



IAU POLICY 2000

I.	Introduction	3
II.	IAU's Role and Mission	
1.	Internal and External Mission	4
2.	Associative Life and Public Service	5
3.	Membership, Partnerships and Networking	6
III.	IAU Policy 2000	
1.	General Framework	8
2.	Specificity of IAU and Lines of Action	9
3.	Implications for Structure and Functioning of IAU	11
IV.	Statements of Principles	
1.	Academic Freedom, Autonomy and Social Responsibility	12
2.	Towards a Century of Cooperation: Internationalisation of Higher Education	15
3.	Kyoto Declaration on Sustainable Development	18

IAU Policy 2000

Conscious of their high responsibility as guardians of the intellectual life; Conscious of the fundamental principles for which every university should stand, namely: the right to pursue knowledge for its own sake and to follow wherever the search for truth may lead; the tolerance of divergent opinion and freedom from political interference; Conscious of their obligation as social institutions to promote, through teaching and research, the principles of freedom and justice, of human dignity and solidarity; to develop mutually material and moral aid on an international level; The universities of the world, through their representatives assembled in conference at Nice, hereby decide to create an international association of universities.

— Preamble, Constitution of the International Association of Universities

I. Introduction

The citation preceding this text very well captures the vision of the founders of the International Association of Universities. It has remained the intellectual and moral underpinning of IAU's work, even if the Association's concrete role and tasks have evolved over the years.

The *IAU Policy Outline and Strategic Development Plan 1995 – 2000*, adopted by the Tenth General Conference in New Delhi, 1995, summarised the current self-understanding of role and mission of the Association and opened the discussion for the newly-elected Administrative Board on the future of IAU beyond the year 2000. That Policy Outline proposes that, on the one hand, IAU maintains and consolidates its important roles for information, research and analysis on higher education. One of the underlying assumptions in developing the responsibilities of the Association and its International Universities Bureau has been that this service character is essential for IAU's relevance, assuming that its work is to be situated on a consistent axis of information, reflection and action: responding to basic information needs concerning higher education systems, institutions, trends and developments; generating, on an international level, informed reflection, research and higher education policy debate; and, on this basis, organising appropriate support to facilitate and develop international cooperation and exchange in higher education.

It was then suggested that IAU, in building on these achievements, further develop its role as a forum for debate, as a “voice of higher education worldwide” with a more active involvement of the university community. An important focus for such debate is the long-term role of universities in society, some twenty-five years ahead, addressing fundamental issues on how universities may contribute to bring prosperity to all parts of the world. These were also the issues addressed at the IAU Mid-Term Conference in Bangkok, 1997, which focused on the *Social Responsibility of Universities*, and the UNESCO World Conference, 1998. Through these two Conferences, IAU has made a number of substantive and through-provoking contributions to the international debate. It now needs to reflect on how it conceives its proper role and responsibility in the follow-up.

The present Policy Outline first defines IAU’s role and mission and then sets out the general lines for the Association’s policy for the coming years. It concludes by a set of statements of principles on key concerns for the future of our universities and their role in society.

II. IAU’s Role and Mission

1. Internal and External Mission

The policy adopted in New Delhi identifies two complementary lines of action for IAU: an internal mission (direct services of the Association, linking up its Members and the university community) and an external mission (speaking on behalf of, and representing universities to outside partners and interests). Cutting across these roles, IAU shoulders on behalf of its Members, and with an explicit mandate received from UNESCO at its foundation, a public service mission, benefiting higher education and the community at large.

Within the internal mission, a major objective is to help universities to respond to the demands of internationalisation, through information and cooperation, and through the stimulation of open-mindedness and willingness to engage in discussion across cultural and political boundaries. This support in favour of internationalisation and of inter-cultural dialogue appears especially important for the least privileged universities, which are frequently confined to their national space and, in consequence, are prone to the weakness of this limited outreach. In view of the wide and diverse range of universities and countries that the Association brings together, this is an area where it can make a valuable contribution in bridging the widening gap.

With regard to the external mission, the worldwide scope of the Association implies the representation of the universities’ concerns vis-à-vis other international bodies, and the establishment of partnerships which can provide appropriate support to the universities of the world in their effort to discharge their responsibilities to society.

IAU’s mission is defined by its Members, on the basis of principles that they can agree upon and that they are ready to support through their financial contribution and active involvement. Part of this mission was pre-figures when the Founding Members drew up

IAU's Constitution and wrote into it the public service function of the International Universities Bureau, inherited from UNESCO. It now appears timely to review this traditional, fifty year old, special relationship between the Association and UNESCO and to give it a fresh meaning in the light of today's requirements. On the global level, IAU and UNESCO are natural allies in defending and promoting the cause of higher education and its role and responsibility in society. UNESCO has recognised IAU's special role by granting it, together with about a dozen other major Non-governmental Organisations, so-called "Associate Status", and IAU needs, in turn, to stipulate more clearly its specific mission within this special partnership with UNESCO – which has helped IAU's creation with precisely that alliance in mind.

In order to achieve these different goals and respond to the diverse expectations, a structured cooperative approach is needed which determines priorities, distribution of responsibilities and tasks among different actors, and required resources. Major elements in such a joint endeavour, where IAU can help catalysing and federating efforts involving our major partner organisations, are:

- to identify the key issues of a future-oriented higher education policy debate, as well as concrete needs for support in academic exchange, knowledge transfer, and capacity building through international cooperation;
- to assess our respective capacities to respond to such needs, the complementarity and uniqueness of our respective possibilities and responsibilities, as compared with what can be better done by others, bi-laterally or multi-laterally, on the institutional, national, regional or international level;
- to establish appropriate networking structures and facilities that will allow to serve better, through shared efforts, the needs and interests of our common higher education constituency;
- more specifically for IAU; to translate its existing services more clearly in terms of support to concrete cooperation needs, both of individual universities and of partner organisations, and to identify new services as best corresponding to the Association's vocation and possibilities; and to give expression to its internal and external missions through a strengthened associative life, including a broader interaction with other university organisations.

2. Associative Life and Public Service

Recurrent themes in the discussion about IAU's mission are the representativity of the Association, its associative life and its public service function, the latter two often being seen in a sort of opposition to each other. These notions include the questions about the legitimacy base and the outreach of the Association, and also who benefits from its work, and who is paying for it.

IAU finds itself in the paradoxical situation that its major strength, that is its truly international, worldwide character, implies at the same time its major weakness: the difficulty

to design and agree upon programmes of associative action that would adequately respond, without discrimination, to the diverse interests of a very heterogeneous constituency, so as to be able to count on its adherence and support. Many of the very concrete needs of universities can be much more adequately met either through direct institutional efforts or in the framework of organisations that are much closer, be it geographically, politically or philosophically, to their institutional concerns and objectives. Thus, in a principle of subsidiarity, a meaningful scope of action for a global organisation like IAU will have to meet three basic requirements: (1) to serve truly international/trans-regional objectives which, at the same time (2) can best be reached through a multi-lateral approach, and (3) on which the diverse constituencies involved can also agree.

If this assumption is valid, it may provide some explanation why IAU has acquired strength in certain areas (worldwide information and policy research on higher education – public service function) and has remained weaker in others (cooperation programmes – associative life). It may, however, also open a different way of looking at the seeming contradiction between “public service” and “associative life”.

It is legitimate to ask, whether the particular role, mission and organisational specificities of the IAU do not naturally tend towards focusing on action of a type that would be commonly considered as “public service”. This is quite apparent with regard to the information services and the policy research, the scope of which simply cannot be restricted to the sole membership, but this may also apply to “advocacy”, or any type of “associative life” that can be meaningful and sustainable for a diverse membership like that of IAU.

It may be worth recalling that, at no time in its history, has IAU had more than some 10 to 15 percent of the world’s universities as active Members. What has changed is the composition, the relative diversity of the membership in terms of types of institutions and geographical origin. The stability of the overall percentage, however, might suggest some correlation with a traditional, underlying membership concept, which may just not be apt to reach out considerably beyond these proportions. And while Members may be reluctant to finance with their dues services, which are not "exclusive" to them, the Association might, in turn, find it difficult to identify sufficient interest and commitment within the membership for sustained “project” activities that would warrant such exclusivity.

3. Membership, Partnerships and Networking

To break out of this apparent dilemma, it appears necessary to review established membership policy and, to adapt a membership concept that favours a broad, inclusive approach, rather than maintaining the paradoxical contradiction between IAU’s broad mission and its limited and heterogeneous membership. In the same sense, it appears also more appropriate to adapt the concept of “Associative Life” in a way that would be more meaningful for IAU, that is to translate it in terms of a broader networking function with a wide interaction with the international higher education constituency.

This is also valid with regard to a strengthened partnership with UNESCO, which acquires a special dimension in connection with the World Conference on Higher Education and its follow-up. IAU can play a unique role as a platform and interface for articulating the

concerns of the university community on a worldwide level and to attract its active input to global reflection and action. Thus, the “public service” could become, in a new sense, part of IAU’s “associative life”.

IAU has enjoyed, over the years, traditionally close relations with its international Associate Member Organisations. More recently, the question of a stronger involvement of national university organisations in the life of the Association, including the possibility for a type of national “group membership”, has been discussed. These considerations were then placed within a broader frame of reference, both with regard to membership policies and to cooperation with other organisations, by linking these issues more directly to the specificity

of IAU’s role and mission. They find expression in the proposal put before this General Conference to broaden the constitutional membership concept by extending to university organisations, national and international, the possibility to take part in the life of the Association as full members.

Such an approach, however, requires to rethink a certain number of acquired associative concepts, and no longer to limit IAU’s prime legitimacy base to a dispersed and restricted membership of individual universities, but to build it on its capacity to provide a worldwide platform with networking facilities to link up different communities, and to facilitate the pursuit of joint objectives and strategies, amongst others, with UNESCO.

In a broad and cooperative networking perspective, IAU and its partner organisations need not see their, partly overlapping, membership as a field of competition but, on the contrary, as a common asset in order to attain more effectively converging objectives. They can set in place adequate mechanisms and delivery structures and join efforts in promoting effective services to our constituencies, which might, for example, include:

- disseminating relevant information on the world of higher education in an international perspective, on missions, policies and strategies, in the form of concise briefs and overviews, easily accessible and usable for higher education policy and decision-makers. A similar approach could be taken in relation to issues of research and debate, comparison of experiences, publications or conjointly organised special meetings and seminars for university leaders and administrators;
- providing a link to consultancy, second opinions and referee networks for universities, particularly in developing countries, who wish to have access to independent advice, for example on directives from Governments and different agencies or on institutional development plans;
- a pool of independent advisors could also be made available for special tasks, third party assessments, legal advice, management advice, helping with analysis, formulation of strategic plans, governance strategies, codes related to academic freedom, etc;
- consultancy to agencies related to university cooperation;
- evaluation of institutional impact of university links and collaborative programmes,

independent from the usual evaluation by sponsors. Such analysis may point to practical and ethical guidelines for collaboration and codes of good practice, which could serve universities in their interaction.

In this networking approach, IAU's role is essentially seen to serve as a catalyst, facilitator and mobiliser for the international university community, individuals, institutions, organisations, to join in a pro-active and creative effort in defining and assuming the decisive responsibility of universities worldwide and in shaping a common future, where progress and increasing interdependence should be characterised by a true sense of partnership, mutual respect and solidarity. These principles should obviously also determine the base for the inter-organisational collaboration and could thus give a renewed meaning to IAU's mission as it has been laid out in our Constitution by the Founding Universities, fifty years ago.

III. IAU Policy 2000

1. General Framework

The basic values on which the International Association of Universities was founded, fifty years ago, and its main objectives are clearly spelt out in its Constitution, which in its Preamble and Article 2, recalls that the Universities of the World, through their representatives assembled at the Founding Conference in Nice, created the Association:

*Conscious of their high responsibility as guardians of the intellectual life;
Conscious of the fundamental principles for which each university should stand,
namely: the right to pursue knowledge for its own sake and to follow wherever the
search for truth may lead; the tolerance of divergent opinion and freedom from
political interference;*

*Conscious of their obligation as social institutions to promote, through teaching and
research, the principles of freedom and justice, of human dignity and solidarity; to
develop mutually material and moral aid on an international level;*

*To provide a centre of cooperation at the international level among the universities
and similar institutions of higher education of all countries, as well as among
organisations in the field of higher education generally.*

The basic vision of the University underlying the creation of IAU has remained a corner stone in the development of higher education over this past half century. It recalls that the universities, while benefiting from academic freedom and institutional autonomy with regard to their central missions in research and teaching, have to assume, in carrying out these tasks, their responsibility to society and to promote the principles of freedom, justice, human dignity and solidarity. The stipulated purpose of the creation of an International Association of Universities also underlines the essentially international dimension of higher education and its enhancement through cooperation.

At the same time, our societies, the universities, and the entire context of international relations, have been marked by an accelerating pace of change. The tremendous acceleration of the production and diffusion of knowledge and the rapid development of information and

communication technologies has increased the importance for societies to dispose of the appropriate capacities for research and higher education. However, while striving to enhance quality through cooperation, a major concern remains the maintenance of diversity and cultural identity. Furthermore, globalisation brings with it, on the one hand, the advantages of easier interaction and, on the other, an intensification of competition. At the same time, growing inequalities, amongst countries and within countries, with regard to their research capacity and higher education, reinforce competitive disadvantages and call for increased cooperation.

At the institutional level, the emergence of numerous facilities for research and advanced training outside the traditional universities have accentuated competition between universities and vis-à-vis universities, but have also led to the emergence of complementary capacities and enhanced networking opportunities. Further aspects of the dramatic transformation of the higher education sector over the past fifty years include the strong increase of enrolment figures and the ensuing heterogeneity of the student estate, often coupled with insufficient and precarious financial resources, namely from the public sector; furthermore, the strong differentiation of university systems with regard to their content, legal and financial basis and working conditions; and, finally, marked, and increasing inequalities between universities, both across countries and within countries.

At the same time, tensions arise within the universities between the requirements of technological and economic globalisation and the specificities of cultural and national roots. While graduates are expected to contribute to the advancement of both the global economy and local society, “global” technology and science often leads to the destruction of “local” wisdom and know-how.

Also the conditions for international cooperation are considerably different today from what they were fifty years ago. The wide availability of opportunities for exchange and collaboration, and the general interest in such cooperation, brings with it increased possibilities for universities, particularly the better endowed ones, to take care of their own interests and requirements, without the need of assistance from an international university organisation. Also, the creation and development of various university organisations on the national, regional and international levels has brought increased support to individual institutions. In addition, a good number of interests in higher education are represented through organisations representing certain sectors of academic life (professors, students, international relation officers, scholars in the different disciplines, etc.), rather than the institution as a whole. While this situation, ideally, opens new opportunities for networking, these organisations find themselves, at least in part, also competing with each other. Confronted with choices to make between multiple affiliations, institutions and individuals tend to favour structures attending to their immediate, day-to-day concerns, rather than the more remote international community.

In this setting, the basic philosophy of the Founders of IAU, in 1950, which was based on solidarity and idealism, appears today weakened and needs to be rebuilt in the understanding that international relations do not merely serve the individual institution, but provide a means of being stronger together. In a context of increased opportunities, a renewed mission for the International Association of Universities can be, precisely, to develop, in close cooperation with its partners, those modalities that will allow to overcome the weakening

effects in bringing these opportunities to fruition.

2. Specificity of IAU and Lines of Action

A priori, IAU's specificity is two-fold: The Association brings together institutions as such, and not certain sectors, segments, or groups of individuals taking part in academic life; and it has, from its origin, a global vocation, expressed in its slogan: "IAU – Universities of the World Working Together". It sees itself as the "Common Voice of the Universities".

It is with regard to these specificities that IAU needs to identify how it can serve, in the best possible manner, the world of universities, including other university organisations. Indeed, the different types of university organisations have their specific comparative advantages and IAU's own role should, therefore, be complementary to, and supportive of, that of associations with a national, regional, or otherwise specific mission.

Taking into account IAU's original role and mission, as well as the challenges and evolutions outlined above, the following priorities can be identified for the work of IAU:

- to contribute, on a global level, to the production and dissemination of information and knowledge concerning facts, trends and developments in higher education;
- to help contribute, on a global level, to the production and dissemination of reflection, research and debate concerning the universities;
- to help clarify, disseminate and refine a vision of the university and of its value base, shared by the Members of the Association;
- to pay particular attention to strengthening solidarity and reducing inequalities between universities of different backgrounds, resources and capacities;
- to express a common voice of the universities, on a global level, vis-à-vis partners like UNESCO, the World Bank, and other international agencies, as well as the public opinion;
- to catalyse the cooperation of universities and university organisations amongst themselves and with other partners, with regard to major questions of society, which are global in nature and to which universities must make an important contribution, such as:
 - universities and the construction of peace and democracy;
 - universities and sustainable development;
 - universities and the challenges and stakes of globalisation;
 - universities as actors of accelerated change in society;
 - universities and the commitment to ethical standards in the conduct of science and technology;
- to offer to other national and international university and higher education organisations a preferential platform for information, contacts and networking, and to participate itself in such international networks.

In order to be able to attain the above objectives, the Association will need to make every effort to strengthen its representativity, credibility and legitimacy and to assure a high quality of, and accountability for, its work. As far as its international public service mission is concerned, the ties with UNESCO should be further strengthened, and adequate funding

needs to be secured with due regard to the actual beneficiaries, so as to avoid that the cost burden of this service to the international higher education community is excessively born by the sole IAU membership. To secure the necessary funds for other tasks, particularly for facilitating linkages between universities of the North and the South, IAU should also offer to act as an agent for other agencies concerned with the development of higher education, such as the World Bank, the European Commission and others.

At its origin, IAU brought together individual universities sharing a basic commitment to certain academic principles, to international cooperation and to the responsibility of universities to society. Today, if the Association wishes to remain faithful to its original aspirations, it has to be able to assume progressively the mission of a broadly university-based, global platform for higher education, and to become itself an essential part of a broad network of networks of higher education institutions and organisations.

3. Implications for Structure and Functioning of IAU

The central purpose of IAU, as it was defined in the Constitution fifty years ago, is:

To provide a centre of cooperation at the international level among the universities and similar institutions of higher education of all countries, as well as among organisations in the field of higher education generally.

The preceding considerations underline the enduring validity of this purpose. However, in light of the major changes that have affected the world, and the world of higher education, over the past half century, the Association has to give itself the means to assure that it can accomplish its service mission, also in future, in the most efficient manner. This is the purpose of the Constitutional review presented to the General Conference. The proposed reform has the following main objectives:

- Its major thrust lies in adapting the present membership concept so as to favour a broad, inclusive approach and to strengthen IAU's capacity to provide a world-wide platform to individual universities and university organisations, with networking facilities for different communities to link up across the regions of the world and to pursue together joint objectives and strategies. The major change lies in the proposal to admit, alongside the traditional institutional members, also University Organisations as full members of the Association. Apart from the long-standing close relationship between IAU and its international Associate Member Organisations, the Association has, in the past years, also sought a stronger involvement of national University Organisations by admitting them to "associate membership" with consultative status, as well. It is now proposed to give all these organisations, international and national, a full share in IAU's policy and decision-making by granting them the right to take part in votes and elections and to be represented on the Administrative Board. Furthermore, in order to strengthen cooperation with other partners not eligible for membership, a special "affiliate" status is foreseen.

- It is further proposed to strengthen the action of IAU's Governing Bodies, essentially by reducing the interval between the ordinary General Conferences from five to four years, and by increasing the flexibility and efficiency of the action of the Administrative Board through the establishment of an Executive Committee.
- Finally, a number of minor amendments are proposed so as to adapt the wording of the Constitution to more recent requirements.

The details of this proposal are presented in a separate document *Revision of the IAU Constitution*. If adopted, the incoming Board will set in place the modalities for the implementation of the new constitutional provisions and the policy guidelines established by the General Conference. But it will be for the Members, institutions and organisations, who have carried this reform, to fill it with life and revigorate the Association so that it can best serve their needs and interests.

IV. Statements of Principles

In implementing and steering the policy of IAU, the Administrative Board has issued statements of principles on matters that are of key concern to the universities and their role in society. These concerns have therefore been taken up as thematic priorities by the Association. The Statements are put before the General Conference for formal adoption, as part of the *IAU Policy 2000*.

1. Academic Freedom, Autonomy and Social Responsibility

Recalling that at the International Conference convened by UNESCO in 1950, in Nice, the Universities of the World stipulated three indissociable principles for which every university should stand, namely:

- the right to pursue knowledge for its own sake and to follow wherever the search for truth may lead;
- the tolerance of divergent opinion and freedom from political interference;
- the obligation as social institutions to promote, through teaching and research, the principles of freedom and justice, of human dignity and solidarity, and to develop mutually material and moral aid on an international level.

Recognising that over the ensuing half century much has changed: new forms of higher education have developed; the numbers of universities, of academic staff, of students and not least the place the University now occupies in Society have evolved; the emergence of a world economy, with its benefits and its dangers, brings with it further responsibilities of a highly practical nature alongside the University's historic and abiding commitment to universalism, pluralism and humanism;

Acknowledging that in the course of the 20th Century, which has seen an unparalleled growth in knowledge, in research and in their diffusion, Society has entrusted to the University immense responsibilities in the common endeavour of human development, social, economic, technical and cultural advance, and in responding to major planetary problems such as the preservation of the environment and the eradication of poverty, violence and social exclusion; and that in its turn the University is, and will remain, vital in meeting Society's evident need to accommodate and steer rapid if not radical, change;

Convinced that human development and the continued extension of knowledge depend upon the freedom to examine, to enquire and to question, and that Academic Freedom and University Autonomy are essential to that end; that moreover the University does not exist for itself or even for the sake of knowledge but for the benefits it brings to Humankind and to Society by virtue and in view of its social utility;

Emphasising that neither Academic Freedom which encompasses the freedom to enquire and to teach as well as the freedom of students to learn, nor University Autonomy are privileges but that they are the basic and inalienable conditions which enable the University as an institution of scholarship and learning, as too its individual members to meet, fully to assume and optimally to fulfil the responsibilities Society confides to both;

Considering that Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Articles 13 and 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights stipulate that "higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit", underlining the importance of the full development of the human personality and the strengthening of respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms and the maintenance of peace, and that States "undertake to respect the freedom indispensable for scientific research and creative activity";

Observing that the fundamental principles on which universities are founded and which form the basis of their work for the common good have been reiterated by the international academic community on several occasions in the recent past (viz. the Declarations of Sienna 1982, Lima 1988, Bologna 1988, Dar Es Salaam 1990, Kampala 1990, Sinaia 1992, Erfurt 1996) and that they are also specifically highlighted in the Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel, adopted at the 29th Session of the UNESCO General Conference 1997;

We consider it timely, at the occasion of the UNESCO World Conference of Higher Education, to reaffirm these principles and to redefine their implications within the framework of a new Social Contract which sets out mutual responsibilities, rights and obligations between University and Society so that they may meet the challenges of the new Millennium:

1. The principle of Institutional Autonomy can be defined as the necessary degree of independence from external interference that the University requires in respect of its internal organisation and governance, the internal distribution of financial resources and the generation of income from non public sources, the recruitment of its staff, the setting of the conditions of study and, finally, the freedom to conduct teaching and research.

2. The principle of Academic Freedom can be defined as the freedom for members of the academic community - that is scholars, teachers and students - to follow their scholarly activities within a framework determined by that community in respect of ethical rules and international standards, and without outside pressure.
3. Rights confer obligations. These obligations are as much incumbent on the individuals and on the University of which they are part, as they are upon the State and Society.
4. Academic Freedom engages the obligation by each individual member of the academic profession to excellence, to innovation, and to advancing the frontiers of knowledge through research and the diffusion of its results through teaching and publication.
5. Academic Freedom also engages the ethical responsibility of the individual and the academic community in the conduct of research, both in determining the priorities of that research and in taking account of the implications which its results may have for Humanity and Nature.
6. For its part, the University has the obligation to uphold and demonstrate to Society that it stands by its collective obligation to quality and ethics, to fairness and tolerance, to the setting and the upkeep of standards - academic when applied to research and teaching, administrative when applied to due process, to the rendering of accounts to Society, to self-verification, to institutional review and to transparency in the conduct of institutional self-government.
7. For their part, organising powers and stakeholders public or private, stand equally under the obligation to prevent arbitrary interference, to provide and to ensure those conditions necessary, in compliance with internationally recognised standards, for the exercise of Academic Freedom by individual members of the academic profession and for University Autonomy to be exercised by the institution.
8. In particular, the organising powers and stakeholders public or private, and the interests they represent, should recognise that by its very nature the obligation upon the academic profession to advance knowledge is inseparable from the examination, questioning and testing of accepted ideas and of established wisdom. And that the expression of views which follow from scientific insight or scholarly investigation may often be contrary to popular conviction or judged as unacceptable and intolerable.
9. Hence, agencies which exercise responsibility for the advancement of knowledge as too particular interests which provide support for, or stand in a contractual relationship with, the University for the services it may furnish, must recognise that such expressions of scholarly judgement and scientific inquiry shall not place in jeopardy the career or the existence of the individual expressing them nor leave that individual open to pursuit for délit d'opinion on account of such views being expressed.
10. If the free range of inquiry, examination and the advance of knowledge are held to be benefits Society derives from the University, the latter must assume the responsibility for the choices and the priorities it sets freely. Society for its part, must recognise its

part in providing means appropriate for the achievement of that end. Resources should be commensurate with expectations - especially those which, like fundamental research, demand a long-term commitment if they are to yield their full benefits.

11. The obligation to transmit and to advance knowledge is the basic purpose for which Academic Freedom and University Autonomy are required and recognised. Since knowledge is universal, so too is this obligation. In practice, however, Universities fulfil this obligation primarily in respect of the Societies in which they are located. And it is these communities, cultural, regional, national and local, which establish with the University the terms by which such responsibilities are to be assumed, who is to assume them and by what means and procedures.
12. Responsibilities met within the setting of 'national' society, extend beyond the physical boundaries of that society. Since its earliest days, the University has professed intellectual and spiritual engagement to the principles of 'universalism' and to 'internationalism' whilst Academic Freedom and University Autonomy evolved within the setting of the historic national community. For Universities to serve a world society requires that Academic Freedom and University Autonomy form the bedrock to a new Social Contract - a contract to uphold values common to Humanity and to meet the expectations of a world where frontiers are rapidly dissolving.
13. In the context of international cooperation, the exercise of Academic Freedom and University Autonomy by some should not lead to intellectual hegemony over others. It should, on the contrary, be a means of strengthening the principles of pluralism, tolerance and academic solidarity between institutions of higher learning and between individual scholars and students.
14. At a time when the ties, obligations and commitments between Society and the University are becoming more complex, more urgent and more direct, it appears desirable to establish a broadly recognised International Charter of mutual rights and obligations governing the relationship between University and Society, including adequate monitoring mechanisms for its application.

2. Towards a Century of Cooperation: Internationalisation of Higher Education

Preamble

It has often been taken for granted that universities are international. The universal nature of knowledge, a long tradition of international collegiality and cooperation in research, the comings and goings of faculty and students since Antiquity have all served to create this impression. Conscious that this impression only partially reflects the day to day reality of higher education institutions in the world, and noting that internationalisation of higher education is today more than ever a worthy goal, the International Association of Universities wishes to reaffirm its own commitment to this effort and to urge all stakeholders to contribute to its realisation.

As we approach the 21st Century, a number of major challenges face women and men around the world as they interact with one another as individuals, groups, and with nature. Globalisation of trade, of production, and of communications has created a highly interconnected world. Yet the tremendous gaps between the rich and the poor continue to widen both within, and between nations. Sustainable development remains an elusive long-term goal, too often sacrificed for short-term gains.

It is imperative that higher education offer solutions to existing problems and innovate to avoid problems in the future. Whether in the economic, political, or social realms, higher education is expected to contribute to raising the overall quality of life, world wide. To fulfil its role effectively and maintain excellence, higher education must become far more internationalised; it must integrate an international and intercultural dimension into its teaching, research, and service functions.

Preparing future leaders and citizens for a highly interdependent world, requires a higher education system where internationalisation promotes cultural diversity and fosters intercultural understanding, respect, and tolerance among peoples. Such internationalisation of higher education contributes to building more than economically competitive and politically powerful regional blocks; it represents a commitment to international solidarity, human security and helps to build a climate of global peace.

Technological advances in communications are powerful instruments which can serve to further internationalisation of higher education and to democratise access to opportunities. However, to the extent that access to new information technologies remains unevenly distributed in the world, the adverse side effects of their widespread use can threaten cultural diversity and widen the gaps in the production, dissemination, and appropriation of knowledge.

Highly educated personnel and research at the highest levels are essential to increasingly knowledge-based development everywhere. Internationalisation and international cooperation can serve to improve higher education by increasing efficiency in teaching and learning as well as in research through shared efforts and joint actions.

The International Association of Universities, founded to promote international cooperation among higher education institutions, notes that despite the universality of knowledge which has always served to affirm the international nature of higher education, the level of internationalisation remains low and uneven. Furthermore, international cooperation has had relatively little impact on global wealth and resource distribution even in the realm of higher education. Worse, the external braindrain and other negative consequences of poorly designed cooperative activities have at times even exacerbated the conditions in developing nations. In more recent times, commercial and financial interests have gained prominence in the internationalisation process and threaten to displace the less utilitarian and equally valuable aspects of this enriching and necessary transformation of higher education.

Recommendations

In recognition of the urgency to take positive actions, the International Association of Universities recommends that:

1. higher education institutions seize the initiative in the process of internationalisation rather than reacting to external globalisation forces, such as the market, in determining their actions;
2. higher education leaders, with active support of all levels of the academic community, develop clear institutional internationalisation policies and programmes that are seen as integral to the life of the institution and as such enjoy adequate internal and external funding;
3. this support be facilitated by the creation of a Forum on Internationalisation Policy by the IAU and its Associate Members for the exchange of ideas and experience;
4. the curriculum of the university reflect the preparation of international citizens, through facilitating language competence; and understanding of global, international, and regional issues; preparation of experts in areas needed for such fields as information technology and science, peace and conflict resolution, and sustainable development, as well as the special curricular needs of international students;
5. North-South cooperation in higher education, focusing as it does on human resource development, be recognised as a major instrument of the fight against inequality among nations, people, and groups and be given adequate support and funding by national development agencies, intergovernmental organisations, and private foundations;
6. the highly successful and valuable academic mobility programmes developed within particular regions (Europe, Asia, North America) continue to serve as catalysts and models to expand such flows more widely to ever-growing numbers of individuals and institutions on the global level. Efforts should be made to promote the growth of academic mobility programmes in the other regions of the world (Africa, Middle East, Latin America) as well as expanding inter- regional programmes of inter-university cooperation;
7. institutions of higher education take pro-active measures to ensure the quality of the internationalisation process by making use of existing quality review expertise developed by various organisations and that IAU make such projects known among its membership and contribute to the development of a roster of experts available to take part on peer review teams;
8. the expansion of education export development be conducted within internationally ethical codes of good practice and be accompanied by research to evaluate its educational and economic impact and to sustain quality control;

9. the expertise and experience of retired faculty members and scholars be mobilised and shared across the North-South divide in an Academics without Borders volunteer programme to be facilitated by IAU and UNESCO;
10. UNESCO, national governments, and educational institutions each demonstrate their commitment to international cooperation in higher education by implementing , within their respective purview, policies that remove obstacles to mobility , such as stringent visa requirements, restrictive recognition practices, and other regulations which impede the flow of students and academics; and
10. all internationalisation programmes be founded on the principle of partnership among equals and promote intercultural competence and a culture of peace among global citizens.

3. The Kyoto Declaration on Sustainable Development

The International Association of Universities issues the following Declaration:

1. To urge universities world-wide to seek, establish and disseminate a clearer understanding of Sustainable Development - "development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the needs of future generations" - and encourage more appropriate sustainable development principles and practices at the local, national and global levels, in ways consistent with their missions.
2. To utilise resources of the university to encourage a better understanding on the part of Governments and the public at large of the inter-related physical, biological and social dangers facing the planet Earth, and to recognise the significant interdependence and international dimensions of sustainable development.
3. To emphasise the ethical obligation of the present generation to overcome those practices of resource utilisation and those widespread disparities which lie at the root of environmental unsustainability.
4. To enhance the capacity of the university to teach and undertake research and action in society in sustainable development principles, to increase environmental literacy, and to enhance the understanding of environmental ethics within the university and with the public at large.
5. To cooperate with one another and with all segments of society in the pursuit of practical and policy measures to achieve sustainable development and thereby safeguard the interests of future generations.
6. To encourage universities to review their own operations to reflect best sustainable development practices.

7. To request the IAU Administrative Board to consider and implement the ways and means to give life to this Declaration in the mission of each of its members and through the common enterprise of the IAU.

Proposed Action Plan for Individual Universities

Each University, in its own action plan, will strive:

1. to make an institutional commitment to the principle and practice of sustainable development within the academic milieu and to communicate that commitment to its students, its employees and to the public at large;
2. to promote sustainable consumption practices in its own operations;
3. to develop the capacities of its academic staff to teach environmental literacy;
4. to encourage among both staff and students an environmental perspective, whatever the field of study;
5. to utilise the intellectual resources of the university to build strong environmental education programmes;
6. to encourage interdisciplinary and collaborative research programmes related to sustainable development as part of the institution's central mission and to overcome traditional barriers between discipline's and departments;
7. to emphasise the ethical obligations of the immediate university community – current students, faculty and staff – to understand and defeat the forces that lead to environmental degradation, North-South disparities, and the inter-generational inequities; to work at ways that will help its academic community, and the graduates, friends and governments that support it, to accept these ethical obligations;
8. to promote interdisciplinary networks of environmental experts at the local, national and international level in order to disseminate knowledge and to collaborate on common environmental projects in both research and education;
9. to promote the mobility of staff and students as essential to the free trade of knowledge;
10. to forge partnerships with other sectors of society in transferring innovative and appropriate technologies that can benefit and enhance sustainable development practices.

In adopting this Declaration the following points are specifically underlined:

1. That sustainable development must not be interpreted in a manner that would lead to "sustained undevelopment" for certain systems, thus blocking their legitimate aspiration to raise their standard of living.
2. That sustainable development must take into consideration existing disparities in consumption and distribution patterns, with unsustainable over-consumption in some parts of the world contrasting with dramatic states of deprivation in others.
3. That global sustainable development implies changes of existing value systems, a task in which universities have an essential mission, in order to create the necessary international consciousness and global sense of responsibility and solidarity.
4. That university cooperation for sustainable development must also assure that universities from countries with insufficient proper resources may play an active role in the process.
5. That IAU, through the intellectual and organisational potential of the Association, its clearinghouse, catalyst and network function, has a major role to play in the implementation of this Declaration.