



THE KENAN
INSTITUTE FOR ETHICS
at Duke University

DUKE'S GLOBAL VENTURES

Collaboration or Colonialism?

April 2009

Each spring, the Kenan Institute for Ethics hosts a symposium to foster discussion on a subject of particular importance to the Duke community. Each symposium consists of a half-day series of panels with scholars and experts from within the Duke community and across the nation. Support for this annual event is provided by the Matt and Susan Mackowski Fund.

The 2009 Public Ethics Symposium – “Duke’s Global Ventures: Collaboration or Colonialism?” – was cosponsored by Duke Chapel and took place on April 1, 2009. Four speakers from business, medicine, law, and literature examined Duke’s growing international presence as an example of the increasing number of schools creating international outposts of their home campuses. What does it mean to say “abroad” when we are both here and there – and what do we mean by “we”? What happens when American universities are asked to endorse practices that would be unacceptable at home? Is there a role for the humanities in these ventures, for pursuing hard questions of truth unbounded by strategic relations? The Symposium explored these and other questions at the core of the intellectual opportunities, ethical dilemmas, and strategic pitfalls involved in the emerging transnational educational ventures. This publication contains an edited transcript of the event.

Panelists



R. Sanders (Sandy) Williams, Senior Vice Chancellor of Duke Medicine and Senior Advisor for International Strategy for Duke University. He is a physician-scientist who has served Duke as Dean of two Schools of Medicine, in Durham and in Singapore, and he currently plays a key role in formulating and guiding Duke's plans for greater engagement by students and faculty with the world around us.



Blair Sheppard, Dean of the Fuqua School of Business at Duke University. He was the founder and CEO of Duke Corporate Education and currently serves as the Chair of the Duke CE Board of Directors.



Ranjana Khanna, Margaret Taylor Smith Director of Women's Studies and Professor of English and Women's Studies. Her research interests include Anglo- and Francophone postcolonial theory and literature, psychoanalysis, and feminist theory. She is the author of *Dark Continents: Psychoanalysis and Colonialism* and *Algeria Cuts: Women and Representation 1830 to the present*.



Karla Holloway, James B. Duke Professor of English at Duke University. She also holds appointments in the Law School, Women's Studies, and African & African American Studies. Her research and teaching interests focus on African American cultural studies, biocultural studies, gender, ethics and law.

Moderators

Sam Wells, Dean of Duke Chapel

Noah Pickus, Nannerl O. Keohane Director of the Kenan Institute for Ethics

PICKUS: Welcome. I'm Noah Pickus, Director of the Kenan Institute for Ethics at Duke, and it's my pleasure to join with Sam Wells, Dean of Duke Chapel, to present this symposium on "Duke's Global Ventures." I'm particularly grateful to the Matt and Susan Mackowski Fund, which supports the Kenan Institute for Ethics' Annual Symposium.

Duke, like many universities, has long been involved in a series of international engagements. In recent years the level and kind of engagement has ratcheted up considerably as a corporate and strategic effort of the university. Today we want to learn a bit more about what's going on and to think together across the university about the implications, the challenges and the opportunities that this new kind of engagement presents.

We have three kinds of questions about Duke's global ventures:

1. Description. What is happening? Are these profit-making ventures? Are they benevolent?
2. Critique. Will Duke replicate abroad the complexities of its relationship with Durham? Will these ventures distract us from our core purpose as a university or are these indications that Duke no longer has a core purpose?
3. Analysis. What happens when we encounter value conflicts abroad? What happens if we are asked to endorse practices that would be unacceptable at home? What does the competition introduced by these new ventures do to local forms of knowledge and educational systems? And what does it mean to talk about Duke now that it is not primarily defined by its tight concentration in one geographical area?

These questions apply, of course, to the significant number of universities across the country that are undertaking similar ventures. So while we will talk today about some uniquely Duke aspects, we are mindful of a broader national trend that merits analysis as well. Indeed, we hope by focusing on one institution, our own, we can illuminate that larger trend.

We're delighted to have the four panelists who help us to do just that:

- Sandy Williams, Senior Vice Chancellor of Duke Medicine and Senior Advisor for International Strategy for Duke University
- Blair Sheppard, Dean of the Fuqua School of Business and the Chair and Founder of Duke Corporate Education
- Ranjana Khanna, the Margaret Taylor Smith Director of Women's Studies and Professor of English and Literature
- Karla Holloway, the James B. Duke Professor of English and Professor of Law

WELLS: Sandy, what is Duke doing in Singapore and why?

WILLIAMS: I'd like to start with the why and put two premises on the table. First, to be a leader or even a good citizen will require in the future a much more nuanced understanding of different peoples, different cultures, different modes of communication that exist around the world than has been true in the past.

Second, the great problems that face humankind today are not by and large limited to local, regional, or national boundaries. They all play out at a local level eventually, but the dynamics that drive those challenges and the approaches to their solutions to the extent that such are available will best be gained by international teams, by people who understand these problems as they exist and are connected in different parts of the world.

You're all aware of the epidemic of HIV/AIDS that has swept the globe in just a couple of decades and the devastating impact that it's had both on individuals, families, communities, and whole nations around the world. Appearing apparently from nowhere, this epidemic did not respect national borders, and the ease of transportation

today allowed it to spread quite rapidly around the world. We face similar threats from other infectious diseases, including various forms of influenza. I was in Singapore during one of the outbreaks of the SARS virus which killed doctors and nurses there and the next day killed a nurse in Toronto. Fortunately, that one was contained. But these things will continue to occur and will threaten all of us and the solutions are not likely to be gained from parochial thinking in one point of the globe. It's going to require networks to solve it.

So let's move to the what. What are we doing in Singapore? The brief history goes back to about 2001 when I became Dean of the Medical School at Duke. Within the first month I was asked to meet with some visitors from Singapore. I said to my vice dean, "I don't want to do that." But my wise vice dean said these are serious people – you should see them. So I did. I liked them. To make a long story short, between 2001 and 2005 we entered a dialogue with representatives of Singapore that led in 2005 to the signing of a seven-year contract with Duke. We agreed to use our talent and expertise, our reputation, and our knowledge of what a first-class medical school in the world should look like, and create such a thing *de novo* in Singapore fully financed from their end. And that was the nature of the agreement. So in 2005 I became the founding dean of the Duke-NUS, National University of Singapore Graduate Medical School, which is now, I think, generally viewed as best-in-class among the major relationships between U.S. educational institutions and partners abroad.

We have been able to do what Singapore asked us to do to their great satisfaction and we have been able to be true to all of the principles that were our own criteria in going into the relationship. What were those principles?

1. What Duke does abroad should be fully Duke. That to me is the most important distinction of virtually all of the Duke programs abroad today compared to my knowledge of most of what other universities are doing. We are not doing what I call shallow franchising agreements where for monetary return we give our brand to something that is not really representative of that brand. What we are doing should have the look and feel and quality of what we expect of our units and colleagues here. The students who are attracted and study there must be of comparable quality. The faculty must aspire to the same kind of things we expect of our faculty. The accomplishments of the school however you might judge it must be Duke quality.
2. The second principle is that to be sustainable and valuable the program must serve the needs of the local people. There's a sad tradition of what's called "parachute research" by U.S. research institutions sending people in to study, write their research papers, and then leave, leaving the local communities no better off and in some cases creating disruptions in their culture that have negative impact.

A few more facts about the medical school in Singapore: it was founded in temporary quarters, but this month we will occupy a beautiful thirteen-story building that really harkens back to the original days of Duke Medical School when everything fit in one building. So the classrooms and teaching laboratories are in the same building as the administrative offices, the library, and the laboratories of the scientists of the school. You walk right across the street to the Singapore General Hospital which is a hundred years old – not the building, but the institution – which is a very modern, flagship hospital with the quality of medical care that we believe is comparable to what one would find at Duke Hospital. They are our clinical partner in the teaching of the school.

This involved an investment of about \$350 million by the Singapore government to sponsor this. But that money does not flow to Duke except for some cost recovery and some small flow of dollars here. It mostly resides in Singapore, but under Duke management, since we provide the management of the school. They have a very fine pre-existing medical school that produces excellent doctors, but their government believed they were not producing the doctors who were impatient with the current status of medicine. They were not producing the inventors and the scientists and the drivers of new technology, doctors strongly inclined to question the status quo and create new health services. They wanted a U.S.-style medical school with entrepreneurial energy, and of all the U.S. medical schools they chose Duke as the one who best provided what they wanted. We believe we're delivering that to them as well as training some more very fine doctors.

So we admitted our first class of medical students two years ago. We're now enrolling our third class. In the first two years, we admitted seventy-five students. We'll admit fifty more this year. The seventy-five students in the first two classes are citizens of seventeen countries. About half are Singaporean. The next largest group interestingly are U.S. citizens, many of whom have turned down admission to well-known U.S. medical schools to go to Duke in Singapore, and we have people from every Asian nation and even several African and Latin American nations who have enrolled there, so it's almost certainly the most multinational of any medical school on the planet which is what Singapore wanted. They wanted us to attract foreign talent to create a melting pot of high energy.

We've attracted researchers of high caliber. About a dozen long-standing Duke faculty members have moved their families there, live there, and have full-time appointments there. There's another dozen like myself who shuttle back and forth for various roles, but we've attracted about thirty additional full-time research faculty from some of the best institutions in the world, from Yale, Harvard, UCSF, Cambridge – the top peer institutions. And we have prepared and trained about a hundred and fifty of the best doctors in Singapore to teach in the clinical settings in the Duke style. They've all come to Duke and seen how we do it here. We've sent Duke clinical teachers there to show them the way you do it in the Duke way.

WELLS: Tell us the negative part. What are the pitfalls?

WILLIAMS: The pitfalls fall into two categories, pragmatic and moral.

1. Will it be a drain or a negative to things we do here? That could happen through financial drain. In many people's view, if we're taking resources that we need right here and shipping them overseas, that could be a negative, particularly if the return on that investment is remote. It could be a problem of dilution. When we sent twelve of our best faculty to Singapore, they're no longer here, at least in physical presence, to be colleagues to people of their department. That carries some kind of cost. As the Dean of the Medical School, I put about twenty percent of my time into nurturing this relationship. I can't spend those hours on something here, so there's a risk of dilution and then there's a risk of reputation. If the thing flops or we get involved in moral hazards that put Duke in a negative light, then all of the reasons that we think the project advances the reputation of Duke could be destroyed.
2. The moral hazards fall in similar categories.
 - There is a danger of revisiting the excesses of a sad era of western colonialism in that you come in and damage the environment, damage the culture, and do little for the local people, and then you ship profits home. I think quite a number of U.S. educational programs abroad could rightly be tarred with that brush – but I do not believe that is what Duke is doing.
 - A second moral hazard is a kind of cultural imperialism: the notion that we're going to go abroad, we know what we're doing, we're here to give our wisdom and know-how to a less-than-equal set of partners. That's a serious mistake, particularly when you begin to interact with the kind of partners we are seeking abroad. If the Duke person does not bring their A-game to the encounter, they will quickly find themselves being outgunned intellectually by the partners. You need to go in top form and never for a moment think that somehow you're bringing a whole different level of cultural or intellectual superiority.
 - There's a third hazard, which I might call a similar kind of arrogance. The thinking goes, "Because we are a superior culture – the rich and powerful – and our moral standards are the gold standard for the world, we have some obligation to take those abroad." I don't think we have such a claim to moral superiority over other cultures of the world that we should ever fall into that trap. Yes, there are occasionally uncomfortable features of working abroad. Yes, you are thrown into mores and laws sometimes that may in some respects be inconsistent with your own personal values or even with what I would call a consensus set of Duke

values. Yes, those hazards are out there, but I'm quick to point out that you can find many examples of the same in our own country. So, yes, you need to be vigilant to those things, but I don't think it follows *ipso facto* that because you're working in another country where such things exist that you have to demean or besmirch yourself.

WELLS: And, finally, what are you discovering and what would you count as having been a success?

WILLIAMS: In Singapore the measures of success that we set for ourselves are being achieved.

1. Duke's reputation as a leader in innovation and as a place of real excellence in medical science and medical education is being enhanced. There are thousands, maybe even millions, of people in that part of the world that have heard of Duke now and carry a positive impression of us. I just visited China with Blair Sheppard last week. The Chinese officials that we met were aware of what Duke had done in Singapore and had a positive impression of that work, which created a good first step forward in the new relationships that we're trying to build with them.
2. At a personal level I have made a set of very interesting friends. There are people in Singapore now that rank in my top ten list of the people I'd most want to spend an evening with. I have learned a lot that is useful. I had the privilege yesterday of meeting with Nancy-Ann DeParle who is President Obama's health reform leader. I spent two hours with her. We spent a good part of that hour talking about some of the experiments that Singapore is doing on better ways to deliver quality health at affordable costs. I wouldn't know nearly as much about that had I not lived and worked in Singapore

WELLS: Thank you. Blair Sheppard, what is the Fuqua School of Business doing abroad and why?

SHEPPARD: The word "abroad" is actually inconsistent with what we're trying to do, right? So let me first take objection to the framing of the question, and you'll see why in a minute.

We begin with a premise that one of Duke's roles is to prepare people for the world we're about to hand them and not for the world we came from. Business schools are by definition structured wrong for that role. If anyone needed evidence that our assumptions about what business should be are flawed, we have it. At the heart of this are three interrelated issues that we're trying to respond to.

1. If I, as a Canadian, could use an American metaphor: Jefferson won in the U.S. debate between a federalist model and a states' rights model by securing the states' rights. But Hamilton actually won because we have a single set of regulatory regimes. We have a single set of legal assumptions. We have a single currency. We have a single model by which commerce is done in the United States. There is a general set of rules by which all states abide. And we now live in a world that is interdependent even if we didn't want it to be, because it turns out, for example, that carbon dioxide couldn't care less about borders. We have no choice but to recognize we live in one planet that has significant interdependence.

The economic, business, and exchange elements of our planet actually are fairly Jeffersonian. There are multiple currencies. There are multiple regulatory regimes. There are multiple political economies. There are multiple views of the world. Anyone preparing people for a world that doesn't incorporate those multiple perspectives is actually doing a bad job. I don't think this is a uniquely American problem. It becomes a global problem. We are unbelievably parochial in this country, and, as a consequence, I think we are ill-prepared for the world we are about to hand our children. If we purport to prepare the leaders of tomorrow through that lens we are at risk and the world is at risk.

2. There are some assumptions in our economic model that are flawed. The assumption that continuous growth is the only mechanism by which you can measure success is probably a bad starting assumption given that we live in a finite-resource climate. It turns out that that assumption is connected to the previous one in that the mechanism by which we can change the working model will require global cooperation. One country can't work that one alone. So if we want to define a set of operating assumptions about how an economy should function, the ways in which businesses should interact around the world, and the changes we should implement to increase sustainability, we can't do that without managing the global independence issue at the same time. The two are inextricably tied with each other.
3. Most of the important issues that business speaks to now entail disciplinary questions that don't reside in a business school. For example, we don't have any expertise in the technology of energy or the understanding of quick movement of disease around the world; those bodies of knowledge tend to reside in schools other than business.

So if you take those three issues, our objective is not to "go abroad." Our objective is to reinvent the business school as a structure that is more commensurate with the nature of the presenting problem. It turns out that being multi-sited and heavily networked through the world is a part of that, but it's only a component of it.

Here, then, are the three ways in which business schools are actually structured wrong today. I would assert this is true of universities as well, but I don't have that role, so it's not mine to say. But I'd argue by metaphor at least.

1. We're regionally predicated. We have 34 passports on our faculty. After two years they're all American. The reason they're all American is that Durham is a fantastic place to fall asleep to the rest of the world. My measure of that is the only conversations happening at the Fuqua School of Business March are about basketball. I've got a Sri Lankan faculty member who never saw a basketball in his life until he came to Durham, but the press of the social milieu we find ourselves in actually causes us to adopt a set of lenses that are largely parochial. I got a chance to teach the seniors for a few years when I was running Duke Corporate Education, and I was terrified at how parochial they were. We start with the notion that to frame the questions from an American lens is the only way to frame them. I think the reason we're parochial is largely sociological: you take on a view based on the place in which you spend the majority of your time. Therefore, if we could spend significant time in other places, we would take on other views.

You have to be embedded in locations other than the one you're in, and you have to be so in a humble fashion, because you actually have to take on that local view as your own. Then the question becomes, "How do you integrate them in some way that creates a coherent curriculum research agenda and outreach agenda?"

2. Business schools are heavily isolated from the rest of the university. There's a reason that Harvard Business School is on the other side of the Charles River. The dangerous mechanism I use for describing that is that the rest of Harvard thinks of Harvard Business School as a trade school and Harvard Business School thinks that the rest of the university is a series of communists who don't care about business. I think there's some deeply held sense of that belief that keeps the things apart from each other so we can't touch each other because they have representational views of the world that actually are antithetical to our own.

It turns out that the world we live in doesn't permit that kind of simple dichotomy any more. It was never smart in the first place. It was never good to build business independent of public policy or independent of other worldly views. The original work that we aspire to is *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, which turns out that Adam Smith also wrote. We don't read it but he wrote it, and so even our "theology" is actually flawed, in that we select the pieces we actually care to listen to.

3. We're incredibly discipline-siloed. Our finance faculty actually know finance faculty in other schools better than they know the marketing faculty in their own school. In the world I just described that's an incredibly flawed structure, so we're trying to solve that problem.

Here are our operating premises for going forward:

1. Be multi-sited. You can't be everywhere, so be thoughtful about where you are. We were trying to be practical in two dimensions. First, we considered the places in the world that are going to shape the future dramatically because they have some leverage in the future and are different enough from each other that you would actually benefit by being there. So we chose not to be in Germany, France, and the UK, because they share enough in common in terms of their histories and their world views that being in one of them might be enough if you had limited resources. I'm not sure that we chose the right places, but we are going to be in China, India, Russia, Western Europe, Middle East, Sub-Saharan Africa, and eventually somewhere in Latin America. Incomplete – but it's a start and I can only hold seven things in my head at one time, and so that's a limit until we get a new dean.
2. We need to be *of* the location when we're there. I'm not sure this is the right way to frame the question, but here's how we've been framing it: If a world class university that had no idea what it should be doing in your country chose to come and wanted to be a good citizen, what should it do? Let me give you the answers we get in India. The answers we get in India are we have some presenting problems we think you may be able to speak to.
 - First, a significant percentage of the population has never had access to university. We've just mandated by law that they must. It turns out huge numbers of classes are required within five years to represent the exact population in universities proportional to the population in India. The dilemma is they're not prepared. So you're either going to have a series of kids that have tremendous failure experiences or you're going to create a dual system which is a track for kids that aren't ready and a track for kids that are ready. And that's just unacceptable. The question is, are there ways in which we can bring some of the insights that we have from Duke to help with that problem? We can't solve it, but can we help?
 - Second, seventy percent of the kids who graduate from Indian universities are unemployed. Now what you have is this thriving economy and no one to fill it. The reason is in part that their current educational system creates fairly narrow, highly academic graduates, and the curriculum doesn't change as fast as the economy does. You therefore have people who are ready for a problem that existed twenty years ago rather than one that exists today. So the question is, can we put some kind of overlay on top of the graduates that keeps what is great about that system, but that helps prepare them so they're employable, rather than maintaining this disconnect between the economy and the student capacity.
 - Third, there aren't enough faculty of quality to support the universities, especially in business schools.

Now it turns out we can do something about all three of these problems as long as we don't assume we know the right answer. And by engaging that set of issues in a way that uses local partnerships and local insight and is humble, two things occur. We are valuable as a member of the community and we learn. Now from the selfish standpoint the important part of that is we learn. The reason that's the important part is you have to start with my operating assumption, which is the need to deparochialize Fuqua, so it's the humble learning which is the critical asset in that.

And then the issue is, how do you bring these two operating premises together? We have a couple of things we're doing to accomplish this.

- We have some degrees that are trying to take advantage of being multi-sited. They're imperfect but they're a start
- We have research activities which are going to be comparative – so for example we'll be doing social entrepreneurial work that we'll compare across countries. We'll address energy and environment questions so they'll compare across countries

So the simplest way to describe the logic of what we're doing is *embed and connect*. Become part of and then figure out how to connect. Here's the phrase I don't accept. *Abroad* implies that Durham is the central. I can't accept the premise. If you understand what we're trying to do it's actually antithetical to what we're trying to achieve.

WELLS: What are the pitfalls of this approach?

SHEPPARD: Here are some.

1. I think the fundamental risk of the approach is that we're not ready to execute it. A big risk is we don't know our own blinders. Can we break frame in a way that permits us actually to learn what we're trying to learn? Now a part of how we're trying to manage that risk is to not do it alone. In a sense a big piece of what we're trying to do is hire the diaspora and hire locally so that it's not a series of people going to China. It's actually Duke figuring out how to engage in a way that takes China as part of the asset base you use. But there's a huge risk and I can give you twenty horror stories. Now the good news is we've learned from every one so it turns out we are doing things in a much more thoughtful way. It creates a very useful discourse internally about what we do wrong so as long as we listen to the mistakes and learn from them and adjust.
2. The second potential pitfall is that we don't know what we don't know operationally. In Sub-Saharan Africa we're doing a really cool program with the University of the Witwatersrand where we're working with local entrepreneurs in designing a program to help them be effective at scaling their business. We are drawing these social and business entrepreneurs from all over, about twelve countries that are there, and we have faculty from five universities participating, helping to co-design the program. I would say we did almost everything right, and then there were just some things we just missed. We assumed applicability of ideas that weren't applicable, and there were opportunities to do other some thing that we missed. So we don't know what we don't know.

The real pitfall in all of that is we're not either astute enough or humble enough to learn from the mistakes we made. That's the real risk.

WELLS: What are you discovering and what would count as a success?

SHEPPARD: The first thing I'm discovering is there isn't one model. I'll give you the example of a frame that was wrong. We went on the assumption that our goal was essentially to create a network of universities to work together, each of which were good exemplars of their own country. The premise is that by investing in them we can make them especially successful in their own country. And therefore that network was highly valuable.

It turns out there are many circumstances where that's just a stupid strategy. In China, partnering with the university is a mistake. The incentives for the university in China are to stop you from embedding. Their goal is to keep you at arm's length as much as possible. You're better to partner with a province and a city than with a university and then figure out how to deal with the university as a by-product of that.

In India it turns out this is illegal. So... nice idea. It can't be done. And in Russia it was exactly the right thing to do. So the first lesson we've learned is one size doesn't fit all which is actually a kind of silly lesson for us to learn because it was the starting premise of the idea. And I think our success to this point has been that we have engaged very, very committed people in each place we're in who are helping shepherd our activities so that we don't make mistakes. So take the city that is by the Chinese government's standards the most successful city in China. They're teaching us how to be a good member of the Chinese community. The alumni in India are doing the same. Putin's government is doing it, and the partner in Russia is doing it, so we've been successful in finding people who steward us wisely. I think that is our biggest success.

WELLS: Part two is critique. Ranji, why are American universities embarking on these kinds of ventures?

KHANNA: I'm not going to argue with some of the things that have come up already as far as that's concerned. American universities are embarking on these kinds of ventures around the globe in order to acknowledge that globalization demands several kinds of changes in the way in which we structure education. The particular sites of the particular parts of universities that are tending to go abroad do have very definite needs and desires to think about. Things like business, technology, medicine, and the environment travel. It's not simply a coincidence that the parts of the universities that are moving all over the place are the ones that one can't actually dispute in any way the importance of the international scope of education.

Don't forget that education systems in many parts of the world have been international for a long time and have moved across regions for a long time even before the establishment of US universities abroad.

WELLS: What might make you feel uncomfortable about these kinds of ventures?

KHANNA: Well there are at least two different ways of going about answering that question.

1. One is, of course, about the history of educational colonial ventures and the problems that have emerged from them: the implicit hierarchization of peoples around the globe in relation to previous ventures.
2. There's also the sense of the way in which the university is divided up. I think Blair's point about Harvard Business School being on the other side of the river is an important one. I think that one of the problems that I always have is that there are only certain parts of the university that travel. I'm not against international relationships with universities.. Obviously they exist anyway and there's no point in pretending that we are simply a local formation. For me, too, the local and the global need to be taken into account when we consider the future of the university in the age of globalization, and I don't see any need to prioritize one over the other, the local or the global.

I do think that it's incredibly important when we think about the movement of universities abroad that we keep our ideals focused on what the university should be. It's not what Duke's reputation is in X or Y, not what Duke can gain from this or that, but what the function of a university is and what we want it to be. In many ways, my desire for the future of universities echoes some of the older philosophical discussions about what a university should be that have been in place at least since Kant, but have been taken up more recently by philosophers like Foucault and Derrida.

Now obviously one of the questions for this panel addresses colonialism. It is important to specify distinctions. When you think of European colonialism over the last few centuries, education was specifically part of the colonial venture. But obviously there's something different going on at this point in the way in which education is thought of internationally.

For example, under French colonialism the rationale for teaching French was articulated quite differently from teaching English under British colonialism. The British in India did not demonstrate any particular desire to assimilate the natives of India culturally or linguistically and seemed content to enforce a different kind of power which called into being, in the most British of manners, an elite who could mediate between the British ruling class and the people with their various local cultures and languages. That was the structure that was built up. In that way British economic and political goals could be more effectively achieved. Whether that happens is another issue. The French idea of teaching French and establishing new kinds of schools for all effectively resulted in Algeria where they were for a hundred and thirty-two years de-skilling much of the population. It was detrimental in particular for women's literacy because it destroyed local forms of education in order to establish something different.

To some extent the creation of an international bourgeoisie has already been achieved. That's already in place. That was part of the work that was created by different moments of colonial ventures. So we already have an

international bourgeoisie whether at Duke now or whether in our connections with people elsewhere. So education is already global for a certain class of people. When it comes to the question of women, some ventures have benefited women greatly because some people are unwilling to send their girls abroad for education in some universities. Obviously we are not talking about the same mechanisms of coloniality that were in place through the nineteenth century. But we do have to be very conscious of power differentials, the imposition of economic and political systems that implicate each actor in different ways.

Clearly also there are world class institutions everywhere now that easily equal if not surpass the quality and reputation and education that can be supplied by universities whether they are Duke, Harvard, or Penn. I'm thinking of such institutions as the Indian Institute of Management, which I understand Fuqua has a global leaders' program with.

Really we don't have a discipline in the university that has thought consistently about the history of global education. In philosophy, there have developed universalist ideals of education. In History and in Literature—in the Humanities more broadly — there has been thought about the different forms of global flows in relation to education; and not only in terms of thinking about the forms of colonial education in the last three hundred years or so. Also there has been serious thought about what universities stand for in terms of questions of truth, of the notion of the human, of an uncompromised form of education and questioning around truth that is not constrained by what someone wants, by economic and political implications or by religious mission. To me the questioning of education as a colonial venture isn't just about asking people there what they want or what they need. We can't simply develop educational models in response to what a government in Singapore wants, for example. It has to be about understanding and being hospitable to risks, to the possibilities of disagreement, the possibilities of humanistic inquiry, the possibilities indeed of being completely undone by what it is you find and what you seek.

WELLS: Are there other constructive proposals about a better way of doing things you'd like to mention?

KHANNA: What does it mean that some of the University of Paris campuses have the majority of students from former colonies? What does that mean for education? What does it mean in the UK that a huge percentage of economic professors are Indian? I do think that looking to the way in which Europe has tried to reconceptualize the humanities and the function of the university is actually not a bad idea and not only for Europe, of course.

The function of the university is not about being a good leader or a good citizen. I don't think an openness to others and a respect for difference is about listening to governments. I don't think it can be. Obviously one has to take into account and not be naïve about this. But the university is not about modeling good citizens. It's about asking difficult questions about truth.

WELLS: Karla, why do you think American universities are embarking on these kinds of ventures?

HOLLOWAY: I have heard enough times how the name of Duke is known. We have to interrogate what exactly it means when the name of Duke is known.

1. Because we now offer aid to some international students, we get an exchange of capital with students coming to Duke to enroll in graduate and in undergraduate programs, and we tap into various constituencies not only in the United States but outside the United States that can be beneficial in our long-term financial interests.
2. Now there is also the allure of the international as a new object of U.S. academic inquiry and this returns us to thinking about the material benefits for Duke as well as the intellectual benefits.
3. There is a very U.S.-centric notion of cultural exposure that means reaching out of our borders. There have been many references today to our borders and how borders don't for example contain viruses or monetary transfers. And so the idea of being insular, being within a particular U.S. border, we think is not going to be of

good service to our students when they learn hopefully to understand at Duke that their education cannot be just centered in one governmental entity.

WELLS: And what might make you uncomfortable about these kinds of ventures?

HOLLOWAY: Here are three thoughts.

1. When we speak about a program being fully “Duke,” do we understand, could we say in this room, what are the values of this institution? What are the core principles that we are going to take with us and make sure we execute when we go outside of Duke?
2. Leadership and citizenship mean completely different things. Leadership at Duke and at any corporate institution means something different than following. It means actually being at the forefront of any policy-making, any decision-making procedures. There is a two-tiered university system in Singapore where there is a very good medical school that produces good doctors and now there is the Duke venture. So what’s the difference between these two places except that we have developed a tiered system – which is very familiar in the United States? We have the elite schools. We have schools that are not among the elite. So when we think about what values we’re transferring and what institutional knowledge we’re transferring, we’re also transferring the ways in which we have been successful around leadership, and I think that without those things being open to interrogation I think it is problematic.
3. We know that clinical and hospital costs are much lower outside of the United States. I don’t think this is an insignificant value when we think about why we are moving medicine and research in particular outside of the U.S. We know that since 2002 FDA-regulated trials are increasing at the rate of fifteen percent per year for studies outside of the U.S. We know that we have questions about inducements to participate in clinical trials. We know that there are drugs being tested that will not be used in those countries. They’re not, for example, drugs about malaria or TB but drugs that will be used in populations in the U.S., so when we think about the idea of research going overseas who are the new subjects of study. Who is it that we are taking these to?

There are one hundred and forty-three million orphans in the world. Fifteen million of them have been produced by HIV/AIDS. Who is it who will regulate and what kinds of informed consent is available to do clinical trials in children? One of the things that the FDA in the U.S. is doing is pushing more corporations to do clinical trials on children and more of those trials are being done on children outside of the U.S. Well if a lot of these children are orphans, what kinds of consent are we thinking about doing? What’s the language of that consent? I think we’re doing extremely beneficial research in malaria and TB and there are people who are focused on that but we have to be very careful as to whether or not our associations with people outside of the U.S. are associations for what purpose and what are the ethics that guide us and we know that we take these trials outside of the U.S. because the federal regulations in the U.S. are tighter than they are outside so that’s the reason why these trials are jumping in terms of those numbers.

WELLS: And what might be a better way of doing things?

HOLLOWAY: My own focus now is in a sort of cultural ethics, which I talk more about in terms of bio-cultural ethics. I think about more global bodies that would be involved in the ideas of regulations and standards. There’s an article that came out from one of our own physicians at Duke Medical Center suggesting that the World Health Organization might be a better regulatory body than the FDA in terms of thinking about taking clinical trials outside of the U.S. I believe very much in the international courts for example. Many in the U.S. now have a pejorative narrative around the United Nations, but I think unless we think about places where, the United Nations isn’t an example, but where our vote counts the same as the vote of our colleague next to us, I think we are likely to repeat

the forms of colonialism. We are not making something new. These are very old processes that had histories as old as the university at Timbuktu and to consider that the ventures we are embarking on now are new for the world is a mistake of history. We might know more of what we don't know if we look at this as not a new project but as an historical project. That's where other facets of the institution might have something to contribute.

WELLS: Thank you very much. I'm now going to ask Sandy and Blair to respond to the comments made.

WILLIAMS: Well I'm grateful for those comments. We were urged, I think, by both Ranji and Karla to understand history and I think that is very important. We should understand the history of universities. Universities as we know them today and I'm no historical expert on this but my perception is that they began as places of sanctuary in medieval times when the world outside was a very hostile place, a place often of brutality, of extreme disparities in wealth and in social justice. In some places universities should be sanctuaries. Sanctuaries for free thinkers. Sanctuaries for those who would challenge what their governments might say, and therefore we must protect, I believe, that aspect of what the university stands for.

On the other hand, I would think that many of us would have found a medieval university inhospitable in many respects because I suspect there was a forced orthodoxy of thinking and speech and in behavior that I think we would find quite antithetical to anything that would be values of a university today. My own ideals of what a university stands for are a place where people representing different points of view who bring a deeply rooted and considered understanding of different cultures, different modes of intellectual thought can come together under safety. You can express those views safely within a university and it is this voicing of ideas and different points of view out of which mutual learning emerges and then I hope that that process spills over outside the walls of the university, out to the society at large and to the extent that we believe that is the true ideal of the university, I would hope we could bring that to other parts of the world where that tradition may not be so firmly ingrained. Not in a cultural imperialism sense, but in a sense that we are creating that kind of environment where the ideas and values of those people can come in and we can learn from each other.

It is time to change the notion of the university as a single place behind a set of walls while protecting some of the things that are more lasting and that should not be altered. It is true that medicine and business have been out front as pioneers of Duke creating these global networks where knowledge and energy resonate back and forth for good we think, but my own view is that the presence for Duke abroad will never be complete until there is a much broader presence of Duke in these locales and in the global network that's being created that would clearly include arts and humanities.

In no way would I support the point of view that we ought to be at the beck and call of governments, our own included. If you accept the role of the university I described, it is our purpose and our role to challenge governments when the ideas that emerge from this clash of thought make that necessary. So I think the fact that some of our programs in other countries require necessarily the support or at least the acceptance by governments is simply a pragmatic fact. Where our own values align with what a government may seek then we move forward; where they don't, we do not. And it will almost always be necessary to have the support or at least the forbearance of a foreign government, but our intent is not for the government, it is for the peoples of that country. Just like we try to do here. By "citizens" I mean well-informed people who are prepared to do what's right in the world in a variety of capacities.

I think there are clear moral values around informed consent about our own perceptions of human dignity and what that means when humans become research subjects about which we cannot waver on our standards. I don't view that as cultural imperialism. There are some ethical boundaries that when they differ from mores or what might be viewed as acceptable in other countries we do not cross. There are other cases where there will be practices that we don't condone and our presence in that country does not imply that we condone it but it's also not realistic in the

short term to change or alter those and we have to be respectful of what that society is doing. The notion that we're training a workforce primarily to serve financial goals of major multinational corporations, in the absence of seeking solutions to major problems facing our global community, is far from what any of us would intend, but the fact that that risk would occur to you means we need to be vigilant against it.

SHEPPARD: Part of our role is to restructure the meaning of the business school. It includes inviting those who would be natural critics of what we do into the conversation. We'll continue to make mistakes. We just have to listen to the critics when they tell us. That speaks to the goal of a university. I think at least when I use the phrase "leader," I include the critic in that category. I think leaders are all people who actually care deeply about making the place they inhabit better. You can do that a whole bunch of ways, including telling us the ways in which we're doing it badly now, and I think that's the obligation of a great university. I do agree that that implies 'leader' in the way you were describing it, which is out front. I'm okay with that. I'm a member of great university and I'm unapologetic about that and I think that entails particular obligations, which is to be sensitive to the ways in which we self-describe and how that gets us in trouble.

We're largely unselfconscious about the ways in which we think and that lack of self-consciousness causes us to do things that we should not do. One of the objectives behind what we're trying to do at Fuqua is to increase the level of self-consciousness both in the faculty and the students. That's our goal. A principle that may be wrong but that has stood me well is to interact with parts of the university and parts of the world that are most likely to jar my self-consciousness. On that point I suspect we agree. I actually think that's really hard to do in Durham, North Carolina, but I think there are many ways we can do it. For example, one of the most compelling experiences of my life was when I was the facilitator for the Durham Race Relations Committee my first four years here. I had to understand – because I grew up in a city that didn't have the same history – how the history of a place could dramatically change the present discourse in ways that I could never conceive. So there's no question you can have phenomenally important experiences, but I think there are opportunities for us to have others that we just can't miss because of the interdependence we now live in.

Some other points if I may.

1. The first is the question of "only certain parts travel." That one has bothered me a lot for the whole year we've been engaged, since I consider part of our job to be facilitating opportunities for other parts of the University. And what's interesting are the parts of the University who consider that a reasonable offer and the other parts who bring garlic in with them when they come. And the dilemma for me is it's actually the parts that I think we would benefit most from going with that are the ones who bring garlic. And so I think a piece of what we have to do in the inside the community of Duke is be more open to the hypothesis that at least there's a few people in other parts of the University who aren't as we think they are because it gets hugely in the way for me.
2. I think without a doubt the role of a university is to at least challenge questions of truth and I think that that's at the heart of what we're trying to do, however crudely. The beginning premise is that what we're now doing doesn't work, and I don't know that we're doing it as well as we should and I'm actually quite disappointed. If you were to ask progress on that I think it's going nowhere near as fast as it should but I can show real progress in ways that I'm excited about.
3. What does it mean to be a leader and a citizen? When I use the word 'citizen' I'm describing Duke as the institution rather than the individuals who are members of Duke. I do think that an institution of the weight and stature of Duke has to think of itself from a citizenship standpoint, including thinking about the ways in which the present government is not doing what it should do. So we have this really interesting debate about what it means to bring divinity to China when China refuses to have a divinity school. I think that's an institutional question that is a citizenship question that you have to pose that I wouldn't demand of an individual. I think because of the weight we carry and because of the scale we convey we must ask the citizenship question.

I think (and this is why I became an academic) there are institutions that exist in the world that make us better because they're here. I think they go awry. It was actually the Grand Inquisitor *The Brothers Karamazov* that persuaded me that I wanted to become a management professor. I couldn't understand how an institution could paradoxically engage in the behavior it engaged in where the means submerge the ends – where the achieved ends that were the antithesis of what they were designed to create institutionally. I just was curious about how could that occur. I think they get broken. They get stale. They get old. They get politicized. They get all sorts of number of things but because they're here we're better and actually everyone spoke to that today. I think we have the obligation to try to continuously improve the nature of the institution of which we're members. Duke is less the place it could be for all of those who participate in it because of structural flaws and intellectual flaws that going abroad, if I could use that phrase, connected to many, many, many other things can help. If we don't start there, I suggest we don't begin.

PICKUS: I think we've accomplished something important here today. We've had the very conversation many of you have called for about the opportunities and pitfalls involved in Duke's global ventures. We should do this more often. To close, allow me to underscore two key points, one about the conversation within the university and one about the implications of our ventures on our students and on the world.

1. It's essential but enormously difficult to have both the actors moving the university abroad and the critics concerned about such efforts working together in the same time frame. It's also enormously difficult to do so. We need mechanisms for attending to the kinds of questions that have been raised today in an ongoing fashion. And we need concerned critics who are able to help resolve these questions in real time.
2. As we reduce the differences between Durham and the rest of the world we should not blind ourselves to other differences we may be creating. Are we creating a two-tiered system of medical schools in Singapore? Are we creating a global business class whose shared identity and values are at odds with their fellow citizens? Such a cosmopolitan elite may not be self-conscious about that fact because they are celebrating how unself-conscious they are about engaging with each other. This could be a recipe for disaster and requires serious attention.

With that, on behalf of the Kenan Institute for Ethics and Duke Chapel, I want to thank all four of you for a terrific conversation.