

## Development, Academic Freedom and the Idea of a University: The Case of Addis Ababa University (1950-2005)

Amare Asgedom\*

### Abstract

*This article explores the relationship between academic freedom and the idea of a university by examining the case of the Addis Ababa University in its life history of five-and-half decades (1950-2005). I have described the historical data of the Addis Ababa University using Ronald Barnett's analytical framework of three ideas of a university: a university in society, a university of society and a university for society. These three metaphors represent three distinct epistemological stances and university relationships with society or the state. These three ideas of a university are superimposed on the three political case histories (monarchy, military/socialism and revolutionary democracy) of the Addis Ababa University. Applying a 3x3 qualitative matrix analytical framework to the data yielded results that tentatively suggested the dominance of the idea of a university for society mainly in the feudal and to some extent in the contemporary periods. The idea of a university of society was the most dominant paradigm in the socialist period. It was interesting to learn from the data that the idea of a university in society was alien to the Addis Ababa University in all of its historical and political episodes. Addis Ababa University has never experienced the mission of internal focus with the goal of basic research, which was common in traditional western universities. However, in its claim of being accountable for public service, the Ethiopian University, had sustained uninterrupted conflicts both within itself and with the state. In its advocacy of political freedom (where it played a vanguard role during the 1974 Ethiopian Revolution) for itself and the poor, it had sustained an environment where everybody qualified to be a threat to the academic freedom of every other. In this sense the University was both a victim and a perpetrator of political violence. The hostile state-university relationship had always resulted in boomerang effects: loss of life, dismissal of members of the academic community, closure of the University, unstable administration, etc. It is recommended in this paper that a cooperative university-state relationship rooted in partial autonomy and academic freedom (in the sense of the special theory) will help the university accomplish its historic mission, research and teaching. This relationship should be based and sustained by a reconstitution of a culture of deliberative democracy instead of power. If the political mission of the university is subordinated to its academic mission, with a focus on teaching and research, state-university relationship could logically be mutually supportive and much helpful for university autonomy and academic freedom, the very preconditions for higher learning.*

**Keywords:** university, academic freedom, development, curriculum, research

\* Associate Professor, College of Education, Addis Ababa University, P.O. Box 1176

## **Introduction**

This research will explore the idea of a university and its relationship with academic freedom by taking the case of Addis Ababa University in its developmental journey over the three distinct political regimes (*monarchy, military/socialism and revolutionary democracy*). For this purpose, I have described the historical data of the Addis Ababa University using Ronald Barnett's analytical framework of three ideas of a university: *a university in society, a university of society and a university for society* (Barnett, 1997b: 37-38). I have found the use of these three metaphors useful to my analysis because they have a wider implication for the university's accountability and autonomy and a clear relevance to higher education in Ethiopia.

These three metaphors represent three distinct epistemological stances and university relationships with society or the state. Here society is an ambiguous term, sometimes collectively represented by the term *state*. In this study, however, a distinction is made between the state and society, because the power of the state does not always emerge from delegation of authority by the grass root communities (ordinary citizens, civil societies, professional associations, etc.). In the Ethiopian society, the state is often viewed as distinct from the society and government bureaucracy constitutes the former. In the western literature, the two concepts, the state and society, might be interchangeably used. In Africa and particularly in Ethiopia, the two concepts are distinct, and this will be shown whenever the two terms are applied to the Ethiopian or African context.

### **Method of Study**

To assess the relationship between academic freedom and the idea of a university, I have used the case of Addis Ababa University by taking its distinct political histories (feudalism, Soviet type of socialism and ethnic democracy) as my framework of analysis. (1) What kind of idea of a university has existed in the entire history of the Addis Ababa University? (2) Did the different political regimes imply a different idea of a university? (3) How are the different ideas of a university related to academic freedom?

To answer these questions, I have used a qualitative case study research method (Creswell, 1998). In this research, Yin's multiple case study design (Yin, 2003: 19-55) was found to be more appropriate - using the case as an instrument instead of an end in itself (Stake, 1994:237). The three cases were: (i) the monarchical period (1950-1974); (ii) the military-socialist period (1974-1991); and (iii) the revolutionary democracy period (1991-2005). The data was clustered along these three cases and compared with the three ideas of a university.

The case study design in this research could be taken as unique in that it is based on cases distributed over *historical time* in the same socio-spatial setting, instead of the conventional approach, which examines cases in different *socio-spatial settings* at roughly the same time. One could also argue that the research could be well constructed around a longitudinal study of a single case rather than a comparison of three cases. Certainly it takes an historical and narrative perspective on the development of Addis Ababa University in both approaches. On the other hand, the political changes, which took place in the study period were, literally, revolutionary ones and resulted in quite dramatic political transformations. The contrast (between the three political regimes under which the different ideas were re-defined) was sufficiently stark to make it possible to treat them as three distinct cases.

The inquiry, therefore, necessarily demands a combination of case study and historical research. The latter relies on the use of documentary and other records and memories of individuals who lived in those contemporary historical epochs and the not dissimilar sources appropriate to contemporary case study designs. The data collection process is described briefly in the ensuing paragraphs.

## **Data Collection**

As shown before, I have used qualitative data from a variety of sources: historical evidences (official and unofficial documents), interviews (tape-recorded), observations and archival records.

*Interviews*—formal interviews were carried out with 41 academic staff members of the Addis Ababa University (AAU) over a 20-month period (28/3/2004-1/12/2005). Informal data collection process had however continued to the end of writing this research. I had provoked discussion with many colleagues during informal meetings in tearooms as well as in other encounters. At other times, data was flowing by itself when colleagues initiated discussions regarding the fate of Addis Ababa University as part of their general concerns, which helped this research very much. It was interesting to realize how locatedness in a research setting obliterates the field-home paradox; sometimes data flows in when the researcher is not actively engaged formally in data collection process. In those situations, I was forced to keep the data in my memory and hurried to write research notes in my office before I forgot them.

The 41 research participants involved in this study had served the university from a minimum of five to a maximum of 30 years. They all had diverse academic experiences in research, teaching, administration and public service—in the form of research consultancy. Their academic profiles varied from the highest academic rank, full professor, to a lower rank, lecturer. Moreover, data on my own professional experience was also a resource for this research. A colleague conducted a long interview (three hours recorded tapes) with me on 12 August 2004, which I have used as observation data. This allowed me to represent my own experience in a more objective form, which I could read and analyze alongside data gathered from other sources. Thus, in this research, my personal experiences are wedded with other oral and document sources. In a way, this research constitutes a rewriting of my own professional history in the Addis Ababa University.

In selecting the research participants, I made some effort to include most academic fields, balancing the two major streams, the Natural Sciences and the Social Sciences (or what are sometimes referred to as the Cultural Sciences). The latter include the languages, humanities, the arts and education. I have paid particular attention to include as many participants in the area of general education, such as, basic sciences, philosophy, history, sociology, languages, mathematics, etc., as in the vocational and professional fields, such as, engineering, medicine, law, business, pharmacy, etc.

*Archival Documents:* In this study, I have used archival documents extensively. Policies, procedures and annual reports of activities of government and universities were often found in published forms. Unpublished monographs, statistical abstracts and other reports were rich sources of information on the intentions of managers and governors. In addition, the rich description of cases and contexts was possible with the use of such documents. These documents were found in the form of management information systems, policy guidelines, presidential annual reports, senate and faculty minutes, proclamations, newspapers and newsletters, etc.

One of the challenges to me in using such documents was the requirement to evaluate authenticity, the context of their production, and the motivations of their sources. Merriam (1988:107) has produced a long list of questions for validating documents, including completeness, history, accuracy, authenticity (whether or not documents were tampered with), etc. To the best of my ability, I have used these documents consciously after checking their usefulness and accuracy by counterchecking with other sources of information. These documents have been found to be very useful for bridging information gaps and for serving the purpose of triangulation.

### **Academic Freedom and the Idea of a University *IN* Society**

A university *in* society stands for a characteristic of a university which claims maximum independence from society and the state, premised by the professor's or chair holder's justification for specialized and general knowledge; or it stands for an intellectual culture which lies over and above the state, economics and society (Allen, 1988:17). The German notion of a

university represents an ideal of this model, where the society as collectively represented by the state, has only a responsibility to facilitate a maximally free environment for mainly the extension of knowledge as represented by the doctorate. This means the role of the university was mainly epistemological (search for the truth through value-free research) to the exclusion of the political--putting the resources of the university at the service of the state or society (Brubacher, 1977:13). Wilhelm Von Humboldt's memorandum, which inspired the creation of the University of Berlin in 1881, projected a university based on three formative principles: unity of research and teaching, freedom of teaching, and academic self-governance (Levine, 2000:5).

The German model of higher education claims its legitimacy in its devotion for "truth", validated by academic objectivity and detachment (called *Wertfreiheit*), with the professor always expected to reach value-free conclusions (Brubacher, 1977:13). The Humboldtian model with its advocacy of free academic researchers in a maximally autonomous university, emerged as an ideal which greatly persisted today, nonetheless, in the form of a "trench warfare" (Tjeldvoll, 2000: 33). The epistemological justification of this model is contested by the refutation of the presumption of the idea of researcher-noninterference in the course of events of the research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003: 3). "There are no objective observations, only observations socially situated in the world of--and between--the observer and the observed", argued Denzin and Lincoln (2003: 3). The German universities under Hitler set a good example of the uselessness of the idea of value-free objectivity. "Adhering strictly to undistorted objectivity, to detachment and non-involvement in current affairs, professors presented no obstacle to Nazi takeover in which objectivity was usurped by the anti-intellectual practice of thinking with one's blood" (Brubacher, 1977:13).

Carried to its logical conclusions, the Humboldtian model, which subordinates all other functions of the university to the extension of knowledge (Allen 1988:17) has resulted in refusal of professors to teach in undergraduate programs" (Levine, 2000: 8). By acknowledging its flaws, Tjeldvoll recommended a 'functionalist university' of the American type

(instead of the German one) where individual academic freedom to a certain degree has to give way to professional collective and utilitarian considerations of the state and industry (Tjeldvoll, 2000: 34).

It is paradoxical however that independence from society was presumed necessary for the advancement of knowledge in order to ultimately serve the interest of the state (Pring, 1995). In this context, academic freedom was considered a constructive force toward the advancement of the interest of the state.

Pring contested the logic of the necessity of academic freedom for the purpose of ultimately serving the state by contending that there is a potential conflict between academic freedom and service to the state (Pring, 1995:48). While academic freedom serves the ideological justification of the profession, the power and interest of the state cannot be compromised as observed in the history of German universities. The German universities had to operate in the context of a particular type of truth, the superiority of the Aryan race (p.51). It is unrealistic therefore for the university to be independent of the state as long as it depends on it for its funds and justifies its *raison d'etre*. Here the evidence shows that the German University is not a good example of a university that is both autonomous and accountable to society. The German university had amassed power not for the protection of civilized values but the promotion of elite interests (Roszak, 1968). Academic freedom in the context of the *idea of a university in society*, which draws its inspiration from German idealism, was therefore contested by the need for social accountability.

### **Heteronomy and the Idea of a *University OF Society***

As distinct from other traditions of the need for full or partial autonomy, the philosophy of higher education conveyed in the idea of '*a university of society*' advocates heteronomy as a value by supporting the position that academic institutions should be subordinated to political governance in order to implement and serve prioritized political objectives (Tjeldvoll, 2000:36). This notion follows the Central Control Accountability model (Halstead, 1994:150), which is grounded in the theory that university

teachers as employees of public institutions are under the obligation to demonstrate that they are, in fact, doing what they are paid to do (Gibson, 1980). Heteronomous higher education systems have survived in Stalinist and many third world totalitarian traditions (Allen, 1988).

*In the Soviet Union, all institutions of higher education are centrally controlled and have their enrolments and specialisms calculated to meet the targets of Gosplan, the state planning agency... The chain of command runs directly from the Central Committee of the Communist Party through the USSR Ministries of Education and Higher Education to the constituent Republics and so on down the line. Everything is prescribed, right down to the number of hours per week per subject and the specification of lectures or seminars in terms of teaching style (Allen, 1988:30).*

Heteronomous higher education systems were grounded in the tradition of the Napoleonic University Model, which rested on a clear subordination of the university to the state (Neave, 1988; Clak, 1983). The university's mission was to ensure the political stability and unity of the nation in a physical sense. This model sharply contrasted with the Humboldtian interpretation in which culture, science and learning existed over and above the state.

### **Conditional Autonomy and the Idea of a *University FOR Society***

The idea of a *university for society* avoids the stance of either-or extremes (state dependence or state independence). It assumes that the university cannot ignore its own context, the society in which it is part, or the state on which it depends for funding. It cannot also be a servant to the state or the society. Academic freedom and conditional autonomy are essential for a university to be useful to society (Enslin and Kissak, 2005). In this sense, the university is both an epistemological and political institution (Brubacher, 1977:22). The idea of a *university for society* is therefore premised on continuity between thought and action (ibid). This perspective is based on Dewey's dualistic philosophy of higher education (Dewey, 1910). Dewey admitted this idea of social continuity (of action and thought) was borrowed from the Darwinian idea of continuity between diverse species (Brubacher, 1977:22). But how could a university be both a thinker



as well as an actor? How could it be both dependent as well as independent of the society and/or the state? How could one resolve this paradox?

Enslin and Kissak (2005:39) proposed a deliberately inducted consensus from stakeholders to be the basis for action, "a deliberative university implies an educative university classroom and a process of research in which justification through reason, the presentation of evidence and public debate are necessary conditions" (ibid.). One research participant (KB, 24/2/2006) commented, "A university for society would be designated as an institution that delivers socially relevant knowledge to address the major underpinnings of present problem". His comment stresses the university's role in serving society without losing its freedoms.

Historically, professional education was the medieval university's first service to society (Tjeldvoll, 2000:46). In the Victorian England, academics in the sciences and in letters saw a role for themselves in engaging a wider society and indeed in carrying out their thinking directly to the wider society in public lectures and debates (Barnett, 1997a: 147). The role of the intellectual was available in university professors in which many attempted to educate the public directly (p. 154). Instead of looking inwards to the peer community, to the internal norms and values of the academic subculture, the idea of a university *for* society demands the academia to look outwards, to the society, to play the role of the intellectual, to serve society (ibid). An absolute independence for mere epistemological justification is therefore simply a myth.

In late modernity, the university has become a large and complex institution such that the idea of a university must be viewed around the reality that the university has become a major public institution in society and must be examined in that context (Melody, 1997:74). In the context of prevalence of diverse interests of society, the university must have the initiative to address these diverse interests as much as it can through realistic preferences and appropriate ideology (Clark, 1983:263). According to Clark (1983:240), cross-national higher education comparisons suggest the prevalence of pressing interests and corresponding values regarding the role and function of the university. The university has a responsibility for taking into account the different societal interests and values--the expectations of attentive

publics, the interests of government officials and the attitudes of academic workers (p. 241). The four values that universities must serve to address all stakeholders are justice, competence, liberty and loyalty (ibid). This research has focused only on assessing the idea of a university in the context of different political terrains of the Ethiopian society.

### **The Case of Addis Ababa University: Academic Freedom and the Idea of a University**

This unit will present an analysis of the data using a qualitative matrix (3x3 qualitative matrix as shown in figure 1) of the different ideas of a university (a university *in* society, a university *of* society and a university *for* society) against the three distinct histories of the Addis Ababa University (feudalism, socialism and democracy).

**Table 1. The idea of a university and Addis Ababa University**

| Political System                    | A University in Society | A University of Society | A University for Society |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Monarchical (1950-1974)             | No                      | No                      | Yes                      |
| Military/Socialist (1974-1991)      | No                      | Yes                     | No                       |
| Revolutionary Democracy (1991-2005) | No                      | No                      | No/ yes                  |

Source: Author's own construction (2007)

From analysis of the qualitative data one understands that Addis Ababa University had, in one way or another, experienced the philosophy of both a university *for* society and a university *of* society. Addis Ababa University had never experienced the idea of a university *in* society, the presence of disinterested scholar confined to his/her basic research. These ideas of a university have wide implications to the scope of a university's autonomy, academic freedom and accountability. The relationship between the idea of a university and political theory in the Ethiopian context is discussed in some detail in the ensuing units.

### Monarchical System and the Idea of a *University FOR Society*

As shown in Table 1, the philosophy of a community of disinterested scholars committed to scholarship and extension of knowledge with little accountability to society or state was hardly known to modern HE of Ethiopia (ZS, 17/9/2004). The German idea of independence from the society in order to advance knowledge, with an internal focus and engagement with basic research was hardly known to the Addis Ababa University which had often described its roles as public service, responsibility to society, “cultivating intellectual values and abilities, providing trained manpower and rendering public service”, in the context of autonomy, academic freedom and truth” (Abebe, 1968: 28). In fact the faculty appeared to be more familiar with applied than basic research (TA, 16/9/2004). “The University was expected to play political roles of being a *change agent* or a guardian of freedom” (Abebe, 1968: 28). During the feudal era, the university was expected to play roles of modernization and to be initiator of change. Owing to the knowledge deficit (instrumental knowledge) of the society, “the University was placed in a privileged position comparable to the one-eyed proverbial person, who assumed a kingdom in the country of the blind” (ibid).

Having inherited a dual curriculum system from the liberal art University College of Addis Ababa (UCAA) in the 1950s and the various technical and vocational colleges in the same period, Haile Selassie I University (old name of Addis Ababa University) began operating in the context of the service idea of a university (Aklilu, 1975: 119-120). The evidence for the argument that Haile Selassie I University (HSIU) operated in the context of a *university for society* is summarized in its comprehensive programs during its consolidation, in 1961, as shown below.

- The extension program of the University College of Addis Ababa, the ad hoc courses given by the staff of the Engineering College, and the Agricultural Extension services of the College of Agriculture were precursors of the expanded university activity in extension programs.
- The early concern to meet the manpower needs of the country, as manifested in the activities of the Public Health College and the Ethio-

---

## Development, Academic Freedom and the Idea of a University: ...

### Amare Asgedom

---

Swedish Institute of Building Technology. They remained a strong feature of the new University.

- Concern for rural development and the exposure of students to practical training in the area and situation where they were going to work was exemplified by the Public Health College. It was this same concern that led the university to establish the Ethiopian University Service (EUS).
- The orientation of university research to the solution of some of the real problems facing the development of the country which was early manifested by the building materials and low cost housing research of the Ethio-Swedish Institute of Building Technology; and the Debre Zeit Experiment Station of the College of Agriculture.
- The admission of experienced schoolteachers to the University College without the usual requirement of the Ethiopian Leaving Certificate Examination (ESLCE), and the summer in-service training organized in collaboration with the Ministry of Education (Aklilu, 1975: 119-120).

HSIU planned and operated with a commitment to apply knowledge to national and public utility by actively participating in rural development projects, by aiming to make research relevant to solving real problems facing the development need of the country, and by extending its services to adult learners through extension (evening) and summer programs (ZS, 17/9/2004). Since its emergence, the Ethiopian University has abhorred the idea of a *university in society* as being irrelevant to developing countries (Abebe, 1968: 28). “A university in a developing country ought to be much more responsible to the society in contrast to the traditional (European) idea of a university, an ivory tower operating in a societal vacuum” (Aklilu, 1972:2). HSIU professors had a harmonious view of the service role of the university with the corporate view as described by Professor Teshome Wagaw, the then Dean of Students:

*Obviously a national university in a developing country must lay peculiar stress on its public service role; its relationship to government must reflect the fact that a national university in a country lacking expansive revenue resources represent a major public investment designed to promote goals of development and change as these goals are articulated through constitutional processes. The investment must yield rewards measured in terms of our graduates' ability to contribute effectively to national progress (Teshome, 1990: 128).*

It was, however, believed that academic freedom and university autonomy were a requirement for a university to be responsible to society (Abebe, 1968). The Charter of HSIU (Negarit Gazeta, 1961) gave academic, financial and administrative powers to the university. Article 3 of the Charter reads:

*It is a function of the Haile Selassie I University, like any university, to serve society by advancing the frontiers of knowledge and to encourage learning through instruction that does not seek to indoctrinate, but to develop, among students, an understanding of the spirit and methods of free, rational, dispassionate and intellectually-disciplined discussion as a means of seeking truth. Furthermore, it is a function of the University Faculty to be creative, not imitative: to develop, through imaginative planning and consistent open-minded re-evaluation, instructional programs and research activity which contribute to Ethiopia's special needs for trained manpower and knowledge. It is thus a function of the University to develop itself as a community of scholars devoted to the continuing improvement of the university as a free institution in the service of the nation and society in general, in accordance with the best traditions developed by great universities throughout the world (Negarit Gazeta, 1961:32).*

This Article (Article 3 of the Charter of HSIU) has also guaranteed administrative and fiscal powers, such as entitlement to block grant, purchase, lease, sell mortgage, invest all movable or immovable property, erect and or contract all such buildings and expend the money required for any of these purposes and for furnishing and equipment of the university (Negarit Gazeta, 1961: 32-33).

The Consolidated Legislation of the Faculty Council of HSIU (HSIU, 1973a: 28) guaranteed full academic freedom with tenure (p. 21). According to this Legislation, the faculty of the university is guided by the following principles:

---

## Development, Academic Freedom and the Idea of a University: ...

### Amare Asgedom

---

*In his contact with students for teaching purposes a university teacher may always promote and permit an atmosphere of free rational and dispassionate inquiry with respect to issues relevant to the subject matter of his course. This may include discussion of controversial issues and the presentation of particular views thereon, but always without forcing the assumption that these issues are settled in advance; or the assumption that there is one "right" view of the issue to the exclusion of the open, intellectually disciplined dispassionate discussion of any other relevant views; on his private life a teacher enjoys the same legal rights and duties as any other private citizen. He will not be penalized by the university for the exercise of these rights; but he may be subject to disciplinary action by the university on grounds of objective standards promulgated by University professional associations in an effort to ensure minimal academic standards; And as far as university is concerned, a teacher's professional writings are only judged on the scholarly merits and on the contribution they make to this advancement of theory and knowledge (HSIU, 1973b: 29).*

The Ethiopian University Teachers Association (EUTA) adopted the model of the Association of American University Professors (AAUP) to defend academic freedom (Abebe, 1968:31). The service orientation of HSIU which developed out of a deep concern of patriotism (Balsvik, 2005), the feeling of indebtedness to the rural poor who paid taxes for the education of the few without being educated itself generated a consensus among students, university teachers and the administration to undertake programs which gave opportunities to the academic community to participate in community development programs, in rural development projects, to design curriculum and university programs that addressed the needs of adult learners, rural welfare needs and national manpower planning needs (HW, 1/12/2004).

The First University Five Year Plan (UFYP), 1968-1973, among other things, predicted student distribution among different programs to reflect priorities of national plans (HSIU, 1969: II-3). According to this plan, national priorities became the guiding principle to future direction of the university's research and teaching programs which were expected to cohere strictly with national priorities (HSIU, 1972: vii). The university administration advised teachers not to depend on a single textbook, but encouraged to use a wide variety of sources in their teaching in order to give students wider latitude of choice in their search for truth. For this purpose a wide variety of statutory research institutes were established in

different fields of study to produce mainly relevant teaching materials (ibid).

The major objectives of these research institutes were: sustained development of indigenous teaching materials; applied research in agriculture, education, and public health; development of innovative teaching methods; study one's own culture by collection and preservation of Ethiopian archives, art, music and historical artefacts; development of better testing devices; and Pan-African Research in collaboration with UN and OAU (Aklilu, 1973b: 16).

The Extension and Outreach Program of HSIU, which gave access to adults, operated almost in all campuses, Addis Ababa, Harar, Asmara (now the capital city of Independent Eritrea), with enrolments parallel to the regular program. In 1973, the summer school in-service program enrolled 2,318 teachers, and was growing at the rate of 20 percent annually (ZS, 17/9/2004). "The Extension and Outreach Program of HSIU, which was much assisted by UNESCO and began as early as 1950 was a robust program of the university which is still considered a public service function of the university" (ZS, 17/9/2004).

A unique and sustainable public service idea of HSIU was the Ethiopian University Service Program (EUS), which was inaugurated on 17 April 1964 requiring all university students to serve for one academic year, mainly in the rural areas of Ethiopia, where 95% of the population lived during this time. Some Ethiopians (ZS, 17/9/2004) believe that this program emerged "out of a concern by many university educators; (1) that education was becoming the privilege of a minority; and how to educate this minority to benefit the majority; (2) that education had tended to be too theoretical, too abstract and less informed by the fundamentals of rural transformation. This program was pedagogical, in the Habermasian sense of learning from the people in order to educate the people, a communicative act (Habermas, 2004). One clearly notes that the traditional values of indebtedness, cooperation and patriotism were reflected in this indigenous idea of University Service. It is also interesting to note that consensus was reached among the faculty, students, the government and the administration on the service idea of the university mainly through a deliberative act that

---

## **Development, Academic Freedom and the Idea of a University: ...**

### **Amare Asgedom**

---

was systematically and democratically carried out among all stakeholders (Aklilu, 1973b: 130).

The consensus (between the university and the state), which emerged in the early years of HISU, did not, however, last long as the university accentuated its commitment and responsibility to the society. The contextual characteristics of the 1960s--liberation movements in Africa, radical movements in the West, including the Vietnam War, and movements of socialist ideology--situated HSIU (which defined itself as a change agent, a centre of intellectual court and a servant of the principles of freedom) in an awkward position of political radicalism. The academic community (including its alumni) increasingly felt its responsibility to society--to be relevant to it", to guard it against exploiters and above all to be a guardian of its freedom (Kiflu, 1993:19). These sympathetic views developed out of the university's practical proximity to and engagement with the Ethiopian society and out of its ambitious expectations of its responsibility to it. The university felt that it has to play a vanguard role in fighting for major social, political and economic reforms (Kiflu, 1993; Balsvik, 2005; Fentahun, 1990).

Students rallied around the land issue, 'the most important economic resource to Ethiopians, which was controlled by a handful of landlords, leaving the majority landless tenants, especially in the massive Southern part of the country (Kiflu, 1993). Their opposition to the government policy was demonstrated in their publications, campus debates, open demonstrations that brought them into direct clashes with police (HW, 1/12/2004).

The monarchical system believed the responsibility of the youth is discipline, obedience, conventional thinking, hard work, and conformities (Teshome, 1990: 215). Serious conflicts arose between the feudal system's education values, (traditional conventions) and the university's values of continual examination, analysis, and criticism of existing order (ibid).



### Political Radicalism: Prelude to a *University OF Society*

With unsympathetic response of the state to student economic and political concerns, student reactions were ever getting tough (HW, 1/12/2004). Student publications and organizations were proliferating with radical views and advancing the idea of dismantling the archaic feudal system. Students realized that negotiations with the state and reforms were unrealistic (Fentahun, 1990).

Inspired by Marxist literature, and their readings of authors, such as, Fanz Fanon, “the Wretched of the Earth” (Balasvik, 2005; Fentahun, 1990; Kiflu, 1993), HSIU students adopted a very uncompromising position of the need for fighting the feudal system. For this purpose, student unions created an intricate system of networks, nationally and internally, such as, USUAA (University Student Union of Addis Ababa), NUES (National Union of Ethiopian Students) and NUEUs (National Union of Ethiopian University Students). The unions had worldwide networks, such as, Ethiopian Student Union in North America, ESUNA (Fentahun, 1990: 52) and Ethiopian Student Union in Europe (ESUE) (ibid).

Other worldwide organizations include WWUES (World-Wide Union of Ethiopian Students), and WWFWES (World-Wide Federation of Ethiopian Students). In addition to escalating an extensive propaganda against the regime using various student papers, students overseas pledged to heighten their commitment:

*History demands that we play head to our hungry, illiterate and over-exploited people; consciousness demands that we forget our personal interests and fight alongside our people. By struggling for the noble cause of our people; and shading our blood with them, we have done our historic duty (Fentahun, 1990:37).*

Student pamphlets made reference to the Revolutionary Ethiopian National Movement, which suggested a formal connection between students, peasants, workers and other groups opposing the regime (TA, 16/9/2004). These publications portrayed university students as leaders of the revolution, as the vanguard of workers, peasants and soldiers (Fentahun, 1990: 71). “Armed struggle was openly advocated by university students”

---

## Development, Academic Freedom and the Idea of a University: ... Amare Asgedom

---

(TA, 16/9/2004). The most popular slogan of the day that advanced armed struggle is shown below:

ፋኖ ተሰማራ ፋኖ ተሰማራ  
እንደ ሆኛሚን እንደቸገሼራ  
ፋኖ ተሰማራ  
እንደቸገሼራ እንደ ሆኛሚን  
ፋኖ ግባ ደን  
ፋኖ ግባ ደን

*Freedom fighter! Go to fight.  
Like Ho Chi Minh. Like Che Guevara.  
Freedom fighter! Go to your forest.  
Like Ho Chi Minh. Like Che Guevara.  
Freedom fighter, enter the forest.  
Freedom fighter, enter the forest (Balisvik, 2005:294).*

Peaceful political coexistence and dialogue between opposing groups were unknown in Ethiopia and within the university (Balsvik, 2005:295). “The publication on the question of nationalities in Ethiopia, which now serves as a premise of the present Constitution, by student Walelign Mekonen, served as a straw for provoking the government’s impatience with the student movement (Balsvik, 2005:266). This publication denied that Ethiopia was a nation but consisted of many nationalities (ibid).

In response, through its mass media, the government launched a major propaganda attack on what it called, “the fanatic few and the erring, the ringleaders of radical irresponsibility, the marionettes manipulated by foreign powers” (ibid). The government propaganda in the state media accused students of being led by communists who wanted to break up the unity and territorial integrity of the country, attempting to destroy all religious and cultural traditions. In mid 1960s, nine students who later played roles of leadership in the political opposition were suspended from the University for 15 months for allegedly breaking university regulations. The Academic Vice President, Edward D. Myers wrote, “These students are suspended for the following reason: they have flagrantly and deliberately violated university regulations” (Fentahun, 1990:viii). In 1969, four university students and one teacher were punished by five-year imprisonment for an alleged crime of distributing papers that incited

violence and lawlessness in the country (Fentahun, 1990:vii). Their names are Walegign Mekonen, Getachew Sharew, Fentahun Tiruneh, Ayalew Aklog and Gezahengn Mekonen (ibid).

On Sunday evening 28 December 1969, the President of the University Students Union (USUAA), Tilahun Gizaw, was shot by two unknown men near the Sidist Kilo Campus (ZS, 17/9/2004). Many other students (including High School) were killed following the reaction of university students to the death of their leader. Fentahun (1990:73) reported many students (both university and high school) to have died and wounded during this event. Fentahun asserted that this incident marked the “expression of the irreconcilable contradiction between the opposition and the government” (ibid).

Thus, one notes that the academic freedom and institutional autonomy enjoyed by the university (the faculty and students) during the early days of HSIU, was fully lost during the crisis years of the feudal system, when the values, mistrust and conflict, replaced the previous values, trust, service, cooperation and above all, deliberative democracy (Enslin and Kissak, 2005). University students were impatient to the continuation of the monarchical system (Balsvik, 2005). The advocated change conflicted with fundamental interests of those in power rendering university rights and privileges redundant. Academic freedom can only be presumed when those in power are assured of their authority and legitimacy. It proved that academic freedom is not a question of charters, legislations and structures. It is a matter of how power and interests are affected. Academic freedom (and institutional autonomy) is guaranteed when the university is an endorser arising from participation in decisions of national and institutional significance. This conflict between the monarch and the university in the late 1960s and early 1970s served as a prelude to the idea of a *university of society* fully experienced during the rule of the Marxist Military Regime in the 1974-1991 period.

### **The Ethiopian Revolution and the Idea of a *University OF Society***

*There will be an educational program that will provide free education step by step to the broad masses. Such a program will aim at intensifying the struggle against feudalism, imperialism, and bureaucratic capitalism (NDR, 1976:14).*

According to the NDR (National Democratic Revolution) program, heteronomy is the dominant characteristic of the idea of a *university of society*. No autonomy or independence is allowed in this idea of a university. Subservience to national goal is the dominant requirement of the idea of a *university of society*. After the 1974 Ethiopian socialist revolution, a Napoleonic type of university or what Ronald Barnett (1997b) called a *university of society* reigned for 17 years until 1991. As per the National Democratic Revolution program, education was a weapon of ideological struggle, "aiming at intensifying the struggle against feudalism, imperialism and bureaucratic capitalism" (NDR, 1976:14). The idea of academic freedom with the principle of collegiate rule was castigated as harmful, "The Collegiate methods are an excuse for irresponsibility and the most dangerous evil", the Commissioner of Higher Education, Dr. Mulugeta Semru, argued (Mulugeta, 1984:81). University autonomy is understood as a decentralized administrative system only for implementing higher education policies premised by a responsibility as a "society's servant" (p.83). "Autonomy doesn't exist merely for the university, but university exists for society, and its autonomy is solely to carry out its tasks of social service more competently (ibid). One clearly notes a radical divergence in conceptualization of the idea of university from the monarchical system. The former viewed the idea of a university as free but responsible to society, the latter as controlled and servant of society.

At a policy level, the University Charter of HSIU was castigated and immediately replaced by Proclamation No 109/69 (Negarit Gazeta, 1977: 124-129) which brought the administration of all institutions of HE (including private) under a central control of the government, Commission for Higher Education (CHE) which was authorized to lead and control them in a centralized way. This arrangement was ideologically justified by the

need for a coordinated and centralized administration to cohere with the central planning strategy of the country (Negarit Gazeta, 1977: 124-129).

CHE formulated the objectives of HE to reflect subservience of all ideas to Marxist ideology and curing Ethiopian education from its western influences. Before revising the university curricula to comply with Marxist Leninist ideology, the new government closed all higher education institutions for a two year compulsory service in rural areas, called *Zemecha*, Development through Cooperation Campaign, an idea that must have been a carryover of the old EUS (Ethiopian University Service), a robust academic service program to society during the monarchical period. Unlike the EUS, however, which was applied through faculty and student deliberation, the *Zemecha*, was enforced upon students and the faculty by the use of coercive power, Proclamation No. 11/1974 (Negarit Gazeta 1974: 41-46), obliging the academic community to participate unconditionally. It was enforced through sanctions that threatened citizenship rights of students and the faculty:

*Any person who is obliged to participate in the campaign shall, as long as he fails to fulfil his campaign obligation, not be permitted; (1) to attend day or night school in Ethiopia; (2) to be employed in any government or private organization; and (3) to leave Ethiopia whatsoever (Negarit Gazeta, 1974:44).*

Unlike the EUS program, which was also linked to academic activities through student research, constantly supervised by a competent academic staff member, the *Zemach* isolated students from academic life and denied them the right to help the rural poor in an autonomous manner (TA, 16/9/2004). Headed by a military officer, students and faculty members in the *Zemecha* centres had to be ruled by a strict military discipline and implement the centrally prescribed tasks in the countryside (TA, 16/9/2004).

Deviations in interpretations and perspectives were severely penalized by jailing and killing. Landlords who lost their land after the Land Proclamation No. 31 of 1975 (Negarit Gazeta, 1975) murdered a sizeable number of students. Frustrated military officials used students as scapegoats for their failures in implementing the often-difficult state policy in which students in all centres were doing every effort to desert the Campaign.

---

## Development, Academic Freedom and the Idea of a University: ... Amare Asgedom

---

When classes started in 1976 after *Zemecha* (after two years), HSIU which now changed its name to AAU (Addis Ababa University) had to undergo a process of radical restructuring with the general education courses to be replaced by Marxist-Leninist courses, such as Dialectical Materialism, Scientific Communism, Political Economy, etc. Some faculties, such as the Faculty of Education, Theology College, and the School of Business Administration were dismantled or closed down. Each professor had to undergo a process of *Tehadso* (renewal), a brainwashing attempt to drop his/her old beliefs, perspectives or ideology and swallow a Marxist-Leninist philosophy. He/she is required to do the same to the courses he/she teaches, including in the physical sciences. Researchers were obliged to adopt Marxist research methodologies (TA, 16/9/2004).

The Ethiopian University Teachers Association (EUTA) was restructured with appointed (nominally elected) leaders and made part of the centrally organized, Ethiopian Teachers' Association (ETA) headed by Dr Haile Gebrie Dangne, member of the Central Committee of the Workers Party of Ethiopia (WPE).

The new ETA structure was used as an instrument of the state to penetrate the university campus and ensure political and ideological control. Through the Red Terror Project, which destroyed a "generation that was visionary, idealist and perceptive and consisted of the most enlightened and brightest criticizes" (Kiflu, 1993, preface), the Marxist military government sustained an environment of fear and terror, making education a nightmare.

The state fully penetrated the university campuses ("the state is the university" to use the language of George Dennis O'Brien [1998]) through its cadres--professors, students and other members of the university--who were mere accomplices of the party and the state. Discussion forums were conducted every Monday afternoons ostensibly for ideological education but mainly stood for spying opposition elements in campus. Occasionally conducted academic conferences were often harangued by accusations of professors for still reflecting reactionary Western views. The Commission for Higher Education made it mandatory that a certificate in Marxism-

Leninism (offered during the Summer Vacations) was required to teach in the university. Clearly, it was ideology and not pedagogy that certified teaching in higher education of Ethiopia during the Marxist Regime.

The idea of *a university of society* also took the form of participation in forced labour by closing the university for several months to work in forced resettlement areas in the most uninhabitable places, such as Gambella and Metekel (HW, 12/1/2004). When the civil war was intensified by rebels in the Northern part of the country, Tigray and Eritrea, all university students had to suspend their education as a result of mass conscriptions for a military training in Blaten Military Camp. Militarization was one idea of the Ethiopian University (Mekete, 1991).

A conference conducted by the Addis Ababa University to review professional development opportunities during the demise of the Derg, the Planning Officer, Professor Mekete Belachew (1991: 3-30) concluded that the previous period was characterized by moral decadence, declining academic standards, full blown mediocrity, and prevalence of indiscipline among staff and students, and politicization and militarization of the university.

It became uncertain (in Ethiopia) what kind of idea of a university would prevail in the event of a new world order when Gorbachev introduced the idea of *Glasnost* and *Perestroika* in the early 1990s. That period was critical to AAU as it defined a transition from a university fully dominated by political power and a single ideology to an open system of competition of ideas and power following the demise of the Derg and seizure of power by rebel forces led by EPRDF.

### **Revolutionary Democracy and the Idea of a *University for Society*: Yes and No?**

The idea of *a university for society* in a democracy presumes freedom and autonomy of all higher education institutions in their relationship with the state and in the context of accountability and the national need for advanced skills and scientific knowledge (Enslin and Kissak, 2005:1). This kind of relationship with the state demands mutual understandings, trust,

---

## Development, Academic Freedom and the Idea of a University: ...

### Amare Asgedom

---

partnership and a deliberative type of democracy. It is not clear whether or not the present philosophy of higher education in Ethiopia is guided by the notion of a university *for* society. From the qualitative data one concludes that it is not a university where the faculty is guided by the principle of disinterested research confined to theory (HA, 23/12/2004). It still has an external outlook to the society to contribute to political and economic development (HA, 23/12/2004). Neither is it a university fully subservient to bureaucratic rule as mere servant of the state or society (TA, 16/9/2004). It is also hard to describe the present situation as being fully characterized by the philosophy of a university for society with cooperative state university relationships with full academic freedom and institutional autonomy (HA, 23/12/2004). The present state could perhaps be characterized by 'anarchy' (Hook, 1970), or better said, a 'university of crisis' (Preston, 2002), with diverse sources of power and absence of professional collegiality.

After the demise of the Marxist state that ruled the country through legitimizing its power by the authority of the Ethiopian working class (which was negligible in number), a new state was created in 1991, which legitimized its power, by the authority of the Ethiopian nation-nationalities (FDRE, 1995), the power of the state justified by a mandate from autonomous ethnic states (Stavenhagen, 1986).

Some authors (Merera, 2003; Assefa, 2002) preferably use ethnic nations to stand for what the new state designated term, nation-nationality. The idea of democracy to the new state was grounded in creating new ethnic federalism justified by the thesis of the relationship of power to culture and language (Huntington, 1996). This implies the right of ethnic groups to a fair share of power which is embedded in the belief of the importance of culture to development and social justice, as opposed to the traditional model of development, modernization, and its concomitant political theory, nation-state (Stavenhagen, 1986; Huntington, 1996). In the context of democratization, social justice and globalization, the idea of nation-state with its centrist perspective, has reached a state of obsolescence in the post cold war period (Kwiek, 2005; Enslin and Kissak, 2005; Stavenhagen, 1986). The idea of ethnic federalism has gained epistemic validity in the



political theory of deliberative democracy in pluralist and multi-ethnic societies as described by Seyla Benhabib (1996) who rejected the aggregative model of democracy which interprets democracy as a centrally electoral device in which the often “selfish preferences of individuals are aggregated in favour of parties and policies chosen because they are seen as most likely to advance the perceived interest of the majority” (Enslin and Kissak, 2005:33). Deliberative democracy, according to Benhabib, is:

*... best understood as a model for organizing the collective and public exercise of power in the majority institutions of a society on the basis of the principle that decisions affecting the well-being of a collectivity can be viewed as the outcome of the procedure of reasoned deliberation among individuals considered as moral and political equals (Benhabib, 1996:68).*

In the idea of deliberative democracy, norms are valid only if agreed to by those likely to be affected by them, in the Ethiopian case, all nations and nationalities. All participants must have the same right to participate, to initiate debate, ask questions and interrogate (Enslin and Kissak, 2005:34). The policy of ethnic federalism is, therefore, justified by the felt need for a social justice to allow culturally and linguistically distinct groups to deliberate on their political and economic fate (Stavenhagen, 1986; Huntington, 1996). In Ethiopia, it is a response to the demand for ethnic autonomy, which has been destabilizing the country since the 1960s, following the formation of a critical mass of educated elite. Merera (2003) argued that competing ethnic nationalisms has been the dominant political opposition in Ethiopia for a long time.

How does the new political landscape tally with the philosophy of higher education? We have seen that the service idea of a university born in the monarchical society was taken too far by the academic community mainly students who probably aspired for power as the next generation of leaders (Balsvik, 2005) by accentuating their political commitment as the vanguard of the people (Fentahun, 1990) but culminated in creating a political university.

After the 1974 Ethiopian Revolution, the Marxist regime exploited the political nature of the university and turned it into full “servitude” by using projects, such as *Zemecha*, manual labour, red terror (Yohannes, 1992),

---

## **Development, Academic Freedom and the Idea of a University: ... Amare Asgedom**

---

militarization (Mekete, 1991), prescribed curriculum, indoctrination and mind supervision. In the wake of a new revolution, democratic federalism, the university was unprepared to have a solid idea of a university (HW, 1/12/2004). Its academic community was divided among ethnic lines, political ideologies, and self-interests characterized by apathy (Mekete, 1991). Attempts at consensus creation within the academic community easily aborted (TA, 16/9/2004).

The first platform organized by Professor Mesfin Wolde Mariam, “an Ethiopian peace initiative” (Mesfin, 1991), which discarded both the outgoing and the incoming ideas of governance, did not materialize as it conflicted with the interest of diverse ethnic groups who were demanding freedom from domination by the Amharas, the dominant ethnic group since the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Merara, 2003). Failing to apply deliberative democracy which involves the contestation of the diverse ethnic groups, the proposal lacked a consensus (within the academic community) around the political locus, “peace and reconciliation”, and failed to be adopted when it was presented to a general staff meeting of the academic community in the same month of the seizure of power by the incumbent (HW, 1/12/2004). Instead of the proposed peace and reconciliation committee, the general staff meeting, through majority vote, passed a resolution to reinstate the old Ethiopian University Teachers Association (EUTA), which dissolved again following direct conflict with government (HW, 1/12/2004).

EUTA failed to be a platform of the academic community after it participated in what the state called “inciting” the university into violence (HW, 1/12/2004) and physical confrontations with the state in the 1993 general crisis. It encouraged and supported unlawful demonstration (permission was not secured from government) by students to contest the Eritrean Referendum during the state visit of the UN Secretary General, Dr. Poutrous Poutrous Ghalli, on 3 January 1993 (Topia, 3 January 1993:14-14) resulting in violence and subsequent closure of the university. When the University reopened in April 1993 with a new Administration and a new regulation, all academic staff members were required to sign a new two-year contract with the exception of 42 professors who received a different

type of letter that terminated their continued employment in the University (Levine, 1993:3). The list includes all members of the executive committee of UTA and others who appeared to be highly vocal and politically active (Levine, 1993:3).

This violent event was highly influenced by the Ethiopian academic culture of *Deregetawee Aserar*, which attempted to create a unified group in the Executive Committee of EUTA by wholesale dismissal of all Tigrigna speaking members (before term of tenure) both by EUTA Congress and its General Assembly (HW, 1/12/2004). The majority (members of the Executive Committee) rationalized the dismissal of the minority by the intolerable views of the latter that reflected a supportive view of the state (HW, 1/12/2004). *Deregetawi Aserar*, a distortion of democracy, germinated in the Ethiopian Student Movement (Fekade, 2001:3) and reared in the Marxist era, became the ideology of the academic community at a time when African intellectuals were aspiring for a deliberative democracy (TS, 12/5/2005). *Deregetawee Aserar* is a culture of conspiracy adapted to oppressive environmental culture but which has now prevented the development of critical intellectual culture and deliberative educational system in Ethiopia. A professor, who had gone through all experiences of learning (as a student) and teaching in the Addis Ababa University made the following observation regarding the culture of *Dergetawee Aserar*:

*Students in general including myself, used to feel freedom of opinion in the university Campus was one-sided even during the Imperial Period when there was relative academic freedom in Campus. The Student Union itself had a problem, shattering of dissenting views. I remember, there were unheard voices in the Campus even then. Student activists were using several techniques of controlling free flow of ideas in all forums. The latter (they) used to deny individuals with dissenting views the right to speak even though they raised their hands for hours in the discussion halls. The activists knew in advance what was in the mind of others. Those who could speak in favour of the dominant view were made to sit in strategic posts and the chairman very well knew this. Another way of shattering these dissenting views was by producing abundant noise including whistling and shouting, a kind of mob action, to discourage hearing a dissenting voice. Finally, the resolution they read was not the result of a student consensus. The interested group, in advance of the session, drafted it. When I see things in retrospect, the Derg applied this system very intensively both in its parliamentary elections and National "Shengo" (the second house of parliament). What I see in present day politics is what University students were doing in the 1960s and 1970s (TS, 12/5/2005).*

---

## Development, Academic Freedom and the Idea of a University: ... Amare Asgedom

---

We have seen in the preceding discussions how AAU turned out to be a political university. The idea of a political university undoubtedly aggravates tensions among the ethnic tribes [instead of Tony Becher's disciplinary tribes (1981)] that constitute the faculty. Using the ideology of *Deregetawee Aserar*, instead of critical perspectives (including self-criticality), the political university has precipitated the development of a culture of autonomous thinking, deliberative democracy and academic freedom of its constituency. A professor noted ethnic hatred, a culture of incite for violence, and lack of deliberative approaches in a meeting of the academic staff sponsored by EUTA.

*The General Assembly of the Ethiopian University Teachers Association (EUTA) held on 10 January 1993 was poorly attended. I doubt there was quorum. The information used as the basis of the discussion was misleading. It was about division of university students along ethnic lines. It was reported that the Pro-charter (loyal to the constitution of the transitional government) betrayed the anti-charter (those that defied the constitution of the transitional government) group during the anti-government demonstrations. When the invited student-representative read the statement that the pro-charter group stabbed the anti-charter group from the back, emotions of hate fuelled up among teachers. They said, "The pro-charter group wanted to resume classes". "The rival wanted to continue the strike". The main issue that led to the adoption of the five-point resolution of EUTA, according to my opinion, was the dilemma of whom to teach: The pro-charter or the anti-charter group (HW, 1/12/2004)?*

Appalled by the absence of intellectual culture in the university, another professor described the university in the following manner:

*I think there was also a problem on the part of the university, especially with the highly politicized vocal minority, which tried to create a hostile environment to EPRDF when it seized power by defeating the Derg. I was astonished to witness such events as University students fleeing to Kenya from Blaten Military Training, and when some teachers started teaching their political views in classes. That vocal group had a negative disposition. The reason could be, I guess, that the group believed EPRDF facilitated instead of resisting Eritrean cessation. It could also be the question of legitimacy to rule this country. "Who are they to rule us, they asked". But I believe that no one could reverse the tide of events in Eritrea. The Amharas, the Ghurages, or the Somalis would do the same as the TPLF (GM, 21/7/2004).*

At this stage, one could make the hypothesis that the state-university relationship reached a stage of antagonism. During the state-university three-week deliberations in the summer of 2002, Prime Minister Meles said, "the major problem of AAU is political, the absence of academic democracy". He added, "The university is a hostile environment to minority views; internal democracy is not distributed. The Prime Minister asserted that a dominant group which has affiliations with a certain political party controls decisions and actions of the university". He expressed dismay at the arrogance of the university to dismiss the Constitution of the present Ethiopian state. In spite of that, the Prime Minister regretted its previous hostile attitude and promised to help the university (AAU, September 2002:3).

Despite the optimism generated in the conclusion of the faculty-state deliberation during the summer sessions, a subsequent university crises precipitated university-state relations, culminating in direct state intervention by prescribing changes and reforms: curriculum change, appointment of officials, admission quota, and interventions in determining class sizes, and defining the requirements of degrees (TA, 16/9/2004).

The expansion reform of HE, Higher Education System Overhaul (HESO), developed by Ministry of Education (Alaazar *et al.*, 2002) in collaboration with donors, such as the World Bank and USAID (Damtew, 2004) had unprecedented effects in creating stress among the faculty who expressed that they had been relegated to mere accountability for the Ministry and the students and lost all freedoms of deciding whom to teach, how to teach and what to teach, including student assessment rights which they believe have been compromised by the requirement to comply with standard rules prescribed by the university administration (TM, 13/5/2005).

## **Conclusions**

From these arguments, one can conclude that the idea of university for society operates productively in the context of mutual trust and understanding between the state and the university. One learns from the Ethiopian experience that a critical stance of the university could not be tolerated by the state if its criticisms affect the legitimacy of state-power and the interest of those who hold this power. It is not, however, clear to what extent a university could be critical of the state and still maintain trust and support from the state. A moral stance of moderation in one's criticisms could however be tolerated more than an extremist position of critique which might deter negotiations and deliberations. In this connection, Mazrui said, "What a university owes to government is neither defiance nor subservience. It is intelligent cooperation, respecting the academic's right to be skeptical without being subversive, sympathetic without being subservient" (Mazrui, 1978:275).

## References

- AAU. 2002. *Setting Efficient Systems: Building Capacity for Better Future, Plan of Action for 2002/2003 Academic Year*. Unpublished, August 2002, Addis Ababa University.
- Aklilu Habte. 1972. *Introduction to The President's Report 1971-1972* (Mimeographed), Addis Ababa University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973a. *Introduction to The President's Report 1972-1973* (Mimeographed), Addis Ababa University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973b. *Higher Education in Ethiopia in the 1970s and Beyond*. A Paper Prepared for The *Bellangio Education and Development Conference* (Unpublished), Addis Ababa University.
- Alaazar Tilahun *et al.* 2002. *Higher Education Management and Administration System*, Volume 3, (translated) unpublished, Ministry of Education. Addis Ababa.
- Assefa Endeshaw. 2002. *Ethiopia: Perspectives for change and Renewal*. NP: Seng Lee Press.
- Balsvik, R. R. 2005. *Haile Sellassie's Students: the Intellectual and Social Background to Revolution, 1952-1974*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.
- Barnett, R. 1997a. *Higher Education: A Critical Business*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1997b. *Beyond Competence*. Coffield, F. and Williamson, B. (eds.), *Repositioning Higher Education*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press. pp. 27-44.
- Becher, T. 1981. *Towards a Definition of Disciplinary Cultures*. *Studies in Higher Education*, 6(2): 109-122.
- Benhabib, S. 1996. *Toward a Deliberative Model of Democratic Legitimacy in Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*. NP: Princeton University press.
- Brubacher, J.S. 1977. *On the Philosophy of Higher Education*. London: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Clark, B.R. 1983. *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

---

**Development, Academic Freedom and the Idea of a University: ...  
Amare Asgedom**

---

- Creswell, J.W. 1998. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Dantew Tefera. 2004. The World Bank Prescription for Ethiopian Higher Education: The Missing Antidote in Pursuing the Vision.
- Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. 2003. Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research. In Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds.) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues*. Thousand Oaks: Sage publications. Pp. 1-46.
- Dewey, J. 1910. *The Influence of Darwinian Philosophy*. New York: Holt
- Enslin, P. and Kissak, M. 2005. Conditional University Autonomy in a Deliberative Democracy. Unpublished (Draft Copy).
- Fekade Azeze. 2001. Interview with Ethiopian Radio. *Addis Admas*. November 10, 2001.
- Fentahun Tiruneh. 1990. *The Ethiopian Students: Their Struggles to Articulate the Ethiopian Revolution*. Chicago: Nayala Type.
- Gibson, R. 1980. Teachers as Employees. H. Sockett *et al.* (eds.), *Accountability in the English Educational System*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, pp. 85-97.
- Habermas, J. 2004. *Knowledge and Human Interests*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Halstead, M. 1994. Accountability and Values. D. Scott (ed.), *Accountability and Control in Educational Settings*. London: Redwood Books, pp. 146-163.
- HSIU. 1969. *A Forward Look: Haile Sellasie I University*. Addis Ababa: Commercial Printing Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972. *The President's Report 1972* (Mimeographed). Addis Ababa University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973a. *The President's Report 1972-73* (Mimeographed). Addis Ababa University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973b. *Consolidated Legislation of the Faculty Council of Haile Sellasie I University* (Mimeographed). Addis Ababa University.
- Hook, S. 1970. *Academic Freedom and Academic Anarchy*. New York: Cowles Book Company.
- Huntington, S. P. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World order*. London: Simon and Schuster.



- Kiflu Tadesse. 1993. *The Generation: The History of Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party* (Vol. I, Vol. II and Vol. III). Trenton, N.J: The Red Sea Press.
- Kwiek, H.M. 2005. Renegotiating the Traditional Social Contract? The University and the State in Global Age. ECER Keynote Address, Duplin, September 9, 2005. Unpublished.
- Levine, R.N. 2000. The Idea of the University, Take One: On the Genius of This Place', Presented at the Idea of University Colloquium, Chicago, November 8, 2000. <http://v.Chicago.edu/levine.html>
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1993) 'Is Ethiopia Cutting Off its Head Again'? <http://ntama.uni-mainz.de/~aau/Levine-1993.html>
- Mazrui A.A. 1978. *Political Values and the Educated Class in Africa*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Mekete Belachew. 1991. Selection and Recruitment Procedures of Academic Staff and Opportunities and Participation in Career Development. Ayele Meshesha and Azeb Desta (eds.), *Proceedings of the Workshop on Professional Staff Development Organized by AAU and DSE*, 8-13 December 1991, Nazareth. Addis Ababa: AAU Printing Press, pp. 1-30.
- Melody, J. 1997. Universities and Public Policy. A. Smith and F. Webster (eds.), *The Postmodern University*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, pp. 72-84.
- Merara Gudina. 2003. *Ethiopia: Completing Ethnic Nationalisms and the Quest for Democracy, 1960-2000*. Addis Ababa: Chamber Printing House.
- Merriam, S. 1998. *Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mesfin Wolde Mariam. 1991. An Ethiopian Peace Initiative. Bahiru Zewdie et al. (eds.), *The Eleventh International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Printing Press, pp 781-786.
- Mulugeta Semru. 1984. The Development of Higher Education in Ethiopia with Special Reference to Management and Planning, PhD Thesis (Unpublished). Addis Ababa University.
- NDR. 1976. Program of the National Democratic Revolution. Unpublished. Addis Ababa University.

---

**Development, Academic Freedom and the Idea of a University: ...**  
**Amare Asgedom**

---

- Neave, G. 1988. On Being Economical with University Autonomy. M. Tight (ed.), *Academic Freedom and Responsibility*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, pp. 31-48.
- Negarit Gazeta. 1961. *General Notice No. 284 of 1961* (January 28). Addis Ababa: Berhanena Selam Printing Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974. *Proclamation No. 11 of 1974: Development Through Cooperation, Enlightenment and Work Campaign Proclamation*. Addis Ababa: Berhanena Selam Printing Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977. *Proclamation No. 109 of 1977: A Proclamation to Provide for the Administration of Higher Education Institutions*. Addis Ababa: Berhanena Selam Printing Press.
- Preston, D.S. (ed.) 2002. *The University of Crisis*. Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V.
- Pring, R. A. 1995. *Closing the Gap: Liberal Education and Vocational Education*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Stavenhagen, R. 1986. Problems and Prospects of Multi-ethnic States. Annual Lecture Series, The United Nations University 27 March 1986 Lome, Togo.
- Teshome G. Wagaw. 1990. *The Development of Higher Education and Social Change*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Topia. 1993. Dismissal of University Teachers and Detention of University President (Translated) *Topia*. No. 1 p. 40.
- Yin, R.K. 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (3rd edition). London: SAGE Publications.
- Yohannes Mulugeta. 1992. *Escape after Crimes of Genocide*. Addis Ababa: Commercial Printing Press.