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Abstract
Increasingly, all throughout the world, universities have begun to initiate activities and projects that go beyond the classroom and which profoundly impact both the communities of which they are a part and society more generally. In order to better understand how such initiatives work to benefit both university and community, we examine two very different projects emerging out of the private and public sectors in Bulgaria and the United States. The analysis is focused on two cases of university activities of quite different types, which impact their respective communities in very different ways. The purpose is to provide a better understanding of both the wide array of activities through which universities interact with their societies and communities, as well as to examine the consequences and benefits to both the institution and the society of such activity. The two projects presented in the article are very different in many respects but, at the same time, they serve to point out the many elements that such projects have in common and the many diverse ways in which they can benefit the institutions carrying them out. They also serve to tie the institutions involved much more closely to the various communities of which they were a part and resulted in significant engagement with those communities by the faculty involved in them.
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1. Introduction

As efforts are underway at major research universities throughout the world to seek a vaccine to address the terrible Covid 19 pandemic, we are of course reminded of one of the major functions of the modern university, the conduct of basic scientific research (Bok, 1982, pp. 61-88). However, especially in the United States since the 1950s, and in other parts of the world over the course of more recent decades, universities have come to play many other roles within both the communities and the countries in which they are located (Loss, 2012). As higher education opportunity has grown in countries all across the world, with increasing numbers of students being educated, the economic implications of the university have become an ever more important matter of concern to scholars, citizens and political leaders alike.

Similarly, over the course of the past several decades, practitioners and scholars concerned with generating economic growth have begun, with increasing frequency, to focus upon the local community as the critical source of such development. Many recent studies by international agencies have pointed to the importance of locally generated economic development for national prosperity (Sassen, 2005, pp. 73-88). The spectacular rise in recent years of high tech related activities, almost entirely located in urban areas, which have generated massive new wealth, has called further attention to the central role of the local community as a producer of economic development. At the same time, the uneven nature of such development has given rise to much exploration of what are the particular characteristics of communities that are especially successful in terms of generating significant economic growth (Pavelea and Neamtu, 2020). In so doing, increasing attention has been paid by scholars to what appears to be a very important relationship between the concentration of educated professionals within a community and its economic growth (Florida, 2014, pp. 196-205).

In turn, increasingly, not only scholars but political and governmental leaders throughout the world as well are recognizing the importance of universities as the key producers of the skilled professional and creative workers that characterize economically highly successful communities (Florida, 2003, pp. 3-19). One consequence is that even more attention is being given to the role that universities play both in terms of the broader society and its economic development as well as within their local communities. In some parts of the world, this is a relatively new occurrence since, traditionally, the role of the university has been one of considerable detachment from the communities of which they have been a part. Historically, this has been the case in Europe, where, until relatively recently, universities as institutions have been viewed as somewhat removed from the day-to-day issues confronting society and seen primarily as ‘ivory tower’ retreats focused entirely upon their educational mission.

This tradition contrasts significantly with that of the United States where higher education institutions have long been seen as organizations possessing the capacity to address various important societal problems. Indeed, the first university to be created in the United States, Harvard University, while a private not-for-profit institution, was established in large part for the purpose of educating clergy people
and ministers for the growing number of churches being opened in the early colonies (Brubacher and Rudy, 1958, p. 8). This tradition was further strengthened when, in the midst of the US Civil War, one of America’s most illustrious presidents, Abraham Lincoln, signed the Land Grant College Act of 1862 which transferred large amounts of federal land to the individual states to be sold for the purposes of establishing higher education institutions specifically designed for the promotion of the agricultural and mechanical arts (Brubacher and Rudy, 1958, p. 63). In doing so, the federal government stimulated the creation of what ultimately would, following World War II, become a massive nationwide state governed system of public universities (Rosenbaum, 1987, pp. 57-59).

While the notion of the university as a driver of economic development is relatively new in many parts of the world, and still not fully appreciated in some regions (for example, many parts of Latin America), this relationship is being increasingly recognized for its importance in many local communities. In this regard, within the United States, and to a lesser degree in Europe, the concept of the University as an ‘anchor institution’ within local communities has become increasingly popular. The underlying implication of this concept is simply that by their presence, major universities, because of their substantial physical plants and increasingly large numbers of faculty and staff, are particularly important forces for positive economic benefit within the communities in which they are located (Kerr, 1963). As a consequence, increasing attention is being paid to not only the role of universities in generating economic development but also the nature of the relationships between them and the communities in which they are located in order to better understand how best to maximize their economic productivity.

As increasing attention has been paid to the role of the university in both the broader society and its local community, many such institutions, especially in the United States, have, over the past decade, established administrative offices to promote such activity (Cuerto, 2019). Nevertheless, historically, and still today, the bulk of connections between a university, the broader society and its immediate community has been a product of the initiatives of individual faculty members within an institution as they pursue their various research, service and technical assistance activities. For illustrative purposes, for the remainder of this article, we will examine two cases of university activities of quite different types which impact their respective communities in very different ways. The purpose is to provide a better understanding of both the wide array of activities through which universities interact with their societies and communities, as well as, to examine the consequences and benefits to both the institution and the society of such activity.

The research involved has been conducted through traditional case study methods. For both case studies, a wide array of documents related to the projects have been examined and reviewed. This has been of particular importance for the Bulgarian case study since it involves a project that both addressed various technical issues and sought to impact not only its immediate community, but the entirety of Europe. The
information reported there has been augmented by the participation of one of the co-authors in the various conferences that were a part of the project implementation.

As regards the US case study, the principal source of information has been the participant observation of the American co-author who in fact initiated and directed the project being examined throughout its twenty-five years’ history. However, much of the information presented in the case study in terms of the impact of the project draws upon the assessment and commentary of others, ranging from leaders of international bodies, mayors of local communities throughout Latin America and the review of the extensive media coverage, both in South Florida throughout Latin America, of the project under examination.

2. Strengthening university collaboration with stakeholders and state institutions: a Bulgarian case

The project ‘Contraband and Counterfeit Risk Identification (Business Process Analysis and Spatial Aspect)’ was implemented by a research team from the Department of National and Regional Security at the University of National and World Economy, Sofia, Bulgaria. During its implementation, the researchers established contacts with representatives of many public institutions, private organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) at the national and international level to exchange useful opinions and ideas (Dimitrov and Penchev, 2019).

The project was funded by PMI IMPACT, which is the global initiative of Philip Morris International (PMI). It brings together organizations fighting illegal trade and related crimes in order to enable them to implement more impactful solutions. PMI IMPACT selects projects for funding from various countries in West and Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Asia, and North and South America representing a broad range of sectors including think tanks, academic institutions, universities and law enforcement authorities. In this way, PMI IMPACT creates a platform for a wide range of organizations and stakeholders to implement projects against illegal trade, because ‘to eradicate the illegal activities that hurt the economy and threatens society’s security is a goal too challenging for any one group, government, or company to achieve alone’.

During the two-year project, the UNWE research team was strongly supported by the management and the administration of the University, as well as by state institutions such as the National Assembly, Ministry of Interior, Border Police, Customs Agency and the General Directorate Counteraction to Organized Crime. The National Tobacco Growers Association and other stakeholders, including leading international research organizations, helped the research team verify the results.

In the initiative’s first round, the PMI IMPACT Expert Council selected 32 projects for funding, which focused on tackling illegal trade and related crimes in the European Union. The project proposals were evaluated against five criteria – quality, cost efficiency, impact, feasibility and novelty. The Contraband and Counterfeit Risk Identification Research Project was selected in part because it demonstrated that fighting the illicit trade in the tobacco industry was a major problem which requires much
effort and the coordination of the work of many institutions. The project was designed to have an impact on the countries along the Balkan trafficking route for illegal goods, from Turkey to Western European countries, with a focus on the receiving countries such as France, the United Kingdom, Germany and Italy. Bulgaria, situated on the Balkan route, is a prime focus for impact because of its geographic location. It thus was felt to be able to play a significant role in reducing the level of illegal trade.

The topic of the project was considered to be an important issue, both at the national and international levels, because the illicit trade in tobacco products has significant negative effects. Two of them are of key importance for the economy and the security of society. First, it causes major financial losses to both government budgets and to tobacco producers’ sales and, second, it undermines anti-smoking public health initiatives and, thus has a negative impact in terms of public spending for health care. In addition, the tobacco products involved are usually not subject to control by public authorities. Thus, they are of very low quality and may contain harmful impurities which, very likely, have destructive effects on human health. At the same time, it also is obvious that there is a link between the illicit cigarette trade and other types of crime. As such, this activity both stimulates and is stimulated by organized crime. Thus, it encourages corruption, smuggling of other goods and drug trafficking. Further, revenues derived from such activity may also be used to finance terrorism.

The project covered two focus areas: ‘Research’ and ‘Education and Awareness’. The objective of the first focus area was to determine the modus operandi and spatio-temporal dependencies of the illicit tobacco trade, including links to organized crime, corruption and drug trafficking, and to identify present gaps and deficiencies in the existing European and national legal frameworks and to suggest improvements of the legal documents and actions in combating illegal tobacco trade. The objective of the second focus area was to develop teaching materials and training courses for decision-makers and law enforcement officers. These courses could, among other uses, be implemented as modules in various disciplines in UNWE bachelors and master’s degree programs. They also could be used to conduct a major communication campaign to raise awareness on the problem that illicit tobacco trade represents and its links to other criminal activities.

The collection of relevant data, and its analysis with the help of selected tools, provided a better understanding of the illicit tobacco trade, its relations to other crimes and the key support factors and processes. In the study, various quantitative tools were used in a common logic scheme and they included business process analysis, spatio-temporal analysis, clustering, structural equation modelling and legal analysis. The results from the project provided solid ground for improvement of counterfeit and contraband counteraction and complimented the public debate on the proper way to introduce anti-crime improvements. As a result of the research, the project team suggested improvements in many activities involved in combating the illegal tobacco trade, as well as developed an education and awareness campaign. Based on the research results, the project participants have developed teaching and information
materials on these issues to be used in training courses designed for decision-makers and law enforcement officers.

The results did achieve the project aim of determining the modus operandi of smugglers and identifying present gaps and deficiencies in the existing EU and national legal frameworks concerning the illicit cigarettes trade and related crimes. This research project proved that fighting the illicit trade in the tobacco industry requires much efforts and the coordination of the work of many institutions. The project results were widely discussed during various public events and in a number of interviews and articles published in the media. Within the framework of the project, the project team organized two round table discussions and an international conference. These events were attended by project experts and researchers, officials and representatives of international initiatives fighting illicit trade in tobacco products.

The first roundtable took place in June, 2018, at UNWE and its purpose was to bring together experts to discuss the impact of contraband and counterfeit cigarettes, as well as to share their preliminary results, methodology and the next steps in the research. The second roundtable was organized a year later (May, 2019) and, in addition to discussions with experts from the state institutions, included representatives from the tobacco industry and foreign guests. It was dedicated to trainings for experts from the project’s stakeholder organizations.

More than 1,000 students from the Department of National and Regional Security have benefited from UNWE’s curricula modules. As a result, topics related to combating illicit trade will be included in the regular programs through which UNWE trains professionals and experts. The project team developed a Handbook and three Learning Packages with materials that focus on three different areas: How to analyze the illicit trade; How to measure the illicit trade; and, What are the legal aspects of the illicit trade. The team has prepared detailed legal analysis identifying 25 gaps and deficiencies in relevant legislation, with recommendations and suggestions. The training course was structured consistent with the three main topics and utilized the developed learning packages.

After the roundtable, a press conference was held in order that the project team could share with the public the achieved results, receive feedback and indicate next steps for future cooperation with stakeholders. Another major event organized within the framework of the project was an international conference that took place at the University at the end of October, 2018. Special guests at the conference were experts and researchers from Lithuania, Serbia, South Africa and various international organizations, as well as Bulgarian officials from the National Assembly, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry and experts from the National Association of Tobacco Growers. Topics presented at the conference led to fruitful discussions and ideas for future development of the research activities of the project team.

In short, the project results can be summarized as follows: the research team developed a unique method to measure the propensity to illicit trade in tobacco products based on the statistical technique of structural equation modelling. The data involved
is obtained entirely on the basis of public information and this makes it much easier for researchers to obtain the needed data. Implementing this method the project team came up with a new indicator that measures the illicit trade in tobacco products – the illicit trade of tobacco products indicator. This has been one of the most important research achievements of the project. It is displayed on an interactive map and thus is applicable anywhere in the world. It can be used in the day-to-day work of institutions dealing with illicit trade of tobacco products. This method was tested in 186 countries and separately for 1,744 EU regions and the modelled data were validated and verified by comparison with studies already conducted by other international research centers. Through the interactive map, the individual regions in a country where there is a greater tendency to smuggle are shown and this supports the activities of law enforcement institutions by indicating to them where to focus their efforts for combating the smuggling of tobacco products.

One of the most tangible result of the project is the publication of a handbook on risk identification regarding smuggling and counterfeiting, which is designed to be used in the day-to-day work of tobacco control institutions and to facilitate the work of stakeholders. This strengthened the collaboration between state institutions and stakeholders. In addition, project events were attended by representatives of all interested institutions in the country, as well as from international research centers and representatives of universities from different countries. As a follow-up several institutions and research centers stated a strong desire to continue working together.


A very important element of US foreign assistance policy over the past several decades, has been the encouraging of democratic development by supporting the decentralization of government in countries which have had long experience with highly centralized government. Frequently, these are countries which have a history of concentrating political power in a relatively small number of hands. This has been viewed as a major problem which frequently leads to the rise of dictatorial and authoritarian government. Historically, this has been a major issue through much of the history of most Latin American countries. With this in mind, in the mid-1980s, senior administrators at the US Agency for International Development (USAID), the principal foreign aid agency of the United States, concluded that one priority for foreign assistance in Latin America would be to encourage decentralization through the strengthening of the region’s historically weak local governments. It was strongly believed that such a development could result in the dispersal of political power more widely across Latin American societies (Rosenbaum, 2019, p. E5).

In developing such an initiative, after much internal discussion, USAID personnel concluded that perhaps the best strategy to most effectively strengthen Latin American local governments would be to engage successful US local government administrators in this task. This was seen as a major break from traditional practice in which most USAID projects were being managed and implemented by large consulting
companies utilizing professional consultants, with relatively few such projects being administered by US universities and virtually none by local governments. One critical variable for USAID however was that those who would work directly with Latin American local government officials had to be able to communicate with them in the Spanish language (Portuguese was felt to be of less concern since Brazil had a somewhat stronger local government tradition than Spanish-speaking Latin America).

The biggest and most highly professional local government in the United States with a large number of Spanish-speaking administrators was the government of Miami Dade County, Florida. This local government, at the time, had a budget of approximately $5 billion and employed 30,000 individuals. It provided virtually all local government services, with the exception of education to a metropolitan area of 2 million people (in keeping with historic US practice, education was provided by a separately elected local government authority focused solely upon creating and operating local schools). At the time, it was regarded as one of the most professionally managed and highly effective municipal governments in the United States.

As perceived by USAID staff, the proposed project would be a ground-breaking one in at least two respects. First, it would be the agencies’ initial effort to strengthen local government in Latin America. As such, it was designed to work simultaneously in several South American countries. Second, it would break new ground by drawing upon the expertise and experience of senior Miami-Dade County government officials to provide technical assistance to their Latin American counterparts. However, upon approaching senior officials of the Miami Dade County government it quickly became apparent that they were not receptive to the idea. There was very great concern that a project of this type, with substantial overseas activities, could leave local government officials very vulnerable to criticism for neglecting local problems and instead devoting their attention to activities that could easily be characterized as pleasurable foreign junkets.

Nevertheless, the senior USAID officials involved in project design continued to see such an approach as a highly effective arrangement and discussed at some length with senior county government officials what options might be considered. This discussion led to the suggestion from county officials that an arrangement could be worked out whereby USAID contracted with the local state university, Florida International University (FIU). In prior years, the county government had developed various working relationships with the university, including the seeking of advice and consultation from individual faculty members on various policy initiatives, thus some connections between the county government and the university already existed.

After considerable discussion involving USAID, County and University officials, it was agreed in 1994 that the Institute for Public Management and Community Service at Florida International University, would receive a two million dollar contract and assume the responsibility for implementing for USAID a three-year project to strengthen local government in South America. While the university would manage the project, it would rely upon both its own faculty and senior Miami Dade County
administrators to travel to Latin America and provide needed technical assistance. As needed, this would be supplemented by the efforts of faculty from other universities and/or consultants. It was also agreed that while, project activities would occur in many Latin American countries, Chile and Paraguay, both of which were then emerging from highly authoritarian and frequently brutal dictatorships, would be priorities.

During the course of the project’s three year history, dozens of activities were engaged in ranging from advising on municipal finance reform in Columbia, the re-organization of local government in Buenos Aires, working with the national legislative body of Peru on the country’s first decentralization law, to assisting community organizations design the vote initiatives in Chile and Paraguay. Particular emphasis throughout the project was placed upon encouraging national decentralization and the strengthening of municipal government as a means of both dispersing political power in order to foster democracy and to encourage economic development at the local level.

At the conclusion of its third and final year, the project was viewed as having been very successful. It had pioneered for the Agency, the use of actual government practitioners in the providing of overseas technical assistance. During the project’s second year, discussions had been initiated about how to continue its positive impact following what would be the conclusion of USAID funding a year and a half later. It was these discussions that set the stage for what has now become a 25 year partnership between the University and Miami-Dade County local government for the organization of an annual conference for Latin American local government officials. The purpose of the annual event is to provide for Latin America’s local government officials cutting edge information on the new and most effective practices in local government throughout the world.

The initial Inter-American Conference of Mayors and Local Authorities took place in Washington DC. In order to emphasize the importance of the event for Latin American local government leaders, it was jointly cosponsored by the region’s most important international organizations: the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Organization of American States and USAID. Approximately 65 Latin American mayors from throughout the hemisphere, all of whom had their expenses paid by one of the four cosponsoring organizations, participated in the event. The speakers, in addition to a variety of experts, included the heads of the sponsoring organizations.

At the request of the four cosponsoring organizations, the second conference (which, given that the USAID project was ending, was to be the last which the four organizations would co-sponsor) took place in Miami and, at their request, was organized by the Institute for Public Management & Community Service (IPMCS) of Florida International University (FIU). The third, and all 23 subsequent annual conferences were organized by FIU’s IPMCS with the co-sponsorship, and financial support, of Miami Dade County. Thus, the Inter-American Conference of Mayors and Local Authorities, as a joint University – local government project, was born. Over the years, additional financial support has been provided by the State of Florida, the World Bank
and, upon occasion, by various private sector organizations such as Microsoft, Visa and several Latin America-based companies.

The 25th Inter-American Conference of Mayors and Local Authorities, was, as it had been for the past 23 years, held in Miami in mid-June 2019. It is now the longest running, largest and most highly regarded non-political annual gathering of Latin America’s local government officials. For the past two decades, the conference annually has brought from 400 to 650 local government officials (60 per cent of whom are mayors) from 25 to 30 countries from throughout the hemisphere to Miami. The event lasts for 2 1/2 days and keynote speakers have included the President of the Inter-American Development Bank, the Secretary General of the Organization of American States, the United States Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, various Vice Presidents of the World Bank, past Presidents and Vice Presidents of various Latin American countries, as well as the Mayors of such Latin American cities as Bogota, Buenos Aires, Lima, Santiago and Quito.

The conference has numerous panel sessions which typically include many mayors from mid-sized and smaller cities in the regions, as well as many prominent experts on local government in Latin America from throughout the hemisphere. Best practices awards are presented annually for outstanding program achievement by local governments in Latin America. In some instance, hands on training workshops have been a part of the program. The Presidents and Executive Directors of most of Latin-America’s national municipal associations are routinely consulted with as regards the design of the program and regularly participate in the conference. Through such participation, the conference provides access to all of the local governments of virtually all of the countries of Latin America.

Among the various achievements of the event have been the following:

1. Most importantly, it provides a continuing opportunity for government officials from throughout the hemisphere to share ideas about building democratic local governments that are responsive to their citizens and highly effective in terms of local service delivery. As a former Mayor of Asuncion, Paraguay, commented in a Miami Herald newspaper story over a decade ago, ‘The conference is like a great supermarket of ideas for local government officials’.

2. The conference has played a very important role in introducing Latin America’s local government leaders to the leaders of major international development organizations. For example, the former long-time President of the Inter-American Bank (IDB), Enrique Iglesias, publicly noted that it was through the conference that he first came to fully recognize the possibilities for, and the importance of, the IDB working directly with local government officials. Given that the IDB invests about 6 billion dollars a year in development activities in Latin America, far more than any other organization in the world, this has been a major benefit to the region and a significant achievement for the conference.

3. Senior officials from other major organizations involved in development activities in Latin America, including the World Bank, the OAS, USAID and the US govern-
ment (ranging from Ambassadors to Assistant Secretaries of State for Latin America), regularly participate in the conference and thus have had the opportunity, often for the first time, to meet and interact with many of the region’s local government leaders.

4. The conference has played an important role in supporting the building of national municipal associations, and other related organizations, to advance the development of local government in the countries of Latin America. These associations continue to work very closely with the IPMCS as it organizes this annual event. This includes sponsoring and organizing in various countries, and in Miami, a variety of other training and technical assistance projects for Latin American local government officials.

5. The first time a hemispheric Presidential Summit addressed the importance of local government for the future development of Latin America, it resulted from the work of the IPMCS and Latin American local government leaders brought together through the conference. At the conclusion of the Quebec Summit of the Hemispheric Presidents in April 2001, the final communique of the region’s heads of state, specially expressed appreciation for the work of the Inter American Conference of Mayors and Local Authorities in the building of democratic local governments in the region, views which subsequently have been expressed on many other occasions by high ranking Latin American and US officials.

6. For the past fifteen years, five municipal best practices have been recognized at a special plenary session. Information regarding these various municipal innovations has resulted in numerous similar program initiatives by many municipalities throughout the hemisphere.

7. The conference has received a great deal of positive media attention both locally and internationally. Each year, anywhere from 25 to 50 stories about it appear in both South Florida media, as well as newspapers and TV throughout Latin America. It has also been widely recognized by Miami leaders for its major contributions to the local economy of South Florida. Recently, the conference was the recipient of the highest annual award of one of the area’s two main economic development agencies, the Greater Miami Convention and Tourist Bureau, for its significant annual contributions to the building of South Florida’s economy and the enhancing of the region’s reputation as a destination for Latin American visitors. It is estimated that a third of the participants bring family members with them for shopping and vacation, thus adding about two million dollars a year to the South Florida economy.

4. Conclusion

Obviously, the two projects at which we have looked here are very different in many respects. As such, they serve very nicely to illustrate the very wide diversity of activities through which universities engage with their many communities, whether those are national, international or local. They also serve to illustrate how far the activities of the contemporary university have moved beyond traditional classroom teaching. At the same time, the two projects also serve to illustrate the many elements
that such projects have in common and the many diverse ways in which they can benefit the institutions carrying them out.

Certainly, the two projects which have been examined here cannot be more different in their origins. One was funded through an international competition by a professional trade association, ultimately, among other things, for the purposes of advancing its commercial interests. The other was initiated by a government agency with the goal of encouraging the democratization of other nation’s governments. One project focused heavily upon research, analysis and educational activities. The other project focused much more heavily upon technical assistance and demonstration activities, while presenting the possibility for research and writing derived from the experiences involved in the project’s implementation. One project had very clear beginning and ending dates, while the other project has a 25 year history that continues to the present.

However, both projects served to generate resources for the institutions which implemented them and for the faculty members who engaged in their implementation. Similarly, while the activities engaged in through the projects were very different, both projects were obviously driven by the interests of their external sponsors and the goals that the sponsors were seeking to achieve. Likewise, both projects served to tie the institutions involved much more closely to the various communities of which they were a part and resulted in significant engagement with those communities by the faculty involved in them.

Obviously, very strong cases can be made regarding the importance of the benefits that each project produced for those directly involved – the sponsors, the implementing universities and the faculty directly involved. They also, in quite different ways and to varying degrees, each generated revenue for the communities in which the universities were located. In doing so, again in varying degrees, they enhanced the images of the communities of which the universities are a part. On the other hand, each project in its own way illustrates complicated questions that institutions ultimately must confront as they engage with their communities. For example, while higher education institutions on both sides of the Atlantic are increasingly facing serious financial difficulties, certainly one can raise at least some questions about the appropriateness of each project.

Should a university, especially a publicly supported one, be assisting one country’s government as it seeks to impact other countries’ governments? Should a university be working with an industry that has frequently sought to avoid responsibility for the potential harm that its product can produce, even if it helps to generate increased revenue for its home country’s government? These are not simple questions. Nor do they have simple answers. In each case, they present complicated issues for both the institutions involved, as well as for the faculty members who engaged in these projects. Nevertheless, the reality of the situation is that for good or ill, and most likely more for good than ill, the contemporary university has become increasingly engaged with its community and these admittedly complicated relationships are unlikely to
change in the foreseeable future. Indeed, if anything, they will increase which is why it is important to continue to examine and study them.
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