immigrant workers, appear in a new light. Interculturality, coupled with mobility, becomes the hallmark of individuals and institutions adjusting to a changing economic, social, cultural and political environment and aiming to acquire a new European identity which will enlarge their scope for action and their possibilities for self-realization.

Mobility is the method as well as the aim of acquiring this new quality or qualification. Mobility needs to be seen as a method suited to enhance the ability for cultural integration on the part of institutions/organizations and to enable individuals to live and act in varying multicultural contexts.

Thus intercultural communication for us is a project whose preconditions need to be clarified in the light of educational institutions bearing the stamp of their respective national cultures. The movement of persons from one place to another does not in itself bring about intercultural communication. This is particularly true if mobility as such is regarded as a mark of quality and an aim of qualification. We regard interculturality or the ability to communicate interculturally as preconditions for mobility. It is defined as an enhancement of the ability of orientation and integration, the ability to learn and to engage in technology transfer as well as in creativity. It also encompasses the ability to handle new rights and duties of European citizenship as laid down by European educational policies (Memorandum 1991).

Any form of communication takes place under certain organizational conditions in a narrower or wider sense (we shall come back to this later) and those involved act (consciously or unconsciously) according to written or unwritten laws which they have internalized sufficiently in the course of their socialization and personal biographies to ensure a smooth functioning (in the ideal situation). In case of problems it will at least be possible to gauge why these may have occurred and, in the worst case, understand why negative sanctions are legitimate.

Organizational conditions are characterized by formal and informal rules, the latter being normally acquired in the organization itself through experience and communication with other members of the organization. Organizations are determined by hierarchies and the distribution of power. They, in turn, determine the structure of communication amongst those involved as well as their status, roles and scope for action. The concept of status implies that there are groups within an organizational whole (i.e. individuals of the same status) facing other groups of different status. To what extent status can be ignored and the scope for action expanded depends on the type of hierarchical order involved. This is monitored and controlled by those occupying the same status as well as by those of lower or superior status. Thus organizational communication can be defined as a social situation in which the actors from one and the same socio-cultural environment master the relevant rules of the game, i.e. that which appears to be 'normal' to all involved. This, however, also entails certain expectations regarding the organization itself.

Mobility in Higher Education as an Issue of Communication and Qualification for Professional Mobility

Using the example of German students of economics at a French 'Grande Ecole de Commerce', the 'Ecole Supérieure de Paris' (ESCP), we investigated what is involved in studying one's academic subject at a foreign institution and in pursuing individual, economic, social and political aims of qualification related to an expanded European environment.

Once a link has been established between an individual's academic and professional biographies, mobility becomes the *method* as well as the *aim* of qualification. Thus, we need to establish an inner link between method and aim and to relate both to the individual and the organizational framework of the foreign institution within which the individual wishes to acquire his or her qualification. If, then, mobility in the context of education and professional activities is defined as an instrument of internationalization/Europeanization, we need to consider:

- * the internationalization/Europeanization of the *conditions* for qualification
- * the *acquisition* of a qualification
- * the *qualification itself*, as well as
- * the *application* of the qualification in professional life.

In what follows we would like to outline the linguistic socio-cultural problems that arise at the four levels referred to and which relate to internationalization as the change in the socio-communicative framework and in the communicative prerequisites for teaching and learning in the context of higher education co-operation and the mobility of lecturers and students as envisaged in mobility programmes such as ERASMUS.

Internationalization as the Prerequisite for Qualification through Transnational Cooperation between Institutions of Higher Education

On the basis of the sociological differentiation between institutions and organizations (Petit 1991 (6)) we work on the assumption that the educational mission reflected in the institution of the educational system of a society, i.e. the mission to safeguard the political, social, professional and cultural integration of the population, is implemented in different forms by different organizations. Organizational differentiations themselves as well as the various ways in which organizations define and evaluate the general educational mission for themselves allow certain conclusions regarding the relationship between qualificational and allocational functions (professional integration, allocation of social status) of individual educational organizations. These define the status of individual educational establishments within society and thus play a part in negotiating and implementing transnational co-operation amongst institutions of higher education as well as the mobility of staff and students.

The French higher education landscape is marked by the distinction between universities and 'grandes écoles'. It thus presents a particularly striking example of the creation of differing conditions of socialization due to different definitions of the educational mission, conditions for access and the function of allocation which are of crucial significance for the professional and social integration of graduates. It is therefore essential that those negotiating agreements for cooperation and mobility between German and French institutions of higher education are aware of the educational mission and social status of the relevant partner institution. It is only thus that they are in a position to gauge the added subject and social (socio-cultural) qualification available to their students within the foreign academic context as well as to assess possible psychological barriers to the acquisition of such qualifications.

This, in turn, requires familiarity with one's own institution and its status within the German higher education landscape. Thus it is extremely important to realize the significance of whether partnership is sought by a traditional university, a technological university or a 'Fachhochschule', particularly if the French partner is to be a French 'grande école'. (Intriguingly, the 'Conférence des Grandes Ecoles' has decided to stop co-operation with German 'Fachhochschulen' as these are considered to be of inferior status compared to German universities, although the educational mission and course organization at 'Fachhochschulen' have a good deal more in common with those of 'grandes écoles' than can be said of German universities.)

The concept of institutions of higher education designed for an 'élite' is prone to meet with emotive reactions in a German context. Clarification is needed regarding the differing historic and contemporary implications in public awareness of the concept of an 'élite', as interpretations and acceptance differ in the two countries. What will emerge is, for instance, that this concept is a much less controversial one in France. In France there is universal acceptance in all political camps, albeit with some nuances, that certain institutions, such as the 'grandes écoles', need to look after the needs of a professional 'élite' in politics, administration and industry. In contrast to the German concept of an intellectual élite this does not, however, imply a claim to ideological and moral leadership. In France the selection process is handled centrally and begins long before actual entry into 'grandes écoles'. Individuals' academic career at school followed by a two-year preparatory

course at selected grammar schools ('classes préparatoires') as well as a highly selective competition for access ('concours') turns out to be much more crucial than the training at 'grandes écoles' as such. Germans have some difficulty in understanding and accepting this process (Bourdieu 1989).

The 'climate' at 'grandes écoles', including relationships between staff and students, is determined by the initiation process through 'classes préparatoires' and makes for the evolution of a homogeneous cohort of students with an appropriately high level of self-confidence. If then we consider that each student cohort is organized as a group, including the allocation of a specific name (e.g. Promotion Jean Monnet), as well as subsequently joining one of the alumni associations ('Association des Anciens Elèves') HEC, ESSEC or ESCP, which wield considerable influence over the recruitment of graduates from 'their' 'grande école', this will help to understand the roots of the self-confidence characteristic of graduates from a French 'grande école' - a self-confidence not matched by graduates from any German institution of higher education. The gulf still widens because any 'grande école' represents no more than one subject discipline and has a relatively small student body. Taking our example, the ESCP houses no more than 1,000 students and occupies a complex of buildings right in the centre of Paris. Fees are high, although it must be said that nowadays many students are able to draw on low-interest loans. This they gladly do in the knowledge that this investment is bound to pay off and does not involve much of a risk given the well-paid positions awaiting 'grandes écoles' graduates.

The attitude of these French students to their studies is strongly influenced by the sense of having made it on entering a 'grande école'. This is particularly true of students at the 'Grandes Ecoles de Commerce' (business and management schools). Before entering a 'grande école', French students have learnt during their preparatory classes to cope with a level of class contact hours and regular examinations that would make German students shudder (80 hours/week!). On the other hand, these classes count as part of their later course of studies (bac + 5 = 5 years of study after the baccalauréat are made up of 2 preparatory years and 3 years at a 'grande école'.) Once arrived at the 'grande école', French students regard the regime there as positively liberal, a playground compared to what they were used to before. This was confirmed to us by lecturers. By German standards the regime governing studies at 'grandes écoles' resembles that to be expected at secondary rather than university level. In keeping with the 'grandes écoles' orientation towards professional practice and the needs of industry, students ('élèves') attribute greater significance than their German counterparts to participation in the numerous student associations ('associations des élèves') concerning themselves with practical problems encountered by companies (e.g. 'Junior Enterprise'), and are engaged in market research which can be financially highly rewarding. Study programmes, too, are strongly practice-orientated. This is reflected not only in the recruitment of part-time staff from industry but also in the nature of the curriculum which includes work placements in all three years of study. There has even been a recent development which offers students in their third year of study the choice of an 'année d'alternance', i.e. a year-long placement in industry where they get involved in genuine management tasks. The latter is also true of the three-month placement undertaken in year three in the area of their special option, which frequently leads to the offer of a job in the company after graduation. At the company fora ('Forums d'entreprises') organized annually at 'grandes écoles', demand for these students, whether for placements or for employment, is buoyant.

Study programmes include not only classical business studies subjects such as marketing, financial systems, accounting, company law, etc., but also foreign languages. Two foreign languages are compulsory during the first two years of study and are allocated a relatively high number of contact hours. They are subject-related and, apart from Japanese, presuppose that a solid linguistic base has been laid at grammar school and in preparatory classes and demonstrated at the competitive entrance examination ('concours'). Final examinations also include an assessment in these foreign languages. In addition, the wide range of options ('électifs') in political and cultural studies demonstrates that considerable weight is given at this level to a more general education.

Germans have difficulty in accepting the fact that courses of study are year-based (each year comprising three terms) and follow strictly laid-down programmes requiring regular attendance on the part of students. A comprehensive tutoring and information system (operating via student pigeonholes) makes for a level of

student guidance which amazes German students and explains why French students regard college as a service institution whose administration and teaching staff are permanently at their disposal. No wonder, graduates are ready to enter the labour market by the age of 23 at the latest.

If, then, German universities or technological universities (in our case the faculties of business studies and economics) are aiming to set up cooperation agreements with French 'grandes écoles', including the exchange of both students and staff, the following organizational and subject-cultural factors ought to be taken into account which are to serve the orientation of lecturers and students involved in the cooperation. Only in this way can the 'internationalization' of a course of study bring about the desired and defined additional qualifications that are to be gained over and above the qualifications normally acquired in traditional forms of study.

The most important factor consists in the differing conceptions of professional deontology present in the minds of staff and students alike. Thus the concept of what makes up 'subject knowledge' at host institutions needs to be clarified, as well as related value concepts and traditions (which differ from one category of institution of higher education to the next, depending on whether they are academic institutions in the traditional sense or applied or vocationally orientated institutions). Only then is it possible for a visiting student or member of staff to assess what the host institution may have to offer them. Considerations of subject quality need to be linked with a high level of familiarity with topics studied and expectations regarding performance and behaviour on the part of students towards staff and vice versa. Awareness is needed regarding concepts such as 'scientific approach', the relation between theory and practice, the definition of the qualification attached to the completion of a certain course of study, etc. Relevant variables are: the status of teaching staff and students in the institution and faculty in the context of the flexibility of the programme, i.e. obligatory attendance on the one hand and autonomy and individual responsibility on the other.

Successful transfer from one academic environment to another is not possible if one's own subject standards are taken to be absolute. This is obviously not a problem that has much to do with a person's mastery or otherwise of the language of the host country. It is rather a problem of comparative understanding of the educational, organizational and subject cultures of the country of origin and the host country respectively. These factors require re-examination every time a cooperation with a foreign institution of higher education is planned and negotiated. Nor do legal documents, administrative regulations, structural descriptions of the system or study guides of the traditional type give away any useful information of this kind. After all, they are not intended to facilitate practical cooperation but lay down general rules that are subject to interpretation and implementation by individual organizations and agents. Transcultural orientation, therefore, is a prerequisite of all forms of intercultural communication as well as of that creative surprise afforded to those equipped with what Luria calls an 'informed attentiveness' (Luria 1973): after all, each establishment of higher education is shaped by its particular location, its architecture, infrastructure and distribution of space, its internal organizational relations, etc., not forgetting the individuals working within it each of whom sees their own role in a different light.

The Role of Language in the Context of Mobility in Higher Education

It is our contention that no language can be guaranteed to guard the user against encountering organizational and other obstacles rooted in subject-specific cultures. Even scientific intercourse within national or organizational scientific communities, especially in the area of the social sciences and humanities (amongst which I would include business studies), develops its own socio-communicative meanings (Luria 1982) and operates with value judgments.

Thus, a French visiting lecturer from a 'Grande Ecole de Commerce', lecturing to German business studies students in French and in the way he/she is accustomed to when lecturing to French students, does not necessarily communicate to them a subject culture as such identifiable as French. The French visiting lecturer as well as German students ought to be aware of the fact that the learning and communication

situation is different from what they are used to, and they ought to have available communicative strategies helping them to facilitate understanding. This often means that seemingly matter-of-course issues require

discussion as they may conceal considerable cultural differences. I have attempted to convey a flavour of this using the example of the subject common to both sides. But as we have seen, all concepts lose their innocence, even that of the scientist, student or professor, once we step outside the organizational and subject-specific context of a national higher education system or the specific type of institution of higher education we are accustomed to.

Terminological preparation does not take us very far if terms and concepts underlying them are not dealt with in the context of the relevant subject, organization and scientific culture. The French term 'comptabilité' and the German term 'Rechnungswesen' (English: 'accounting') may be lexically equivalent. But this merely refers to the most general level of the smallest common denominator, telling us that there are such things as 'comptabilité' and 'Rechnungswesen'. We still do not know the specific context into which these terms are embedded and within which they are handled. A recognition of such terminological equivalence is too superficial, if not even misleading, for purposes of intercultural understanding. Even if the French guest-lecturer spoke German, this would still involve culturally conditioned misunderstandings, especially if he/she 'translates', is largely unaware of German sources and ignores expectations held by German students who use the German language in subject-related discourse. His/her explanations may easily strike Germans as superficial or lacking in theoretical foundation, as student reports we received have frequently confirmed. Similarly, German colleagues may have a hard stand if they risk making use of their (possibly not very highly developed) knowledge of the French language without sufficient awareness of the significance of rhetoric in French higher education culture.

The problem becomes especially complicated if English is used as a third language. Cultural misunderstandings may increase manifold due to the fact that each scientific community handles English sources in their own way, re-interpreting them consciously or subconsciously as required within their own cultural context. There is the mistaken impression that one is talking about one and the same thing or one and the same assessment of a state of affairs while in fact, what would be needed, would be a common understanding regarding the English cultural background of concepts used as well as the cultural implications of their application in one's own scientific or company-specific context (to come back to our example).

Negotiating and implementing cooperative programmes in higher education, especially if these imply student and staff mobility, require the attempt to gain comparative organizational and subject-cultural insights which go far beyond merely taking note of the existence of formal structures. This applies particularly to the issue of recognition of qualifications. We cannot assume as a matter of course that foreign subject offerings are accepted, neither with students nor with lecturers. The same goes for certification. Optimal use of what is offered presupposes that the chances of additional relevant subject-specific and professional qualifications can be negotiated between staff and students involved. Thus internationalization is a process of intercultural negotiation at institutional levels, that is at the levels of the institutions and subject areas involved.

Internationalizing the Acquisition of Qualifications, the Qualifications Themselves and their Application

In the case of the internationalization of the acquisition of a qualification, the qualification acquired after completion of the programme and the application of this qualification in a career, the focal point is the individual, the student conceiving or expected to conceive independently his/her own educational and professional biography. This is particularly relevant for German students who, by and large, have greater scope for structuring their own course of studies than is available to French students at a 'grande école'.

Even if higher education institutions spare no effort in negotiating cooperation programmes, individual students' preparation for their studies abroad is ultimately crucial. Frequently one meets with the view that students ought to be 'thrown in at the deep end' and benefit as much as possible from a 'culture shock'. This

may work out, if students concerned are of normal intelligence, used to having to apply survival techniques and in possession of a certain self-confidence, while also having at their disposal a fair amount of time to find their way around an unfamiliar higher education context. This may, for instance, be the case if the student concerned is planning to complete his/her entire course of study at the foreign institution. Such learning through experience can be very time-consuming and frustrating and requires a high level of stamina. Students who, as envisaged by the ERASMUS programme, spend a period of no more than 6 to 12 months at a host institution, with this period to count towards their overall performance record and period of study as well as equipping them with a qualification relevant to their future profession can hardly afford such productive detours, unless this is done in full awareness of the risks involved.

Returning to our example, the first point that requires clarification is which mobility aims can be relevant for a German student of economics undergoing a period of study at a French 'Grande Ecole de Commerce' and how these aims can be achieved within this particular institution.

As stated at the outset, the student needs to be in a position to achieve aims of various kinds: i.e., social (European and national), subject-specific, professional (international qualifications required by industry) and, finally, personal (extending one's personal and professional horizons, improving one's life and professional chances). A general personal gain in the sense of widening one's horizon represents a universally accepted aim of mobility without anyone being able to spell out in detail what this might involve. Another possible professionally relevant perspective might be that of becoming acquainted with the higher education system of another country which produces tomorrow's leaders with whom one will have to deal as a professional in later life.

The issue becomes more complex if one attempts to define the subject-specific and professional gains involved. Current practice in co-operation between higher education institutions and in exchange programmes (Baumgratz et al. 1989a and 1989b) shows that formally the obligation to recognize each other's qualifications is being adhered to, but that this does not automatically entail professional acceptance. Thus individual students face the task of ensuring this professional acceptance for themselves. Two possibilities offer themselves:

Either they attempt to acquire from the host institution formal evidence of achievement (certificates, diplomas, etc.) that might be relevant to studies undertaken but, more importantly, to their future professions and careers, for instance in the form of an added edge on the labour market. Or they decide to use the programme offered rather more in terms of its content, in the form of additional subject-specific, linguistic-communicative and personal qualifications without necessarily acquiring formal evidence of their achievement. Classes and other events selected for this purpose may well be recognized by their home institution. This, in turn, means that these students also have to negotiate academic acceptance on the part of the home institution. This may on occasion be necessary even if there are in existence negotiated cooperation agreements between home and host institutions, including conditions for recognition. One reason being that lecturers as well as students are inclined to select those aspects that appear to offer 'equivalence in subject terms'⁵ and then end up feeling disappointed. What would be more interesting would be to attend (fully aware of the nature of the foreign institution) those events which cannot be found at home, thereby aiming for instance at the creation of complementarity or the acquisition of additional qualifications.

Whatever choices students make, they have to anticipate cultural and communicative implications of their choice within the unfamiliar organizational context. There are three reasons for this:

1. the status of foreign students differs from that of home students;
2. visiting students may not have been given sufficient advance briefing;
3. they consequently face the task of clarifying their own status in order to be able to achieve their aims as well as those set for them by their home institutions.

⁵ An expression used by a (woman) student of economics in the context of a mobility event organized by the University of Saarbrücken, 24.5.92.

This means that host institutions are not going to regard them as academic tourists, but as serious students intending to participate in 'normal' lectures and seminars equipped with certain clearly defined ideas, intentions and possibly prepared to make contributions of their own.

This task is a complex one and the time available to complete it is limited. We regard it as essential that students acquire an orientational competence as well as appropriate communicative strategies and abilities in the language of their host countries even before leaving their home institutions. This will allow them to become properly integrated, i.e. to clarify their status in their own eyes as well as in the eyes of French fellow-students and French lecturers, and to negotiate their status keeping the aims of their stay in mind. If the aim has been the acquisition of formal certificates offered by the host institution within the framework of the scheduled stay, visiting students need to acquaint themselves with formal regulations, the organization of the course of study and the relevant examinations, i.e. the non-negotiable framework conditions (e.g. duty to attend, kinds of assessed work, in some cases even number of words required per piece).

Ways of Professionalizing Mobility with a View to Promoting the Ability to Communicate at the Intercultural Level in Academic and Professional Contexts

Coming to the implementation of the aims of qualification specified above, we once again have to look at institutional and individual levels. Within the framework of our project we therefore tried to develop instruments that might serve both to develop awareness on the part of all involved (university authorities dealing with foreign students, higher education administrations, faculties, students) and to facilitate access to information assisting the orientational competence referred to above. Thirdly, we show up possibilities of and perspectives for the integration of a foreign subject culture in a language context as well as offering didactic hints.

A **video film** entitled «Management à la Française» offers first concrete insights into problems encountered by German students of economics at the 'Ecole Supérieure de Commerce de Paris' (ESCP) in the areas of language and communication, subject-related matters and the institutional culture. The film aims to provide food for thought for institutions of higher education or their faculties promoting internationalization by sending students and staff abroad. More specifically, the film is to assist institutions and faculties in improving the integration of any preparation offered to students willing to go abroad into institutional and curriculum programmes; to bring about better cooperation between arts and other subjects, language centres and academic authorities dealing with foreign students; to facilitate more differentiated negotiations for co-operation agreements between institutions of higher education and staff exchange programmes; and, finally, to improve the way visiting students are being looked after and integrated. The film is to raise awareness regarding the fact that an internationalization of academic studies, in particular if linked with mobility, can only bring about the desired outcomes (professional mobility, technology transfer, 'synergy') if the cultural implications of this changed learning situation are reflected in relevant subject curricula due to enhanced awareness of institutional adjustment and increased foreign language learning⁶.

A multilingual and multi-media case study on the 'Ecole Supérieure de Commerce de Paris' (video- and audio-recorded interviews, including transcripts, lecture notes, graphics, etc.) are also available. They allow for a more in-depth study of the issue in offering relevant pedagogical tools. The materials can be managed and made accessible by means of a data bank, thus assisting the specific information and communication needs

⁶ The film is available in German, English and French from Audio-Visuelles-Medienzentrum (AVMZ), University of Wuppertal, Gausstr. 20, 5600 Wuppertal. Further information on the film, the VOICECART programme and the data bank can be requested from the following: Bernd Rüschoff (AVMZ); Helmut Brammerts, Seminar für Sprachlehrforschung, University of Bochum; Gisela Baumgratz-Gangl (project coordinator), European Institute of Education and Social Policy, c/o University Paris IX-Dauphine, Place du Maréchal de Lattre de Tassigny, 75116 Paris.

created by academic studies in a foreign language as well as by immersion into the unfamiliar cultural environment of a foreign institution of higher education or subject area. They take into account the various perspectives relevant to higher education studies, i.e. the internal perspective of those involved, the external perspective of foreign guest-lecturers, as well as that of exchange organizations (DAAD), attempting to represent as many aspects as possible of such intercultural communication situations and to make these transparent in terms of content and language.

Thirdly, a computer-controlled audio programme (VOICECART) demonstrates first examples of an educational exploitation of these materials in subject-specific language teaching and in individual learning situations.

A book with the working-title «Fremdsprachen als Ausbildungssprachen. Zur sprachlich sozio-kulturellen Dimension der Internationalisierung des Hochschulstudiums»⁷ is being prepared. It is to provide the project's language, political and conceptual framework and is enriched by results of empirical surveys and practical examples deriving from international higher education cooperations. The points of reference are, on the one hand, European educational policies as reflected in the documents published by the Commission and mobility and cooperation programmes; on the other hand, they are the qualification requirements deriving from the internationalization of industry and the Internal European Market.

Audio-visual documentation, data bank and audio programme are building blocks of a **new** project which is to develop a German-French prototype of a **computer-controlled multi-media and multilingual library**, allowing for direct access to photographic, graphic, sound and textual materials, thus meeting the need of learners and teachers for suitable information carriers, information processing and the communicative exploitation of academic studies in a foreign language as well as the enhancement of foreign language skills for professional purposes.

These materials are also intended to provide essential insights into the training and socialization of future leaders in the respective country for students not in a position to study abroad as well as for staff working in personnel departments⁸. Due to the fact that French 'grandes écoles' explicitly function as élite institutions, direct insights can be gained into cultural dimensions of the qualification of French people in leading positions which are of vital importance for the personnel policy and the management of companies with an international workforce.

This prototype ought to encourage higher education institutions keen to engage in cooperative ventures to produce similar documents along similar lines and to make these available to partner institutions. In the long term this would allow the documentation of developments and to make better use of mobility experiences of higher education institutions, lecturers and students. This system could also be used for research into mobility as an instrument for enhancing the qualitative aspects of mobility. Enriched with case studies of problems in intercultural communication in companies, this system brings together mobility as a method and as an aim. It does so by establishing concrete references between learning processes during training and professional practice. Academic and professional socialization are seen as components in life-long learning for international cooperation and for coexistence in multicultural organizations and societies.

⁷ «Foreign languages as training languages. On the linguistic and socio-cultural dimensions of the internationalization of higher education studies»

⁸ The project is funded jointly by LINGUA and the European Cultural Foundation in Amsterdam (July 1992 to July 1995). It is located at the European Institute of Education and Social Policy in Paris and run by Gisela Baumgratz-Gangl in cooperation with the German partners listed in fn. 1 and with the Chambre de Commerce et d'Industrie de Paris.

Bibliography

(Baumgratz et al., 1989a): BAUMGRATZ-GANGL, G. in collaboration with NATHALIE DEYSON, La Mobilité des étudiants en Europe. Conditions linguistiques et socio-culturelles/Mobility of Students in Europe. Linguistic and Socio-Cultural Conditions. Luxembourg: Office des publications officielles de la Commission de la CE. French edition 1989 (131 pp.). English edition 1990 (117 pp.).

(Baumgratz et al., 1989): BAUMGRATZ-GANGL, G.; DEYSON, N., KLOSS, G., L'amélioration de la préparation aux programmes inter-universitaires des coopérations ERASMUS. Paris: Unité Langues pour la Coopération en Europe / Language Unit for Cooperation in Europe. July 1989 (34 pp.). (Baumgratz et al., 1989b)

(Baumgratz-Gangl, 1990): BAUMGRATZ-GANGL, G., Persönlichkeitsentwicklung und Fremdsprachenerwerb. Transnationale Kommunikationsfähigkeit im Französischunterricht. Paderborn: Schöningh. 1990 (168 pp.)

(Bourdieu, 1989): BOURDIEU, P., La noblesse d'état. Grandes écoles et esprit de corps. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit. 1989 (569 pp.)

(Knapp, 1992): KNAPP, K., «Interpersonale und interkulturelle Kommunikation», forthcoming in N. Bergmann/A.Sourisseaux (Eds), Interkulturelles Management. Heidelberg: Physika. 1992

(Luria, 1973) LURIA, A.R., The Working Brain. An Introduction to Neuropsychology. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. 1973 (398 pp.)

(Memorandum, 1991): TASK FORCE. HUMAN RESOURCES, EDUCATION, TRAINING, YOUTH, Memorandum on Higher Education in the European Community. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities. 1991 (46 pp.)

(Petit, 1991 (6)): PETIT, F., Introduction à la psychologie-sociologie des organisations. Toulouse Editions Privat. (6) 1991 (371 pp.)

African Cultures as a Basis for Sustainable Development

Inervention de: S. Exc. M. Nouréini Tidjani-Serpos
Former Permanent Delegate of the
Republic of Benin to UNESCO

There can be no higher education unless new skills and new technologies are built upon the continual questioning of old knowledge, on the analysis and reconsideration of old skills and of the heritage accumulated in time and space by earlier generations.

Yet, just as it is easier to mobilise the culture of book-based civilizations in support of the university and scientific research, so it is difficult for countries with an oral tradition to achieve that kind of mobilization, because their entry into the world of written culture always leads to a depreciation of oral knowledge.

When writing suddenly appears in the world of oral communication, it upsets the accumulated heritage, disorganizes the institutionalization of memory and, if care is not exercised, imprints in the minds of previously colonized Africans a memory of extroversion.

It is therefore essential, when speaking about the mobilization of culture in the service of higher education, not to confuse the wealth that interculturality represents with rejection of everything that is endogenous. Cultural accomplishments must not be epistemological obstacles that impede the progress of scientific and technological research. Nor must a fixed and static vision of culture serve as a pretext for not integrating a culture of maintenance into our own vision of the endogenous world.

To mobilize the power of culture in the service of sustainable development, we must ask questions about the problems that we face today; we must have the humility to ask ourselves what solutions were found by previous generations and, on that basis, make a leap forward. In *Discourse on Method*, Descartes claimed that scientism would make the human being 'master and owner of the Universe'. Today, faced with ecological problems, the development of biological and nuclear weapons, the manipulation of genes which UNESCO has sought to halt by adopting the Declaration that makes the human genome the inviolable 'heritage of humanity', if we do not mobilize culture, we will never know how to be different, how to live peacefully together, and how to recognize that, as Saint Exupéry said, if you are different from me, worlds apart from me, you add to my wealth.

Yes, mobilizing culture in the service of education means disarming history, providing a type of civic education that does not incite the Serbs to liquidate the Albanians and the Hutus and the Tutsis to kill each other; mobilizing culture means putting peaceful co-existence into practice; it means accepting with much tolerance and humility that others can feel pain that, for example, the autochthonous Indians of the Americas can speak of inalienable rights and that it is understandable that the African states, supported by Israel and Cuba, have unanimously requested before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights that the slave trade be declared and acknowledged to have been a crime against humanity.

In view of all these issues, the university cannot remain silent. For us, wrongly or rightly, academics, researchers, artists and intellectuals are the leaven of our societies. It is that leaven that makes it possible to mobilize the members of our civil society.

On that basis, I humbly believe that the Africans present in this room who have experience in higher education must state their views on how they intend to enrich the education of the elite or the peoples by making use of the values of African culture.

Furthermore, I should like to know how, on the basis of those values, African universities can develop without disowning the cultures of Africa:

- in terms of organization and structures;
- in terms of educational content;
- in terms of their relations with society.

Lastly, as consideration is being given to the implementation of the Declaration and Action Plan on Higher Education in Africa, I should like to know whether we have begun to reflect on its adaptation to our cultural context.

Universities and the Cultures of Education

Address by: Dr Hilary Callan
Director
European Association for International Education
The Netherlands

Mr/Madam Chair, distinguished guests, colleagues:

I am greatly honoured to have the opportunity, as representative of the European Association for International Education, to contribute to this debate; and I would like to begin by expressing thanks to the organisers of the debate and of the Conference for inviting me to be here today.

The topic of 'culture' is central to our debate; and it is a topic which can be approached analytically in many different ways, none of which is 'correct' in any absolute sense. In the short time available to me I shall focus not on the role of universities in articulating or implementing cultural policies (to be covered by other contributions) but on another aspect of the cultural mandate of universities: namely the cultural dimension of their teaching, learning and intellectual life, and their function as theatres of cultural exchange, transformation and self-reflection. If a university can be viewed as, in one of its aspects, a 'market-place' of cultural encounters, then the international character of universities, as a component of their intercultural character, also becomes focal to the debate. Accordingly, it is part of my case that educational mobility (physical and, under certain conditions, virtual) together with its multiplier effects within universities, is a pillar for realising higher education's mission to nourish in students and graduates a capacity for intelligent reflection on one's own cultural biases and those of others.

Professor Nettleford writes powerfully in his keynote paper of the force of history and technology in the generation of new and situationally specific ontologies, cosmologies and epistemologies. This cues me into what I want to say. To Professor Nettleford's history and technology I would add culture; and to his ontologies, cosmologies and epistemologies I would add 'discourses' - meaning, very roughly, the registers of language, terminologies and taxonomies, with their accompanying associations and social relations, in which ideas can be expressed and understood. To give a simple example of this relationship: some years ago an anthropological conference took place in England under the analytical theme 'Anthropology at Home' - the aim being to discuss studying 'one's own' culture as a research issue. Someone pointed out that this theme was itself highly discourse-specific: for native thinkers in French or Italian, the nearest equivalents 'l'anthropologie chez soi' or 'anthropologia in casa' could not be discussed in any comparable way. The result: a much improved discussion. The example, simple as it seems, illustrates a more general point: namely that in at least some academic disciplines, the very selection of problems for analysis, and the conceptual landscape on which the selection is based, may be culture- and discourse-specific in ways of which - unless brought to their attention - even the most advanced practitioners may be unconscious.

What are we to understand by the 'cultures of education'? Two views can broadly be taken of the relationship of culture and cultural diversity to the educational process - here focusing on higher education in a university environment. On the first view, knowledge itself and its production belong to a neutral realm standing essentially outside culture, with the delivery of knowledge may require technical adjustments or modifications to be effective in differing cultural environments. I imagine that few educators nowadays would hold this view in an extreme form, but versions of this (as I would call it) 'surface' construction of the relation of culture to the educational process have been the basis for much useful work in developing, for example, culturally sensitive practice among education professionals.

The second view would, like the first, acknowledge the importance of cultural diversity for educational delivery at the 'surface level' of events and interactions, but would also locate cultural specificity within 'deep structures' of thought and academic performance, whether by students or established practitioners. Contrary

to the fears of many, this view does not lead us inexorably down a path to extreme doctrines of the cultural relativity of all knowledge. The laws of physics remain as they are, more or less. Instead, it casts a spotlight on education as being itself composed of culturally constituted practices, values, social relations and paradigms of knowledge. This view of education as a cluster of socially regulated activities, if taken seriously, has profound implications for this debate and for our view of what happens, or should happen, in universities, in both the academic and the organisational domain. A single illustration can be taken from what is coming to be called 'academic literacies', ie the practices surrounding writing in the university, and how student writing is disciplined and evaluated by faculty. The editors of a forthcoming volume of papers on this subject declare it as an aim to place these practices out...in the context of functional, cultural and critical approaches to the study of writing. ...[C]lose linguistic and discourse analysis is related to broader social and institutional interpretations ...[and]... ways of addressing the relationship between agency and subjectivity on the one hand and the constitution of institutions through discursive practices on the other. A key argument...is that the level at which we should be rethinking higher education and its writing practices should not simply be that of skills and effectiveness but rather of epistemology - what counts as knowledge and who has authority over it; of identity - what the relationship is between forms of writing and the constitution of self and agency; and of power - how partial and ideological positions and claims are presented as neutral and as given through the writing requirements and processes of feedback and assessment that make up academic activity.

One consequence of adopting such a broader, more theoretically based approach to student writing might be that the field of 'academic writing support' may be treated less as a remedial ghetto and taken more seriously as a central location in the construction of the academy itself and therefore as a major field of research and theory in its own right. If we follow this view of cultural process as not external or incidental to, but rather at the heart - part of the 'deep structure' - of education and the production and management of knowledge, what are the consequences for our discussion of culture and universities? I think these are many, but the ones I would like to talk about in the remainder of my time fall under two heads: the university as arena of cultural encounter and exchange; and the responsibility of universities to offer a culturally informed education to all those who pass through their hands.

Universities in the contemporary world are of their very nature transcultural institutions. Their ways of being so are as diverse as are universities themselves; but since the transmission of knowledge necessarily takes place with reference to some wider tradition, any university deserving the name will be a point of convergence for differing cultural strands which will interact, confront, compete or reach accommodations with one another. That this is equally true of new, technology-based institutions such as distance education universities, is coming increasingly to be recognised. For universities to be international is not the same as for them to be transcultural: yet many are both; and the international orientation and commitment of universities adds extra dimensions to their character as cultural meeting-places. The international activities of universities - comprising, notably, inward and outward mobility of students, faculty and administrators, international curriculum development, and interinstitutional collaboration across national frontiers - cannot but foster a dynamic cultural interplay throughout the institution. At 'surface' level as I mentioned earlier, an obvious need is generated for transcultural competence in areas such as student services, study skills support and culturally sensitive teaching methods. Organisational models for developing these competences are proliferating fast; and the most enlightened universities are being persuaded to invest in them.

At the level of 'deep structures' of the educational process, the university, particularly the international university, is a theatre for cultural encounters and exchanges of an even more significant kind. Professor Nettleford calls attention in his paper to some of the spheres in which cultural contrasts and their consequences can be explored within universities: such as attitudes to investment and risk; to technology; to work; to planning and the future. To these we can add others: for example interpretations of agency and identity; academic authority; attribution of responsibility for academic success and failure. For example, where there are culturally rooted differences in unspoken assumptions about academic authority held by different parties to the teaching and learning encounter, what a student 'receives' may be quite different from what a teacher 'transmits' when she offers a statement for discussion, or recommends an author or a text. I believe that it should be the business of higher education to do far more than merely recognise the potential for

cultural misunderstanding and miscommunication in such situations, important though that is. Universities need to find ways of analysing academic processes in a transcultural field; of harnessing them for enrichment of the educational experience; and of incorporating them into broader theories of higher education.

At the level of persons, real discovery can happen as a result of experiencing and negotiating across cultural disjunctions within the educational process: the kind of discovery that can transform the vision of the individual and ultimately, through 'ripple' and multiplier effects, the collective vision of the university and the broader society which it serves and on which it comments. And this is my second point: that the capacity to make such discoveries and to be changed by them should form part of our very definition of higher education. Professor Nettleford speaks in his paper of the exercise of the creative imagination through education; and he also speaks of the capacity to deal with the 'complexity of complexity'. I would argue that developing a student's ability to encounter and transact with other cultural realities is a way of unleashing that same creative imagination. And this is no mere luxury for an elite: In the global future into which we are all being rushed, the creative imagination of which Professor Nettleford speaks will be a fundamental skill for life of the properly educated person.

I represent an organisation whose mission is to support excellence in international higher education; and academic mobility is an important part of this. While there are many arguments in favour of investment in academic mobility by universities, governments and intergovernmental bodies, I believe that one of the strongest of these is its contribution to creating the conditions for this kind of experience and this kind of growth. A university education should be, as part of its fundamental mandate, a culturally informed and enriched education giving students a knowledge of the 'other' which in turn makes possible a fuller understanding of the 'self'.

I believe there is a role for UNESCO in realising these ideas. The role of universities throughout the world as agents of cultural encounter, education and transformation is deeply important; yet it is rarely articulated in the public sphere and has attracted very little research attention. In the context of this World Conference, could we not call for UNESCO to take the lead in stimulating a sustained programme of research and analysis of the university as cultural actor? Such a research programme would be open-ended and many-faceted, ranging from micro-level study of culture in the classroom to macro-level exploration of culture as a central, rather than incidental, factor in academic practice. Its outcome could be both a raising of consciousness within universities of the cultural importance of what they do, and the creation of rigorous paradigms for analysing the cultural process within the university. Such a programme would require partners. With a lead given by UNESCO these would not be hard to find (and would include my own organisation together with, I am sure, many others). Could it be done?

Universities have a dual character: they are cultural products and also cultural agents. Placed physically (or in some cases virtually) within a particular space, they partake of a surrounding culture but are also, within the recent Western tradition, ideologically located at a certain critical distance from it. The consequent tension between universities as service-providers to the social and economic order, and as critics of that order, runs throughout contemporary debates on the 'what' and the 'why' and the 'who pays' of higher education. Universities have a special role in cultural conservation; and simultaneously a special role in making possible, through the juxtaposition of alternative viewpoints, critical reflection on what is culturally taken for granted. In this sense, they are one of a class of institutions (the performing arts being another) which make it possible for a culture to reflect critically upon itself. Moreover universities, particularly those which are located across large-scale cultural or ethnic boundaries or are in other ways (such as internationalisation) able to bring together contrasting cultural experiences, are powerful forces for cultural accommodation, innovation and transformation. Put in a nutshell, my argument is that as well as thinking about 'mobilising the power of culture' in relation to universities, we (and UNESCO in particular) need to be thinking about articulating, and mobilising, the power of universities in relation to culture.

References

(1) Street, B. (Forthcoming). General Introduction to Jones, C., Turner J. And Street, B. (Eds) Student writing in the University: Cultural and Epistemological Issues

(2) See for example DeVries, J. 'The cultural component of global distance learning' European Association for International Education Newsletter No.30, October 1998

Cultural Policy and University Change:

Address by: Mr Eduard Delgado
Director, INTERARTS
Spain

General Context

This paper aims at providing complementary suggestions to the «Action Plan on Cultural Policies for Development» adopted at the Stockholm Conference, April 1998. Its author is the Director of INTERARTS, an Observatory of Urban and Regional Cultural Policies, which works worldwide from its base in Barcelona, Spain. In its current activity, INTERARTS develops programmes towards the interaction between arts policies and other public policies at particular territorial levels. Education and, more specifically, **Higher Education, Culture and Development** have been the objects of special interest in the past decade, given the deep transformations experienced by active policies in both fields. INTERARTS operates in Europe, the Eastern Mediterranean and Latin America and also participates in co-operative activities with universities, institutes and agencies in Africa, Asia and Australia.

Main Framework and Scope

The «anchor concepts» for this paper draw from UNESCO and UN declarations, policy papers and background documents on higher education rights and reforms (1960, 1990, 1995, 1996, 1998). This includes references to *Our Creative Diversity*; the Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development. Council of Europe documents have also been consulted (see bibliography), including the Heraklion report *Higher Education and Regional Cultural Development*, 1988 and *In from the Margins*, 1997. Additional checks have been made with materials from the Organisation of Iberoamerican States (OEI) and the European Union. The paper's practical scope is geared to the implementing of new policy, research and training exchanges between universities as well as between higher education institutions and the cultural action communities within and around them

Provisional Answers to Five Seed-Questions Proposed by the Conference

Q. How well do educational systems inform young people about "other cultures"- those of the past as well as those different from our own ?

A. World wide educational systems are intensely ethnocentric; they are designed to establish the boundaries of monocultures rather than to underline intercultural connections. For as long as the educational system remains the main repository of prescriptive cultural choices, it will not fulfill its universalising role. Conversely, educational systems should not only «inform» but help qualifying information whilst linking it with experience.

Q. The arts are taught with too much emphasis on technique: how can arts education be broadened to include the various context in which art forms originate and flourish?

A. Arts education is discriminated against in most of the world's universities, especially in developing nations. When offered, it usually suffers from isolation from its cultural context. No more no less in fact than the university itself. For their part, arts policies tend to disregard the cultural role of universities, by not taking advantage of their cultural energy and by not taking into account the fact that they might introduce in their campus activities related to the cultural life of their surrounding communities.

Q. How can meaningful intercultural education be made part of university education in the context of today's globalized information flows and Cyberspace?

A. Intercultural education must be approached from a non-academic viewpoint because an active interest in «other cultures» can only be a function of the need to «operate» with or within them. The role of arts creativity and cultural programming in universities is a key to intercultural practice. The opportunities afforded

by the information society must help launch new programmes where joint cultural ventures with projects all over the world can be implemented more easily.

Q. What are the kinds of research or other academic activity that universities can undertake to fill these lacunae ?

A. Research on the role of universities in implementing local arts policies designed to bring about intercultural understanding is necessary. Policy-oriented conclusions should be helped by compiling a guide of ideas and practices in this field. Existing networks of arts officers in universities all over the world should take a pivotal role in such processes.

Q. Can some methods be identified to enable universities to work more closely with museums and antiquities departments to build better awareness and understanding of cultural heritage?

A. The notion of cultural heritage must be opened to goods and processes which will become the heritage of the future. Universities must take on board a multiple responsibility that invites them to become a true «observatory» of culture and development, involving economy, arts, the media and the new «sciences of creativity».

Independent Shifts and Trends

The background to those proposals is to be found in an analysis of shifts and changes both in cultural policy and in the cultural role of higher education institutions all over the world. Although different degrees of economic development and geo-political centrality condition the pace and direction of university cultural development, there are complex trends which can be identified. These contradictory trends can be summarised along the following lines:

Cultural Policy - Positive Shifts

From

Monocultural approach
Officially implemented
Centralised structures
Public financing
Arts expenditure
Institutional planning
Arts and heritage separation
Arts and leisure separation
Institutionally based
Arts as social therapy
Arts as ethnic identity
Multiculturalism

To

Multicultural approach
Public and private agents
Decentralised policies
Cross-financing
Arts investment
Territorial planning
Integrated strategies
New synergies
Project oriented
Arts as social fabric
Arts as civic identity
Interculturality

Cultural Policy - Negative Shifts

From

Public responsibility
Arts as creative projects
Balance amongst cultural disciplines
Arts and Media co-operation
Subsidised arts training
Protected arts experimentalism
Globalization as co-operation
Bottom up policy-making
Artist's protection

To

Increasing privatisation
Arts as tools towards social and economic ends
Heritage hegemony
Media marginalisation of the arts
Decline of public arts tuition
Neglect of non-commercial arts
Globalization market extension
Marketing the arts
Increased instability in cultural employment

Universal cultural rights
Protected cultural markets

New forms of censorship
Free commercial zoning for the arts

Culture and Higher Education - Positive Shifts

From

University as museum of knowledge
Higher education for the young
University as enclosed precinct

Information dissemination
University as knowledge repository
Technology as means of information storage

Academics as mediators
Training-oriented arts courses
Curriculum oriented arts tuition
Cultural eclecticism
Exclusion from the cultural system
Training for jobs

To

University as prospective organisation
Permanent education for all
University as open "knowledge and creativity platform"
Knowledge systems building
University as debate agora
Technology as creative tool

Academics as intellectual challengers
Creativity Research
Project-oriented arts education
Positive sensitization towards interculturalism
Involvement in cultural policies
Education for life

Culture and Higher Education - Negative Shifts

From

General acknowledgement of university education
Universities as intellectual leaders
Ethical commitment to Humanities
University as discourse building
Universities competing for knowledge
Universities as meeting place for the cosmopolitan academic community
Socially sensitive universities
Universities embedded in regional development
Training for cultural co-operation
Using Cyberspace for communication
Involving artists as educators
Globalization as experience enhancement
Cultural development as part of universities' concern

To

New higher education "class system"
Technical tuition; Institutionalisation
Pragmatic approach to non-technical degrees
Unqualified circulation of information
University competing for students
Melting pot where cultural identities fade
Solidarity as an individual choice
Universities increasingly "aterritorial"
Training only for arts management
Information Society as knowledge file
Involving artists as image surplus
Globalization as distribution systems
Cultural development as a social event

Emerging Scenarios for Common Arts Policy and Higher Education

A. Retrieving the sense of cultural values

As abstract and symbolic values re-occupy a central place in society, mostly at the demand of an insatiable media system, they seem to be increasingly prone to ethical vacuity. Signs and symbols unconnected to any social reality are dumped onto the nets creating a world which is artificial rather than virtual.

In the face of this development, cultural policies and higher education should share the responsibility of connecting individual experience to collective values, social imagination and a meaningful sense of progress.

They should play a humanizing role in the face of an increasing ethical vacuum.

B. Fighting skewed globalization

New connectedness amongst societies is but a mirage of interactive communication. Roads are opened but few can travel on them. It is necessary to empower «communication have-nots» with all the economic, social and political rights that should be concomitant to globalization. In fact, a «charter» of such rights should be explored in order to raise the awareness about the new inequalities threatening human dignity. Cultural policies and higher education should both tackle this skewed globalization. Higher education institutions must ensure the universal vocation of their mission. For cultural policies, globalization is an imperative of creative reciprocity without which arts will not encompass the totality of human experience.

C. Think local, act global

Globalization tends to unroot experience from the immediate context by diminishing the social worth of face to face relations, community life and local culture. In the face of this, both culture and education should enhance the value of area-based interaction where individuals and groups might interact at many different levels, exchanging the totality of human experience and engaging in inter-generational exchange. Higher education and cultural life lead naturally to world-wide perceptions but they must make sure that their activities respond to some inexchangeable local reality. Only by strengthening full face to face experience can one's message be universal.

D. Raising intercultural sensitivity

Universities carry a special responsibility in assisting society to understand and respond to the new load of information about the cultural experience of other societies. The interdisciplinarity of university activity places higher education institutions in a unique position to help the community to set the basis for a fruitful intercultural life. Such educational programmes must be based on arts awareness and sensitivity raising curricula.

Only universities can provide a comprehensive understanding of other cultures by using their multipurpose experience in handling knowledge as well as their capacity to translate intercultural codes. Again, cultural policy and higher education share a serious responsibility in ensuring the knowledge and sensitivity necessary to avoid intercultural fractures and build a better society with the best creative tools of each community.

E. Education for expression and creativity

The artist, the scientist and the intellectual share the need for expressiveness and creativity, with every other human activity. The new variety of communication tools available to university and arts élites could lead us to believe that expressiveness is ensured; however, the existence of multiple channels to convey a message does not guarantee the quality of its efficiency. Training in expressiveness is necessary to ensure communication and the eventual access to creativity. In addition to that, the creative demand might float in higher education and arts environments, however, the sustainable creative drive depends on well trained sensitivities for innovation and nuance. As information and systems knowledge can be shared through many different spaces, universities should be freer to explore the realm of creative thinking and innovatory languages. Such area of activity demands a strong connection to the arts in all their forms.

F. Socio-economic development

Universities play a multiple cultural role in the cities and regions where they operate but together with the whole cultural system they play an increasingly central economic role. This is well understood by public planners as well as by the business community. Taking job creation (and sustaining) as a measuring rod, higher

education and the arts are earmarked amongst the richest hot houses for new employment. However, universities and the arts sectors should learn to work more closely together in this area. Their most productive convergence should be found in training for new jobs, helping dialogue for participatory planning amongst the different economic partners in the region, promoting the globalization of local economic networks through the promotion of the creative profile of the area and local research flagships.

G. Old university, new cultural centre

Most universities enjoy a substantial heritage - in the quality and versatility of their infrastructures - which is under used for cultural purposes. Furthermore, the legal and institutional framework of higher education centres provides a suitable shelter for arts initiatives. Finally, universities might be successfully able to become catalysers to the raising of funding for specific cultural purposes. Such opportunities should be explored, particularly in those regions where arts infrastructure is scanty or non-existent. Universities can become selective arts centres in ways which do not obstruct the normal run of academic life but rather play a synergic role with it. Arts production and distribution might become a real responsibility for universities in deprived areas, but also the leading of debates on local cultural concerns including heritage, cultural tourism, contemporary arts, cultural professions and arts policies. Arts organisations are under-exploited in extra-mural studies and in extending higher education concerns and programmes to the community and to non-academic intellectual circles. The new «24 hour university» must also take on board new cultural responsibilities.

H. Cultural studies

The academic social sciences have been reluctant to deal with both general cultural needs and those of particular populations. The debate on cultural studies and their relationship with «cultural policy studies» has come to the fore with regard to any analysis of public space and governmental action. The tradition of cultural criticism has led in more recent times to the question of power relations in the different fields of culture but still keeps an arm's length distance to policy issues. Future academic concerns will have to reconsider the position of «the applied sciences of culture» as part of an old line of academic pursuit but also as a deliberate effort to illuminate contemporary issues on culture and development. This is particularly urgent as the tools used for media studies are not adequate to tackle the new challenges of interpretation with regards to culture in the information society.

I. Arts policy and management training

The configuration of arts management professions in the second half of the XXth century has induced a line of academic activity geared to supplying managers and administrators to a growing arts jobs market. Library and heritage conservation studies take the lead in this area but today, policy, management, development and co-operation curricula pose new challenges to an already dispersed field of academic interest. As demand for this type of academic tuition grows in developing countries, there should be renewed efforts to foster independent curriculum research in order to avoid a new type of cultural colonization in the form of Western-style training for arts managers and administrators. Conversely, a strong world network of higher education researchers and trainers in this field should be fostered.

J. Technical and scientific culture

Arts and science need each other more than in the Renaissance where at least both samples of human talent were at the service of a single conception of human destiny. Today cultural and political choices inspire scientific research more than is generally acknowledged. Similarly, technology is conditioning arts choices at an unprecedented scale. Higher education and cultural development strategies must open new channels for dialogue and co-operation especially in the field of electronic arts and media.

CONCLUSIONS: For a Shared Perspective

As open universities and distance learning take a new place in the higher education spectrum, it becomes essential for academic institutions to strengthen their «cultural profile». This is necessary in order to ensure a meaningful social role of universities in the future as well as to manage successfully the new relations between culture, science and technology. Criteria such as the following could guide recommendations to the academic community:

- The university as an institution must assume a central responsibility in fostering intercultural ethics at all levels of academic activity and in spreading this sensitivity to its community.
- Universities must promote joint projects between sciences and humanities, favouring direct co-operation between artists and scientists.
- Higher education centres must facilitate the creative relationship between the study of ancient or traditional arts, crafts and heritage sites with contemporary arts, design and architecture.
- Higher education institutions should make their voices heard in guaranteeing the quality of cultural standards in the new information society and media.
- Along the same lines, they should make a contribution in exploring the uses of information technologies with regards to arts development and exchanges.
- Universities should adapt social sciences and management curricula to the needs of contemporary policy-making and administration in the arts.
- They should rethink the theoretical framework of «cultural studies» programmes in order to make them more sensitive to the intellectual and scientific issues arising from contemporary cultural relations in our societies.
- Eventually, universities should consider their role as cultural centres, turning arts faculties into open research and action-research units for arts production and distribution.
- These developments should involve the university community as active audiences and participants in local cultural life.
- This nexus with the community could be extended to opening university facilities for arts and community cultural projects, particularly those in need of communication technologies.
- On the economic front, the role of universities in local and regional development should be linked to cultural policies, specially those designed to improve employment opportunities.
- Higher education centres should take a more active role in ensuring their embeddedness in the social, economic and cultural reality of their local context.
- From their privileged position, universities can stimulate world wide nets of cultural exchange on the basis of higher education networks and affinities.
- Universities could consider an active participation in the suggested observatory of cultural policies, developments and co-operation, recommended by the Stockholm Conference.

Bibliography

- *.Action Plan of the Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development*. UNESCO, 1998.
- *. In from the Margins*. Council of Europe, 1997.
- *.Our Creative Diversity*, Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development. UNESCO Publishing, 1996.
- *. Crete Conference on Higher Education and Cultural Policy*. Council of Europe Docs., 1988.
- Michel Bassand, *Culture et Régions de l'Europe*. IREC, Lausanne 1988.

The Role of Anthropology in Multicultural Education⁹

Address by: Prof. E. L. Cerroni-Long
Professor of Anthropology
Eastern Michigan University
U.S.A.

The Roots of Multiculturalism

The approach of multicultural education derives from the broader concept of «multiculturalism», a term developed in the last quarter of the twentieth century to define the attempt to constructively address cultural heterogeneity in the context of democratic nation-states. While the term is quite new, the phenomenon it addresses has preoccupied political leaders since the establishment of the first large-scale states, about five thousand years ago.

For the largest part of the approximate fifty thousand years since our species acquired its current characteristics, human beings lived exclusively in small-scale, self-governing groups relying for subsistence on mobile foraging. As people spread into most habitable areas of the world in order to meet their foraging needs, they diversified into a huge number of separate ethnolinguistic units, which themselves branched into a myriad of smaller, self-contained groups. The word tribe is appropriate to refer to these groups, as long as it is kept in mind that tribal societies generally lack permanent, centralized political leadership. Historically, it is only when tribes turned to sedentary life and became territorially localized that, under particular circumstances, they underwent administrative reorganization into the type of larger political units we are most familiar with: chiefdoms, states, and empires (Bodley 1994: 12-17). This process of scale expansion inevitable brings together groups that are culturally quite distinct; consequently, how to successfully handle such distinctions is central to the survival of state organization.

Generally speaking, there are five possible methods of top-down management of cultural heterogeneity in large-scale political units. The first approach is genocide, which simply eliminates the source of heterogeneity by destroying it (mass deportation, or recent episodes of «ethnic cleansing» have a very similar objective). A second approach is assimilation, which aims at culturally «homogenizing» all members of a society so that they come to approximate the characteristics of the dominant group. A third strategy is the territorial segregation of culturally distinct groups, as the case of the South African «apartheid» illustrated in recent times. A fourth approach is amalgamation, which aims at the type of cultural integration that can only be achieved through compulsory intermarriage a policy difficult to implement in modern democracies. And, finally, the fifth way to manage heterogeneity is pluralism, which is the attempt to create a type of sociopolitical organization which eschews cultural hegemony.

Because pluralism most closely matches the democratic ideals embraced by most contemporary societies, this latter model is currently the most sought after. Unfortunately, however, its implementation directly clashes with the administrative and political characteristics of the modern nation-state, as developed in post-Enlightenment Europe and as imposed throughout the world, especially in the wake of European colonial expansion. Consequently, with perhaps a very few exceptions, most of the societies that currently present themselves as pluricultural are instead pluriethnic and problematically and conflictually monocultural.

This is not surprising, since the issue of cultural hegemony is inextricably entangled with the process of nation-building, but the byproducts of the situation are serious, owing to the fact that cultural dissonance

⁹ This paper is an edited version of the comprehensive report of the Commission on Ethnic Relations (chaired by Professor Cerroni-Long), Congress of International and Ethnological Sciences (Williamsburg, USA, 26 July - 2 August, 1998).

in hierarchical, centralized polities sets into motion a powerful centrifugal process. This process often leads to group self-segregation and secessionist movements, two phenomena that are emerging with increasing frequency in all parts of the world, being further catalyzed by a reduction in the coercive power of state governments, as they lose control of resources through economic globalization.

Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education

In an attempt to circumvent the type of internal conflict which leads to separatism, some states have introduced an overt policy of «multiculturalism,» aimed at protecting the cultural integrity of all constituent ethnic groups, while integrating them into a social fabric as flexible as possible. The most well known example of such an approach is perhaps the Canadian one, inaugurated by then Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau in October 1971, and made into law by the passing of the Multiculturalism Act (Bill C-93) in July 1988. However, such innovations are usually injected into a tradition in which cultural hegemony, and the strong assimilatory doctrine emerging from it, have played a crucial role in the definition of citizenship. Consequently, multicultural policies may be seen as an accommodationist strategy, defusing conflict by focusing the attention of non-dominant populations on issues of cultural identity, rather than on the ongoing realities of social inequality.

The inherent ambiguities of the multiculturalism policy emerge most clearly when one looks at its impact on education. Multiculturalism education is increasingly being recognized as the most relevant pedagogical innovation of the turn of the century, but there is very little consensus on what it is, how it should be implemented, and what outcomes should be expected from it. Obviously, different countries have different definitions, related to the type of specific histories and unique needs which characterize them. Nevertheless, it is possible to distinguish three separate models of multicultural education, often used in combination, but revealing quite distinct pedagogical perspectives.

The first model is built around the concept of individual rights, and defines multicultural education as a way of assuaging discriminatory attitudes through providing all members of a society with the same amount of «cultural freedom» (James 1995:16). The second model focuses instead on the importance of group identity, and proposes conflict alleviation by boosting the «cultural prestige» of all groups, in the hope that a healthy self-esteem may lead to enhanced interpersonal and intergroup harmony (see Nieto 1992). Finally, the third model frames cultural diversity in the context of the commonalities characterizing our species, and encourages the understanding of diversity in reference to an analysis of cultural membership and of the process by which it is acquired and perpetuated.

The third of these models is the one in which the role of anthropology is particularly important, given this discipline's contribution to the holistic study of our species in general, and to the enculturation process in particular. However, this is also the model that has so far received the least pedagogical attention, and only sporadic attempts at application. Most multicultural education programs have instead adopted various versions of the other two models, or their combination, so that multiculturalism has rapidly become correlated with issues of equity, consciousness raising, the airing of grievances, the alleviation of interpersonal conflict, and identity politics. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that some of these programs have ended up resembling «group therapy» sessions, and that their self-celebratory tone has been castigated as anti-educational and divisive by some critics. As a matter of fact, in the American setting where these trends have perhaps reached extreme expressions, a huge debate over the merits and demerits of multicultural education has raged for years under the generic label of «culture wars» (See Hunter 1991), and the term «political correctness» understood as rigid allegiance to multicultural orthodoxy has become an emotionally charged epithet.

As an anthropologist specializing in the study of ethnic relations, I find these developments extremely interesting. Two decades of research in the United States, combined with fieldwork-based comparative analyses of multicultural trends in a number of settings: Japan, India, England, Italy, Mexico, and Canada have convinced me that multicultural education gets crucially shaped by culture-specific factors, catalyzed by the historical circumstances defining citizenship and diversity in each national context. At the same time, I would

also suggest that there are some world-wide trends affecting current definitions of multiculturalism, and that their understanding may help to clarify the aims of multicultural education, and to facilitate its implementation.

The Impact of History

The regional reports presented in the central part of our panel clearly document that multicultural education means different things in different settings. Indeed, even the term «multicultural education» is not universally used or understood. Alternative terms in use, such as «intercultural», «multinational», «pluralistic», «interracial», «ethnic», and «minority education», reveal the various perspectives from which diversity is defined, and implicitly the role assigned to education in addressing it. Some of these perspectives can easily be related to the historical circumstances giving rise to heterogeneity.

To begin with, an obvious differentiation separates countries built fairly recently through a process of immigration such as Canada or Australia and countries with a long tradition of territorial identification but an equally long history of indigenous pluriethnicity, as, for example, China or Russia. A third case is that of countries like Italy; that is, countries characterized by strong regional diversity but which, until recently, have been defined by ethnic homogeneity, and are just now beginning to experience the impact of foreign immigration. Finally, there are countries such as Nigeria or those of the Caribbean region, which were created by colonial powers and are still in the process of redefining themselves after achieving political independence. These four major types of historical experience not only generate settings characterized by different types of diversity, but also lead to profoundly different ways of defining citizenship, and to different strategies for achieving intergroup harmony.

Another issue complicating the perception of diversity is that of «race». While the scientific relevance of the race concept has by now been completely exploded, the term has infiltrated so many specialized fields that it will take a long time before it is completely expunged from our conceptual repertoire. Furthermore, the traumatic experience of racism on the one hand, and, on the other, the confusion of race with ethnicity in the folk definition of «visible minorities» mightily contribute to the perpetuation of a category which should be simply subsumed to ethnicity, but which instead continues to have a disturbing life of its own.

The confusion over «racial» categories should remind us, however, that the visible component of diversity plays an important part in its definition and management. As a species we especially rely on vision, and are biologically wired for pattern recognition. Consequently, the ideal that democracy should create «color blind» societies is a particularly badly phrased one. Certainly the principle that diversity should not affect social equality is crucial to a democratic society, but to deny that markers of diversity are perceived differently, and that their visibility enhances their perception and interpretation, is unrealistic and ultimately self-defeating.

Developmental studies clearly indicate that from infancy we are attracted by those who look like us and that we usually find diversity stressful (Ornstein 1993). This is the type of knowledge that should be central to the development of effective multicultural educational programs but as already mentioned, this is not yet the case. Partly, it is because of the impact of history on the emergence and definition of diversity, and the consequent fragmentation of educational programs aimed at enhancing social harmony. However, there are also some worldwide trends which contribute to limiting the scope of multiculturalism.

Identity and Postmodernity

It was mentioned above that many programs of multicultural education focus either on protecting individual rights, by securing «cultural freedom», or attempt to boost self-esteem, by celebrating cultural uniqueness. This attention to individual perceptions of group membership seems related to the preoccupation with personal identity characterizing «postmodern» societies. These are societies in which capitalism has entered a new developmental phase, defined by the transnational dispersion of labor and capital, and the promulgation of a consumerist ethos. In such settings, which are rapidly growing in number, local traditions

get constantly subverted and the social is privatized, so that a sense of identity can often be built only on the basis of globalized consumption practices.

Consequently, the *Zeitgeist* emerging from the postmodern condition involves hunger for personal recognition as well as the dilution of social allegiance; Margaret Thatcher used to say that societies «do not exist», only individuals (see Habermas 1994). Unsurprisingly, the type of multiculturalism promoted in such settings is one in which cultural membership is considered a matter of choice, and any kind of group membership is defined as a source of diversity, potentially needing protection of equal rights and celebration of uniqueness. Thus, in American society, for example, one's ethnicity is often considered an identity «option» (Waters 1990), and multicultural education has been applied to issues of diversity not only emerging from national origin or ethnicity, but also from gender and age differences, religious preference, economic disadvantage, sexual orientation, physical disability, and choice of «alternative lifestyle» (see Schuman and Olufs).

There are various pitfalls to such an approach. To begin with, it creates an enormous confusion about cultural membership, the relation between culture and ethnicity, the dimensions of intracultural and intraethnic diversity, and the dynamics of intergroup relations. Also, it ends up making multicultural education a vehicle for the affirmation of the rights of «interest groups» a legalistic and moralistic enterprise rather than an instrument for a better understanding of the process by which intercultural relations often lead to conflict. In the American setting, for example, it has been argued that multiculturalism is «a code word for minority demands for separate recognition in academic and other cultural institutions», consequently: «Culture for multiculturalists,...refers primarily to collective social identities engaged in struggles for social equality» (Turner 1994:407). In line with this perspective, American multicultural education has generated endless debates on the textual content of school curricula which have become the «contested space» now being claimed by previously unrepresented groups. Also, it has catalyzed the rapid growth of «Cultural Studies», an academic discipline originating from the Gramscian analysis of class relations, but now wholly focused on issues of subjectivity and consciousness.

In postmodern societies, then, multiculturalism has both politicized and trivialized the concept of culture, which is increasingly perceived as «the jouissance of the late capitalist consumerist subject, playing with the heady new opportunities for self-creation that the ever-growing world of commodities appears to provide» (Turner 1994:419). From this perspective, which dismisses the normative aspects of cultural/ethnic membership, the aspirations to self-determination of various populations victimized by colonial expansion can be easily misunderstood. Even more crucially, the behavioural expression of cultural/ethnic diversity ends up defined as a voluntary affirmation of membership, so that the intergroup conflict it triggers ends up being blamed on the presumed «cultural militancy» of group members.

Anthropological Contributions

Given this state of affairs it is perhaps not surprising that anthropology has contributed very little to the definition of multicultural education, particularly in postmodern societies. Indeed, some American anthropologists have voiced a puzzled frustration with the disregard for anthropology displayed by multicultural educators (Perry 1992). This disregard, however, has been rather selective. While multiculturalism has capitalized upon the anthropological concept of «cultural relativism» in order to build an argument against the Eurocentrism of traditional school curricula and academic canons, it has certainly adopted a vague and/or simplistic view of culture. But insofar as many current forms of multiculturalism are a response to the postmodern *Zeitgeist*, and insofar as anthropology itself has been influenced by postmodernism, there has been an exchange of concepts between the two. The attention given by postmodern anthropology to meaning, subjectivity, symbols, and interpretations has fueled the celebration of intracultural fragmentation characterizing some forms of multiculturalism. Also, the continuing sense of guilt many anthropologists feel about the «original sin» of the discipline, its early social evolutionism and complicity with colonialism has found validation in the «bashing» of Western civilization implicit in so much multicultural practice.

One aspect of the Western tradition which receives a particularly critical treatment both within multicultural education and postmodern anthropology is the Enlightenment faith in rationality and its formal expression, science as an emancipatory force. Consequently, it is the scientific study of our species, at the biological and sociocultural levels that gets short shrift in multicultural education. This is unfortunate, because anthropologists have accumulated information that may be crucial to a better understanding of the issues at stake. Furthermore, the promise of the scientific approach is its universality. Consequently, the injection of scientific anthropological knowledge in programs of multicultural education permits the development of pedagogical approaches that are not culture-specific.

Conclusion

The need for dealing constructively with cultural diversity is rapidly becoming a central issue in education. Sociocultural heterogeneity continues to grow because of three factors:

1. changes in the organization of the world economy, triggering mass migration trends,
2. the expansion of transportation and communication systems, greatly facilitating the movement of people and information, and,
3. the worldwide attention given to human rights, resulting in the organization of a multitude of culture-specific interest groups.

None of these factors is likely to disappear in the near future and cultural differences seem destined to play an ever-increasing role in intergroup conflict. Thus, the need for educational strategies enhancing intercultural understanding is increasingly urgent.

A general assessment of current developments in multicultural education reveals that the particular historical and cultural context in which any program is implemented has a tremendous impact on its characteristics. However, three models of multiculturalism were identified, respectively emphasizing the rights to recognition and social representation of all marginalized groups, celebrating group-specific uniqueness, and focusing upon the common characteristics of our species as the context within which diversity can best be documented and understood. Also, the critical contribution of postmodernism to the current prevalence of the first two models of multiculturalism, and the ways in which postmodern anthropology has contributed to their application, were analyzed and discussed.

Among anthropologists directly involved with the development and implementation of programs of multicultural education, however, there is much interest in capitalizing upon anthropology's interdisciplinary potential to engage the attention of students with what seem the «natural premises» of multiculturalism: the recognition that we all belong to one species, characterized by basic commonalities but also by a tremendous array of differences which, however, can be categorized, studied, and understood in reference to the multifarious human experience from which they emerge. It is just by documenting the range of these differences, and by putting them into a comparative framework, that we can acquire a better understanding of what culture is and how it relates to ethnicity and other forms of subcultural variation. Also, this knowledge can provide insights into the factors triggering intercultural conflict, thus facilitating the development of the skills necessary for its early detection and successful diffusion (see Cerroni-Long 1996a).

Apart from bypassing the solipsism of the postmodern perspective, this approach would also stimulate a better understanding of what is culture-specific in scientific practice itself (see Cerroni-Long 1996b), and thus encourage the establishment of a cross-cultural intellectual dialogue among anthropologists involved in multicultural education worldwide. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, rooting the study of diversity in a better understanding of the overall characteristics of our species would implicitly contain the ethnocentric, divisive tendencies of some forms of multiculturalism. Certainly, it would call attention to what many still consider the original mission of multicultural education: the establishment of social harmony through a better understanding of the dynamics of intercultural conflict.

Anthropology, as the scientific study of our species, can constructively contribute to the fulfillment of this mission but, for a variety of reasons, has so far been only marginally involved in the development of multicultural education programs. While recommending that more attention be given to favoring this development, it is also acknowledged that a better understanding of the dynamics of cultural membership and intercultural relations may not, in itself, be sufficient to resolve intergroup conflict until and unless it is combined with the redress of structural inequalities and a fairer distribution of resources, both within each state organization and at the level of the global economy.

If contemporary states attempt to solve the problem of internal heterogeneity through forms of multiculturalism that do not involve the dismantling of cultural hegemony they are not likely to succeed. On the other hand, if no attempt is made at linking multiculturalism to the definition and establishment of some form of «civil consensus», few of the some two hundred politically sovereign states now internationally recognized will survive the impact of internal fragmentation. Perhaps, as the new century begins, the state may need to reinvent itself. A useful model may be provided by the ancient concept of *ecumene* a loose sociopolitical organization gathering a number of culturally heterogeneous units around some unifying symbol of commonality, but allowing each unit to operate independently in most areas affecting the every-day life of its members. In a way, this would reintroduce tribal organization, which may well turn up to be the most supportive context for the development and peaceful expression of cultural pluralism.

References

- * Bodley, John H.
1994 *Cultural Anthropology: Tribes, States, and the Global System*, Mountain View, CA: Mayfield
- * Cerroni-Long, E.L.
1996a «Aspirations to Universalism», *Anthropology Today* 12(5):26-27.
1996b «Human Science» *Anthropology Newsletter* January:52, 50.
- * Habermas, Jurgen
1994 «Struggles for Recognition in the Democratic Constitutional States»
In: A. Gutmann (ed.) *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. 107-148,
Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- * Hunter, James Davison
1991 *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America*, New York: Basic Books.
- * James, Carl E.
1995 *Seeing Ourselves: Exploring Race, Ethnicity and Culture*, Toronto (Canada):
Thompson Educational Publishing.
- * Nieto, Sonia
1992 *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education*,
White Plains, NY: Longman.
- * Ornstein, Robert
1993 *The Roots of the Self*, New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- * Perry, Richard J.
1992 «Why do Multiculturalists Ignore Anthropologists?» *The Chronicle of Higher Education* March
4: A52.
- * Schuman, David and Dick Olufs
1995 *Diversity on Campus*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- * Turner, Terence
1994 «Anthropology and Multiculturalism» In: D. T. Goldberg (ed.) *Multiculturalism: A Critical
Reader*. 406-425, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- * Waters, Mary C.
1990 *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Culture: Proposals for a Debate

Address by Prof. Nabil El Haggar
Vice President
University of Science and Technology,
Lille (France)

*Culture also makes us less willing to adapt to
our immediate surroundings, more open to other places, other people,
the broader context (...).*

*Education in the fullest sense of the word
is perhaps no more than the right balance,
however difficult it is to achieve, between
the need for objectivation, which means adaptation,
and the need for reflection and dis-adaptation.
It is this fine balance that keeps us upright.*

Paul Ricoeur - History and Truth

In recent years certain French universities have created cultural projects. Some of these projects endeavour, as an extension of the training offered to students, to establish an openness to culture which makes possible a critical approach to knowledge but also to the world. A number of questions arise in this context:

- Is there not an obvious link between the university and culture?
- Is it the university's job to promote or defend a *particular concept* of culture?
- Why must the world of the arts and artistic activity take a particular interest in students, and how should the university too concern itself with students' relationship to culture?
- What role should the university play in promoting culture and cultural activities among the general public?

In other words, what is the university's place in the essential relationship between instruction, education and culture? What role should it play in society?

All these questions, which have long been forgotten, must be put back on the agenda, and each of us must take their measure.

The university has a duty to defend, above all else, the affirmation, in words and deeds, of a culture that is not only entertainment but **an elevation of the spirit, as much by objective and rational knowledge as by a subjective, artistic, in other words, multifaceted approach to the world.**

But not only is the university not, or no longer, a place of cultural ferment where ideas conflict and views are exchanged and enlarged, but culture too, with its own requirements and constraints, is no longer a fundamental concern of our society. Any debate on culture, its evolution and its development, must immediately take a position on this fact of social life, which holds now and most certainly will continue to do so for some time to come in our societies. It is the reason why the resources allocated to culture will remain at a generally low level, and basically be given over to a **'culture of entertainment' that is socially and politically 'profitable'**.

Despite the choice thus made by society, there are academics, 'gatekeepers', artists and intellectuals who are now beginning to form pockets of resistance. It is thanks to them that genuine cultural development is still possible, even if only for a minority. The university, **as a place where ideas are confronted and views**

exchanged, is crucial in enabling this 'cultural resistance' to achieve its objectives and in making culture a primary concern for our society.

But that is a hope, an ideal, which is shared neither by the majority of the academic community nor by society as a whole.

Challenges and New Responsibilities for the University

To preserve knowledge and learning

One of the challenges facing the university at the close of this twentieth century is the protection of knowledge and learning from the corrosive effects of an alarming process of cultural impoverishment. In the solitary confinement of their own specialized field or their own laboratory, cut off from the world around them, a considerable proportion of university teachers/researchers, in science but also in non-scientific fields, are abandoning the broad-based, all-encompassing approach to knowledge and learning and focusing all their attention on the segment that will enable them to excel in their own respective field. The teacher/researcher is becoming a 'technical expert' with few pretensions to universality, still less humanism. The only aspect of research and teaching in the sciences, the arts, philosophy and the human sciences that has been retained is the training aspect, in the form of a narrow professional training designed to meet the criteria of technical effectiveness and economic profitability without any concern for the cultural aspect, in the sense of the development of the **critical approach to knowledge which is a precondition for the ability to see a subject in perspective.**

Although specialization is essential for research and creative work to be successful and subject compartmentalization may sometimes be necessary, we must assess the implications of knowledge and learning and be able to look at them critically, despite social pressures and internal and external constraints geared to profitability and effectiveness. We must understand the implications of subject compartmentalization as well as those of decompartmentalization and the broader approach.

In any case, while offering teaching and high-quality research work focusing exclusively on training that is as specialized as it is effective, surely the university must also provide students and members of society in general with **opportunities to take the broader view and develop all their potential, striving to be a wellspring of ideas and proposals on major social issues.** By its very nature the university should contribute to the dissemination, transmission and further study of literary, scientific, economic, sociological and political cultures. Whatever learning it imparts, the university should take up its position in the cultural field from the outset since culture does not concern only the arts and letters but all knowledge.

The university could also be defined as a **community that forms around a body of knowledge** and as a place where individuals from different cultures meet, where customs, behaviour patterns and languages intermingle and where **different views of the world, ideas and history should be exchanged.** It should be a place of freedom because it encourages learning and reflection. It is a place of tolerance because it brings individuals closer together. Culture at university should make meticulousness, quality, scholarship and receptivity its mottoes. For students, life at university often means a change of habits. It is up to the university to see that this change is accompanied by **the acquisition of cultural practices that will last beyond their student life.**

All sections of society must be given the opportunity, in accordance with their capacities, to learn how to look, listen, appreciate, criticise and evaluate the quality of a text, a production, an interpretation, in short an artistic work. The work that precedes professional artistic activity will also have to be considered by academics, certain artists and 'gatekeepers' **together**, outside the context of the media, show business, politics or economics. One day we may perhaps be able to leave the 'audience ratings' approach behind us: one day perhaps we may no longer need to 'please'. This approach, which seems today to be fundamental to the development of artistic creation, is a sad reflection of the overall cultural situation.

Thus, it is for the university to see to it that the student, sensitive to this type of concern, leaves it not only more knowledgeable but more cultivated, in the sense that **it can help to educate students' ways of looking at the world.**

The university in society

Finally, the university will also be able to promote culture among citizens other than students. **As a public institution it must be open to all**, and primarily to those who are pondering a number of questions to which they are entitled to receive clear and precise answers, far from television talk shows in which controversy and audience rating rule supreme. The university should be a forum in which all citizens, whatever their age, qualifications or culture, can state their opinion and listen to that of others.

The university must be a driving force in the development of citizenship and in thinking on democracy. For it is one of the key points that allow political awareness to emerge at both the individual and the collective level, and it is this that makes possible not only real participation in the running of public affairs, but also, by the same token, democracy itself, which requires this participation.

To conclude, let us say that the university must provide **a unique combination of knowledge, teaching, reflection and education and help to increase the awareness both of young people and of those who are no longer young.** The inability of our modern world to give meaning to democracy and politics is one of the reasons why concepts such as 'social cohesion', 'living together', 'the common good', 'public-spiritedness', 'participation' and 'responsibility' are seeking a substance that seems to have been diluted, leaving only the shadow of past illusions. **Because freedom and impartiality are the hallmarks of the university, because it is not governed by the merciless logic of profitability in any field, the very least it can do is to assume responsibility in respect of reflection, debate and exchanges of views on all these controversial questions.**

Education, culture and citizenship

As long as our approach to culture consists in **reducing cultural activity to certain artistic practices, promoting certain 'classics' and compartmentalizing cultural fields** by making them the special preserve of one group or another, and as long as **the link between education, culture and citizenship** has not been brought into line with modern tastes and each individual, at his or her respective level, has not thought this complex and precarious interaction through and put in place the means necessary to establish it, the 'new approach to citizenship', however it is remodelled, will be an illusion. Besides, it should be noted that words such as 'culture' and 'education' are so complex and cover such a wide area that they must be used cautiously and intelligently. Any attempt to reduce the distance between creative activity and the public, like that between teaching and the pupil, even though different problems and different purposes are involved, will be of limited, if any, use. We must make it clear that **education and culture make possible the full exercise of citizenship**, at each moment and at each stage.

In this way cultural development could be given depth, solidity and permanence. We could support artistic, literary, scientific and philosophical work, creativity, products and spectacles by using education as it can be used, to create an active, rather than passive, and intelligent public. An approach to education that is inspired by a relationship based on quality and high standards will not only dominate the interaction between the spectacle and the spectator, between teaching and the pupil, between research and the researcher, but will also help **individuals to develop to the full their interactions with society, the world and life.**

Perhaps this would offer part of the answer to a question that has baffled us so far: **What action should we take to ensure that science and scientific research, the arts and artistic activity, knowledge, learning and technical skills, all products of the intelligence and imagination of humanity, can serve human progress?**