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PREFACE

The International Education Program, enunciated by President Johnson in his Message to Congress on February 2, 1966, and the International Education Act (IEA) of 1966, which was approved by large margins in both Houses of Congress, constituted the most significant advances of the last two decades in the field of international education. The fact that most of the 1966 proposals were not implemented, and that Congress has so far not appropriated any funds under the Act, does not diminish the fundamental long-run importance of those measures.

Severe as our disappointments have been, however, the situation for the U.S. academic community is not entirely negative—provided U.S. institutions of higher learning put to good use the time remaining before a renewed effort is made to achieve government support for international education.

If there was one insistent theme in both the International Education Program and in the IEA, it was that major responsibility for international education belongs to the educational community.

In an earlier essay on this point,* I wrote:

The government can stimulate, give shape and direction, and provide large-scale financing. But the ideas and activities that make up international education are mainly the province of the schools, colleges and universities of the nation. And the Congress has essentially confirmed this relationship by insisting—through several provisions of the new Act—that the academic community be promptly geared into the planning

process as a fully equal partner with the government.

So the responsibility is fully upon the private sector to make a decisive contribution to the further shaping of the new initiatives in international education. What happens under the Act in the years ahead depends significantly on how the academic community now responds.

Running parallel to the theme of private responsibility was the stress on the need for careful planning—within the government agencies concerned, within the academic community and within individual educational institutions. Those who framed the Act and those who sought to make it a reality recognized, of course, that not all our higher educational institutions are at the same stage of development in their international programs. Some major universities are old and skilled practitioners, veterans of many overseas and on-campus programs; other universities, though large and venerable, have not so far given prominence to the international dimension either in their curricula or in their service activities; and still other institutions—perhaps a majority among our four-year liberal arts colleges—have had neither the resources nor the impetus to gather momentum on the international front.

Ever since the IEA took legislative form, Education and World Affairs has been particularly concerned with the latter two groups—the uncommitted, the inexperienced, what might be called the "developing" colleges and universities in the international field. It was believed that these institutions were the ones which would require extra encouragement and basic guidelines if they were to move effectively into the widening areas of international education; they could profit from the lessons to be learned from the more experienced universities; and, finally, they would profit from a continuing flow of information about the problems and prospects of their efforts to internationalize.

Several earlier EWA efforts were pointed to this same need of the colleges and universities for shared experiences and new insights. In 1966, under the leadership of Allan A. Michie, the international program profiles of six major universities—Cornell, Indiana, Michigan State, Stanford, Tulane and Wisconsin—were

An equally ambitious undertaking to make the sum total of international education experience more readily available was a compendium of extracts from the relevant literature—from the end of the Second World War to mid-1966—which Mr. Michie and EWA staff members edited at the request of Congressman John Brademas, co-sponsor of the IEA in the House of Representatives and chairman of the Task Force on International Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor. This publication, *INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: PAST, PRESENT, PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS*, was distributed widely by the office of Congressman Brademas, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Government Printing Office and by EWA.

Corresponding to this main thrust of EWA effort over the years, the present report is in direct lineage to these earlier publications. Early in 1968 Mr. Michie was invited to prepare the section on international education which was to be included as a chapter in a book—*HANDBOOK OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION*—which McGraw-Hill Book Company will publish in 1969 under the editorship of Asa S. Knowles, President of Northeastern University, Boston.

This review was designed to be of greatest value to those institutions which are only now moving into the international field, especially perhaps to those which are beginning their activities from a standing start. It therefore includes a survey of the diverse activities which make up international education, an indication of some of the common institutional strengths and weaknesses which the colleges should take into account, and, finally, an indication of the array of resources—governmental and private—which are available to institutions willing to seek them out. To this has been added an extensive bibliography of the field of international education, compiled by Sandra K. Meagher, Director, Library and Reference Services, Education and World Affairs.

It is our conviction that this material—combining, as it does, features of a "how to" handbook with an overview of the essential literature of the field—will be highly useful to those institutions
of higher learning now going through a period of self-assessment, planning and implementation of their international programs and activities. For this reason, EWA is publishing Mr. Michie's chapter as a special report, thus assuring that the material will be immediately and widely available through the educational community. We are grateful to McGraw-Hill Book Company for permission to print and distribute this report in advance of the book in which it will later appear.

WILLIAM W. MARVEL
President
Education and World Affairs
In an address at Harvard some time after the end of the Second World War Sir Winston Churchill remarked upon the fact that the United States, almost against its will, had emerged from its self-imposed isolation of the between-wars years to become the world power which Britain once had been. "Remember," Sir Winston warned, pointing to the future, "that the price of greatness is responsibility." And, he might have added, responsibility requires a well-informed citizenry.

In the years that followed the United States has assumed an unprecedented role in world affairs: never in its history has the nation been so deeply and controversially involved abroad. In any year close to one and a half million Americans—most of them military personnel and dependents—live and work outside the United States and another five million of our citizens are inextricably involved each year with citizens of other lands and other cultures through travel, business, professional duties, immigration.

And yet, despite growing involvement and increased contacts abroad, there is mounting evidence that the United States has neglected to build the broad competence in international education—to prepare our young people to be aware of other peoples, other nations—which our world responsibilities demand. From all sides there are indications that the international dimension of U.S. higher education is far from adequate in providing either general or specialized knowledge of other countries and other cultures.

In their 1964 report, The College and World Affairs, a distinguished group of U.S. educators charged: "The change that has swept the world in our century has altered the lives of nearly every person in it, or will soon do so. Unfortunately, it has not yet produced anywhere in corresponding magnitude the necessary adaptations in education. There has come into being a fateful lag between the circumstances of life in which men and women must live and their inner preparation to do so wisely and effectively."
Fewer than two dozen of our 1,500 four-year colleges and universities require all candidates for the baccalaureate degree to take even a single course dealing primarily with non-Western areas.

Of 191 state colleges and universities surveyed in 1966, a bare 50 percent reported offering a single course in non-Western studies.

According to a 1963-64 study carried out by the Association of American Colleges, fewer than ten percent of the students in the 482 liberal arts and other four-year colleges offering courses on the non-Western world took such courses. Fewer than one percent studied a non-Western language.

In a rapidly changing world, U.S. teacher education has become "obsolete in both method and content," said a 1968 report published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Only from three to five percent of U.S. teachers have taken courses dealing with world society, international issues, or non-Western subjects.

Although junior and community colleges are assuming an increasing role in higher education, programs in international education in these institutions have been relatively neglected—a development all the more to be regretted when such education is terminal.

Despite the near-certainty that the problems of living in a world with China will dominate the next generation, as the cold war dominated the last, only five percent of our four-year higher education institutions in 1966 offered any language courses in Chinese—and many of these were at a very elementary level—and only 28 of 240 U.S. graduate schools offered graduate studies in the Chinese language. A 1968 Office of Education report stated that in the past few years only a handful of doctorate degrees in Chinese have been awarded, and estimated that in the next ten years 1,050 such Ph.D.'s will be needed to fill positions in the United States.

More immediately dramatic was the revelation, at a time when Vietnam was the overriding problem of U.S. overseas involvement, that there were probably not more than eight U.S. scholars carrying on scholarly research on Vietnam, and not one who might qualify as a senior academic specialist on the divided country.
"'International education' is in some respects an awkward phrase which connotes too many different activities, none of which is neatly described," said John T. Caldwell, Chancellor of North Carolina State University at Raleigh, at a 1967 Notre Dame seminar on the subject. "By now we are accustomed to including under its umbrella the education of foreign students in the United States and the education of United States students abroad; the activities of foreign scholars in the United States and the movement and activities of the United States scholars abroad; the performance of technical assistance of all kinds in developing nations; more specifically, professional assistance to the development of educational institutions and programs in developing nations; international conferences of scholars interested in comparative education including comparisons of access, funding, philosophy, adequacy, and so on; and finally, educational programs in the United States designed to improve the competence of the American citizen and the professional to understand and participate effectively in the world beyond our national boundaries. Obviously the umbrella has a big circumference."

By this definition, U.S. universities and colleges are today involved in international education on a range far wider and to a depth far greater than is commonly realized, even by participating educational institutions.

The multiplication of international programs was the principal finding of a second inventory of such programs which was carried out during 1964-65 by the East-West Center of the University of Hawaii, with the assistance of Education and World Affairs, and published early in 1967.¹ This inventory, The International

¹Published by the Office of International Programs, Michigan State University, 1967. The study was made possible by operation funds of the East-West Center, University of Hawaii, and Education and World Affairs.
Programs of American Universities, updated the survey—published under the same title—which Edward W. Weidner carried out in 1958.

Both surveys have the same built-in limitation, in that they defined "international programs" from an exchange orientation ("a 'program' is defined as an activity that involves the sending of persons or things between an American university [or group of universities] and a cooperating foreign institution, country or region") and thus they do not include the wide range of international curricular programs, such as language and area centers, as well as many international campus activities.

Although the findings of the East-West Center survey do not therefore reflect the total international commitment of U.S. higher education, they nonetheless evidence a phenomenal growth in the number of formal and informal international affiliations, exchanges, contracts and institutional arrangements that have resulted as colleges and universities have organized themselves for international education.

For the 1964-65 survey, 2,178 colleges and university presidents were contacted, with a 99 percent response.

The comparative results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1957-58</th>
<th>1964-65</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of universities responding</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities with programs</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>115.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programs</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>245.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International education as we know it today in U.S. universities and colleges has been slowly built up over the decades, each advance resulting from an historic development or new national interest. Some of the earliest U.S. educational involvements overseas stemmed from the "missionary" impulse. This manifested itself at different universities in various forms. At Princeton, for instance, it took the form of being the intellectual godfather of colleges in the Middle East. At Indiana University, in an early form of the Peace Corps, it sent graduates hastening to enlist in international YMCA, church and mission work all over the world. At Cornell, individual faculty members became
involved with mission schools in China: both Cornell and Harvard began teaching the Chinese language in 1870.

A second stimulus of interest in international affairs resulted from U.S. academic involvement in new international organizations—such as the two Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 and the League of Nations—which took form before and after World War I. During the second of the interwar decades several research-oriented institutes developed at major universities and leading colleges, but in the main parochialism prevailed on the U.S. campus and it was left to a few citizen organizations (the Foreign Policy Association, the Council on Foreign Relations) to try to create an informed public opinion on world affairs.

World War II jolted the provincialism of the average U.S. campus. Scholars were involved both in the war effort and in the plans for peace in greater numbers and with larger responsibilities than ever before. But with their involvement came the realization that Americans were tragically ignorant about the cultures and peoples of other areas of the globe. Some groundwork had been laid in specialized university institutes, supported largely by the major foundations, and in 1941 the Rockefeller Foundation had farsightedly given the American Council of Learned Societies grants to develop instruction programs in a number of “neglected” modern languages that might be needed by military personnel in the impending conflict. The Emergency Intensive Language Program developed by the ACLS pioneered many of the techniques later adopted when the U.S. Army’s Specialized Training Program of area and language training was launched in 1943.

The growth of area studies, stimulated in the main by foundation funds, has dominated the post-Second World War period in international education. Interdisciplinary and yet specialized in character, and graduate programs for the most part, they concern themselves with the language and culture, past and present, of a given geographic area. In retrospect, they probably provided the most suitable mechanism for overcoming the parochialism of the typical U.S. campus.

Yet another benchmark with which to measure the extent of the involvement of our higher education institutions in the international field came with the inauguration in 1949 of the Point IV Program, in which the United States generously offered to
share its resources with the underdeveloped third of the world. U.S. universities were among the first institutions to respond to this challenge—Michigan State University, for instance, embarked upon its first overseas technical assistance program in 1951—and the subsequent engagement of university personnel and resources all over the globe has had a major impact on these educational institutions.
THE EXTENT OF INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT

Even a rough inventory of existing international activities and programs of U.S. colleges and universities adds up to an impressive total, a growth even more phenomenal when it is recalled that most of it has taken place over the past ten years.

¶There were a total of 110,315 foreign students enrolled in U.S. institutions of higher learning in the academic year 1967-68, the highest number on record and an increase of 10 percent over the preceding year. Of these, over 48 percent were undergraduates and 43.7 percent graduate students. Foreign students were enrolled in 1,927 U.S. institutions, but more than half were at some 66 institutions. While 38 percent of foreign students were self-supporting, 22 percent of the students were given financial aid by U.S. colleges and universities.

¶There are now more than 1,000 full-time foreign student advisors on U.S. campuses.

¶During 1967-68, U.S. universities and colleges played host to more than 11,641 foreign professors, scholars, researchers, faculty members, and other senior academic personnel (an increase from 635 in 1954-55).

¶There were 4,775 U.S. scholars abroad during 1967-68, the highest number ever recorded. Forty-nine percent of these scholars were in Europe; over 50 were in Vietnam, the first time this country appeared in the list of countries visited.

¶A total of 21,579 U.S. students were "enrolled" as regular full-time students in foreign institutions of higher learning during 1966-67 (the last year for which such figures are available). These students were at 549 institutions in 63 foreign countries, but fifty-eight percent of all U.S. students abroad studied in Europe. Half of the students studied in the humanities.

¶The Fulbright program, the first major international exchange

*This figure represents a decrease of about 13 percent from the preceding year, but several major institutions did not report.
program for students, teachers and scholars, began in 1948 with
the participation of 22 nations and 84 grant recipients; in 1966,
the program involved 136 nations and more than 5,100 grantees.

Specialized area study centers now exist in 150 U.S. higher
learning institutions. There are 40 formally organized African
study centers in U.S. colleges and universities, 21 of them at
major universities (the first of which was established at North-
western in 1946).

To meet a critical need for specialists in foreign languages
and countries, the National Defense Education Act, enacted in
1958, established Language and Area Centers to provide inten-
sive language training and related studies such as geography,
history and anthropology. During the current academic year 106
NDEA Language and Area Centers (88 graduate and 18 under-
graduate) are operating in 63 U.S. institutions, and focus on 79
different modern foreign languages rarely taught in the United
States.

According to a 1967 survey by the Association of State Col-
eges and Universities, about 100 of its 200 member institutions
offer some form of international education.

The most extensive international programs of U.S. universities
are technical assistance activities, which take the form of either
consultative services to overseas governments or institutions, or
operating functions, with the U.S. university participating direct-
ly in assistance activities—or a combination of both.

As of March 1968, 67 U.S. universities and colleges were at
work in 40 foreign nations on technical assistance projects
financed by the U.S. Agency for International Development; a
total of $205,076,535 in AID funds was committed to finance
the 148 contracts. Under another 163 contracts, universities or
other academic institutions trained foreign nationals or provided
technical support to AID both in the U.S. and abroad; these
contracts amounted to an additional $26,099,204.

By 1967 more than 100 U.S. colleges and universities had
trained some 33,000 future Peace Corps Volunteers. Instruction
ranges from language and area studies to practical procedures
in hygiene, community living and cultural adjustment. In addi-
tion, many U.S. institutions now seek out returned Peace Corps
Volunteers for graduate work, and some give credit for the over-
seas experience.
The Extent of International Involvement

Upward of 100 U.S. higher learning institutions have been involved in training foreign students, faculty and professionals on U.S. campuses under participant trainee programs sponsored by AID or in cooperation with U.S. foundations and other organizations.

In any one year there may be upward of 18,000 foreign military students in the United States under the auspices of the Department of Defense (only a small proportion of whom, however, attend civilian educational institutions).
PITFALLS, PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Despite this rapid rise and widening range of international involvements there are still glaring gaps and obvious shortcomings in the resources and commitment of U.S. colleges and universities in the international field. As William W. Marvel, President of Education and World Affairs, has put it: "U.S. higher education has a much longer distance to travel than it has so far come."

The following capsule comments can do no more than direct attention to some of the pitfalls, problems and prospects that lie ahead:

Undergraduate Education

At the undergraduate level the growth of courses with an international content (of 50 percent or more) has been unsystematic and heavily Western-oriented. Western orientation begins in the elementary and secondary schools and carries through the four-year institutions. A 1966 report on education in New York state estimated that the average high school student spends less than two percent of his time studying those parts of the world that contain two-thirds of the world's population, and whose historical record goes much farther back than our own.

It is arguable that a disproportionate share of our resources have been going into specialized graduate courses in the international field. Robert Byrnes of Indiana University contends that "we have been busy turning out academic theologians, when what we really need are parish priests."

Universalizing the curriculum, however, requires more than tinkering with existing courses. It may require complete rethinking of an entire field: it demands faculty members who are themselves internationally minded.3

3Worth noting is a faculty development program, the Faculty Institute for International Studies, which was initiated by the Regional Council
Language and Area Centers  The rapid spread in specialized language and area centers in recent years has given the impression that there is hardly a spot on the globe left uncovered by American scholarship. This is not true. Coverage is uneven, and in places nonexistent.

Japan, for instance, has emerged as a world power in the postwar years. The fact that Japanese is not a world language, however, calls for especial attention from the U.S. academic community: and yet there are perhaps not more than ten U.S. graduate centers for Japanese studies that meet the scholarly requirements of major centers.

Our failure to produce Vietnam specialists matches our failure to capitalize on our earlier involvement in Korea. Despite the investment of three years and the loss of some 40,000 U.S. lives, Korean studies remain undeveloped in our academic institutions. The Korean language is taught at some ten U.S. universities, but few offer advanced courses. Despite the obvious parallels with the war in Vietnam, no known academic study is being made to draw insights from the Korean experience.

To some extent academic fashion has prevailed in the area studies field. To many educators, the introduction of an area studies program seemed to be the only way to achieve a measurable international dimension at their institution. The emergence of the Soviet Union as an expansionist world power after World War II led university after university to focus upon Soviet studies—and neglect to a great extent the nations of East Europe which were brought within the Soviet orbit. With the breakup of colonial Africa and the emergence of new nations and mini-states on that continent, U.S. higher education institutions followed each other in haste to establish African study centers.
overlapping and competing with each other for scarce faculty and material—particularly library—resources.

There are other major shortcomings to the area studies approach. The concept is certainly not valid for all institutions, regardless of kind or size. In general, area centers have not become fixed in the U.S. university structure: they are often regarded as isolated, peripheral and to some degree temporary. They have had very little impact on undergraduate education within their institutions; more important, perhaps, the output of their scholarship—in men and materials—has had relatively little effect (for the money invested in such specialized studies) upon U.S. society and its understanding of other societies.¹

**Professional Schools**

In general, U.S. professional schools—which award 52 percent of all four-year bachelor degrees—have been slower than liberal arts colleges to respond to the international dimensions because of their strong domestic and vocational bias, despite the fact that most technical assistance programs overseas are undertaken by professional schools.

Throughout 1966 and 1967 Education and World Affairs—through the mechanism of a Study Committee on the Professional School and World Affairs—surveyed the professional schools in eight fields—agriculture, engineering, medicine, public health, business administration, public administration, law and education—and in a series of reports (later published in book form by the University of New Mexico Press) made specific recommendations for the internationalization of the course content and activities of each of them.

These blueprints and other innovative efforts to chart a more universal approach for the various professions have been widely discussed, and have established a climate of receptivity in which implementation of the recommendations—and similar sugges-

¹For an assessment of the forms of area studies and their impact upon U.S. higher education, see Foreign Area Studies in American Higher Education, a study carried out by Ellen Gumperz of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley. This study, which contains an extensive bibliography, was published in September 1966 by the Bureau of Research of the U.S. Office of Education.
Pitfalls, Problems and Prospects

Teacher Education As a result of a two-year study of the education of U.S. teachers in world affairs (made for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and published in 1968), Harold Taylor, former President of Sarah Lawrence College, visited 52 campuses and concluded: "Those students most actively concerned about foreign policy questions, world issues, and social change are seldom involved in teacher education programs, and, conversely, those who are preparing to become teachers are seldom interested in world issues, social change, and international affairs. Few of them have heard of the International Education Act or are conscious of a wider dimension in the role of the teacher than that of taking the required courses in general education, an academic major almost completely devoid of non-Western studies, and practice teaching in schools where very little of international interest is evident."

Mr. Taylor, in addition to recommending an international curriculum that will attract into teaching those socially concerned students who consider the present education curriculum too confining, makes a number of specific suggestions, including: 1) the establishment of World Urban Teaching Centers, both here and abroad, to which student teachers and teachers of the world could come to consider common educational problems and develop new materials and new curricula; 2) the expanded use of foreign students already in the United States to share in teaching about their own cultures and countries as direct participants in school and college classrooms (an extension of the Ogontz Plan, which has been successful in the Philadelphia and surrounding areas for some years); and 3) an extension of the Reserve Peace Corps experiment, by which selected student teachers come to

"The Ogontz Plan (Ogontz Plan Committee, International House of Philadelphia, 140 North 15th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19102) is a carefully planned "live laboratory" program which supplements the existing social studies curricula in elementary and secondary schools by arranging for selected foreign students to teach about their own countries and cultures in regular classroom situations. Begun in 1962, it was named for the junior high school in Elkins Park, Pennsylvania, where the program was first tested."
this country to work with U.S. students in community education projects.

**Study Abroad Programs** Study abroad for U.S. students, both academic year and summer term, has proliferated so rapidly in recent years that it has created the impression of an uncontrolled, uncoordinated and ill-prepared movement.* It is thought that more than half of our liberal arts colleges permit their students to earn credit overseas. There are nearly 200 U.S. organizations involved in the field of student travel and transportation.

How much of this is a form of intellectual tourism? How much of the study abroad syndrome is attributable to a desire to keep up with competing colleges, or to provide a come-on in the college catalog? The quality of many overseas study programs is open to question, and the haphazard growth and concentration of such study programs in Western Europe has caused concern in government and academic circles in those countries over the strain of these programs on local university facilities. It is shortsighted to overrun host countries with bands of affluent Americans.

The proper timing of overseas study in a student’s career is still open to discussion. Is the junior year abroad the best pattern, or is another undergraduate year more viable? Is there a case for graduate study abroad over against undergraduate? What are the values of summer study programs?

Probably no single area of international education stands more in need of a national inquiry than study abroad. Pending such an undertaking, however, there are certain broad observations on which academic agreement might be reached.

What should a college or university hope to achieve in the education of its students abroad? Certainly quality programs should strive for 1) the humanizing, broadening contact of a cross-cultural experience; 2) the intellectual and professional advancement of the student in his specialized field; and 3) the furtherance of international understanding.

In the selection of candidates another series of questions

---

*Study abroad figures are, at best, estimates because many students travel abroad on their own and are not recorded in formal programs (in 1966, for example, a total of 324,180 U.S. passports were issued to persons between 15 and 24).
Pitfalls, Problems and Prospects

should be faced. Should study abroad be part of the general education program, which in most colleges is completed in the first two years? Should it be treated as an integral part of the four-year course? Or should a program be designed to help an upperclass student specialize in his chosen field or major? Then there are the qualitative criteria. Should overseas study be limited to high-grade students, a reward held out in an honors program? Or is it the intent to provide all undergraduates with a better opportunity for cultural exchanges?

Should students receive full academic credit for overseas study? A quality program should certainly aim for the same academic standards demanded on the home campus. Or, put another way, credit granted should represent no diminution of standards, even though different criteria are established.

Nine-tenths of all U.S. undergraduates who go overseas are not actually enrolled in the foreign university they attend, in the true sense of the word "enrolled." They tend to cluster at name universities, and more than 50 percent stick to Western Europe. The result: a serious overcrowding and all-American enclaves which are less politely known as "golden ghettos" or "expatriate campuses." It is possible, instead, for U.S. institutions to seek arrangements with counterpart educational institutions in non-European parts of the world, or even in provincial European cities, when such locations are consistent with the U.S. program's objectives. In Germany, for instance, there are some 80 teacher training academies which are smaller than the universities and which resemble U.S. institutions in the make-up of their student bodies. These small colleges are generally interested in working out arrangements with U.S. institutions.

Finally, in an effort to assure that the time spent abroad is something more than a singular and separate experience in the educational career, U.S. colleges and universities should give at least as much thought to feedback and evaluation as they do to preparation. What is done to maintain student interest when he returns? How is the student used as a campus resource? What plans are made for his reentry to the U.S. campus, to a sort of reverse cultural shock? And, in the evaluation of programs, what influence does study abroad seem to have on career objectives? Is there any evidence that a year spent out of the country offsets the loss of a year's study on the home campus? Few institutions
with on-going study abroad programs have taken the trouble to conduct a systematic analysis of the impact of overseas study.

In late 1967 the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education adopted a statement on undergraduate study abroad programs which represents the common policy of all regional accrediting associations. Until a national scrutiny of such programs can be attempted, the statement can serve as a guideline for U.S. institutions engaged in study abroad programs.

The Federation suggests that institutions that conduct foreign study programs or whose students participate in such programs should ascertain that the programs meet the following recommendations:

1. The programs should be clearly relevant to the purposes and objectives of the sponsoring or participating institutions;
2. be designed to provide educational experiences integrally related to the institution's undergraduate curriculum but otherwise unavailable;
3. be limited to carefully selected students;
4. have rigidly specified language proficiency requirements when appropriate to the program and place of study;
5. include extensive preliminary orientation for intended participants;
6. so far as conditions permit, be staffed and directed under the same policies as the home institution—continuity of administrative direction is especially important;
7. provide counseling and supervisory services at the foreign center equal to those on the home campus, with special attention to problems peculiar to the location and nature of the program;
8. include clearly defined criteria and policies for judging performance and assigning credit in accordance with prevailing standards and practices at the home institution;
9. stipulate that students will ordinarily not receive credit for foreign study undertaken without prior planning or approval;
10. include provisions for regular follow-up studies on the individual and institutional benefits derived from such programs.

Foreign Students in the United States  Foreign students are a major educational asset to a U.S. campus. It is the exceptional institution, however, which treats them as such: although there is hardly a campus without its quota of foreign students, too
often they are regarded as problems, novelties, exotic evidences of internationalism, or treated as no different from U.S. students.

In the two decades since foreign student exchange was endorsed by the U.S. government and foundations as a technique for internationalizing our education there has been no lack of systematic research on the questions raised by the admission of foreigners to our higher learning institutions (the latest of which is “Foreign Student Exchange in Perspective,” prepared by Barbara J. Walton for the Office of External Research, U.S. Department of State, 1967). The answers to the questions raised, however, are harder to come by.

Of the 110,315 foreign students in the United States during 1967-68, perhaps only 15 to 20 percent were here on planned programs and effective sponsorship: many were either chronically hard pressed financially or just barely meeting their expenses. The prediction is that foreign students at U.S. institutions will increase to 150,000 over the next few years, with no ceiling in sight. This growth is expected at a time when an ever-greater number of U.S. students will be seeking higher education. A few U.S. universities have quietly imposed a quota on foreign students—apparently in anticipation of criticism from the local constituency at a time when facilities for U.S. students are in short supply—and a few other institutions use a rule of thumb to limit their proportion of foreign students to not more than 10 percent of total enrollment.

Merely admitting foreign students does not relieve the U.S. institution of further responsibility. Their presence on campus should be as a result of a carefully thought-out rationale, and the academic program provided for them should be an integral part of the institution’s educational strategy.

Are foreign student applicants being properly selected and screened in their home countries? Are foreign students coming to the United States at the proper level of their educational development? Are they being placed in the appropriate schools?

*For what appears to be the most comprehensive bibliography to date on foreign students and their relation to international education see Foreign Students and International Studies: A Selected Annotated Bibliography by Manuel Rodriguez-Bascur, prepared for The Professional Schools’ Program of the Institute of International Studies, University of California (Berkeley), 1967.*
when they get here? Are they sufficiently oriented in advance about our educational system, customs, institutions and values; and is their command of English sufficient to enable them to hold their own with U.S. students under competitive conditions? In too many of our institutions foreign students appear to be admitted in a haphazard, unplanned manner from among those who happen to apply in one way or another. At many universities, foreign graduate students are admitted by decision of the colleges and departments concerned: there seems to be no all-university coordination and therefore no control over the numbers admitted or over the desired mix between graduate and undergraduate applicants.

Once in the United States, how much assistance should foreign students receive from their host institutions? What special services should a university reasonably provide? Are universities ever justified in adjusting their academic standards to meet the needs of their foreign students? Do some institutions, in fact, operate a double standard without admitting it? One study a few years ago suggested that universities tend to treat foreign students the same as their U.S. counterparts in certain areas of university administration where their "foreignness" demands different treatment, and that in the more academic areas they tend to treat the foreign student differently—and usually more generously—when more equal treatment might be in the better interest of both student and university.

Can foreign students be used while in the United States as educational resources, either in intercultural studies or through extra-curricular programs? Are there any instructive instances of the imaginative use of the resources of foreign students or scholars? (Admittedly, not all foreign students and scholars wish to be used as "resources" while in the United States.) Disappointingly, although our educational institutions have played host to foreign students for decades—even on a small scale in the years between the wars—no systematic study has been made of the contribution foreign students make toward international understanding on the part of U.S. students. Nor, for that matter, does there appear to have been a nationwide study of the contribution to international understanding foreign students make to foreign students of a different nation on the same campus, or to students of their own nation.
It is highly questionable whether the academic programs prescribed for foreign students while in the United States do, in fact, prepare them for their roles back in their home culture. We need more systematic research on these products of our educational system back in their home countries to learn more about the applicability of U.S. education to the rest of the world, particularly its developing areas.

In recent years economists and educational planners have come to recognize that non-returnees among the foreign student population and the migration of native talent from the poorer countries to the United States—popularly known as the "brain drain"—cancel out in large part the financial and technical assistance given to the developing countries. Despite this recognition—and a spate of conferences devoted to the "brain drain" problem—little real progress has been made in devising possible strategies to deal with it.

One alternative—which may prove to be the long-term solution to the outward flow of skilled and talented persons from the less-developed nations—is to reshape the training given to foreign students while in the United States so that it is especially relevant to the problems of an underdeveloped economy and not tailored for an advanced industrial economy, thus encouraging the students to return to their homelands at the completion of their studies abroad. At the same time the home countries should be encouraged to provide increasing and rewarding educational and employment opportunities for the returnees.

Technical Assistance, Development Education The relevance of international service—the transfer of U.S. technology and the building up of institutions, mainly educational, overseas—to the goals and purposes of U.S. higher education has long been debated. The verdict is still open. There are those who accept and welcome consulting activities overseas as being relevant to the professional development of the individual faculty member but who question whether overseas involvement in either technical assistance or institution building is the appropriate role for a university.

In general, state universities—particularly those with the land-grant tradition of service to the community—have been more ready to shoulder responsibilities of public service abroad, while
private universities have been somewhat reluctant to accept service commitments overseas. But there are important exceptions to this observation, and some of the major U.S. private institutions of higher education conduct extensive overseas programs. One, Cornell, which is a mix of private and land-grant, has pioneered in its cooperative program with the University of the Philippines (Los Banos) a pattern which combines technical assistance with its own teaching and research requirements, to the benefit of both. Under this program faculty and students from both countries and from many disciplines take part in research and training activities in both countries.

Much academic sensitivity to overseas development work traces back to the fact that the source of program funding is in the main the Agency for International Development. AID and its predecessor agencies have relied on the university contract as the chosen instrument in handling technical aid overseas. Despite recent attempts by AID to improve working relations between the agency and its university contractors, academic objections persist. These include the fear that an operating relationship with a U.S. government agency is inimical to professional principles; the resentment of supervision from the AID field mission; the necessity to refrain from public criticism of the U.S. or host government while serving overseas; the need for a security clearance by the U.S. government; and the obligation to clear with AID officials publications arising from field experiences.7

Despite such objections the AID-university contract is a convenience to both parties and is likely to continue running on its own momentum. In fact, the very convenience of the relationship seems to have discouraged AID from thoroughly exploring and considering the use of non-university contract groups to carry out technical assistance programs, many of which—such

7For a discussion and recommendations concerning the relationships between the universities and AID in the United States, see AID and the Universities, by John W. Gardner, published in 1964 by Education and World Affairs, in cooperation with the Agency for International Development. For a counterpart discussion and recommendations concerning U.S. universities in the field, see U.S. Universities: Their Role in AID-Financed Technical Assistance Overseas, by Richard H. Wood, published in 1968 by Education and World Affairs.
as state governments and education departments, industrial laboratories, museums, research institutions and a variety of public school bodies—would seem to be more suited than universities to developmental assignments abroad.

Yet another arrangement worth exploring is for the United States to provide the financial assistance to enable third parties, such as educational institutions in smaller, less highly developed nations, to serve as examples for the transmission of skills to the underdeveloped areas. Too often U.S. experts transplant "Made in America" technologies without realizing that modern technology requires a modern environment to thrive. Some of our agricultural experts, for instance, seem inclined to go from the flail to the combine in one single leap—whereas what the underdeveloped areas usually require are modified technologies or new solutions tailored to their own problems.

A most useful role for U.S. educational institutions would be in identifying and making known to AID talents and competencies from non-university sources in the United States and abroad which could be mobilized for overseas operations.

Overseas Research In general, faculty members look upon research as the primary area in which their interests are international: the relevance of international research is usually not questioned in academic circles. However, over the past two or three years there has been increasing concern over research procedures abroad—concern as to the proper relationship between the U.S. researcher and his overseas colleagues; the sources of overseas research monies; the appropriate connection between the U.S. researcher and the official U.S. community overseas; and the quality control of overseas research programs. A few nations have expressed their concern by instituting preliminary clearance and control mechanisms for U.S. scholars working in their countries.8

8The growing resentment at the exploitative nature of the research conducted by foreigners was most aptly put by an Indian professional (and quoted by Clifton R. Wharton, Jr. of the Agricultural Development Council, Inc. in a paper prepared for the implementation of the International Education Act of 1966): "They come; ask us for our help in conducting the survey, in making official contacts, in providing enumerators, in serving as translators and in interpreting the local customs.
In the spring of 1967 the Board of Trustees of Education and World Affairs, nationally known educators and leaders in the field of public affairs, expressed their concern in a major policy statement which called upon the U.S. academic community to undertake a new appraisal of the role of its scholars in overseas research, particularly in the light of disclosures of CIA financing of various private groups.

“We are at the end of an era, if indeed it ever existed,” said the EWA Board, “when an individual scholar could undertake field research in any part of the world with little regard for possible consequences.”

One of the causes of concern about the conduct of research in other countries can be traced back to the insufficient experience and degree of sensitivity revealed by U.S. scholars working abroad. However, there have been instances—the statement noted—“where U.S. universities, research groups, and individual scholars and students have knowingly accepted support, directly or indirectly, from intelligence or national security agencies of the U.S. government, concealing or disguising the nature of their sponsorship and financial backing. In other cases, the government agencies providing the funds have concealed their own identity from the recipients. When exposure comes in such circumstances, the reputation of American scholarship is injured, and future investigations by American scholars are placed in jeopardy.”

The EWA Trustees then put forward a set of guidelines, and urged that they be subjected to widespread scrutiny and debate within the academic community and among those concerned with public affairs in order to arrive at an acceptable code of behavior.

The guidelines were:

1) Universities must adopt effective safeguards and standards for the conduct of U.S. overseas research;

2) The university must insist on full disclosure of purposes, sponsorship and funding of overseas research;

They then return home, carry out the analysis, and publish it in a book which gives them great prestige. But if we want to find out what he learned which might be of value to us in solving our problems, we find that the book is printed in the U.S. and priced way beyond our ability to pay.”
3) The university should reject covert funding of overseas research and urge an enlargement in the grant-making capacity of government agencies which are not part of the military and intelligence complexes;

4) The university must apply appropriate academic quality controls on the overseas research projects and the scholars who will undertake them;

5) The university should assure that the overseas research of its faculty will enhance the U.S. academic presence abroad and project the best qualities of the U.S. educational community;

6) The university should lend its support to the government's appointment of Education Officers in our embassies and to the strengthening of existing private educational field officers overseas and creation of new ones, which could minimize the sometimes disruptive influence of large-scale U.S. social science research in developing countries;

7) The university should generate an appreciation of overseas research problems among its graduate and professional school students.

In the months that followed issuance of the statement the guidelines were widely distributed and discussed in academic areas and eventually adopted and adapted as policy by a number of major universities.
INSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Are there minimal conditions for effective institutional involvement in international education? Looking back over the experiences of a score and more of major universities and a few liberal arts colleges which pioneered in international education and developed special characteristics and competence in the international field, what institutional changes—if any—have resulted? How have these institutions been affected by their commitment to international programs?

Certain institutional conditions seem to be common to the successful implanting of the international dimension:

Leadership Internationalizing the institution requires long-range planning, assessment of the institution’s goals and objectives, time, decisions and the commitment of university money. These demands make leadership—from president, trustees, deans, and key faculty—central and critical. The role of the leadership is to make it continually clear—inward to the university community, outward to the public—that the international dimension is a permanent, integral part of the university’s total educational mission.

Commitment Like leadership, commitment should be visible. It should be backed up with institutional funds—“the budget is the ballot box,” says one international dean.

At the same time, over-commitment is a real danger. There is a distinct trend toward globalism in international education. No university or college should try to do everything. Commitment to international education should be commensurate with the institution’s strengths and resources.

Competence There is a parallel tendency to over-extend both the reach of the institution and the expertise of the individual faculty member, particularly in complex technical assistance projects overseas. The capabilities of some U.S. universities
operating abroad have on occasion been severely stretched even when faculty members engaged in activities they knew best: the universities’ effectiveness is made more problematic when these same professors are expected to engage in direct managerial operations that are only vaguely and remotely related to teaching and research.

Costs Certain aspects of internationalization, such as specialized area centers, siphon off a good deal more money than most universities realize when they enter upon the commitment, because of the ever-widening nature of the activity. In their eagerness to set up multidisciplinary centers to focus on particular regions of the world, many universities overlooked the resulting strain on their libraries. Servicing area programs usually confronts a university with serious budgetary and financial problems: obviously these should be considered before any new program is begun. There are few shortcuts: it takes time and money to build a library collection adequate to a first-class area program. And the basic library costs for the support of a relatively limited area program—at least on the graduate level—are about the same as for a major program.

Library procurement in the international field is a problem that requires more extensive institutional collaboration than colleges and universities have thus far achieved. Regional variants of the Farmington Plan, by which college and university libraries in a given area would collaborate on purchases and share resources, and the extensive use of faculty members on overseas assignments to find and buy library materials abroad, are possibilities that should be more thoroughly explored.

Feedback Feedback is observed more through lip service than practice. It is the shorthand phrase for the process by which institutions should analyze their overseas experiences, evaluate the results, particularly the impact on teaching and research on the home campus, and draw lessons from both. Feedback must be purposely worked at: it does not happen by itself, as many universities and otherwise-internationalized faculty members too often assume. Nor is a cosmopolitan faculty any guarantee that feedback will take place: cosmopolitanism seldom translates itself into curricular programs. In most higher learning institutions, in fact, the more cosmopolitan members of the language
faculties are usually the most resistant to further internationalization of the curriculum.

Obviously not all colleges and universities move into the international dimension from the same baseline. At a time when it appeared hopeful that the International Education Act of 1966 (IEA) would make it possible to enrich the undergraduate curriculum, there was some concern that what might be called the low baseline liberal arts colleges should work out their own minimal conditions for international education. Taking an eclectic approach and refining the hard-earned experience of the larger universities, EWA President Marvel set down a checklist of ten “commandments” for any undergraduate institution seeking an international perspective. Although Congress failed to fund the IEA, the commonsense points are still valid today.

In the first issue of Vidya, a periodical published by the Regional Council for International Education, Mr. Marvel wrote:

1. Don't start at all unless sufficient faculty and administration commitment exist—or can be built. A good test of commitment is readiness to put up some of the college's own money.

2. Create a definite focal point of leadership for the institution's new efforts in international education—and back it to the hilt. All attempts at institutional development and reform require a catalyst. They are never self-generating or self-sustaining.

3. Make a full inventory of the college's present resources in non-Western and international studies—faculty, courses, library resources, special facilities. Even the president should not presume that he knows intuitively what the full picture of his institution is at any given moment.

4. Get acquainted with the relevant literature on this area of "institution building." Four or five easily obtained reports provide a good beginning.

For a consideration of various alternatives and recommended approaches to the development of the international dimension at the liberal arts college level, see A Background Paper Prepared by the Regional Council Area Focus Task Force, issued in 1968 by the Regional Council for International Education.
5. Reach out for help and advice—to living situations on other campuses where successful programs have been developed; to consultants who can come in for a few days; and to organizations that are repositories for experience and knowledge on the problem. Don't try to go it alone.

6. And, in another way, don't try to go it alone; explore all the available opportunities for cooperative sharing arrangements with nearby colleges or between them and a large university in the area. Thus the total result can often be much greater than the sum of the parts.

7. Be especially wary of quick, faddish answers to the problem of building an international dimension into the college. Student abroad programs have a strong nuisance connotation for many university leaders overseas. And it is by no means always clear that such programs are of such striking educational value for American undergraduates.

8. Mix in one radical ingredient: the idea of drawing some of the undergraduate student leaders into the planning process. They too have a stake in seeing their college develop successfully on the international education front.

9. From the very outset, plan to absorb gradually into the institution's own budget the costs of the new international program. Grants under the IEA will not stretch to eternity. And commitments like tenured faculty and library acquisitions do not wither away!

10. Try to end up with a realistic, meaningful, and above all coherent, strategy for building the international dimension of the college. The IEA will not be congenial to a haphazard grab-bag approach.
In an indictment of what he called the 19th century university now operating in 20th century America, Sir Eric Ashby in 1967 charged that U.S. universities and colleges, in general, have not devised built-in mechanisms for change. In one sense, Sir Eric is clearly wrong. Confronted by the multiplication of international programs and activities over the past few years, U.S. higher education institutions have responded by institutionalizing international education through a new campus structure, the international office.

EWA's experience provides a rough yardstick of the growth of such coordinating structures or individuals charged with administrative organization of their institution's international dimension. In late 1964 EWA could identify about a dozen such international offices. By 1965, when the organization began to track such coordinating offices for mail list purposes, the number had grown to more than 25. The passage of the IEA—containing as it did the clear implication that those institutions which showed international organization, commitment and long-range purpose would have a head start in grant applications—stimulated the formation of cross-campus coordinating offices. Another large increase came in the spring of 1968 when the State University of New York completed the designation of Directors of International Education at 63 campuses of the statewide system. This brought the total of such offices to 170 as of May 1968.

Reflecting the diversity of U.S. higher education, each campus seems to have mirrored something of its own character in the type of structure it has devised to administer its international programs. Such offices range in size from one-man offices to fully-staffed, high-level administrative structures, and the titles of chief administrative officers range from international deans, coordinators, directors of international offices to committee chairman.

At what point should a college or university institutionalize its international activities? What about the location and function of
the office—at what point on the administrative hierarchy is it apt to be most successful? Can an international office succeed in its assignment without total commitment from the top, without involving the whole university or college community or without a favorable climate of campus opinion? What kind of background should the new breed of international officers have? An academic background, or specialization in public affairs? And if the former, should they attempt to retain one foot in the academic camp while serving in their new roles?

Certain common experiences emerge from a close look at the international offices now in being. Coordination is an essential component of the duties of the international office, although most such offices have responsibilities going well beyond coordination. Without performing such other functions as communication and the dissemination of information within the campus, no coordination is possible. The international office should be located as high on the administrative hierarchy as possible, in order to provide clearly defined leadership in the international field and to have the opportunity for overview of all campus international programs and activities.

The international officer must be a capable administrator; he must know the resources available to him; be able to relate his university's mission to his own activities; and he should have at his disposal discretionary funds. He should also devise a built-in procedure for program evaluation and review if such programs are to be considered for permanent budgeting as part of his institution's regular operating budget.

The international officer should assist in the promotion of the international dimension in as many disciplines as is appropriate. He should have access to key faculty committees and make use of a faculty advisory council both as a means of evaluating his own efforts and as a channel through which he can learn what he needs to know to perform his coordinating function. He should work as closely as possible with the foreign student advisor and other service personnel involved in international education—and have them on his administrative staff organizationally if local conditions permit.

In their campus communications role the international offices have utilized a number of devices to spread the international word. Several have begun their activities by making an inventory
of faculty with overseas experiences and publishing the results, a survey which often reveals hidden faculty resources and interests. A number of international offices issue their own newsletters—such as MSU's quarterly *International Report*, *International News at the University of Pittsburgh*, Cornell's monthly *International Studies Bulletin*, *Purdue International*, and *Focus on International Affairs* at the University of Houston. A few international offices issue either annual or periodic reports—among them Cornell, Teachers College (Columbia), the University of Pittsburgh, SUNY—and make them fairly widely available on-campus and off. Indiana University from time to time undertakes to update and publish a survey of its international activities and both MSU and Stanford have held faculty retreats at which the institution's plans and objectives in the international field have been thoroughly debated. Cornell pioneered in issuing a separate catalog of courses in international studies, a convenience to students at a major university, and Columbia issues a similar *Bulletin* for its School of International Affairs and the Regional Institutes.
COOPERATING FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

On a wider front, the on-campus coordinating office for international education often serves as a starting point for cooperative, collaborative efforts with neighboring institutions in the international field, leading in some cases to more formal consortia in order to strengthen the common effort and share scarce resources.

A 1965-1966 study conducted for the Office of Education by Raymond S. Moore revealed that there were then more than 1,000 consortia involving two or more U.S. institutions and at least 300 more in advanced stages under development, with a further 500 to 1,000 under study. Of the established arrangements, it is estimated that about 150 had to do with international activities, principally study abroad, U.N. programs, area studies and technical assistance. At least 200 different colleges, universities and member institutions participate in 28 cooperative arrangements that have been established for study abroad. A 1964 survey by the Association of American Colleges found 102 colleges then participating in cooperative programs related to non-Western studies. Moore predicts that it is likely that in the next ten years the present number of institutional partnerships will be multiplied three or four times.

The quickening of interest in interinstitutional arrangements has led to the attempt to establish a systematic communications link for academic consortia across the nation. This is The Acquaintner, which is styled "An International Newsletter for Regional Councils for Higher Education," and which is published monthly by the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, 220 West 53rd Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64112.

The two major cooperative arrangements are the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), an organization of the Big Ten universities plus the University of Chicago, which has in-
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cluded cooperative language training and other overseas programs in its joint efforts; and the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, Inc. (MUCIA), established in 1963 and incorporated in 1964 with Ford Foundation assistance to enable the universities of Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin and Michigan State to extend their international programs in partnership.

In addition, there are several cooperative international programs carried on by organizations, as distinct from colleges and universities—such as the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) Interinstitutional Affiliation Project—and joint college organizational projects, such as the Great Lakes Colleges Association, a consortium of 12 liberal arts colleges in Ohio, Indiana and Michigan, which has its own international program.

Yet another development in cooperation is statewide, in which the states of Kansas, Indiana, New York and Pennsylvania have led the way. Some years ago the Kansas Association of Colleges and Universities set up as a standing committee, the Kansas Commission on International Education, which has carried on three statewide surveys of international programs and potentialities at Kansas institutions, private and public, in order to prevent costly duplication and make suggestions to those institutions interested in developing and strengthening their international programs, unilaterally or through cooperative arrangements.

In New York the pioneering efforts of the Center for International Programs and Services, established by the State Education Department to spread international education, led to: 1) the establishment of the Foreign Area Materials Center in New York City, which provides international opportunities and resources for schools and colleges in the state and elsewhere; and 2) more recently the setting up of the Educational Resources Center in New Delhi, which—among other duties—services schools and colleges in the United States with material resources from India. In the belief that the Foreign Area Materials Center could serve a wider non-New York audience, a group of 11 regional associations in the international field established in 1967 the National Council on Foreign Area Materials, a sort of consortia of consortiums (an affiliation of more than 400 colleges and universities in more than 20 states).
These international coordinating mechanisms, significant in themselves, have a further importance in the college and university community. At a time when bigness and complexity contribute to the compartmentalization and fragmentation of the university’s components, the very act of institutionalizing the international programs and activities of an institution seems to serve as a centripetal influence on campus. International programs and involvements are obviously not the only force working in this direction, but they provide a visible focal point where all sections of the university, from professional schools as well as the liberal arts components, can meet. As international offices increase in number, influence and range of responsibilities, these coordinating mechanisms should provide an element of cohesion and common purpose that can further strengthen the university as an effective instrument.
RESOURCES TO TAP

In spite of its relatively recent prominence in U.S. higher education, international education already suffers from a flood of information. As with most communications problems, however, the challenge to those involved in the field is how to stay abreast of developments, how to cut through to the relevant resources.

What follows is a partially annotated listing of some resources which are available to those institutions interested in moving further into the international area:

Federal Funding The International Education Act of 1966, created by substantial majorities in both houses by the 89th Congress, emerged stillborn when the 90th Congress—mindful of the competing priorities imposed by the Vietnam war and aware that U.S. government-academic relationships were entangled in a jungle of inter-agency jurisdictions—refused to appropriate funds to implement the legislation. Instead, modest funds were provided for a study of all Federal government activities bearing on international education—a reminder that there is as yet no coherence to the government's efforts in this overlapping area.

Failure to fund the IEA may prove to be more of a setback than a lost war—provided the time before the submission of a new, major program in international education is utilized both to take organizational steps toward unifying the governmental effort and to persuade institutions of higher education to ready themselves for the challenge. As Paul A. Miller, former Assistant Secretary for Education, HEW, has put it, the delay can be "an advantage, the kind of interregnum you don't always get in government—one which gives the opportunity to do careful, ingenious, imaginative planning in terms of how all this should work in the years ahead."

It is important to note that the failure to fund the IEA did not deprive higher learning institutions of funds previously enjoyed: the action of the 90th Congress did not subtract one dollar of
financing that had been available to colleges and universities. In fact, as far as undergraduate institutions are concerned, what they have accomplished to date in international education has been done with minimal foundation and government financial assistance.

Such institutions, instead of marking the time until a new Federal program in international education takes shape, may now need to show more imagination and resource in establishing potential funding sources within the array of other Federal education programs, with the smaller, regional and local philanthropic foundations, and with corporate givers.

For instance, the Federal government in 1967 obligated some $40,600,000 in the form of contracts and grants for social and behavioral research on foreign areas and international affairs. The problems in obtaining Federal funding are largely procedural—first, knowing where the money is, then determining which funds can be used for international programs, learning which government personnel to contact with specific questions and, finally, submitting the proper proposals.11

American Education, published monthly by HEW/OE, includes an annual report on Federal money and recent legislation for education—and specifies who may and where to apply for programs administered by the Office of Education. Programs and Services, published by the U.S. Government Printing Office, provides basic information on current programs operated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Office of Education prepares a similar handbook, Education '67: Its Programs and Services being the latest.12 This is also available from the GPO.

The Association of American Colleges (1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009) recently established a Federal Rela-
tions Advisory Service, to increase understanding and effective participation in Federal programs among its member colleges. *International Education and Government*, a brief guide to programs and services in international education in the Federal government, was compiled late in 1967 by the newly formed International Education Association of the United States (1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036).

Several commercial organizations provide similar services. One such comprehensive handbook is *Federal Aid for Schools: 1967-1968 Guide*, by Howard S. Rowland and Richard L. Wing (The Macmillan Company).

The Policy Review and Coordination Staff of the State Department’s Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs has compiled a new directory (last published in 1964) under the title of *A Guide to U.S. Government Agencies Involved in International Educational and Cultural Affairs*. Programs are described for 26 different departments, commissions, agencies and governmental foundations.

The Department of State, primarily through its Office of Public Services and Office of Media Services, provides a wealth of resources under one roof—conferences, background materials, teaching aids—which appear to be underutilized by higher education institutions.

The Peace Corps issues its own *Factbook & Directory* (1968). Under a new program, the School Partnership Program of the Peace Corps twins isolated villages abroad with U.S. high schools to build schools overseas. The Office of Overseas Schools of the Department of State encourages similar partnerships between U.S. school systems and American schools established overseas, and in 1965, in cooperation with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, established the University-to-School program, which brings the resources of stateside teacher training institutions to bear on the efforts to improve programs in overseas schools and, at the same time, involve the U.S. institutions in international education activities.²³

²²The Committee on International Relations of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education has sponsored several other programs related to the education of teachers throughout the world and to assist U.S. teachers to become better prepared to teach world affairs.
yet underutilized lies in the Public Law 480 funds, foreign currencies generated by the sale of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities and declared to be in excess of normal U.S. government requirements. Such funds, frozen by agreement for use inside the countries concerned, exist in about a dozen nations in Asia, Eastern Europe and Africa.

Some use has been made of these funds for educational improvements: opportunities are provided for U.S. elementary and secondary teachers and college professors and students to acquire first-hand knowledge of certain countries where surplus funds exist; and the Library of Congress has developed an extensive program of acquisition of materials published in these countries, which are made available to some major U.S. research libraries as well as to some 300 public and college libraries around the country. At a time when these funds are accumulating in substantial amounts, the actual value is being continually diminished by devaluation and/or inflation. Wider use of these funds to improve U.S. education is all the more compelling because they involve no new tax monies. The blocked foreign currencies are not convertible into dollars for use at home.

Foundation Funding Funds from foundations, which have played a major role in internationalizing U.S. education to date, may in the long run prove to be a mixed blessing. There are indications that universities and colleges have too often responded to the "goals" of grant-makers—and then, having shaped their programs to satisfy these "goals," they have been faced with a shrinkage and eventual drying up of foundation funds.

Some institutions are now experiencing painful withdrawal symptoms as the major foundations during 1967 and 1968 went through drastic reordering of their priorities and began shifting their emphasis and direction away from international activities, including education, to urban and domestic concerns of U.S.

"According to the 1967 Foundation Directory 152 foundations spent $141 million dollars in international activities in 1966, with "international studies" ($50.8 million) and "education" ($40.5 million) making up the largest categories of grants. Included in this total was $26.5 million for "technical assistance," much of which had educational implications."
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society. The year 1967 saw a general decrease in interest in higher education on the part of the major U.S. foundations.18

Yet the foundation field is remarkably diversified, and the shifting interests of the major foundations may simply dictate a more intelligent and diligent search by applicants for funds available elsewhere. There are now some 20,000 foundations in the United States and about 1,500 are added each year. Only a few of the behemoths are known to the general public, but the academic public—which might be expected to show interest in funding sources—is scarcely better informed about the size, purpose and degree of expertise in the vast variety of grant-making funds.

Prime source of foundation information is The Foundation Library Center (444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022). The library gathers comprehensive information about all foundations in the United States; publishes a cumulative record of all grants of $10,000 and above; analyzes and reports on trends of grants and problems of foundations; and maintains libraries in New York and Washington, D.C. (and jointly sponsors with universities and other institutions regional depositories in Atlanta, Austin, Berkeley, Chicago, Cleveland, Kansas City and Los Angeles). The center also publishes the bi-monthly Foundation News and The Foundation Directory, published triennially.

Essential background for institutions seeking foundation grants is the booklet, Foundations: 20 Viewpoints, (published by the Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1965), particularly the chapters on "Preparing the Foundation Proposal," by Manning M. Pattillo, and "How Foundations Evaluate Requests," by Yorke Allen, Jr.16

"For the Ford Foundation this does not mean a complete withdrawal of support for international studies, but instead a more selective determination of priorities, and a willingness to back pioneering ideas and innovative activities in the international field. In time, foundations and higher education institutions alike will find common ground in the realization that there is hardly any problem area on the U.S. domestic front that does not have an international dimension or a parallel somewhere on the globe—from city planning to population problems, from the urban poor to educational reform.

Business and World Affairs  According to a joint survey by the Council for Financial Aid to Education, Inc. and the American Alumni Council (as reported in Voluntary Support of Education 1966-67), the national figure for contributions to all institutions by U.S. business concerns in 1966-67 was $213 million, or 16.8 percent of all voluntary support to colleges and universities.

This figure represented an increase of 8.9 percent over the preceding year. In general, however, business support for colleges and universities has not kept pace with either the educational institutions' rapidly rising budgets or with the rising levels of corporate profits.

In a survey carried out by Education and World Affairs of the sources of external funding covering the period 1966-67 for the international programs of 36 involved U.S. colleges and universities, it emerged that only $135,000 of the total funding of $58 million had been contributed by U.S. business interests for on-campus programs—an almost unmeasurable sum when considered against the proliferating international involvement of U.S. concerns.17

The CFAE issues an annual report on corporate support and provides surveys, statistics and news releases from its headquarters (6 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017).

Exchange of Students and Faculty  A continually updated inventory of overseas opportunities for U.S. faculty members is sorely needed. An American Education Placement Service was to have been developed under the IEA. Overseas Educational Service, an affiliate of EWA, matches U.S. and Canadian academic applicants with a limited number of faculty openings overseas, mainly in Africa. The National Register of Scholarships and Fellowships (World Trade Academy Press, Inc., 50 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10017) lists some 200,000 scholarships, fellowships and grants made by colleges, universities, private organizations, government, foundations and private industry. The Understanding Foundations by J. Richard Taft (McGraw-Hill, 1967) is designed to assist administrators and institutions in understanding how foundations operate and how to approach them with grant requests.

National Education Association (1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036) Committee on International Relations can furnish a selected list of sources of information about opportunities for work, study, vacations and travel abroad for students and teachers.

*Fellowships in the Arts and Sciences, 1967-68,* prepared by the American Council on Education (in cooperation with the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States), is a current catalog of specific programs of financial aid to graduate students in the arts and sciences available from sources other than the universities themselves. Included in the listings, of course, are programs in international education.


*Undergraduate Study Abroad,* for which Stephen A. Freeman served as consultant, includes a survey of overseas study programs, a discussion of problems inherent in undergraduate study abroad, and a set of guidelines for those initiating such programs abroad, as well as a descriptive listing of all programs of U.S. undergraduate study abroad that are sponsored by an accredited institution of higher education and for which academic credit is given. First issued in 1964 by the Institute of International Education (809 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017), it has since been revised. A new edition—which will include graduate programs abroad—is in preparation.

The 1968-70 edition of *Study Abroad,* published by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO (UNESCO Publications Center, 317 East 34th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016), provides information on some 215,000 individual awards—scholarships, fellowships and other types of financial assistance—offered by 74 international organizations and 1,773 donors in 128 countries or territories. A companion UNESCO volume, *Handbook of International Exchanges,* gives information on more than 5,300 agencies and organizations conducting programs of international exchange and cultural cooperation. The Institute of International Education issues an annual edition of *Summer Study Abroad,* the 1968 edition of which lists more than 200 courses at educational institutions in 30 countries. The IIE also plans to update and re-

The Council on International Educational Exchange (777 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017: formerly the Council on Student Travel) issues bi-annually (with up-dating supplements) three brochures for U.S. students going abroad—*Semester and Academic Year Programs, Summer Study, Travel and Work Programs 1968* and *High School Student Programs 1968*.

*Saturday Review*, in its issue of February 13, 1967, carried a most useful roundup of organizations and publications devoted to U.S. student travel.

**Organizations and Agencies in World Affairs**  From the days of the First World War until well after the Second, U.S. non-governmental organizations carried the burden of informing the U.S. public about world affairs. Today an estimated 400 such organizations conduct programs about some aspect of international affairs for U.S. adults. Unfortunately, little attempt is made—especially by the educational side—to articulate their efforts with U.S. colleges and universities.

An indispensable aide in the world affairs field is *Intercom*, a program handbook and resource guide directed to the leadership of voluntary organizations. An under-appreciated resource during the years when it was edited under the auspices of the Foreign Policy Association, *Intercom* was taken over during 1968 by the Center for War/Peace Studies and will be issued by that organization five times each year.

EWA issues every three months a *Calendar of Upcoming Events*, a listing of scheduled conferences and organizational meetings in the international education field. Though prepared with EWA's internal needs in mind, copies are available in limited numbers on request.

To assist institutions venturing into more specialized overseas programs, the staff of the Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State in late 1967 compiled a *Directory of Frequent Contacts for International Educational, Cultural, Scientific and Technical Exchange Programs*. The
Office of External Research of the Department of State has recently published a directory, *University Centers of Foreign Affairs Research*. AID has issued (1967) a *Directory of Planning Resources*, profiles of organizations with a degree of experience relevant to AID program interests. A somewhat similar but more ambitious venture is the *International Guide to Directories on Resources in International Development*, which the Society for International Development (1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036) put together in 1965. The International Relations Office of the American Library Association (1420 N Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005) publishes a newsletter, *Libraries in International Development*, which carries information on international book and library programs and conferences, with emphasis on library development in the underdeveloped areas. Also useful is *A Guide to U.S. Government Agencies Involved in International Educational and Cultural Affairs*, which has been published annually by the Policy Review and Coordination Staff of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.

The Division of Foreign Studies of the Office of Education makes available two slim but essential compilations, both of which include background material as well as descriptive listings of programs. One is *Modern Foreign Language Fellowship Program 1968-69*; the other is *Language and Area Centers—1959-1968*.

**International Education Literature** The literature on international education is but a fraction of the literature on higher education, but it is growing at a mind-bending rate.


Eligible institutions, in particular, should see two publications
of the Association of State Colleges and Universities (1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036): International Education in the Developing State Colleges and Universities, by Fred F. Hareleroad and Alfred D. Kilmartin, and Opportunities for State Colleges and Universities in International Education.

For an overview (and history) of the development of non-Western studies see the November 1964 issue of The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, which was devoted to "The Non-Western World in Higher Education."

Bibliographies abound, and among the most useful are: A Select Bibliography: Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe, Latin America, first issued in 1960 by the American Universities Field Staff (366 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017) and periodically supplemented; the occasional publications series produced by the Foreign Area Materials Center (33 West 42nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10036); a Guide to Asian Studies in Undergraduate Education, compiled (1964) for the Association for Asian Studies; and United States Higher Education and World Affairs, a partially annotated bibliography edited by Richard F. Crabbs and Frank W. Holmquist (Fraeger, 1967).

The most extensive bibliography in the international education field—an expanded and updated outgrowth of two earlier bibliographies prepared by Education and World Affairs—is the final section in this publication.

Extracts from the essential literature of international education from the Second World War to 1967 can be found in International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects, which I edited for Congressman John Brademas, chairman of the Task Force on International Education of the 89th Congress. The


565-page Brademas compendium, as it came to be known, was made available by the Congressman's office and by HEW and can still be obtained through the Government Printing Office. For those higher education institutions which have developed their international dimension, the compendium serves as a flight log of the areas already traveled: for those institutions setting off on the route to internationalization of their education, it could serve as the ground radar on the way ahead.

In the last analysis, however, what is needed is not more and more information about the various programs and activities crowded under the umbrella of international education. Universities and colleges already have access to more information than they have time to think about. What would be most helpful—to both the more sophisticated and the developing institutions in international education—would be an overall evaluation of the component parts of the international dimension, a names-named, objective appraisal of existing studies, programs and activities, at home and abroad, involving all U.S. educational institutions. Such appraisal should allow for the differing circumstances under which various programs were established and under which they now operate. The task would be monumental: but the result would be of immeasurable help to U.S. universities and colleges in establishing their own priorities at a time when choices will manifestly have to be made.
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: BIBLIOGRAPHY

Compiled by Sandra K. Meagher, Director, Library and Reference Services, Education and World Affairs.

This bibliography, the most functional and comprehensive to date to cover the field of international education, is intended to serve as a useful tool and resource both to those who are longtime practitioners and those who are just embarking upon the internationalization of their education. Its functional divisions are closely related to the component sections of this publication. The bibliography is a greatly expanded and up-dated version of one which was originally included (© Education and World Affairs, New York) in "International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects," a compendium which the staff of Education and World Affairs edited for the U.S. House of Representatives Task Force on International Education in 1966, and which was in turn expanded for publication in 1967 in "Diversity and Interdependence Through International Education," edited by Allan A. Michie for the Board of Foreign Scholarships.
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I. HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORLD AFFAIRS

A. General


Harari, Maurice. "The Role of Higher Education in World Affairs." Speech delivered at the annual conference of the Louisiana state colleges and universities, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, March 5, 1965 (mimeo).


Shiver, Elizabeth N. (ed.). Higher Education and Public International Service. Papers, addresses, and discussion summary of a seminar sponsored by the Commission on International Education of the


B. Role of College and University


*The International Programs of American Universities: An Inventory and Analysis*. East Lansing: Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University, 1958.


Miller, Paul A. “The Role of the University in Developing World Community.” Speech delivered at the American Sociological Association, Chicago, September 2, 1965.

Muller, Steven. “The Enlisted University.” Address before the 12th an-
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annual meeting of the Cornell University Council on The Role of the University in Promoting Change, October 5-6, 1962, Ithaca, N. Y.


Neal, Joe W. "Developing the International Office." Overseas, April 1964, pp. 7-11.


C. Role of Government


Coombs, Philip H. Strengthening the Educational and Cultural Compo-


D. Role of Foundations


II. CURRICULUM
A. Internationalizing the Curriculum


Anderson, Wallace L. “Undergraduate International Programs: A Rationale and an Approach.” Speech delivered at the Intercollegiate Regional Conference on Undergraduate Education and World Affairs, University of Iowa, Iowa City, April 22, 1966.


Higher Education and World Affairs


Rothwell, C. Easton. “The World in Higher Education.” *The Interna-
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Tional Dimension in the California State Colleges, proceedings of a conference held by the California State Colleges in cooperation with Education and World Affairs, January 28-29, 1966, Los Angeles, Calif. Los Angeles: California State Colleges.


B. Language and Area Studies


Cline, Howard F. (comp.). *Latin American Studies in the United States*. 


Dressel, Carol A. “Non-Western Courses and the Undergraduate.” College and University, Vol. 43, No. 2, Winter 1968, pp. 185-189.


Gumperz, Ellen M. Foreign Area Studies in American Higher Education. Report of research conducted under contract to the U. S. Office of
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Hall, Robert B. Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences. New York: Social Science Research Council, Pamphlet No. 3, 1947.


C. Library Resources


D. Teacher Training


E. Research


Nagle, William J. "Reflections After Three Years in the Foreign Affairs


III. EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES

A. General


B. Foreign Students


Committee on the Foreign Student in American Colleges and Universi-


Fox, Melvin J. “Foreign Students in American Colleges.” *College Board Review*, Winter 1962. Also a Ford Foundation reprint.


Halasz, Sari C. “UCLA Study of Graduate Students from India, Japan, the Philippines and Taiwan.” *College and University*, Vol. 43, No. 1, Fall 1967, pp. 90-114.


Kuppusamy, B. *Studies on the Role as Culture Carriers of Eastern Students Who Received Their University Education in Western Countries: Report on the Indian Study*. Paris: Unesco (Unesco/SS/Com/7), 1964.

Lambert, Richard D. (ed.). “America Through Foreign Eyes.” The


Ruscoe, Gordon C. *Latin American Students in United States Colleges*
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C. U. S. Students Abroad


———. Study Abroad. Edited by W. R. Hatch. Washington,
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Cheadle, Vernon I. Remarks made at meeting on student exchange, Tokyo, August 30, 1965 (mimeo).


Fraser, Stewart (ed.). The Evils of a Foreign Education or Birdseye Northrop on Education Abroad, 1873. Nashville: International Center, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1966.


A Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Pro-
Shank et al. "Opportunities and Problems Involved in the Study Abroad of U.S. Students." College and University, Summer 1963, pp. 434-460.
Transplanted Students: A Report of the National Conference on Undergraduate Study Abroad, held in Chicago, October 1960, under the sponsorship of the Association of American Colleges, the Council on Student Travel, the Experiment in International Living and the Institute of International Education. New York: Institute of International Education, June 1961.
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D. Faculty and Scholar Exchange


Fulbright, J. W. "Education in International Relations." Speech delivered at the University of Colorado, Boulder, August 1, 1966 (mimeo).


E. International Migration of Talent


Jones, Thomas F. "Should the Foreign Engineering Student Return to His Native Land to Practice His Profession?" Memorandum to members of Education and World Affairs Study Committee, June 1966.


———. Testimony on program designed to assist developing countries relating to professional persons and skilled specialists, before the 89th Congress, 2d Session. Congressional Record, Vol. 112; October 13, 1966.


IV. U.S. OVERSEAS ACTIVITIES

A. Role of Education in Developing Countries


Bibliography: U.S. Overseas Activities
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---


B. Role of University in Technical Assistance

(1) General


Bibliography: University in Technical Assistance


*Proceedings of the Conference on International Development*. Sponsored by the Agency for International Development, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the U. S.

Riggs, Fred W. “Memorandum on Foreign Aid, Political Development, and the International Role of Universities and Professional Societies.” Comments in answer to a questionnaire distributed by F. Bradford Morse, Member of Congress from Massachusetts, on behalf of a group of Republican Congressmen conducting a review of U.S. foreign aid programs, [1966?] (mimeo).


Smith, Bruce L. Indonesian-American Cooperation in Higher Education. East Lansing: The Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University, 1960.


(2) AID Contracts
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(3) Peace Corps


V. Cooperative Educational Efforts


VI. INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM


———. “The University as a Medium of International Communication.” Speech delivered at The East Coast Fulbright Conference, Syracuse University, June 8, 1967 (mimeo).

Miller, Paul A. “Expanding Opportunities in International Education.”


VII. RESOURCE MATERIALS

A. Reference Works

(1) General International Activities of Universities


The International Programs of American Universities: An Inventory and Analysis. Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University, 1958.


(2) Government


(3) Private Organizations


Mithun, Jacqueline S. (comp.). African Programs of U.S. Organizations:
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(4) Scholarships and Fellowships


(5) Curriculum


(6) Educational Exchanges


(7) Research


University Centers of Foreign Affairs Research. Washington, D.C.:
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Office of External Research, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State, 1968.

(8) U.S. Overseas Activities


(9) Cooperative Arrangements


B. Bibliographies

Bereday, George Z. F. and Lauwerys, Joseph A. (eds.). "Education and


Research in International Education: Research in Progress and Research Recently Completed. New York: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs and the Institute of International Education (annual).
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Schools' Program, Institute of International Studies, University of California, 1967.


The Social Sciences in Foreign Policy: Documents on Government Support of Foreign Affairs Research. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State [1966].
EWA PUBLICATIONS

Studies and reports issued by Education and World Affairs:

AID and the Universities, by John W. Gardner. Published by Education and World Affairs, 1964. (Out of print.)
The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome? Published by Education and World Affairs, 1964. (Out of print.)
The University Looks Abroad: Approaches to World Affairs at Six American Universities. Published by Walker & Company for Education and World Affairs, 1966.
The Overseas Selection of Foreign Students. Published by Education and World Affairs, 1966.
The Professional School and World Affairs. Published by Education and World Affairs, 1967:
  - Business Administration and Public Administration. (Out of print.)
  - Agriculture and Engineering.
  - Law.
  - Education. (Out of print.)
The Professional School and World Affairs. Published by the University of New Mexico Press, 1968.

The following publications and information services have been provided by Education and World Affairs:

Intercultural Education. Published by Education and World Affairs, 1965. (Out of print.)

Coordinating International Programs and Activities at U. S. Colleges and Universities: A Directory. Published by Education and World Affairs, 1966, 1967. (Out of print.)


The Universities Service Center—Hong Kong. Published by Education and World Affairs, 1967.

Diversity and Interdependence Through International Education. Published for the Board of Foreign Scholarships by Education and World Affairs, 1967.

Consulting Service for U. S. Colleges and Universities on International Programs and Activities. Published by Education and World Affairs, 1968.

*Occasional Reports:*

No. 1. The Teaching of Economics in Mexico, by Blance M. de Petricioli and Clark Winton Reynolds. Published by Education and World Affairs, 1967.

No. 2. Guidelines for the Planning of External Aid Projects in Education by Arthur J. Lewis. Published by Education and World Affairs, 1967. (Out of print.)

No. 3. Scientific, Engineering and Technical Education in Mexico, by Russell G. Davis. Published by Education and World Affairs, 1967.

No. 4. Educational Development in Africa: The Role of United States Assistance, by John W. Masland. Published by Education and World Affairs, 1967. (Out of print.)

No. 5. U. S. University Activity Abroad: Implications of the Mexican Case, by Charles Nash Myers. Published by Education and World Affairs, 1968.


*Policy Statements:*


In addition to these reports, several other publications are distributed by EWA.


Some Facts about Serving in Educational Posts Abroad. Published by Overseas Educational Service, 1964. (Out of print.)

Overseas Educational Service: Its Purpose and Program. Published by Overseas Educational Service, 1965. (Out of print.)

Overseas Educational Service. Published by Overseas Educational Service, 1968.


Further information about these publications may be obtained from

Education and World Affairs
522 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10036