

THE DIALECTICS OF EDUCATION *

The Inter-University Centre in Dubrovnik

By Johan Galtung
Director General
Inter-University Centre of Post Graduate
Studies, Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia

1. Introduction. The Inter-University Centre of Post-Graduate Studies is an international, inter-university organization, with its campus located in Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia. It was established in the spring of 1972 and inaugurated in January, 1974. Since then, from early 1974 until the end of the spring term in 1975, fourteen courses and three colloquia have been carried out, under the 1974/75 academic program, attracting close to three hundred (292) participants, most of them students, from 31 countries and involving the cooperation of above two hundred resource persons from 24 countries, most of them university professors. The Centre has approximately fifty member universities that contribute to the design of courses, make staff available, advertise courses and facilitate student participation, and is governed by a Council with one member from each of these member universities; in turn electing an Executive Committee and appointing a Director General and a Deputy Director General.

However, the basic constituent unit is the course, which is self-managed under the guidance of the course directors, who select resource persons in consultation with the member universities. The course typically lasts four weeks and is conducted at the IUC premises, a refurnished former school building right outside the city walls of what was once the city republic of Dubrovnik - one of the best conceived, best preserved and most scenically located cities in Europe.

* to appear in The International Journal for Adult Education

The present paper is about these courses, and not about the administrative framework within which they are conducted. Suffice it only to give a very brief answer to those who ask: "But where does the money come from?": the students themselves pay only about twenty dollars for participation (one dollar per day), that the resource persons get little or no honoraria, and that the member universities cover some of the travel expenses, and the University of Zagreb has so far covered the expenses connected with the running of the building itself, including a very small administrative staff. But nothing of that is of any interest or value in or by itself - the courses are the raison d'etre of the institution. So, what are the experiences with these courses, and what kind of pedagogical theory and practice is emerging?

The following is based on a combination of participant reports, comments and reports from resource persons, and my own observations and reflections - having been a resource person in many of the courses and having had a major hand in planning and executing four of them. The comments can conveniently be organized under some headings that are formulated as four dilemmas - well known, we should imagine, to all kinds of educators and educatees, which means more or less all of us.

2. High temperature vs. low temperature pedagogy. One typical participant comment, of the positive kind, would run about like this: "The course was like an earthquake to me, it shattered all of my pre-conceived notions and made me much more aware of the significance of other approaches". Some participants actually relate that they divide their academic "career" in two parts, before and after Dubrovnik- - -

Of course, one should be careful in accepting such testimonies too easily, but let us assume that they stand for genuine feelings and experiences, and ask how they might come about?

First of all, and that is a basic point running through these pages; no pedagogical experience can be seen in isolation. It always must be placed in a context, particularly of that which preceded it and is expected to succeed it. Thus, a highly intensive four weeks course, with four hours in the mornings (Monday through Friday) filled with two presentations with discussions; two-three hours in the afternoon filled with participant-generated seminars; and with participants and resource persons usually living together at good hotels (but at quite inexpensive, off season rates - i.e. eight dollars per day, all included) will for university students be compared with standard university life. The latter is characterized by very low intensity and very high predictability: courses still take place "Friday from 10 to 12", with a known or at least knowable faculty and with a very limited contact surface between resource persons and participants. Relative to this, the "Dubrovnik experience" looks rich and meaningful, saturated, not like the diluted and often alienated experience of ordinary university life. From this, it does not follow, however, that one is good, the other bad.

One of the basic components in a course at an emerging world university like the IUC is that everybody is new and fresh to one another. A typical course might have twenty participants and ten or fifteen resource persons, altogether from fifteen countries - the participants staying for (most of) four weeks; the resource persons for a couple of days, preferably one week, or - in the case of the course directors and the course coordinator (usually a more junior faculty member) for the entire period. In 30 persons there are about 450 pairs - we should imagine that on the average only about 5%, maybe in some cases little more could be said to be acquainted with each other in advance. In that case there should be, in principle, fewer masks to wear. Professors or students have not settled into informal roles as

"progressive", "bright", "conventional" or what not that easily develop when a structure gets more permanent. Intellectual life is often marred by the norm of consistency: a professor is known for certain views and cannot easily add or subtract without causing raised eyebrows. He or she is more permitted to experiment and put on new clothes of thinking in a new setting. And the same applies to students; they might not be much affected by the judgement of their professors back home, but of their fellow students. Hence, it is strongly argued that education must include pockets in time and space where much of the same that is done in more regular settings can be done in a setting of newness and freshness, permitting new intellectual role-taking, with a higher level of unpredictability, a higher level of excitement and openness, in general.

Another component, equally important, is the inclusiveness of the relationship - known to all who have ever participated in summer camps, etc. Being together in many settings (class room, excursions, hotel bars and dance floors, walking back and forth, sharing meals) obviously serves the purpose of getting better acquainted, of continuing classroom discussions and initiating new ones - also permitting the resource persons to be more questioning, less answering because of the out-of-class setting. This is rather obvious - what is less obvious is that these relations often will become strongly emotional (thus marriages belong to the IUC "spin-off" effects very much to be hoped and expected) and through that the soul and mind open up not only to the wind the sun and the sights and the colors and the waves, but to everything. If a course "clicks", there should be a honeymoon feeling about it, some kind of intoxication - everything matters, becomes meaningful within that context. It is like being lifted up on the crest of a powerful wave, being tossed in many directions at once, not merely exposed to the

elements of which education is made, but being much more open to them. For this purpose the environment is important; the beauty of nature, of rich history and good food and wine all enter the picture, potentially creating the type of euphoria that the participants (here indeed counting the resource persons) can ride on.

Still another component is the large amount of material that is presented and discussed. High temperature pedagogy should work like some kind of earthquake on the mind, it should create not only openings through which something new might penetrate, but also serve to break down unreflected, conventional wisdom so that new cognitive structure might be built on the ruins of some of the old - that is, if the participant chooses to seize upon the occasion. He or she who does so should be in an environment so loaded with ideas and pieces of information that if the conditions are present, there will be more than enough raw material for the person to process it in his or her own way. The good course should be so intensive that participants leave fatigued and bewildered, filled with intellectual contradictions that will work as breakers in their minds, and with much new information that will seep into the crevices. Thus, the ideal course day starts at breakfast and ends late at night, guided not only by curiosity or a desire to learn, but by an existential need to be a participant to important discussions.

Thus, what is here referred to as "high temperature pedagogy" is characterized by freshness, is highly emotionally loaded (including the fights over the course itself), is very intensive in terms of activity. It would be a major mistake to see this as a pedagogical ideal to be copied everywhere. It works for short periods only, and participants have been very quick to point out that courses lasting four months, even two months according to so intensive schedules are impossible.

There are even those who feel that four weeks are two too many - to us it looks like the minimum. Reasons given are often different from what is here seen as the major cause: only very few people can live under such pressure for any amount of time, for it involves not only a high level of exposure to new and diverging ideas, but also to new people with the explicit (or at least implicit) norm to be concerned with their concerns. It is too taxing. There is a need for withdrawal from exposure to ideas and people and environment, and the regular relaxed university routine offers this combination of exposure and withdrawal, expansion and contraction. Often the withdrawal from one subject is brought about by exposure to another, and the result is the great variety, mixture, seen in the week calendar of most university students. A small wave of excitement is built up in one discipline, after a lecture followed by a seminar, and then has to be built down, for another wave, in another field, is waiting for its turn - and correspondingly for the exposure to people. This low temperature pedagogy is probably as conducive to learning within existing paradigms as high temperature pedagogy is to the process of breaking up old paradigms and establishing new ones.

If this is anything like a correct picture - of course, it is overdrawn, the contrast is exaggerated - then two important consequences follow.

First, good education is probably based on the contrast between the two; one of them is only valuable in the context of the other. The mature participant can make use of this dialectic and even develop some kind of gut feeling to the effect that "I am now in need of a real shake-up", or "I am now ready for a period of thorough study again". For this interchange to take place, needless to say, there are other places to go than to Dubrovnik; many universities or student

organizations organize short summer institutes, extended weekend sessions, etc., very much with the function mentioned. Characteristic for the IUC perhaps would only be that this idea is made more systematic use of: the courses are structured to have this effect, last longer and cover more areas.

Second, it would be a mistake for an institution like the IUC to try to become a regular university, with the only difference that it would be more transdisciplinary and transnational than most in its construction and course composition. A regular university has an enormous support structure that is usually invisible, provided by the surrounding city or university town, by the whole society, in fact. Of course, there are institutions that provide intensive training over a longer period in one field only, but they are not in the liberal college tradition, more like military academies, seminaries, etc. What is needed is precisely the contrast institution that is not only different in content and structure, but also fills a different pedagogical role, and not only for participants, but also for resource persons; the role of renewal rather than filling up. on the other hand, such institutions should also recognize that in a sense they are parasites on the ordinary university structure. They rely on universities to do the ground work and then have the - not at all unpleasant - function of engaging in highly critical pedagogical activity; resented by some, enjoyed by many.

3. Unintegrated vs. integrated education. What is being said under this heading is somewhat in the same vein; it has to do with the extent of course planning that should be engaged in beforehand. The point of departure would be such typical participant remarks as "Professor A says this and Professor B says that and it is totally incompatible, what am I to believe in all of that?" or " It would have been so much better if topic X had been presented before topic Y". Such complaints are gen-

uine and reasonable enough, and yet not necessarily something that should be paid too much attention. For, imagine a course with total consistency, no resource person contradicting himself or others at any point, and everything presented in an orderly, accumulative way. Is this really a way of treating adult people, or anyone for that matter? Is it not merely a way of presenting processed reality, wrapped up in plastic, instead of live, inconsistent, unfolding reality itself? If reality, including our reflections upon reality, is ever-changing, never static, always filled with contradictions - should there not be some kind of correspondence between reality and the courses we try to organize? Would not the streamlined course organization in a sense be a reflection of the opposite view of reality, as something perfectionable, something that will one day find its final shape so that it is our task in our courses to find some kind of prefiguration of that perfection?

Obviously, the view taken here is in favor of rich, but relatively unintegrated courses. In a sense, this is a deed of necessity. The courses given at the Inter-University Centre deal with such topics as "Participation, Workers' Control and Self Management", "Models for the Future , Domestic and Global", "Theories of Development, Conflict and Peace", "Science and Philosophy", "Phenomenology and Marxism", "Transnational Corporations and World Economic Order", "Local Government in Rapid Social Change". These are all controversial topics, and more controversial topics will probably be on future programs. There are also less politically controversial topics, although they may be intellectually as controversial ("Shape Theory and Pre-Homotopy" in topology being one example). If one does not want the place to become a school of ideological indoctrination, and on the other hand believes more in resource persons with clear pronounced views they themselves believe in than resource personx only able to catalogue views held by others, confusing detachment with objectivity, the only way out is pluralism, eclecticism. And then there is the purely practical circum-

stance that it costs much more money to guarantee that Professor A with his topic X arrives before Professor B with topic Y - when in fact B is in the vicinity long before A is available and only a little extra travel money is needed to make him join the IUC for a while.

The net result can sometimes be a degree of unintegration so high that participants may feel they are tossed around in all kinds of directions. And that leads to an important point. The ideology of low level of integration (combined with a high level of pedagogical "temperature") should not serve as a pretext for lack of preparation and guidance on the side of the course directors. The simplest way of preparing a course, even simpler than the streamlined course, would be to draw up a list of topics and a list of good names, pairing them together, finding out about the availability of the resource persons, and then leave the rest to a secretary who finds suitable travel schedules and makes hotel reservations. Actually, it can probably be argued that it takes more time and energy for the course directors to prepare and guide the loosely integrated than the well integrated course - and that it takes least of either to do it in the laissez-faire way just described.

There is a difference though: the integrated course relies on very much advance preparation; for the unintegrated course, on-the-spot guidance is needed. Concretely, this means that the course director/coordinator has to make use of the contradictions and inconsistencies, the more or less sharp divergencies as pedagogical raw material. Sometimes this can be done by having professors A and B work it out in a dialogue, very often it should be done by having participants themselves react to it. This is very rarely done in university courses wherein the assumption quite often is some sort of intellectual landlord'ism; professor A "has" this topic and professor B that one; course monopoly implies some kind of protection against

criticism and confrontation with others. At the IUC, the assumption is rather that all resource persons share the entire field with the participants and make their presentations and inputs to discussions in maximum visibility and audibility of each other. More about that later.

However, inconsistency and contradiction are not only found between resource persons; it could also be located within any single one of them. In practice, this is rarely the case for so much of our intellectual tradition consists precisely in weeding out inconsistencies in order to present an integrated whole - which is one more reason why the unintegrated course has to be based upon a multiplicity of resource persons with divergent views and points of departure, and different personality types and experiential backgrounds. But what one can do instead is to encourage resource persons to set aside their ready-made lecture notes and usually not follow the paradigms in books they have already published - assuming that the level of literacy among such participants is high, anyhow. Ideally, the resource person should present something that is still raw and crude, ideas in search of integration, and the good resource person would not be he who presents his solution convincingly well, but he who manages to bring others into his mental workshop where problems and pieces of problems, bits of information and evidence, some good ideas and very many bad ones are floating around; inviting them to participate in the processing of all this raw material into insight. On the other hand, that should not be the only formula, either, so there is also the possibility of encouraging the resource person to present his latest, but as yet unpublished piece of work as it is still fresh and vibrant and has not yet become reified between jackets - for a final burst of constructive criticism. In both cases, the resource person should himself share the problems and be willing and able to point out weaknesses not dis-

covered by the participants. And the task of the course director is to facilitate the utilization of contradictions for pedagogical purposes, not to cover them up by means of glib formulas. The idea is not necessarily to transcend them, that rarely happens - but to get them out into the open. As a matter of fact, in summing up the discussion, the good discussion leader (not necessarily the course director) would be able to list contradictions, dilemmas, rather than conclusions.

How would this differ from a conference? Doesn't a conference provide all this: a series of papers only roughly within the same field or sub-field, interspersed with a couple of panels - most of them followed by discussions? There is much to be said in favor of this parallel. The IUC draws upon the structure of the conference as well as the structure of the summer school (IUC works only in the off-season period, though - October, November - April, May). But there is an important difference: there is the obligation to cover the most important sub-fields and approaches - in that sense there is more similarity with regular university courses. Ideally, the pedagogy would be based on the best from all these three forms; hopefully not ending up with a combination of the worst, the piece-meal, coitus interruptus nature of the conference discussion, the academic tourism that may overshadow the educational content of the summer school; and the ritualism of regular university life.

In this connection, some words may perhaps be said about the degree of beforehand preparation of lectures as opposed to improvisation as the course unfolds itself. There is virtue to a time-table; participants and resource persons have a right to know what happens when, at least one week in advance (and in a preliminary sense half a year in advance, after all - that is the basis on which they would register as participants or become interested as resource persons). But I am not so con-

vinced as to the virtue of handing out lecture notes or short summaries beforehand. Participants tend to encourage this, and some resource persons follow suit - but the experience is not necessarily positive. It becomes like a contract between resource person and participant, tying both of them to a frame of reference that may be outmoded already by the first question or by some reflection that came to the resource person's mind the moment he distributed those sheets. It takes some of the drive out of the presentation ("let me see, where am I now, oh yes - it was that point at the bottom of page 2"), and the general guess would be that the participants become more passive, tending to think that "well, it is in those sheets anyhow". Moreover, it may make the resource person defensive about his notes rather than open to, and able/willing to integrate, criticism. Hence, a much better solution for all the reasons mentioned ~~may be~~ to ask a resource person to write a summary immediately afterwards, benefitting from the discussion and his own afterthoughts.

4. Pedagogical pluralism vs. pedagogical singularism. So far something has been said about presentations, discussions, participant-generated seminars and informal talks. What is our experience with these approaches, which one is better? Obviously, that is the wrong question to ask; the problem is not whether we should have lectures or seminars/discussions, but how to mix them properly. Only the naive would argue in favor of the total exclusion of any one of them. Of course, from the passivity induced by lectures to a more or less captive audience and the feeling of being alive after one has made an important input in a seminar discussion, the conclusion is drawn- quite often: "let us drop the lectures and have only seminars and discussions". The conclusion is naive because once more it fails to grasp the dialectic of the pedagogical venture: it is relative to an overexposure to lectures that seminars

appear as the solution. When left to seminars alone, the shortcomings will become much more clear: there is less occasion for a well-reasoned, systematic presentation of large fields of inquiry; deeper-lying arguments cannot be presented in the chopped-up manner of a seminar discussion; for seminars or working groups to be effective they have to be relatively small (to permit everyone to participate) but this cuts down the mutual visibility of the whole group and even reduces the type of group integration that stems from reacting to the same presentation.

From this, however, it does not follow that everyone who is called in as a resource person should be asked to give his or her presentation in the form of a lecture; moreover, under no circumstances should a lecture last more than 45 minutes, and there should be at least equal time set aside for discussions. Lecturing is one form - it requires very special pedagogical skills to be meaningful. Thus, a good lecturer should probably present his thesis at the very beginning, even giving a minimum outline in the form of five or six points so that the audience can gear its attention level to the progress of the presentation, knowing at all points how the lecturer is progressing. Good and ample use of blackboard or similar devices is a necessity; most people benefit from a combination of visible and auditive stimuli and can catch up on the blackboard when the flow of words has moved in another direction. However, there is probably also virtue to the unprepared scribbling rather than slide nicely prepared for the overhead-projector: the latter takes the spontaneity out of the presentation and makes the participants less of a witness to an act of creativity, whereby the flow of words is accompanied by diagrams, words, figures, arrows and whatnot.

For others, another form would be much better, also depending on the topic; presentations in the form of theses, or

topics, or experiences, ideas - maximum ten minutes for each and then immediate discussion. A good, critical audience will be bursting with questions, comments and queries after ten minutes, or after the first sentence for that matter ("why did you choose to start off that way?!") - to wait 45 minutes requires some compensation in the form of intellectual excitement, whether it is derived from style of presentation, depth of insight, or the nature of the information given. The lecturer who takes much time to present what he has to offer would do well to ask himself whether he is warranted in doing so, or some other form of presentation could be found. For instance, if it is a question of pure information, the idea of handing out some sheets might be a good one - proceeding straight to the discussion - what should be avoided is the double presentation. One simple criterion, but a cruel one, is whether the audience is bored or not: to bore other people is to exercise violence, ~~what they are~~ not free to leave. Good research, science, theory is never boring - if the presentation is nevertheless boring, there is either something wrong with the underlying research, or with the person presenting it - and in the latter case, the search for an appropriate form should be found.

Of course, the repertory of pedagogy contains much more than what has been mentioned here. Thus, there is the use of **all** kinds of machinery, projectors, etc. Like for all other methods, they have to be used in a way that suits the material, and not excessively. Can one talk about "alternative life styles in rich countries," arguing in favor of a simpler style, using expensive TV equipment to make role playing more visible. i.e. to those who played the roles? Can one talk about "participation and self-management" using lectures as the only form of presentation? Can a presentation of the extent of poverty in the world today be littered with jokes? And, more particularly, concerning gadgets and gimmicky methods of teaching: they may become

tools of alienation, lending attention away from the simple spoken word (accompanied by something written) to the gadgets (the TV screen) and the gimmick (the role-playing, "now you shall be Isreal, and you the PLO, and you Egypt") because of the mechanical nature of the gadget and the artificiality of the gimmick. Very little of such things can compare favorably, we would think, to a spontaneous discussion inspired by nature, culture, food and wine - in fact the role of such stimuli (including friendship, love and sex) are probably much underestimated in our generally very puritan theory of education, wherein only that which can be brought into the classroom counts pedagogically.

Another way of slicing the pedagogical cake, implicit in what has been said above, would be to make use of the distinction between vertical education, horizontal education and self education. Generally speaking, the vertical form presupposes some distinction between teachers and learners, which is there however much it is masked by such terminology as is used here; "resource persons" and "participants". Usually this corresponds to an age differential; it is hard to deny that by and large the older have had a chance to experience more, reflect more and read more - also to write more and talk more and to get more reactions - than the younger. Of course, the young can marshal against this superiority due to age their ability to see things with fresh eyes, unfettered by conventional wisdom and solidified paradigms, not respected by these youths.

Hence, the basic point in the pedagogical pluralism referred to as desirable is not what kinds of gadgets or gimmicks are made use of, on a scale from the simplest to the technologically most sophisticated - but to what extent all these structural types are present and in a reasonable mixture. More concretely, this means that there is room for vertical education, for teaching in the classical sense, for a good resource person giving his and her insight and for participants taking notes -

there is nothing wrong in this form, as long as it does not dominate or is not too heavily correlated with age and academic position (which it usually is).

But added to this, then, come three fundamental horizontalising devices. First, there is critical discussion from participants to resource persons so that the verticality is transformed into a two-way relation and thereby totally changed - because the informality of the out-of-classroom settings (with a carry-over inside the classroom) often makes this a discussion between equals - perhaps because both parties know that theirs is not a lasting relationship so they can engage in social patterns they would not have attempted at home (The naive student or professor will believe that this is because professors or students from this or that other country are so much "nicer"). In such discussions, the authoritarian nature of some students and professors is very quickly revealed; there is the negatively authoritarian student opposed to everything coming from a professor, the positively authoritarian equally inclined to accept everything and the more mature student who selects, who finds out - often very quickly - what is the resource of a particular resource person and tries to benefit from that rather than pressing for weak points - and who also recognizes his duty to the professor as a person, to help him in his further development, not to see him merely as a tool for own enrichment, there only to please and give, a born class enemy, who can be treated as a thing. And correspondingly for the professors: there are those to whom every question is a threat, something to be avoided, ("let me wait until I have presented the entire line of reasoning") which may mean until there is no more time left for discussion; those who can be recognized by never taking notes when the discussion period comes, signalling that they have nothing to learn from such sessions; those who become angry ("you have not understood me") - and so on. There are many types, and it is the task of the course director to cut through all of this, much of

which is bad role-playing anyway, and get a real dialogue out of it, sometimes with short, sometimes with longer interventions - sometimes right after the presentation, sometimes with a participant working group in-between, preparing questions and comments. Again, this is far more easy in a high temperature than a low temperature pedagogical setting.

Second, there is the participant-generated seminar. All participants are equal, but some are more equal than others: some take more initiative, are better at organizing, setting up discussion groups, etc. In such seminars, resource persons are guests, participating like all the others - and it seems to be very important that the discussion leader is one of the participants - on the basis of rotation. During the four weeks, this gives a chance to all participants to present something - at least if they split up in working groups according to interest, which then later may be written up as a paper, providing participants with that symbol of completion which probably has considerable pedagogical significance. Ideally, this can even be done during the stay and even be the subject of some comments from resource persons (at least in a preliminary form), but in practice it will usually have to be completed upon return back home.

Third, there is the possibility of seminars for the resource persons - not necessarily in an organized form, but informally. Experience from the Inter-University Centre has brought out very clearly how lonely university professors quite often are. As already mentioned, the structure of university teaching is such that universities are tied together at the bottom, but fragmented at the top: professors teach singly, not in pairs or groups. Often they do not do research together or have seminars together, either, but appear only in a vertical setting, with junior professors, assistants and students. But this means that a very important source of learning, horizontal

education among equals who together try to define and solve problems is reduced to much below what it could and should be. As a matter of fact, this probably explains much of the sudden change in the balance of structural power between students and professors that became so clear at the end of the 1960's: the students had come together (in addition to lectures, seminars, colloquia through university canteens, student cities, dormitories, all kinds of students activities including student tourism) whereas the professors were kept apart, split by the pattern just mentioned and their integration, singly, not combined, into bourgeois-family life. If in addition the professor fails to engage in self-education through continued study, and the structure does not allow for feed-back to his lectures, he is lost relative to modern students with countless opportunities, resource-wise, and structurally, to grow together. Hence, one of the tasks of the IUC is also to provide a setting for the resource persons to benefit from each other's presence - and they do indeed seize the opportunity. Much of this could and should happen in the class-room itself, as long as horizontal dialoguing among the resource persons does not happen at the expense of a deeper resource person-participant relationship. And some of it can take the form of special seminars for the resource persons alone: they do have a right to engage in this, too, not only the participants.

Finally, there is the obvious possibility of self education - simply reading, reflecting. In general, I would be willing to sacrifice this source of learning in the particular setting of the IUC. Partly even this is a deed of necessity; the library resources are almost non-existent. But it is also a question of what is desirable: given the amount of resource persons and participants, their diversity, the good opportunities for dialogue and the limited span of time available, one would be inclined to say that reading can be done back home, upon return, except for some particularly important material, of course.

It would not make much sense for a participant to arrive in Dubrovnik with a suitcase filled with books and use the time not consumed by scheduled activities to engage in reading only. Of course, he and she are free to do so - but the idea of the place is to provide a setting with maximum opportunity for all kinds of dialogues. Self-education belongs more to the low temperature repertory and is absolutely indispensable - but in another setting, where participant and resource person alike can continue, both making use of the dynamism brought into them through intensive educational exposure to grow further.

5. The dialectics of education, in time and space. We have emphasized repeatedly that the whole venture is "dialectic" meaning by that overused word not only that everything has to be understood in a context, even of that which is not there (e.g. regular university teaching), but also that true pedagogical effects probably stem from contrasts and contradictions rather than from any particular single factor. To take one example: what has been known at the IUC as "the third week effect". It takes the form of fatigue, and of aggressiveness against course organizers; there is a certain absenteeism, and the general morale is low. In the fourth week it usually picks up again. Why?

One simple explanation is in terms of fatigue, partly physical, mainly mental. The latter, however, is hardly due to the amount of material, but rather to its contradictory nature. A participant listens attentively the first day. The presentations are good, and he accomodates them inside his system with appropriate labeling - even equipped with a "plus" for "I agree/like" or a "minus" for "I disagree/dislike". After a couple of days there will be some pluses and some minuses, which is perfectly normal and unproblematic; there will also be some cases of ambivalence. The problem arises when the presentations start bursting through his and her paradigms,

and so much so that they cannot even be classified as ambivalent, there is no way of handling them within one's own thought system. The temptation will be to stamp them out as nonsense, not to be taken seriously, but here is an important factor in the IUC picture; most of the participants are likely to be rather autonomous and capable of reflection, otherwise they would not have had the stamina to leave their home base during the term to go all the way to Dubrovnik - an implication that does not necessarily hold for the summer course participants and hence one more reason why the IUC does not organize summer courses - another being that facilities are overcrowded and expensive). In addition, they are usually a rather diversified lot, which means that there will always be some for whom the "nonsense" makes sense - and that makes it much more difficult to write it off as unworthy of attention. Moreover, in discussions among participants, there will be a need to have some kind of justified view. And this is where the painful process of adapting the thought system so as to be able to accommodate the unexpected starts. This one may do once, twice, three times during the first week - but when the input continues at the same speed the process becomes increasingly painful and difficult - and mentally, and thereby also physically, exhausting. The result is both fatigue and aggressiveness against a course and an institution that does such things. There will be a call for integration, in the form of a formula that stamps out three quarters of the presentations, leaving only those that are marked with a clear "plus" or a clear "minus" so that cognitive consonance is achieved, or in the form of a new approach, simple, all embracing. The latter may be innovative, but may also take the form of some kind of populist salvationism from hard intellectual work.

Then, there is another factor. In the beginning, the third week syndrome seemed so strange because the resource persons were of the same quality and quantity that week as the

preceding weeks - until one was struck by what a naive observation that was. Of course, the participants were no longer the same! They had already been exposed to resource persons, many of them the most well known in their fields in Europe or in the world as a whole; and in addition, these resource persons had given them the cream off the top of their standard presentations. knowingly or not, they had given a concentrated, distilled version rather than diluting it into a one term or two terms lecture series. In this process, the best of the resource persons had no doubt stimulated the others into giving as much as possible - and in addition, the participants had two weeks of group-formation and training in dialogue behind them. But the third week resource person knew nothing of this - to him and her this was all new. It should be noticed again how different this is from a standard university lecture course, wherein professor and students are getting used to each other in a narrow sense; the students know where the professor stands and vice versa - and also how different it is from a conference and a summer school with a more or less resident faculty. No wonder that something happened in the third week; only sad that it could take the form of attacking the poor resource person who was scheduled to appear at that time! But, this is the same mistake that students and everyone else for that matter so often makes of forgetting the time and space context. I remember my own incapability after years of study of mathematics to understand that when I finally thought I had found the good mathematics text (or professor) then it was to a large extent because the preceding ones had enabled me to see its (his) virtues, in addition to the obvious contrast effect.

One solution to this kind of problem lies in sharing this type of thinking (which can only emerge as the result of having observed a certain number of courses; it can hardly be seen by the participant, resource person or director to any one single course) with everyone concerned. Another would be more manipula-

tory; to have the big shots scheduled for the third week, instead of, as many organizers do, the opening performance and/or the closing ceremony. Still another approach would be to draw the conclusion that the third week has to be qualitatively different. To eliminate it is like eliminating the first and last car in a train to prevent accidents; the effect would probably still be located somewhere after the mid-point in time. Hence, do something different, and the best answer would probably be what many readers of this article have already in mind; to engage in some kind of practice. One good possibility would be to make a project together, in which case Dubrovnik and the environment would have to be available for study, at least for the more social science, ecology and some of the history oriented courses. Another possibility would be to place one of the many conferences organized at (rather than, or in addition to) the IUC during the third week and schedule the courses so that participants and resource persons in the course are transformed into participants with inputs to a conference in the same field; meeting with many others, and then coming together again for the fourth week to get a last burst from new resource persons and try to sum up the experience one way or the other. Experiments in either direction will be carried out.

So much for the dialectics in time; what about space? Space in this context unfortunately does not involve the City of Dubrovnik, the Republic of Croatia or Yugoslavia in General, all of which remain rather closed relative to what, for instance, a Northwestern European is used to. Ideally an institution of this kind should be located at a place where there is a basis for a meaningful interaction with the nearest environment; to learn from it, to give something back, in return for the hospitality and this may also in due time develop in the IUC case. But for the time being, "space" means inner space, inside the building, among the course participants, to some extent between the courses taking place at the same time, or the replications of the same

course. And here the variety is considerable; an incredibly rich source for pedagogical advances.

However, the variety behind the slogans of transdisciplinarity and transnationalism, bringing together in the same course people from several disciplines and nationalities, is much less important than many would think beforehand. There is a simple reason for this: people who can imagine participate in such a venture are already somewhat similar, but above all - world communication in general, and in the field of higher education in particular, has brought about considerable homogeneity across disciplinary and national borders. But something remains that has considerable contradiction built into it: real differences in what one might call cognitive culture, on the one hand, and academic structure on the other.

This is not the occasion to go into any detail, but the difference between Anglo-Saxon or North European in general, pragmatism and generally very empirical approach on the one hand, and continental European rationalism bordering on the dogmatic with concentration of the construction of formally perfect theories on the other is considerable. They may both refer to Marx and Adam Smith, but they mean two very different things, for their intellectual cosmos is constituted in very different ways. And similarly for academic structure: whereas there is a North-South difference in cognitive style, there is an East-West difference when it comes to respecting academic authority particularly after this suffered a dramatic decline in Germany (West) at the end of the 'sixties'. Hence, the very colloquial, egalitarian and pluralistic style engendered by the IUC is no doubt best suited for Northwest-Europeans whose cognitive style is less dominated by well constructed theory pyramids, and who do not live in academic structures constructed very much in the same manner. For them the switch from one perspective to another is a part of the intellectual style, and horizontal educa-

tion comes easy - for others, and perhaps particularly for Southeast Europeans, conceptions of the correct system and sharp role distinction between professors and students will make adjustment to such patterns quite painful.

6. Conclusion. And that, of course, raises the whole question of to what extent an institution like the IUC can be global at all, whether it will not always, at least to some extent, be dominated by a combination of culture and structure found in some parts rather than others of this world. It is difficult to deny this, and indeed foolhardy - but it still makes sense to discuss which pattern is more conducive to what ideal image of the outcome. This discussion is important, and it will have to go on and on - there will never be any final answer, for as we discuss our subject of discussion is itself changing, all the time. And the intention of this article was only to try to clarify some of the dimensions of that type of discussion, illustrated by one concrete example: the Inter-University Centre in Dubrovnik.