

A Fresh Pattern of Higher Education

Dr. I. Michael

Two years ago, at the informal opening of the University of Malawi, one of our guests was Walter Adams, and a short time afterwards our first public lecture was given by Professor Craig. I am delighted to be here again and to be given this opportunity to reciprocate, in a small way, the goodwill from which we benefited so much in those far-off days. Our two universities are, of course, neighbours; but what is of much greater significance is our membership of that community of scholars which is world-wide in extent and eight hundred years old in time. Good relations between our two institutions mean a great deal in immediate human terms, but the fundamental support we can give to each other is more powerfully derived from the traditions of the Universities of Paris, Oxford, Salamanca, Wisconsin, Coimbra, St. Andrews, Cape Town, Allahabad, Birmingham, Bonn, and nine hundred and ninety others.

The University of Malawi has one distinctive, and, I believe, unique, feature: it is responsible for all the post-secondary full-time education of the country. It is composed of five colleges offering three-year courses, from School Certificate, leading to a diploma, and four or five year courses leading to an ordinary degree. All these courses are under the academic authority of Senate; all the students on them are university students; all the staff appointed to teach these courses are university staff; the degrees and diplomas are awarded by the university. All the students, at their own request, have gowns, which they seldom wear. At the moment there are 465 students on

diploma courses, 250 on degree courses, 5 on a post-graduate diploma course, and 2 research students. What can one make of an institution, however young, which claims to be a university when less than a half of its students are working on degree courses? Is such an institution wise? Is it honest? Is it—and this is an even more disturbing question—is it respectable?

We have taken the view that what is of fundamental importance is not the *level* of work so much as the *standard*. We hope that our students will be scholars in the sense that they should have a life-long questioning interest in ideas; that they should have analytical skill but should be aware also of the limitations of purely intellectual processes; that they should have imagination, ingenuity, inventiveness, insight, hunch, flair and dash. And so on, through the scholarly virtues. This is not to say, of course, that they can dispense with knowledge. But one of our biggest questions is: what level of knowledge and skill is needed by Malawi at this stage of its development? Let me run the risk of horrifying you by saying that we have embraced the younger sister of utilitarianism. The nature of the relationship, and the warmth of the embrace, may be illustrated by an experience of my own. Many years ago I was seeing home a girl of very good judgment. We stood outside her front door, in a porch darkened by wistaria and patchily illuminated by a young moon. "Darling", I said to her, "you look lovely". I then added, with academic caution, the words ". . . in this light". It is perhaps unnecessary to add that at this time I had not met

my wife. I must admit that to embrace utilitarianism, even cautiously, sometimes makes the pulse beat faster with apprehension. A few days ago I read in the draft syllabus for one of our diploma courses the following:

Introduction to slaughter houses and slaughter practice, and full-time meat inspection practice is provided at the Cold Storage Commission abattoir under arrangements made with the (government) Department of Veterinary Services. Well? Is public hygiene important in a poor overcrowded tropical community? Is the wise enforcement of regulations to promote public hygiene an important and skilled job? Does the education of those who will become inspectors, responsible for framing and enforcing appropriate regulations wisely, require an understanding of biological and sociological ideas? Should this education contain practical work and some first hand acquaintance with conditions in the field?

I turn to the syllabus for the B.Sc. Honours course in Agriculture of the University of Leeds, and I read:

An introduction to the anatomy and physiology of farm animals, including the practical applications of physiological research; pathological processes in farm animals; the recognition of health and a consideration of common disease and their control.

The knowledge required for the constructive inspection of meat is less than, but not essentially different from, the knowledge required for the constructive consideration of pathological processes in farm animals.

I turn, again, to the prospectus of the Research School of Physical Science in the National University of Australia, Canberra:

An electroprobe X-ray microanalyser has been installed. An A.E.I. spark source mass spectrograph is in use for studying trace elements.

The knowledge required for interpreting the behaviour of these splendid implements is, presumably, hard to attain, but the range and importance of the relevant ideas is not *necessarily* greater, by strictly academic criteria, than the range of ideas relevant to a concern for the diseases of beef-cattle or for the promotion of public hygiene. But in case I seem to be proving too much, let me say emphatically of the student of public health inspection (as of the student of mass spectro-

graphy) that unless he is pursuing *ideas* he has no place in a university.

The University of Malawi is committed to being useful. I will not go over again the familiar manpower arguments; the danger of unemployed arts graduates; the need for technicians rather than engineers; the importance of the middle levels of skilled manpower. These arguments are not in question. All we have done is to take the platitudes seriously, and to act on them in the belief that by bringing this *level* of education into the university, and by associating it with the *standards* of scholarship, its usefulness is increased. Where, you may ask, does this process stop?

If you once grant that scholarly standards can be applied at any educational level is there any reason why the university should not take over the secondary schools, the primary schools, the government itself? Is our policy not discredited by the argument *ad absurdum*? No. In a rapidly developing country the work of the technician—in engineering, agriculture, accountancy, public health—will change so much during his lifetime that if he receives only a highly specific training for what is needed in 1969 he will be unable to see, far less to meet, the greatly different needs of 1989—when he still has fifteen or twenty years of work ahead of him. It is agreed that the technician must be adaptable, imaginative, responsive to social and economic change, able to learn new knowledge and acquire new skills. It is this concern for adaptability which distinguishes the education of the technician from the training of the artisan. The former is an honourable and difficult task for any university to perform; the latter is outside a university's scope, not because it is at a "lower" level but because the training of artisans is not primarily concerned with ideas. But, it may be argued, is not the education of school children concerned with ideas? Are we not committed by this argument to making the school a kind of university, or the university a kind of school? To make schools more like universities is an attractive thought—dangerously attractive. However, the defining qualities of a university include not only the pursuit of ideas but also maturity of the individual and of the institution. One great difficulty which the senior pupils in African secondary schools share with British Sixth Formers is that though they are mature as individuals they are members of a

necessarily immature community. By including the education of technicians within the university we are not, therefore, drawing a line at a point marked only by expediency. Malawi needs technicians in greater numbers than it needs graduates; technicians need education of the same *quality* as graduates; the university is trying to provide it. It is far too soon to say yet how successful we are being. But unless we include the diploma courses and their students fully and wholeheartedly into the university we cannot possibly succeed. This is a new pattern of higher education.

There are five colleges. Four of them were built or planned by government and were legally incorporated within the university on the first of January this year. The fifth, Chancellor College, which teaches only at degree level, was opened in October 1965 as a result of the government's decision to start a University. Bunda College of Agriculture, two hundred miles north of Blantyre, runs a three-year diploma course in Agriculture, with an enrolment of 180 students, men and women. A small number of students will follow a five-year degree course in agriculture, the first three years of which will be at Chancellor and the last two at Bunda. Bunda is not far from the government agricultural research station at Chitedze, and with their co-operation, we hope to develop a modest programme of research at Bunda. Soche Hill, in Blantyre, is a college of Education, with a three year course for intending secondary teachers, closely linked through the Professor of Education with the Education course followed by intending teachers at Chancellor College. The present enrolment at Soche Hill is 120, to be increased. The Polytechnic, in Blantyre, offers diploma courses in Engineering, Business Studies, Public Health Inspection and, jointly with Soche Hill College, Technical Teaching. The college also runs non-University courses (short, part-time or sandwich) for apprentices, clerks, typists, laboratory technicians.

The enrolment of university students in the Polytechnic is at present 260 and will soon rise to about 350. The fourth college, just outside Blantyre, is the Institute of Public Administration, which offers a three-year diploma course and a one-year post-graduate course, in public administration. Next year it will also offer, to a restricted number of students, a five-year degree course in Law, the

first two years to be spent at Chancellor College, the last three at the Institute. The enrolment at the Institute is at present 40, increasing to 60. The premises, and some of the staff, are temporarily shared with the Staff Training College, a government institution which provides short courses for officers of the central and local government. Chancellor College, at present in Blantyre, runs degree courses in arts, social science and physical and biological science. These are four year courses, with a fifth year to be added for honours as we have the resources.

In their first year students have to take four subjects, one of which must be English and one either mathematics or a science. You will not, I hope, take it as a pointed remark if I say that we study Geography, and treat it as a science. In their second year the degree students again take four subjects; in the third their time is divided into five units, distributed in various combinations among two or three subjects. In the fourth year the time is divided into four units distributed among three or two (and exceptionally one) subjects. The courses are very much what you would expect; the two principal novelties, in name, being a first year course called "Development and Change", and a second year course required for all intending teachers, in "Human Behaviour". This is a synthesis of certain aspects of Psychology, Sociology, and Philosophy, and may be continued by those who are not taking Education, during years three and four. We have not yet introduced a degree course in which I am (quite seriously) particularly interested—"Symbols". It seems an admirably interdisciplinary course, of real breadth and rigour. To study the symbolism of mathematics and of natural language, aesthetic symbolism in drama and the arts, and symbolic behaviour in one's own and in other cultures, would ensure a broad, if perhaps protracted, education. One result of the speed with which we have had to start is that we have not been as adventurous in designing the curriculum as we should have been. But curriculum reform is a profound and circular operation. The map of knowledge must first of all be redrawn and the concept of a subject thought out afresh in relation to a particular educational purpose. Teachers must then be able to withdraw for some years and study, co-operatively, the newly defined subjects. The whole operation, for one university, might cost as much as an aeroplane.

We are bold enough, as you probably know, to award our own diplomas and degrees. The decision to stand alone, although perhaps conceited, was taken purely on educational grounds. But there is a proper concern, amongst students, school pupils and the general public, that our awards should be of a good standard. The one question I am always asked is, "How do we know that our degree is going to be worth having?" Part of our answer is in a system of academic consultants. We ask academics with whom we have some personal connection, or who are known to have an interest in a situation such as ours, to act as consultants for the different degree and diploma courses. These consultants, from established universities, see syllabuses from the early stages of preparation, and help in the recruitment of staff; they are usually able to visit us by one means or another, and they meet students and staff, see our physical resources, and teach a little if they are with us for long enough. We are at present discussing, prompted by our North American staff, whether we need a full-scale system of external examiners as well as our system of consultants.

Closely related to the teaching curriculum is the question of research. I believe that, in principle, good teaching at university level requires (or, at the least, is made better by) regular refreshment from the teacher's own highly specialised work in the subject which he is teaching. But there is a great deal of hypocrisy concealed by the application of this principle. Some research is subsidised self-indulgence, and has no effect whatever on the teaching of either under-graduates or graduates. It continues because no one feels competent to question its value. It might seem, therefore, that we, in a country where every penny is urgently needed in ten different places, should apply the principle of utility with particular strictness to research. So we should, and so we do. But utility, what is useful to Malawi, includes more than economic development. Utilitarianism is not materialism. We teach philosophy as well as agriculture.

Our principal research work at present is an interdisciplinary study of a lake—Lake Chilwa—which is of present and potential economic importance, for its fish, and of great ecological interest, both human and biological. It contains an inhabited island on which there is an unusual

amount of low-level radiation. The lake, which has no outlet, also suffers from unexplained fluctuations in level, and from great salinity. This year there is so little water that fishing has stopped; last year an unknown quantity of fish, certainly more than 10,000 tons, was taken from it. Lake Chilwa raises questions of interest to the biological, social and physical scientists; the attempt to answer the questions can be directly related to under-graduate teaching; the answers are of immediate economic and social importance to the country. We hope to develop similar patterns of inter-disciplinary research in the social sciences, and we do what we can to help individual research even in subjects of no immediate utility.

One feature of the University of Malawi which considerably differs from the customary British pattern is the structure of its academic organisation. It is not possible for a university dependent on public funds to be a self-governing community, but this remains the ideal. Any institution gains strength from the widest possible participation of its members in the development of its policy. The university is small, and will always be so. We mock at its bureaucratic democracy, and it does not yet work very well, but I believe that it is important. Every full-time member of the academic staff, from every college, is by right a member of at least one Subject Board. The Subject Board is where the teaching of a particular subject, both at degree and at diploma level, is discussed in detail. The thirty or so Subject Boards are divided into five Group Boards: Arts; Social Science and Administration; Natural Resources; Science; Technology. Every member of staff, through his membership of a Subject Board, is by right a member of a Group Board. The Group Boards discuss (particularly at this early stage) syllabuses sent up by their constituent Subject Boards, and matters referred to them by Senate, but they can also (and this will become an increasingly important part of their work) initiate discussion on any aspect of university life. It is here that all members of staff (if they wish to) may influence, as well as understand, university policy. Each Group Board elects four members to Senate, which is composed, about equally, of elected and ex-officio members, the latter being the professors and the five principals of the colleges. The system is, of course, encompassed by the usual earthworks: committees for this and that; and it will certainly

need modification as we develop. At present the greatest threat to it is the two hundred miles which separate the agricultural college from the others, and the structure was designed in the expectation that we would have a telecommunication system whereby Group Boards and committees (but not Senate) might meet without having to travel: some members at Bunda, some in Zomba, some in Blantyre. The committee rooms will be fitted with individual microphones and ear pieces, but not with vision. We hope to have the system working within a year, and we look forward to developing new techniques of committee procedure. Our technical people hold out the hope that it may be possible, by processes I do not understand, literally to galvanise if not a whole committee, at least some of its more ironic members.

I have tried so far to keep fairly well to the path I was asked to follow: to give an impression of the University of Malawi and of its midly experimental character. I would like now to touch on, more personally, three aspects of the university's development: first, one particular circumstance (experienced by some of you here) which affects the very early growth of an institution, and its implications for administration and leadership; secondly, relations with government; thirdly, what it means for a university to be an international institution and at the same time rooted in the culture and loyalties of a developing country in Africa.

Our University was born with speed. I arrived in Malawi in November 1964 and was told that teaching would start, at the latest, by September in the following year. It did. But till then the situation was odd. The Provisional Council had not yet been formed; there was no other member of staff, administrative or academic; decisions had yet to be made even about the length and nature of the undergraduate courses. There were two fixed points. One was the recent report of an international commission which had recommended that the higher education of Malawi should be organised as a university system with an O-level entry. The second fixed point, and a very welcome one, was the secondary school which had been set aside for the university's temporary quarters. In such circumstances it was inevitable that the formative influences on the early development of the university should be highly personal; and they remained highly personal even when, as it soon did, help

came and the number of persons increased to three. Within two and a half years the situation has entirely changed. There is a Provisional Council of fifteen; there are five colleges, each with its own principal; there is a staff of 130, a Senate of forty, fifteen committees, five Group Boards—everything except a pear tree. What now is the proper place of the personal? Should the administrator be faceless? Never. Should administrative procedures be impersonal, but influenced by personal qualities exercised outside the administrative process? Dangerous. Should a Vice-Chancellor be only the perfect chairman, infinitely responsive to the influences which play on him and infinitely skilled in compromise? How dull!

It is in part only an aspect of my own egotism which makes me think that this aspect of university administration is interesting and insufficiently considered. What kind of authority should a Vice-Chancellor exercise? We have yet to frame our statutes, so there is no legal answer: and the legal answer seldom refers to the real authority. I recognise the primary authority of Senate in academic matters: it is the very heart of our ideal wish to be a self-governing community. But my political masters, and the lay members of the University Council, find the authority of Senate strange. They have appointed me to run the University; there must be, they say, a boss with full authority. And this is true. Why then is Senate not subject to my authority? The familiar answer is that the distribution of real power within the university rests on conventions of consent. But these conventions ordinarily lead to division (and sometimes hostility) between academic and administrative staff. Could we not, as a new university, free to shape ourselves, internally, as we please, design a new set of conventions which would distribute administrative responsibility (if not chores) more widely over the whole community?

This is not the time at which to attempt answers to my own questions but I will suggest an outrageous metaphor which may indicate the kind of answer I would hope for.

An essential task for institutional leadership is the reconciliation, in conceptual as well as in practical terms, of those qualities which are necessary for promoting the organisational aspects of administrative efficiency with those qualities which are necessary for promoting its

human aspects. The organisational and the human, contrasted in this way, can be regarded as corresponding to two aspects of reality. From one point of view reality (if I may use undefined shorthand) can be seen as an efficient organisation governed by impersonal laws whose effects can, in principle, be predicted. From another point of view reality can be seen as an organisation whose efficiency can be assessed only when its moral, personal, basis is understood. An essential task for philosophy is the reconciliation, in conceptual as well as in mystical terms, of physical and moral law. The organisational and the human aspects of leadership will be reconciled by the same process, though on a tiny scale, as that by which in time I believe that it will become a demonstrable, scientific fact that it is "love which moves the sun and the other stars". Perfect efficiency is identical with complete harmony.

On my second specific topic, the relations between the university and government, I can say very little in a short time; but the central fact of the situation is clear, and I have not heard it analysed in these terms before. There are in Malawi, and in other newly independent countries, three groups of people particularly involved in the development of the university: first, the politicians; second, the students; third, the university staff. For all these groups a new university is, and creates, an unfamiliar situation, full of potential stress.

The politicians have called the university into existence; they want it. They believe that a university is necessary for the social and material development of the country; they believe that it can express and promote a sense of national identity. They are prepared to put into the university money which is needed also for projects which might bring them greater popularity in the country as a whole. The politicians want the university which they have created, but they do not entirely know what it is that they have created. They do not know, naturally, which conditions are essential for the proper functioning of a university and which are just expressions of European and American cultural tradition; they do not know how to assess the relative importance of the different subjects which could be studied; they do not know (though they may have strong views about) the characteristic pricklinesses of academics and the cultural monsoons which determine the flowering of student attitudes. The politicians need help and

advice from the university (because no one else can give it) on how to make the best use of their expensive creation.

The students, in the early days, are in even greater need of help. They have frequently grotesque illusions about their own status and about the high life led by students in other countries. They know that they are an elite, but they do not know how far their present status is the product of inborn talent, of money, of luck. Still less do they really know how far it can, or should be, maintained after they leave the university. The students need help in understanding what is expected of them; expected by the politicians, by the ordinary people; by the university staff. Most of all they need help in understanding what they should expect of themselves.

The third group, the university staff, are, at first, almost entirely foreigners. I use the word deliberately, rather than "expatriates", because its harshness is appropriate. There is about the term "expatriate" a tone of nostalgic sentimentality, if not outright hypocrisy, which is quite inappropriate when applied to people employed in an independent foreign country. We are well-paid hired men. If we don't give value for money we will be sacked; if we don't like our jobs we will go. What country we come from is unimportant. What is important is that we are foreigners, and that fact is important only because it makes us expensive, and at the same time limits our understanding of, and hence our usefulness to, the country which employs us.

This harsh description of the foreigner's proper and fundamental role is not, of course, the whole picture. One hopes that he also likes and respects the country he is working in; that he sees his work as service, but as service which is responsive always to what the country says it wants: not necessarily to what he thinks it ought to want. I labour this point because it is neglected, in spite of its familiarity. The old colonialist attitudes (whatever they were: they were before my day) are dead; but the newly independent countries are now exposed to what may be called, with Latin courtesy, "insensitive beneficence" or, with Saxon bluntness, "pig-headed dogoodery". If we think of ourselves as foreigners rather than as expatriates, we can give Malawi more honest service.

At the moment eleven per cent of the university

staff are Malawians. The rest are foreigners. We too need help in order to carry out our work. However varied our experience may be of universities in other parts of the world, and in other African countries, it is the University of Malawi we are helping to make, and this should be not a British university, nor an American one; not even an African university (if there were such a thing), but a university which meets the present needs of Malawi, and is capable of development by our successors in the very different conditions of the next few hundred years. Such a task requires sensitivity, humility, and judgment. We cannot promise to respond to every expression of local opinion, because this might, unintentionally, weaken the essential nature of the university which it is our primary task to establish. We must not be doctrinaire about what a university is or should do. We have, nevertheless, to know what are the essential, defining qualities of a university. That is our task. From the country we need help in embodying these qualities in an acceptable and enduring institution. We, whose roots are not in the country, must see that the university has roots.

Among these three groups: the politicians, the students, and the university staff, there is a pattern of mutual dependence. We have different tasks. We all have to learn. The foreign staff have to learn how to teach in such a way that not only are the essential purposes of a university promoted but at the same time the university is rooted in the country and becomes a principal means of achieving national aspirations. The politicians have to learn how to have, how to use, a university. The students have to learn how to be students and how at the same time to be citizens.

This network of mutual dependence is the central fact about relations between the university and the government. We are still in the first stage, when the fact of this dependence is being understood and is influencing the picture each group has of the other. The next stage, in any country, is the development of a mutual confidence which is strong enough to contain, without mishap, the silly things that students do, the stupid things that academics say, the strange things which politicians think. The bridge from the first stage to the second is always in need of repair: knowledge of what other people are really like. We are trying to bring the politicians into the colleges so that they can talk with staff and students; to take the

students to Young Pioneer and Community Development training centres so that they can see the important work done by their non-academic contemporaries; to encourage schemes of voluntary service so that (amongst other purposes) staff and students are seen to be human and capable of responding to basic human needs. We have also, thanks to foundation help, small sums of money available to help foreign staff, especially those newly arrived, to travel further into the country than they might otherwise do, to visit schools of all kinds, and to see something of the land into which their students' roots are set.

I have used more than once this metaphor of *roots*: my third specific topic. It is, I believe, of even greater importance, and of even greater difficulty, than is commonly supposed. Up to a point the argument is familiar and readily accepted. At first African students had to go to the west for their higher education; they lived for several years in another culture and were in danger of losing touch with their own. Recently higher education has come to almost all African countries and the students can now have their undergraduate courses, at least, in their own countries. But the curriculum is still almost entirely western and the risk of alienation is still great.

It is suggested, by Sir Eric Ashby and others, that things ought not to have happened in this way, and that even now curricula should be severely changed in order to correspond more closely with African cultures and with the economic needs of developing countries. We hope that the fresh pattern which higher education is taking in Malawi meets the last point, but our university is not rooted in African culture, nor has anyone suggested that it should be, or how it could be.

The developing countries want the benefits of technological change, which is an expression of western culture, and they want the education which supports it. And they want it fast. How to relate western culture to local culture has necessarily been, and still remains, a largely unexamined problem. The burden of making adjustments between the two cultures has been carried by individuals: by those who went outside the country for their higher education. There has been no body within the country looking at the social and educational implications of the rapid introduction of western culture. A university is just the body which ought to be able to make such an

examination. But the university is itself a principal agent of westernisation; it has its own acute problems of adjustment.

I hoped, when I came to Malawi, that perhaps we could devise a structure of university organisation which was based on traditional deliberative practices. But this could not have been done, even if it had been an acceptable idea, by a group of newly arrived foreigners. Nevertheless, in so far as African societies have skilled and complex patterns of social organisation—to that extent it is desirable that an African university, as its local staff become more influential, should be ready to localise not only its staff but also its structure. There may come a time when a commission from the University of Oxford visits the University of Malawi to see whether still further improvements may not be made to the Hebdomadal Council in the light of African experience.

Our present preoccupation, in Malawi, is, in its simplest terms, to find ways whereby a predominantly foreign staff can help an entirely African student body, collectively and individually, to gain the western culture they so passionately and (praise be) so critically, desire, without cutting off their roots into their own society. This is not achieved by traditional dancing; it is not primarily a matter of language. To help our students to preserve a particular relationship to their own society—to make this a central aim of the university, is to recognise the fundamentally political, and therefore moral, nature of education.

To say that all education is political is not to say anything at all novel or at all obscure; but it is a view which can be misunderstood, dangerously. What I am saying is that all education is, to varying degrees, *about* man as a member of a community; and most education is conducted *in* communities. The quality of life in a primary school classroom, whether the teacher intends it or not, forms the pupils' attitudes to each other and predisposes them towards certain patterns of behaviour within the class and within the school. It is therefore unavoidably an education in the organisation of a community; it is therefore political; it is therefore

moral. The moment education ceases to be moral it can, and should, be carried out by machines.

Among the moral principles which should be expressed by the quality of life in a university is there one, particularly, which will help our students to reconcile the two communities between which they live? I have been thinking, as some of you will have guessed, of the French teacher of philosophy, Simone Weil, who died in 1943, and particularly of her book *L'Enracinement*—The Need for Roots. Simone Weil would not have liked my talking about a moral principle; her own language was more pragmatic, and it is a very practical discussion of hers with which I want to finish. She is discussing "the needs of the human soul", and one of the qualities which she describes gives profound and unfashionable guidance of the kind I am seeking. These are Simone Weil's words:

"Initiative and responsibility, to feel one is useful and even indispensable, are vital needs of the human soul . . . For these needs to be satisfied it is necessary that a man should often have to take decisions in matters great or small, affecting interests that are distinct from his own, but in regard to which he feels a personal concern. He also requires to be continually called upon to supply fresh efforts. Finally he requires to be able to encompass in thought the entire range of activity of the social organism to which he belongs, including branches in connexion with which he has never to take a decision or offer any advice. For that, he must be made acquainted with it, be asked to interest himself in it, be brought to feel its value, its utility and, where necessary, its greatness, and be made fully aware of the part he plays in it."

These are wise and good words. They are not a rule of life. They are a starting point for the practical organisation of a community which has particular needs at a particular stage of its growth: a community from which I bring the friendly greetings due to a neighbour and the gesture of respect due to an older—a slightly older—institution.