

The Future and the Past

Some Reflections on Cultural Tradition, Social Change and University Education

G.C. PANDE
Bhopal

The modern use of the word 'culture' is not older than the eighteenth century. A new awareness of non-Western societies highlighted the fact that their mores were quite distinct from those of the West. This awareness has continued to grow during the last two centuries and has been strengthened by the study of anthropology and of the history of civilization. It has gradually become a part of modern awareness that every society has a distinctive tradition of its own which is the product of own history. It is not that such an awareness did not exist in earlier ages or societies. The Egyptians and the Greeks, the Indians and the Greeks, the Indians and the Chinese had no doubt the distinctive character of their own tradition. They, however, regarded only their own tradition to be really cultured or civilized. Other traditions were held to be unredeemable forms of barbarism. The modern point of view as developed in the West is a little more intricate. It too regards only Western culture as really cultured and has had no real doubt about the barbarism of other ages and societies. But it believes that this earlier barbarism has been a stage in the development of modern culture and that non-Western cultures are redeemed if they are modernized or westernized. Modern anthropology, sociology and history have supported the idea that modern western culture represents a kind of universal constant towards which all other traditions must aspire.

This idea was instilled into the Indian mind through the deracinating system of education which the British government established in India in the nineteenth century. Hence modernization with its content largely Western remains a popular slogan in India. It is true that an attempt is often made to distinguish

modernization from westernization and a lip-service is paid to Indian tradition and culture. But then in this context culture is largely interpreted as dance and drama, a sensuous pageant such as is displayed by the Cultural Festival of India. Culture apparently is not the values we live by but a matter of taste and liking or advertisement. It is not a matter of knowledge or wisdom, of moral or social values or even of aesthetic standards. In all these matters we seek to follow universal modern forms of science, social justice and individual aesthetic creativity. In effect we follow Western norms in all serious matters. We speak of Indian cultures only when we discuss ancient history or when we seek to promote international tourism or cultural exchanges.

I must confess my utter lack of interest in a culture which is either simply past history or merely a matter of taste or fashion, which the foreigners might like as something exotic. However, that the past is irrelevant in such a context. What we need is to apply past wisdom creatively. Even the scientist and the technologies cannot rest content with their past results. They need to advance their frontiers constantly.

In fact, it has been claimed that this incessant change is the hallmark of the world today and that old traditions and culture are being left behind inexorably. I would like to argue that to meet the challenge of change we need not only the invention of new techniques and symbols, but also an unchanging faith in moral and spiritual values. Since education is the principal process by which culture as well as technology subsist and grow, it is necessary to so orient education that it can communicate values and at the same time encourage criticism and innovation. Creativity does not contradict tradition but develops it. The education which is needed for the maintenance of Indian culture is not a specialization in the history of Indian culture but of the whole gamut of education.

Now the question is whether Indian culture has any serious contemporary relevance, does it provide any guidance in solving our problems today? In seeking to answer this I would like to point to two things. Thus, although, most governments and individuals have always had a concern with the immediate future, the current development of what has been called futurology seeks to foresee and shape the historic future of mankind. The point which I would like to make as a humble student of history is that while it may be possible to foresee in a limited manner certain trends in specific areas in the future, it is not possible to foresee the historic future

of mankind. Let me begin by defining that historic future is that ensemble of the general conditions of human life and thought which would succeed the historic present, that is, our contemporary age which must remain for us an all defined span of time. How our own age will change and be replaced by another, I am afraid, cannot be foreseen in any rational manner. The reasons for this are manifold. For one, the content and direction of the future growth of knowledge cannot be foreseen. Nor, indeed, being in the midst of the basic conflicts of our age can we foresee how they would end. Nor, indeed, is it possible to predict the outcome of man's struggle with his environment in our age. Until now, all past ages have had a limited run and the succeeding ages have shown new and unpredicted futures. In fact, the more rapid the change in knowledge and technology has been the more rapid and unpredictable has been the historic change from epoch to epoch. The age of food gathering, thus lasted much longer than the predominantly agrarian age, which has already given place to an industrial age in many parts of the globe. We can thus be certain that our age will pass and a future supervene which we would not be able to visualize. What futurological thinking is able to do is to visualize the future as the continuation and development of the present, as its endless fulfillment. Whether one turns to the Indian Education Commission's Report (1964-6) or the Report of the International Commission on Education (1971-2) one is amazed at their optimism and faith. They believe that in science and technology man has at last discovered the key to perpetual progress. This, in fact, constitutes the basic philosophy of history, characteristic of our age, and it is within the framework of this philosophy that much futuristic thinking lies.

It is true that some contemporary thinkers have pointed out that the present trend of development threatens to exhaust the non-renewable sources of energy and pollute the atmosphere. We must remember that no ready-made solutions can possibly exist for new and emergent problems. For example, that population is tending to outstrip natural resources or that the non-replenishable resources of nature are facing danger of being exhausted, or that environmental pollution is becoming a grave danger, or that nuclear weapons pose a threat to the very survival of human life – all these and similar problems are wholly new problems which were not faced in the past. Demographic and economic statistics have developed to a point where it is easy to visualize certain tendencies

over, say, the next two decades. At the same time the infusion of rational foresight in the working of most governments today in the form of planning. The present civilization, thus, is likely to suffer from the same malady which destroyed some earlier ones, viz. the exhaustion of available sources. It is true that the historical perception of the present age makes it acutely aware of the difficulties which it is likely to face in the future but the paradox of historical perception lies in its failure to perceive that future difficulties may not be resolved in the same manner in which the difficulties of the past have been. Whether we shall be able in time to replace oil by a new source of energy which will be at once abundant and cheap, remains a moot question.

It may, however, be said that we are concerned not with a remote future lying beyond our age but with our own future, i.e. with the future possibilities of our own civilization. This is certainly a valid type of enquiry but it has clearly two distinguishable dimensions. One is the consideration of factual trends such as of changes in population and production. The other dimension relates to the trend in ideas and opinions, tastes and fashions. As far as this second dimension is concerned, forecasting is likely to have a self-negating effect. But more important than this is the fact that with respect to the future we can hardly remain merely disinterested spectators of ideas and tastes. We cannot afford not to evaluate the ideas which are moving us today and likely to effect our future. In fact, the most important part of our concern with the future must be not with the 'facts' of the future which do not exist and cannot be visualized except in fragmentary and highly ambiguous ways but with what we would like our future to be, what we would in any case like to work for. The vision of the future is an essential part of present striving but it is not a prevision of future. It is simply an ideal which moves us. In this sense the concern with the future is not a matter of historical prediction. It is simply an exploration of the ways and means to realize contemporary ideas. The inevitable tension between ideals, and the gap between ends and means make such an exploration useful as well as necessary. That we should think of this enterprise not as an examination of values in a timeless context but as the examination of opinions conceived as historical realities is merely a consequence of the widespread positivist outlook which tends to look upon ideas and values as merely socio-historical realities except when they are scientific representations of nature. I would suggest, therefore, that thinking about culture

and education in the context of the future ought to dispassionately formulate the ideals of the present as the living past and examine the feasibility and strategy of their realization without merely drifting into the current produced by contemporary pressures and tensions.

I. INTERACTION BETWEEN SOCIETY AND HIGHER EDUCATION: LANGUAGE TEACHING AS A MODEL

It is common to think of society as an objective system which may be defined as a dynamic equilibrium of forces seeking to satisfy common and regular needs through the directed and controlled interaction of man and his environment. We may thus conceive of education as the creation and transmission of knowledge, values, norms and skills, all of which are required for social direction and control. Education thus not only reflects the social process but also constitutes its creative and critical aspects. Within the educational system higher education centred in the universities may be characterized by its emphasis on the learning of fundamental theoretical principles leading to the capacity for original work as well as the attainment of professional standards. Thus defined educational and social change have obviously a dialectical interdependence. In past ages the role of education was conceived as one of maintaining social continuity. The social order itself was conceived as perennial, and the common task of the educator and ruler was to maintain it against the forces of chaos. This was the situation traditionally in India or China or Mediaeval Europe where the educational system was given a central importance and the class of educators was considered in many ways as the most honoured class in society. We can illustrate this for India by taking up the paradigmatic case of language teaching. Language is not merely the complete symbolism but the most pervasive tool of social activity. While it has its grass roots among the folk, it is standardized by the elite. Subject to continuous temporal, spatial and functional variation, language still seems to maintain its fundamental form. The Indian tradition developed the science of linguistic form or grammar to an extraordinary extent and although it recognized the descriptive character of grammar it was inclined to treat it as prescriptive in the context of teaching. The same attitude was adopted to social rules and laws collectively called *dharma*. The result was a remarkable continuity ensured by classical language teaching.

The nineteenth century introduced the notions of society and

language as the products of historical evolution and tended to regard it right that these should change. The principle of natural selection appeared to justify the conquering colonial order. Instead of maintaining the traditional social order, the state now sought to change it by legislation. *Pari Passu* the teaching of classical languages with their reverence for fixed and unalterable forms and standard was increasingly replaced by the teaching of living languages and dialects of which even the grammar had not then been formulated. When the model of classical language teaching with its emphasis on fixed standards and traditional forms was replaced by that of modern language teaching which emphasized empirical flexibility and spontaneity, it might have been expected that the notion of conservative and elitist society would be replaced by that of a progressive and democratic society. The transition was, however, impeded by the fact that the model of language teaching in India tended to become simultaneously a model of foreign language teaching. A foreign language is like a social language in its appeal to an authority beyond the spontaneity of the learner. In India, thus while the nineteenth century popularized the notions of historical evolution and progress, national identity and democracy, the educational model of learning a foreign language continued to emphasize authoritarianism and elitism. Inconsistently enough while such an educational system tended to strengthen colonial rule and create increasing deracination it inculcated at the same time the ideals of liberty and national self-determination. While increasing the gap between the people and the educated bureaucratic elite, it yet tended to encourage popular ambition by inculcating the abstract idea of the people as the ultimate source of worth. The contradiction between liberal British ideals and imperialistic colonial practice was paralleled by the contradiction between the modernizing orientation and the imitative and foreign idiom of the educational system. By the time of Indian Independence in 1947, this contradictory education had worked for nearly a century and produced a still continuing destabilization. The educated and ruling elite in 1947 was the product of a western style education which imitated current western ideas and sought to implement them under the compendious rubric of 'modernization'. A series of Five Year Plans have sought to speed up economic development through industrialization and concomitantly propounded scientific and technical education. Along with these measures was taken a series of other measures

seeking to abolish all vestiges of feudalism and the iniquities of the caste-system. During the Nehru Era, thus, India stood firmly committed to scientific and technical education, industrial development and social equality. This programme, it was obvious, must fight a tremendous backlog of illiteracy, poverty and inequality.

The linguistic model for this educational and social situation is as interesting as it is revealing. According to the Three Languages Formula as actually practiced, primary education is universally conducted in the mother tongue or regional language except in the English medium schools which are favoured by the elite. At the secondary level the mother tongue is supplemented by a smattering of Hindi and English. At the University level the student is expected to use English at least as a library language though in practice only a small number acquire much proficiency in English while the majority are increasingly drifting away from any real knowledge of it. More serious than the deficiency of English at the University level is the deficiency of the mother tongue which most students cannot use spontaneously or creatively as a medium of abstract thought or theory. This is largely due to the continuing prestige of the foreign language with which the students keep struggling at an age when alone the formation and creative transformation of new concepts could take place in the psyche. Even the text books in the mother tongue tend to create an artificial idiom imitated from English originals with the result that concepts acquired through them never wholly shed their opaqueness. The situation is made worse by a pragmatic outlook which devalues the subtleties and native structures of ordinary language and proclaims the sufficiency of the sign language of science and technology. This attitude imports English technical terms wholesale into Indian language and creates a highly cumbersome symbolic tool which lacks inner cohesion and the capacity of spontaneous development. The current system of higher education in India is most tellingly symbolized by this mixture of languages and idioms. The top of the system using a foreign language is joined to the international world of ideas while the roots lie in the soil with its innumerable dialects and innumerable traditions. Between the two ends no adequate organic connections have been built as yet. The development of grassroot democracy with its local, pragmatic leadership and the simultaneous waning of the old style highly cultured national leadership tend to bring the inner tensions of the system into sharp relief and accentuate them. The virtual

exclusion of classical languages from the new Educational policy threatens an unprecedented age of cultural illiteracy.

II. SOCIAL CHANGE AND INDIAN UNIVERSITIES: TRENDS AND PROSPECTS

The most important trend which India shares with the rest of the world is the trend towards social levelling. Education has hitherto been the privilege of the upper classes and its restriction to them has served to perpetuate the distinction between the upper and lower classes. In the old Indian tradition it was sacred learning which was deemed the privilege of the Brahmanas but there were no deliberate restrictions on vocational learning which was essentially practical being acquired through apprenticeship in guilds. Gradually, however, the guilds hardened into subcastes and were placed low in the social hierarchy. When the colonial system of education was established in the nineteenth century it effectively destroyed village institutions of primary learning. At the same time colonial exploitation destroyed handicrafts and introduced new elements of feudalism while strengthening old ones. The result was that during the mid-nineteenth century illiteracy perhaps increased in the vast rural population of India in which the proportion of the landless certainly increased. It is only in the towns which multiplied, that the new system of education catered to the demand for learning without the restrictions of any caste system. In practice, however, it is only the upper castes and classes which took advantage of the new schools and the only purpose which the system served was to help the recruitment of a loyal class of Indian officials.

The first universities in India in the nineteenth century were modelled on the London University and essentially examining Boards while the actual task of teaching devolved on far flung colleges with omnibus teachers and authoritarian principals. This was a complete departure from the traditional system which did not believe in formal examinations and diplomas. In the traditional system of higher education students from different parts of the country sought instruction from famous teachers who were always specialists and were generally supported by local patrons including the local rulers. The new system was completely different. It rested on the grant of diplomas on authority of the state. Since then examinations and diplomas have plagued the Indian universities.

In the old system higher education was inexpensive and often subsidized by charities. The new system has become increasingly expensive and dependent like medical colleges or technological institutes is so expensive that is clearly beyond the means of the poorer class. Although the present day universities in India seek to fight caste and class distinctions on an ideological level, their real benefits are available only to those who come from relatively well-to-do classes.

It is true that as a remedy for this, various measures have been initiated such as financial support in diverse ways to those who come from the lower castes and tribes or have given evidence of scholastic promise. The trouble, however, is that those who have come from the poorest sections find it difficult to make it to the university. Their initial handicaps prevent them from acquiring the kind of linguistic competence and general awareness without which they stand hardly any chance of attaining the standard required for admission to the universities. The result is a growing demand for lowering the requirements for admission to the universities. The worst sufferers from this pressure are the Departments of Humanities which cannot plead for the restriction of admission on the ground of non-availability of adequate laboratory fittings. But then the students who are admitted to those departments come out of the universities without qualifying for any jobs which are generally available to science and commerce graduates alone.

The most potent factor working for egalitarian social change in India today is undoubtedly the inbuilt tendency of a democratic structure of government. The representatives of the people are drawn from all castes and classes, and exert a mounting pressure to make education available to all without distinction. Since, in India, almost all jobs requiring education also seem to require graduation, the right to education is popularly conceived not as the right to elementary education but as the right to job giving education. This necessarily includes university education, which however is not sufficient to ensure jobs. The net result is that except for professional courses in medicine, technology and management or highly specialized courses in science, it is increasingly difficult to restrict admissions to the universities and colleges on grounds of mere scholastic suitability. There is a constant tendency to expand admission to the universities beyond the level justified by their resources and indeed to open far more colleges and universities

much beyond the resources which the current budgetary allocations make available to the state government or the Central University Grants Commission. As a result the search for social equality tends to produce a lowering of quality in most universities and colleges subject to local pressures.

This ironic situation arises from the fact that the model of university education accepted in a developing country like India is that of the industrially developed countries. The cost of providing education of this kind to the fast rising and demanding population of India requires expenditure on an unattainable scale. Thirty years ago the Chairman of the U.G.C. estimated that the starting of a residential university required a minimum of 20 million rupees and from this he concluded that it would be better to concentrate on opening new colleges. The U.G.C. has subsequently reiterated that now universities should not be started improvidently. And yet such efforts to restrict the expansion of higher education are constantly disregarded by the state governments under political pressure necessarily arising from the development of democratic forces.

The remedies suggested and partially adopted for this tragic impasse are to encourage self-study or through correspondence. But these methods are not permitted for the areas most sought after viz., the study of professional or scientific courses, where they are permitted at all, advantage is taken by those who are already in employment and seek to improve their prospects. Thus the pressure from those who seek admission to the universities in order to qualify for jobs remains unaffected. Besides, correspondence courses are much more expensive than regular collegiate courses and do not contain any provisions for exemptions of fees etc. Their quality too does not seem to recommend them and that again is because the universities are unable to spend as much on organizing correspondence studies as they would have to if they sought to attain high standards in them.

The result is that not only does a large and growing demand for higher education remain unsatisfied, even of those who are enabled to enter the portals of universities more than half fail to come out successfully. And even of those succeed, only a small proportion gets degrees which are likely to qualify them for suitable jobs. This situation breeds despair and a widespread indiscipline. Within the accepted model of university education this situation can be remedied only by the acceleration of economic development.

This brings us to second major trend of social change which India shares with the rest of the world and that is the continuous process of economic change consequent on a continuing scientific and technological revolution which is world-wide and of which the pace continues to gain in acceleration. It has been computed that the quantum of scientific knowledge tends to double itself every decade and that the time lag between scientific discovery and its technological application continues to become narrower and narrower. At the same time the dissemination of knowledge is becoming easier, more rapid and global. In the developed countries, thus, educational and techno-economic growth are mutually dependent and run parallel at an accelerating pace. It is natural, therefore, that developing countries like India should seek to inaugurate and promote this independent developmental process. In an accelerating process, however, the pace depends on the time the process has been on. India being a late starter has to reckon with a relatively slow pace of development. The growth of population tends to further diminish the net result of the process.

Let me illustrate some results of this situation on the quality of university life in India. If we take the older universities, especially of the Hindi speaking states which are the largest and the most populous, we find that during the last few decades they have been struggling with increased enrolments and paucity of funds. The policy of the state governments to make the study of English wholly optional at the secondary stage in the states also has added to the academic difficulties of the universities. The disparity between the material facilities which the students expect from the universities and what they are actually able to provide them leads to agitations. On the other hand, some of the newer universities and colleges in state capitals or metropolitan centers which are relatively better financed have managed to improve their earlier and humbler conditions. Then again, there are some new universities and colleges in outlying areas which have never had the material resources to fully harness and utilize their human potential.

From these illustrations it would seem that there is a simple and direct correlation between the financial resources and the academic attainment of the universities. This, however, is largely though not wholly true. To a large extent a university with better resources is able to attract a better faculty and students and is able to retain its own best products whereas if a university falls into poverty it tends to be deserted. This at least seems to be the general rule in our

country. But in this context the exceptions have a great significance. Institutions like the Gujrat Vidya Peeth, imbued with high idealism, functioned in an excellent manner till their staffs and students began to be effected by the prevailing search for affluence.

III. THE EVALUATION OF CHANGE AND VISUALIZING THE FUTURE

It may be tempting to conclude that if the current vogue of economism were to continue and grow in India and her universities were to retain their present model, their condition is not likely to show much improvement in the foreseeable future. It may be objected that we already have a number of excellent centers of specialized teaching and research which have hardly any dearth of funds. Such are, for example, the Institutes of Technology or the post-graduate institutes of medical study or the Agricultural universities or the several institutes of specialized scientific research and laboratories. We also have a few relatively affluent central or national universities and, finally, a number of advanced centers of study in different universities which are specially assisted by the U.G.C. Then again, it may be said that the teaching of science has been improving generally in most universities through the efforts of the U.G.C. and that progress in all these directions may be expected to grow. It may be argued that in a country like India this pattern comprising a variety of standards for different types of institutions is inevitable. Small colleges in remote rural areas, new universities in district areas coordinating the efforts of such colleges and creating a few pace-setting centers, larger and older universities in important towns, especially the state capitals, central or national universities in metropolitan towns, specialized national institutions of research – these would constitute a kind of hierarchy and illustrate different standards. Such is the trend at present and is likely to continue in the future. What is more, the difference between the different rungs of hierarchy are not likely to increase since a basic parity of salary scales has been adopted at the national level for all colleges and universities. We may expect the overall conditions to improve although the diversity of standards will remain.

This version of the future is unimpeachable factually but it rests on a wrong conception of what constitutes a university. It assumes that a university is the same thing as an institute of scientific research, pure or applied. If, on the other hand, the university is conceived as a place where the central values of a social tradition

are critically apprehended and creatively formulated, it would be obvious that the university could not then be a centre of more specialization, specially of the natural sciences, which are often studied in a value neutral manner. Even the inculcation of a scientific outlook which enquires rationally and relies on experimental verification is hardly adequate to the development of the total man. Even the realm of cognitive enterprise extends far beyond the methods and attitudes of experimental or mathematical sciences. And apart from cognitive values the realms of aesthetic, moral and religious values being integral to the conception of an educated man, must be included within the ambit of that wider enquiry which should be held to define a university. Knowledge must be relevant to the discovery of the meaning of life as a whole and in this sense must be a seamless garment. The acquisition of piecemeal proficiency, which is characteristic of pedestrian scientific research, may be necessary for training in the use of empirical reason and even more necessary for meeting the requirements of an industrial society. It does not thereby constitute the sufficient or major task of a university. That task must begin with a sound general education which introduces one to the perennial values and wisdom enshrined in the human tradition. From this point of view the much despised undergraduate colleges and the departments teaching the classics and humanities, fine arts and social sciences are at least as important as the specialized institutes of research for it is at least as important for a man to be enlightened as it is for him to have the skill to help the growth of affluence. He must not only acquire the language of mathematics and the sciences, but also the language of the heart expressing feelings and intuitions.

What is more, from the point of view of a democratic society is the standard of education attained in the rural college and the district university which is of the real moment. Institutions for high grade specialization affect only a few persons. Their utility is not in question. But education is not merely a matter of utility or the techno-economic development of society. It is leading each and every citizen to a sense of his own humanity. Primary and secondary education would not succeed in this if the universities were not to concern themselves seriously and critically with the human tradition of self-consciousness.

The future which our educational policy and practice actually visualize today is one of economic development and social equality

in which education is required to assist as a prime instrument of social change. Beginning with literacy at the primary level and running through general scientific education, inculcation of a secularizing and modernizing and social outlook and vocational training at the secondary level to high level scientific and technological learning and research in the universities and institutions, these constitute the different moments of the new educational ladder. About the actual future of this programme, it seems to me futile to speculate because it will obviously depend on the orientation and distribution of economic resources which may optimistically keep moving towards the distant horizon of a democratic and affluent society. It is the underlying assumptions and ideas of this reaching out for the future which merits serious discussion. That traditional institutions and culture are merely passive hindrances, that scientific knowledge constitutes the pragmatic case of knowledge, that an ever-increasing material standard of living and an ever-increasing concern with it represent prime values, that not only is humanity changing fast but that such a process is inevitable and welcome, and that education should prepare a man for change and help to bring it about, all these assumptions really need critical examination, unless we were to succumb to the organized power of industry and business, the technical professions and the politicians who find nothing more calculated to win votes than the promise of affluence. To propose an enquiry into such assumptions is not to propose a historical volta-face, a return to lost times. As felt by Rousseau, while man has been corrupted by civilization the future of man lies not in a return to the past, but in a new and real education of the human heart. The greatest Indian of the present century, Mahatma Gandhi, felt the same. Education should undoubtedly prepare man for livelihood but it should also prepare him for worthy living. The removal of poverty and inequality in mankind in general conceived as service is, doubtless, a morally elevating task but it gets vitiated if one's attitude becomes that of economism of a egoistic gratification. Moral worth belongs to giving, not to possessing and consuming.

Should the universities be conceived entirely as factories of specialized knowledge demanded by an industrial society or as centres of critical reflection over the whole of social experience, past as well as present? Is scientific humanism so adequate a philosophy that the very structure of the universities should be

built on its foundations? Surely man does not live by bread alone. Nor does he live by positive knowledge alone. Man inevitably seeks a value which transcends his own transience. Is it fair to tell him that this value lies in a future historical epoch, that what man cannot realize as an experiencing individual is somehow approximated in history by humanity in a go-up in terms of its general conditions of existence? Doubtless each man must serve humanity, but the service of humanity does not constitute a sufficient faith for man who must also know what he really is. And no university would deserve to be called so unless it could help in the most fundamental of all enquiries, the enquiry into human nature as a self-consciousness. It is only a *philosophia perennis* which can reveal the unity of mankind, not the exchange of goods, knowhow or military hardware. What is more, the awareness of a moral order requires a sense of permanence and is endangered by rapid social change. I am afraid that we must guard against an excessive preoccupation with the virtues of social change and its means, the sciences of nature or even of society conceived on the analogy of nature and in the spirit of value neutrality. We must at least allow the fundamental questions to be raised by each individual entering the universities, leaving him free to choose his answer. I am afraid that the dependence of a university on the state or on industry and business for its financing tends to curb such freedom of enquiry but I am not sure what practical, viable alternatives there are in the present situation unless we can somehow move away in highly organized and costly institutions built from utilitarian or ideological motivations. We have somehow to move towards a situation where educators as well as learners can act as free individuals seeking enlightenment and not merely livelihood or honours from the state.