

ARTICLES

Abstract

A comparative examination of the way in which academic freedom is expressed and maintained in certain anglophone developed and developing societies. A definition of the term is offered followed by a brief historical analysis of the way in which autonomy was established in the economically active societies of the West.

Malcolm J. Waters*

The Institutionalization of Academic Freedom: Implications of Some Findings from the Third World

For Western academics the issue of academic freedom has typically been vested with a great deal of emotion. That the issue is of central concern has been clearly demonstrated by Gross (1968:529) who found academic freedom to be the most important positive evaluative orientation among both faculty and administrators in American universities. Academic freedom can therefore be seen as a central element in the self-conceptions of members of universities. Any threat thereto is a threat not only to the conditions under which such members work but also to their very identities. An emotional response to threat is therefore predictable. This renders all the more surprising, not to say disconcerting, the fact that very little sociological analysis has been undertaken of the conditions under which a central ethic of academic freedom arises and is maintained.¹ This point may be seen as an instance of the argument made by Crook (1974:1) that sociologists typically apply the orientations, assumptions, and skills of their discipline to the activities in which they participate on a daily basis only to a very limited extent. The concern of this paper is to take a step toward the rectification of that omission.

A definition of the value *academic freedom* might be written as follows: The view that scholarly activity, in the form of research and teaching, is subject to the authority only of academic communities and of no external authority source. Several elements of this definition are of especial relevance for the present undertaking.

First that the essential elements of scholarly activity are twofold: namely, research and teaching. This implies that conditions relating to autonomy of action in each may be different. There also arises the possibility that disputes may arise concerning definitions of scholarly activity, disputes concerning the boundaries of scholarly activity. Likewise there may arise questions concerning whether external authority sources can "legitimately" intervene in scholarly situations as a response to non-scholarly activity undertaken by academics.

*Malcolm J. Waters is a Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Tasmania in Australia.

A second definitional issue of relevance is that concerning academic communities. Implicit in the definition is the notion that there exist structural forums for the evaluation of scholarly activity so that in a sense academics may be viewed as self-policing. However, the possibility exists for dispute as to the constitution of those forums. The question becomes, should the forum be constituted of all one's peers in a given society, of all one's peers within one's discipline, or of one's peers in the academic institution within which an academic works, or of senior members of that institution. Typically the structural manifestation of academic freedom has been the authority system known as collegiality. A collegial authority structure is one in which the legitimacy of decision making is based on consensus among equals. We may argue, therefore, that within a given academic institution, the extent to which collegial authority takes precedence over other types of authority is an indicator of the extent of academic autonomy.

A third potential source of dispute is the issue of what constitutes control. There has been clear recognition on the part of academics in many societies that governments be assigned the right to co-ordinate the activities of universities. Clearly decisions as to 'what would be taught where' are decisions as to whether given academics are allowed to pursue their particular modes of thought. This leads us into a central issue in this paper. Typically, discussions of threats to academic freedom have been concerned with external interference in academic affairs, in other words, with acts which have a negative or constraining influence on academic activity. Yet we must also be concerned with action which promotes or has a positive influence upon modes of academic activity. Such concern is necessary in light of the fact that such promotional activity is necessarily selective and may also have the consequence of subverting the academic activity that it initially seeks to promote to ends which are prescribed in arenas external to academic communities.

Armed with these definitional considerations, I propose to analyse the conditions under which academic freedom is maintained and changes in its scope and strength. This analysis will be essentially comparative and will be based on two sets of data. The first is strictly experiential, that is, upon my own experience of British and Canadian universities. The second is both experiential and observational, being derived from research which I carried out at the University of the West Indies in Jamaica in 1973. This will be supplemented by material derived from a similar study undertaken by Pierre van den Berghe in a Nigerian University (1973).

Such a comparative approach should aid this discussion in a number of ways. Hofstadter and Metzger (1955) have argued that academic freedom both as an ideal and as an actual mode of behaviour arose in a gradual way in the United States. Prototypical universities in that society were religious and philosophical colleges supported by philanthropic endowments both from wealthy community members and from religious organizations. The process of the establishment of academic freedom concerned the weaning away of these institutions from religious control such that religious dogma could no longer play a role in the way in which knowledge was transmitted and extended. The solution to that problem lay in demonstrating that universities could make a contribution to the welfare of the society as a whole as well as to the welfare of some of its individual members. There occurred, then, the establishment of the State universities supported by public funding within which scholarship was, ideally at least, not subject to the control of any singular group within the society.

Similar developments can be recognized in the United Kingdom and Canada. The establishment of the University of London in 1836 was a Nonconformist response to the Anglican hegemony of Oxford, Cambridge, and Durham. London was conceived of as a secular institution and although originally serving sectarian interests (i.e. religious nonconformism) eventually came to be so. The establishment of the "redbrick" universities in the first half of the twentieth century and of the "new" or "plateglass" universities in the 1960s was a matter for state action in terms of general welfare rather than a matter for segmental action in terms of sectional welfare. In Canada a pattern has emerged in which religious institutions founded in the nineteenth century have progressively dropped their religious affiliations and in which late twentieth century institutions have had no religious affiliations and have relied on provincial governments as sources of support.

These developments have occurred in societies in which economic issues have been predominant concerns. It can be argued that governments have typically oriented themselves to economic development as a means to achieving national welfare.² Let us briefly examine the ways in which universities *can* contribute to such development. Perhaps the clearest and most obvious way they can contribute is by ensuring an adequate supply of highly trained and possibly specialized manpower. That this is perceived to be the case can be seen in the rapid expansion of higher education in Canada, and especially in Ontario, in the 1960s, a development which immediately succeeded the propagation of ideas of the so-called "human capital" or "human investment" theorists. A second possible contribution lies in the area of research. The application of knowledge newly established by means of research carried out in universities may provide a basis for economic development. The application of research findings in nuclear physics to the production of atomic energy is a clear and by no means singular example. A third increasingly important contribution to economic development lies in the area of community service, the contractual provision of research or consultation services to deal with specified problems.

That universities have made contributions to general economic welfare in these ways is beyond dispute. The question arises, however, as to whether academic freedom persists because there is value-consonance between universities and the powerful members of those societies discussed above. Parsons and Platt (1968:506) have argued that the predominant value-orientation of Western societies is 'cognitive rationality', that is, the view that the environment may be effectively mastered through, "valid observation, clarity in conceptualization, and logical coherence in relating facts with each other and with other concepts." This is clearly an economically oriented evaluative statement in that it relates control of the environment to knowledge. They further argue that universities manifest this value-orientation in logically extreme form (see Parsons and Platt, 1968:503-508; Parsons, 1968:179-181). To interpret that argument, universities are primarily concerned with knowledge about the empirical. This being the case, it should not be surprising that universities in which academic freedom, freedom to explore the environment, is a prime value orientation flourish in Western societies. In a society in which theological value-orientations predominated they would clearly not flourish. The central point to be made here is that academic freedom can only persist in situations in which the values around which academic activities are organized are consonant with the values of those who dominate the society in power terms. As societies have become more rationalized and secularized, so also have universities.

In third world societies the expectation has often been held that these processes would be collapsed, that they would occur over a much shorter timespan. In many respects such expectations have been fulfilled. Third world societies have experienced rapid and often cataclysmic change during the process of what has been called modernization. A parallel growth in the scope and scale of higher education has also occurred in terms of a similar set of perceptions on the part of decision makers with respect to possible economic benefits by comparison with Western societies. We also find, however, that universities become symbolic of national and cultural independence. More importantly, the gradual development of academic freedom which Hofstadter and Metzger (1955) describe for the United States could not occur in such societies. We can therefore argue that because the value has not been firmly institutionalized in the way in which it has in the West that the possibility for conflict between universities and units in the enviroing society is therefore rendered greater. Further, the rapidity with which systems of higher education have been established renders conflict on the issue not only more frequent but also more visible.

The key question here is value consonance between the particular subsystem with which we are dealing and the societal social system of which it is an element. The conditions which persist in third world societies should allow us to more clearly indicate whether that value-consonance which Parsons and Platt describe in fact exists or whether there is a simple coincidence of interests between the members of universities and powerful members of other subsystems, notably political and economic subsystems. Let us begin to examine that question by looking for grounds upon which the realization of academic freedom might be undermined.

Structured Ambiguity: The Corrosive Effects of Contrary Expectations

The question which has been asked is addressed to the relationship between universities and other units in the society. The transition from philanthropic support to organized public support for universities in Western societies has precipitated a special situation in which, ideally speaking, they are at once autonomous and in receipt of finance from taxation revenues. This transition has meant in other words that universities have managed to maintain the benefits of both the traditional and the contemporary situation and to avoid the malefits of both. This has only been achieved, however, at some cost, the cost being a precarious situation with respect to continued support, and a relationship with governments which must be carefully managed and tended at the interface. We can characterise the situation in general as an ambiguous one, one in which the values of the "old" situation are in some measure contradictory to those of the "new" and in which those values are institutionalized in the internal structures of universities. We should expect divergences of interest between "old" and "new" structures and therefore competition with respect to authority and the possibility of some degree of conflict.

Let us first of all attempt to characterise some of the values which govern the relationship between universities and other units. We may couch these evaluative stances as expectations relating to performance. Typically, those who spend from the public purse will expect some degree of return on what they spend, they will expect some degree of production. From universities they will expect, as we have seen, trained personnel and research outputs. It is important, however, that such products have utility. Trained personnel must then have a capacity for making independent judgments. Such independence must include at the same time the

capacity for being innovative and a willingness to conform with prevailing patterns of normative standards within the society. Likewise research production should be concerned with new knowledge but this new knowledge should relate to issues which are non-threatening with respect to the status quo.

In more ultimate terms, these output expectations relate to two perspectives on the role of the university in society. In one the university is seen as the locus of disinterested scholarship and unfettered criticism, an institution in which an intellectual elite may develop and apply its faculties to the world in which it is located. If it is an agent of change, then this is merely an offshoot of its central activity which is viewed as being intrinsically valuable. Within an alternative perspective the university is viewed as a training ground for the talented, an agent for the production of human capital, in other words, a contributor of growth. Within such a perspective higher education is also seen as an important avenue of mobility and therefore a mechanism for the promotion of equality of opportunity. This is to say that the value of the university is assessed in extrinsic and instrumental terms rather than in intrinsic terms.

These two views of the role of the university in society are not "carried" exclusively by any particular group. Indeed for all those actors for which the activities of universities are a concern they are "carried" in varying degrees of mixture. However, it can be argued that different types of actors will assign varying primacy to each of the views. In the introduction to this paper it was argued that there was some degree of value-consonance between the paramount values of Western societies, or at least of the economically and politically powerful members of such societies, and the values of members of universities on the basis of cognitive rationality. Such an evaluative orientation would clearly be appropriate to both perspectives on the role of the university in society. However, Parsons also argues for value-consonance on the basis of instrumental activism, that is, the evaluation of terms of social organization on the criterion of whether they allow the active pursuit of a religiously sanctioned ideal state, that state in this case being individually assessed material well-being (see Parsons and Platt, 1968:506). Here we begin to note value-divergence, instrumental activism being appropriate to the second perspective but not the first.

The instrumental view of the role of the university in society is primary for those members of economic and political elites who are concerned with higher education. Central concerns are the mobilization of talent and knowledge for production ends and for the latter, equality of opportunity. That which we might call the intrinsic value view of the role of the university has primacy for national or international academic communities. The central concerns of members of such groups are new research findings, new critical paradigms and the production of new members. Both groups of actors are significant sources of support for members of universities, whether that support be moral or material. In return for that support they will require that the expectations which they have regarding performance will be met.

Let us return now to output expectations regarding teaching and research and reanalyze them. It was stated above that personnel outputs (graduates) must demonstrate both innovative capacity and normative conformance and that knowledge outputs (research) must demonstrate both novelty and respect of the status quo. These expectations are clearly ambiguous. They may be described as ambiguous because they combine elements of both the intrinsic value-view of the university and of the instrumental-view, of cognitive rationality and of instrumen-

tal activism. Innovative capacity and new knowledge are characteristic of the former and normative conformance and status quo maintenance are characteristic of the latter.

Let us extrapolate further by examining the ways in which these expectations are mediated such that they become ambiguous structural components of universities as forms of social organization. It was suggested above that universities structurally manifest a bifurcated authority structure. Ideally, and as authority relates to academic autonomy, the authority structure of universities is collegial. This is to say that the legitimacy of decisions resides in the common interests of faculty members who are equal with one another. In particular, judgments with respect to competence, that is hiring and firing, the value of given pieces of research production, and in a less clear way, teaching effectiveness are made collectively by a group of actors whose professional competence is to be perceived as broadly similar. The most important collegial community is the department since it is only within the department that actors will have sufficiently specialized knowledge to make judgments relating to competence. Collegiality, then, implies decentralization.

Faculty members as members of university departments orient themselves in important ways to national and international academic communities. This relationship is generally based on the reward of prestige. Thus, the "value" of a given faculty member to his peers will depend on the extent to which he has received recognition from the academic community relevant to his discipline. There are established forums within which such recognition may be sought, learned meetings, scholarly journals, and book publication are the most notable. Such recognition will be endowed to the extent that research outputs are consonant minimally with cognitive rationality and maximally with novelty and critical importance. Recognition will in turn influence an actor's ability to engage in further research since research fund granting agencies are important sectors of academic communities.

There is some connection between evaluation of competence in terms of research and competence in terms of teaching. In general terms the good scholar is often assumed to be a good teacher. More importantly, the researcher whose findings lead him to adopt a critical stance with respect to his social environment is likely to include this perspective within the material he is teaching. In other words he is likely to offer an alternative view to that which is paramount in the society. The critical viewpoint which is valued by one audience, the academic community, may not be so valued by other significant supportive audiences.

If ideally the authority system of a university is collegial, in actuality it is bureaucratic in many of its aspects. Universities are relatively large-scale organizations and are also relatively complex, meaning internally differentiated, organizations. The attempt to coordinate, and implicitly to control, such organizations is to be seen initially in the creation of higher level collegial units. Faculty councils, Senates, etc. which ideally speaking make policy and allocative decisions within the organization. Certain problems arise with respect to these units however. First, because they are committees and depend upon relative consensus they tend to be relatively slow in reaching decisions. Second, because their membership is more inclusive than that of departments it becomes more difficult for them to make decisions with respect to the specialized competences of individual faculty members and also of departments as wholes. Third, rules of membership usually imply

a preponderance of power in such committees for senior members of faculty. Fourth, their members are not specialists in their level of decision making since they typically engage in activities relevant to their own discipline and these are usually more central to the identities of members than are committee activities. For these reasons such collegial units often assume the character of rubber stamps for decisions made by holders of other offices.

The typical response has been to assign decision making authority especially with respect to allocative decisions to a hierarchy of bureaucratic offices, notably, Presidents, Deans, and Department Chairmen/Heads. The incumbents of such roles usually acquire greater decision making skills and greater knowledge than other members of collegial units in virtue of being decision making specialists. Since the decisions they make are primarily allocative, that is they are concerned with material resources and rewards, their decisions have a great deal of effect on what kinds of activity are carried on within a university.

More importantly, it is the incumbent of the uppermost position of this hierarchy, the Presidency or Vice-Chancellorship, who engages in primary interface with significant actors in the environment. The allocation of material resources to the university as a whole depends to a great extent on the ability of this actor to persuade those who control resource allocation in the society that his particular institution, and indeed academic institutions in general are valuable to the society, or, at least serve the interests of the resource allocators.

Those who control resource allocation in the society are likely to be members of political and economic elites. It was suggested above that the interests of those groups with respect to the university lay in the direction of economic growth and equality of opportunity. It therefore becomes necessary for members of the bureaucratic hierarchy to justify activities within the sectors of the university which they control in terms of such ends. They will usually do this in terms of contributory research activity or the production of highly qualified and/or specialized manpower (relevant for growth) or in terms of numbers of students which they can attract and graduate (relevant for equality of opportunity).

It was stated above that the degree of academic autonomy depends, in large measure, on the extent to which bureaucratic authority predominates over collegial authority in university structures. The above constitutes an explication of that relationship, but more importantly, it indicates that the degree of bureaucratic domination can only increase when sources of material support for universities shift toward political and economic units.

In the prototypical university described by Hofstadter and Metzger, while sources of support were sectional, they were not concentrated. The shift toward state support has meant not that support has been provided in a disinterested fashion but rather that the interests to which a response must be made have become singular and specific rather than multifarious and diffuse.

Variant Characteristics in Third World Societies

The third world institutions which I have chosen to analyse were selected partly as a matter of convenience, one I have studied and one is the subject of a recent and similar study. More importantly the selection of institutions in Jamaica and Nigeria offers an important degree of control at the level of dominant values. Jamaica, Nigeria, the United States and Canada were all colonized by Britain and

while settler, indigenous, or slave cultures have differed markedly, there nevertheless remains the fact that general orientations to the world of the rulers of these societies have been similar. This allows an analysis of varying structural conditions while assuming dominant values to remain relatively constant. This might not be the case if, for example, we were comparing China with Mexico.

We can therefore suggest that with respect to higher education the predominant concerns of rulers of the third world societies are similar orientations to economic growth and the development of equality of opportunity to those found in first world societies.³ However, as was mentioned above, universities are also perceived to play an important role with respect to national identity and independence. This role is perceived to be played in two ways. First, the very existence of a national university or university system is symbolic of nationhood. It is an element of international prestige in the same way as a national flag, or anthem, or airline is related to the external image of the society. Second it is an important source of leadership within the society. In the sense of being the zenith of self-expression, creativity, and productive effort, it is viewed as being an important mobilizing force for a national cultural identity. In important ways, then, the responsibility which is assigned to universities in third-world societies is significantly greater.

Let us now examine the position in which the rulers of such societies find themselves. The most overwhelming factor which they must take into account in decision making is scarcity of material resources. To devote such resources to one sector of the society is necessarily to deprive another sector. The central goal in such societies is to develop the economy rapidly so that the society in a material sense "catches up" with more developed countries. This must be achieved with minimum social disruption, particularly the kind of disruption which might upset existing power relationships. Receiving return on investment, or "value of money", becomes all the more important. It therefore becomes imperative that such investment be planned at the outset and its consequences managed as far as is possible. Because, then, of the desire to collapse the economic development process, the desire and the probability of control in the direction of economic benefit to the society of higher education becomes greater. What we therefore expect, and the evidence this author has collected suggests that this is indeed the case, is the manipulation of supporting inputs such that outputs especially in terms of trained manpower change significantly.

The perceived need in third world societies has therefore been for rapid change in systems of higher education to meet these conditions. Typically embryo systems were already present in the societies under examination. In Jamaica, the University College of the West Indies was established in 1949 as an institutionalization of the "best of Britain abroad". It conferred University of London degrees and deferred to the University of London for guidance and standards. Apart from its strong medical faculty, the education it offered was characteristically liberal, humanistic, residential, small in scale, and in general oriented to the set of expectations described above as the "intrinsic value" view of the role of the university. Its teachers were expatriates, usually from Britain, and its students were the sons of the middle class.

In the years since 1960 programmes in engineering, law, social administration, public administration, media arts, librarianship, and tourism and hotel management (and also social sciences) have been or are in the process of being established. A policy of "West Indianization" has been introduced and has successfully

changed the character of lower faculty ranks. The system of student support has expanded rapidly until in 1973 a system of free higher education was introduced. These are clearly moves in the directions suggested above. Let us examine the ways in which these changes have come about.

In 1960 the University College seceded from the University of London. Two important changes were involved. First funds for the support of the University were no longer administered by the Colonial Development and Welfare fund in London but by the Government of the West Indies Federation. In 1962 the W.I.F. disintegrated but common support for U.W.I. was maintained through an established University Grants Commission composed of civil servants from the contributing territories. Second the ultimate decision making body ceased to be the Senate of the University of London. Control passed instead to a newly constituted University Council. The composition of this board is important. While it included the traditional community dignitaries, control lay in the hands of responsible government ministers from the contributing territories. In no sense could Council be said to consist of "amiable and honored rubber stamps" (c.f. Demerath et. al., 1967:43). An examination of the minutes of the Board has shown that it is clearly an initiator and implementer of policy rather than simply a legitimating device. What is apparent then is a clear concentration of power in the hands of politicians both at the level of control of support and at the level of intrusion into the internal decision-making process.

This degree of control is supported by two other important mechanisms both related to the stratification system of the society and its level of economic development. In the same way that a modern economy is embryonic so also is the development of a "modern" stratification system. The disprivileged group is very large and the privileged group is very small. Being a member of the faculty of a university is to be a member of that small privileged group and to be extremely high on economic reward and prestige rankings. Consequently the faculty member is not isolated in an ivory tower situation but an integral part of the establishment in a way that most faculty members are not in Western universities. This fact has two implications. First, it means that their interests lie in the preservation of the status quo - to criticize and to question the social system of the society as a whole is to threaten their own position within it. Second, because being a member of the university is to be privileged, university affairs in their greatest detail become matters of public political concern (see also Van den Berghe, 1973:57-59). So not only must members act in certain ways to maintain their positions, they are constantly scrutinized to ensure that they do so.

The second mechanism with which we shall deal also relates to the size of the privileged group. We have said that this group is small in scale, but we must also remember that the society, in this case Jamaica, which has a population of about two million, is also small in scale. This renders different sectors of the national elite highly visible to one another and also allows for greater communication at face to face levels between them. It is therefore possible for elite members of the polity both to inform members of the university as to their desires and to seek information on the activities of the university. The following responses were typical:

If I need anything from the government I don't have to go through committees, I can just get on the phone to the minister and he'll do the same with me

Department Head

Everyone knows one another here. You don't need formal channels. The University knows what the Government wants and the Government knows what the university wants

Faculty member

There is profound evidence to suggest that in large measure the government is getting what it wants from the University, both in terms of types of programmes offered and of numbers of students entering. The typical strategy is to present a proposal in a board meeting and to establish a committee of academics to suggest ways in which a new programme might be introduced or rules of entry modified. Where such new programmes might be perceived as applied rather than academic the typical response of faculty members is to invoke a clause in the university charter which provides that all university programmes have a sound academic basis and to seek to integrate new programmes with existing programmes. Usually this kind of compromise proves acceptable to all parties. This has meant, generally speaking, that within the institution funds which might otherwise have gone to existing, that is pre-1960 programmes, have been diverted elsewhere.

For those faculty members interviewed by this author in 1973, all without exception expressed the view that the degree of autonomy they enjoyed was relatively high for both teaching and research. This is to say that they perceived no external interference in their scholarly activity. Yet most of those in purely academic disciplines admitted to difficulty in carrying out research in which they were interested in view of a shortage of funds. Also in some departments, particularly natural science departments, they admitted to difficulty in meeting West Indianization criteria and to hiring underqualified candidates by comparison with say United States universities in order to meet those criteria.

So we may suggest here that a degree of academic autonomy persists within certain limitations and these limitations relate to resources. Yet in certain circumstances direct external interference may occur. Let us examine what those circumstances might be. We can initially suggest that external interference is most likely to occur in situations in which the world-views of given faculty members diverge most markedly from powerful members of the society. Those views are not likely to diverge for those faculty members who engage in technical activity, nor for those whose objects of study are purely physical. They are likely to diverge where the objects of study are included within the social organization of the society, or the values which are institutionalized therein. We are also likely to find greater divergences of views where the society is in a state of severe flux.

With the benefit of hindsight, this author can confirm that cases of direct governmental action with respect to faculty members has been directed toward people in the social sciences and that this has occurred during a period when the society has been changing rapidly. Let us examine two of those cases.

The first case is that of the Guyanese economist, Walter Rodney. Rodney was originally a brilliant student at U.W.I. and eventually became a lecturer at the University. Rodney's writings were concerned with black consciousness. He was also an advisor to the Labour government. He apparently lost favour with that Government and particularly with the Minister of Finance when he began teaching in the cane fields and developing a student following in the University. In October 1968, Rodney was refused entry into the island and declared *persona non grata*. There ensued student demonstrations, running battles with troops and police, press censorship and curfews. Apparently the Government offered no other explanation than that Rodney was a subversive.

A similar kind of incident occurred in 1973. A lecturer in political science, Trevor Munroe, and one in economics, John Figueroa, both of whom were viewed as political leftists, saw a degree of common cause with what Van den Berghe (1973) calls the third estate of the University, the maintenance and plant workers. They formed and organized a Trade Union for these workers and the union immediately struck over conditions and pay.⁴ The union closed the university and police were moved in to keep it open. With at the very least the tacit support, if not at the direct suggestion of the government, the University administration suspended and sought to rusticate Munroe and Figueroa. After a long legal battle the two lecturers managed to have the suspension lifted.

The Government defence in cases such as these is typically expressed in the following terms:

The social science members seem to be using their position as a political springboard. They are trying to build up a cadre of people who are their own supporters. It is difficult to handle. It is normal for radical ideas to be expressed but we cannot tolerate political cadres.

Government Official

It must be remembered, however, that backing up this official position are a series of individual and institutional views of the university and of its members, views which are communicated in formal and informal ways to those responsible for policy. These are some examples:

That man Munroe, I'd like to see him strung up by the balls!

Civil Servant

The university is in apparently one bitch of a mess. The problem is in social sciences. The West Indian negro uses slavery as an excuse for distress and cries colonialism as the cause for all problems. This has spread to every faculty.

Managing Director

If you have a group of Beckfords, and Girvans, and Munroes it has disadvantages.⁵ It tends to drive the competent people out. One narrow view is being expressed in the University and no other views are being expressed. The end product therefore has to re-educate themselves (sic) after University. The fortunate ones among them are those that go overseas.

Employers' Group Official

The following pattern appears to be emerging. The Government is content with other privileged groups in the society, by means of its formal decision making powers and its control of financial resources has sought to change the structure of the university such that its end products match more closely the needs of the economy. That the graduates of such programmes and those who teach in them tend to be supportive of the status quo is no accident. Vocational and professional ideologies must of necessity be conformist. This has meant a depletion of resources which might otherwise have been allocated to more traditional disciplines such that research in such disciplines becomes difficult and the scope and effectiveness of teaching has been reduced. At the same time there is consistent pressure on those members of such disciplines who are perceived as threatening both in terms of the non-academic activities in which they engage and of the qualities of the students which they produce.

Conclusion: Implications for the First World.

Differences in social structure between the third world and the first world cannot be overemphasized. The degree and pace of change, the availability of resources, the level of economic production, the degree of equality are all radically different. Yet the problems which decision makers must face both within and with-

out universities with respect to the development of higher education are similar. Dilemmas exist between smallness of scale and largeness of scale, between innovation and conformity, between elitism and mobility, between vocational and professional education and liberal education, even between research and teaching. It has been a central argument of this paper that for those who control material resources the choice is not a genuine one. Their interests specifically lie in the direction of increasing the availability of higher education, in providing for a greater degree of correspondence between the activities in which students engage before they leave university and the roles which they may occupy after graduation, and in research which upgrades the productive capacity of the society.

That this choice has been made at least in Jamaica and probably in much of the rest of the third world has become apparent. Perhaps because the dilemmas have been more pressing, the resources more scarce, the need for change more urgent, the choice has had to be made. In any event, one outcome has been a severe curtailment of academic freedom by comparison with the West.

This is not to say, however, that similar processes are not occurring in the First World. The hiring freezes that members of universities in the United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada are experiencing are not simply the product of demographic changes in potential student populations. Rather, they are also to be seen as the product of growing awareness on the part of the powerful, of decreasing marginal returns on investment in human capital and a perceived need for correspondence or relevance between university and society.

In the final analysis autonomy of academic activity depends upon disinterested support. Such support has never been available, least of all from the state. The best that can be hoped for is a diversity of support sources. Yet as economic power becomes concentrated in progressively fewer hands the possibility for this continues to decrease.

Thus in true academic fashion our arrival coincides with our point of departure. The transfer of economic support from private sources to the state has meant not an increase in the extent to which they are autonomous but an increase in the extent to which they are controlled. Academic freedom is an ideological construct within which members legitimate academic activity. At best such activity is irrelevant to the world beyond the university walls; in most cases it serves to maintain and not to change it. Insofar as academic freedom persists, it would appear to be freedom to maintain, support and conserve.

John Porter (1965:492-493) probably expresses this most clearly:

It is the commitment of most intellectuals to the *status quo* that gives rise to the term "establishment" and brings about a link between intellectuals and other institutional leaders. By definition those intellectuals who are powerful within the ideological system are the traditionalists, the clerisy, the ideologists, the conservatives.

Résumé

L'institutionnalisation de la liberté académique

Une comparaison des différentes façons dont la liberté académique est conçue et réalisée dans divers pays anglophones, développés ou en voie de développement. Une définition du terme, suivie d'une brève analyse historique de la façon dont l'autonomie a été établie dans les sociétés économiquement développées du monde occidental.

Notes

¹An important exception is, of course, R.M. McIver's *Academic Freedom in Our Time* (1967).

²Although this is not to deny the point that economic development has served to benefit specific sections of society more than others. Indeed "national welfare" may be the ideological mask for such sectional interests.

³This argument is supported by evidence from my interviews with Jamaican political leaders.

⁴It is significant that the University and Allied Workers Union was created outside the traditional Jamaican trade union structure which comprises two major general unions each supporting a political party. The political ideology of the UAWU was decidedly to the left of these.

⁵George Beckford and Norman Girvan were Lecturers in the Economics Department.

References

Crook, Rodney K., "Teaching and Learning Sociology" Unpublished, Ottawa: Carleton University. (To be published in D. Forcese and S. Richer (eds.) *Issues in Canadian Society* Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, forthcoming 1975). 1974.

Demerath, Nicholas J., et. al. *Power, Presidents and Professors*, New York: Basic. 1967.

Gross, Edward, "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach", *American Sociological Review* 33 (4): 519-542. 1968.

Hofstadter, Richard and Walter P. Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*, New York: Columbia University Press. 1955.

McIver, Robert M., *Academic Freedom in Our Time*, New York: Gordian Press. 1967.

Parsons, Talcott, "The Academic System: A Sociologist's View", *The Public Interest* (13): 173-197. 1968.

Parsons, Talcott and Gerald M. Platt, "Considerations on the American Academic System", *Minerva* VI (4): 497-523. 1968.

Porter, John, *The Vertical Mosaic*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1965.

Van den Berghe, Pierre L., *Power and Privilege at an African University*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1973.