TWENTY-SIXTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES

LETTER

FROM

CHAIRMAN, U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

TRANSMITTING

THE 26TH SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON THE EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED UNDER THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948 FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY-JUNE 1961, PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 402, 80TH CONGRESS

JUNE 22, 1961.—Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
72011 WASHINGTON : 1961

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE,
June 21, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: The U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange submits herewith its 26th semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted under the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) for the period January-June 1961.

This report fulfills the requirements of section 603 of the above-mentioned act which states that this Commission shall transmit—

> * * * to the Congress a semiannual report of all programs and activities carried on under authority of this Act, including appraisals, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the programs and such recommendations as shall have been made * * * to the Secretary of State for effectuating the purpose and objectives of this Act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations.

The membership of the Commission is as follows:

Franklin David Murphy, chancellor, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif., Chairman;
Walter Adams, professor of economics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.;
Mabel M. Smythe, principal, New Lincoln High School, New York, N.Y.;
Noah Langdale, Jr., president, Georgia State College of Business Administration, Atlanta, Ga.;
J. E. Wallace Sterling, president, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

A duplicate copy of this report is being furnished the Senate.

Very truly yours,

FRANKLIN D. MURPHY,
Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.

(Enclosure: Advisory Commission's 26th semiannual report to the Congress.)

TWENTY-SIXTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

BY THE

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

(JANUARY-JUNE 1961)

81543°—61 H. Docs., 87-1, vol. 2——16

CONTENTS

TWENTY-SIXTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS BY THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

I. Report on Meeting With the President

At its 48th meeting on February 27, 1961, the Commission members and the members of the Board of Foreign Scholarships met with the President. A report on the Fulbright program was presented to the President by the Chairman of the Board of Foreign Scholarships, Robert G. Storey. In addition, Chairman Murphy reported to the President on the work of this Commission.

The President outlined his views on the need to strengthen the educational and cultural components of U.S. foreign relations and announced his plan for unifying Government policies and programs in this field.

As our own history demonstrates so well—

the President said—

education is in the long run the chief means by which a young nation can develop its economy, its political and social institutions and individual freedom and opportunity. There is no better way of helping the new nations of Latin America, Africa, and Asia in their present pursuit of freedom and better living conditions than by assisting them to develop their human resources through education. Likewise there is no better way to strengthen our bonds of understanding and friendship with older nations than through educational and cultural interchange.

The President said that the great value of educational and cultural exchange to improving world understanding and to strengthening our own international position has already been well proved by the gratifying results of the Fulbright, Smith-Mundt, and similar programs. This experience gives us a strong base from which to launch further creative efforts in international education and cultural relations.

But as recent task force reports have emphasized

the President noted--

this whole field is urgently in need of imaginative policy development, unification, and vigorous direction. These activities are presently scattered among many agencies of the Federal Government. Only by centering responsibility for leadership and direction at an appropriate place in the governmental structure can we hope to achieve the required results. I shall, therefore, look to the Secretary of State to exercise primary responsibility for policy guidance and program direction of governmental activities in this field.

I am pleased that in carrying these responsibilities the Secretary of State will have the assistance of Philip H. Coombs. His experience in education, government, and philanthropy at home and overseas, qualify him well for the position to which he is being appointed.

The President appealed to the educational community, private foundations and voluntary organizations to continue and expand their support and activity in the international educational and cultural field.

These institutions—

he emphasized—

represent our national resource base for helping new countries educationally and strengthening our cultural ties with old ones. Our schools and colleges, our foundations and voluntary groups have an enormously important role to play in U.S. foreign relations and in building a foundation for world peace.

II. Organizational Status of the Educational Exchange Program

Since the establishment of this Commission it has repeatedly urged that proper recognition be given to the important role of the educational exchange program in bringing about a better understanding between the United States and other nations of the world. We have proposed certain actions to bring this about (as reported in the 10th and 22d semiannual report to the Congress) for which utmost consideration has been requested:

1. "Proper recognition, from the viewpoint of actual contribution and prestige," for the role of the exchange program in our foreign relations;
2. "Appropriate importance and emphasis," as respects the identity of the program, "in departmental administrative status, through title, nomenclature and otherwise";
3. "Adequate administrative support and authority within the Department * * *" and
4. "Full cooperation and support in developing and justifying budget * * * which will insure adequate funds" to carry out the program.

To date, certain accomplishments in line with the above proposals have been made and the program, in spite of an inadequate budget and other difficulties, has, we believe, continued to be an effective part of our foreign relations.

On March 31, 1961, Mr. Philip H. Coombs took his oath of office as Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. In this new assignment, Mr. Coombs is responsible for exercising the Secretary's authority (as delegated to him by the President) for policy guidance and development, and leadership and coordination, of governmentwide activities in the field of international educational and cultural affairs. He is also responsible for the overall activities of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

It is most gratifying to the members of the Commission that the new administration has taken steps in accord with the Commission's recommendations, toward stressing the importance of the educational and cultural exchange program by placing it under the direction of an Assistant Secretary of State. With the support of the President who recognizes the need to strengthen the educational and cultural components of U.S. foreign relations, by providing strong policy direction and leadership for our Government's educational and cultural relations programs, it is the Commission's earnest hope that they will undergo not only growth, but appropriately modified to meet changing and pressing realities.

III. Appointment of New Members to the Commission

On March 27, 1961, the terms of office of Mrs. Anna L. R. Hawkes, president of the Association of American University Women, and Dr. Arthur H. Edens, former president of Duke University, expired. Both of these members were completing their second 3-year membership on the Commission, and have been serving until their successors were appointed and qualified in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 402, 80th Congress, which authorized the establishment of this Commission. On May 24, 1961, the President nominated Dr. Mabel M. Smythe, of New York, and Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan, to be members of the Commission. Both of these nominations were confirmed by the Senate on June 12, 1961.

Dr. Smythe is a graduate of Mount Holyoke College, Northwestern University, and the University of Wisconsin, from the last of which she received the Ph. D. degree in economics and law. Her career has been devoted to teaching, educational administration, research, writing, and speaking. She spent 1951–53 in Japan as a visiting professor of economics at Shiga University. She gave guidance to a number of Japanese scholars who wanted to study in the United States, and some 30 of them were successful in realizing their ambitions. Since 1954 she has been on the staff of the New Lincoln High School in New York City, where she is now principal.

She has taken an active role in Operations Crossroads Africa, having served as a member of the advisory committee and as leader of a student group in Nigeria.

In her travels around the world Dr. Smythe has been actively interested in international student exchange, helping place or orient students from Asia, Africa, and Europe.

Dr. Adams is a graduate of Brooklyn College, and Yale University where he received his Ph. D. in 1947. He was instructor in economics at Yale College from 1945–47. He was assistant professor of economics at Michigan State University from 1947–51; associate professor of economics from 1951–56 and professor of economics since 1956.

In 1957–58, Dr. Adams conducted, under the auspices of the Carnegie Corp., an evaluation of university programs in France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Denmark, and Turkey. He is the author of "Is the World our Campus?" and "From Main Street to the Left Bank" with John A. Garraty, published by Michigan State University Press.

IV. Appraisal of the Educational Exchange Program

The appraisal of the Department of State's educational exchange program by Dr. Walter H. C. Laves, chairman of the Department of Government at Indiana University (as reported in the Commission's 24th and 25th semiannual reports) has now been completed and submitted to the Commission.

Briefly, the history of the report goes back to October 7, 1959, when at its meeting of that date, the Commission—

assumed responsibility for the conduct and findings and decided that the study "will be concerned primarily with purposes and basic policies of the various educational exchange programs administered by the Department of State, and will seek to appraise these purposes and policies in the light of this country's involvement with the rest of the world during the next decade. The relationships

of these programs to the other international programs of the U.S. Government and to comparable activities under private auspices—as well, of course, as the content of the programs—will be subject to careful review."

This report is, of course, not a report of the Commission itself but a report to the Commission. We regard it as an extremely useful and timely contribution to a fuller understanding of this important new component in U.S. foreign policy—educational and cultural affairs.

The Commission feels that this report will be of great aid in strengthening and illuminating its own discussions in the course of fulfilling its legislative responsibilities as set forth in section 603 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress.

The Commission also believes that it can serve the same purpose as regards the appropriate officers in the legislative and executive branches of the U.S. Government. For this reason we have included it as an appendix to this report to the Congress.

V. Commission's Participation in Hearings Conducted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act (S. 1154)

Chairman Murphy and Mrs. Hawkes were invited by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to participate in a public hearing on the above-mentioned bill. Mrs. Hawkes attended this hearing on March 29, 1961, and commented favorably on various proposals which she believes would greatly improve and strengthen the international relations of the United States. She said, "Although I could wish the proposed legislation was even broader, it is so much better and more inclusive than existing legislation that, in my opinion, it is a long step forward." The complete text of her testimony is given in the committee's printed report titled "Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 87th Congress, 1st session, on S. 1154, March 29 and April 27, 1961."

Chairman Murphy was unable to attend this meeting, but on March 28, 1961, he wrote to the chairman of the committee expressing his views on this proposed legislation. The text of his letter follows:

This letter is a brief response in relation to your proposed bill to consolidate, on the one hand, and make more flexible, on the other, our whole range of programs in international educational and cultural exchanges.

First of all, may I say I applaud and support enthusiastically your proposals to codify the several pieces of existing legislation and to make them more flexible in order that these programs may become much more effective. I note with special interest provision (6) in section 102 which is so essential if we are to develop the reservoir of skills and talents in this country to permit us to service our growing national need in the area of international affairs.

I do feel somewhat uneasy about the fact that this bill stops short of consolidating the several advisory mechanisms that exist to advise the Secretary of State and the Congress in matters of educational and cultural exchange. I refer specifically to the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, the Advisory Committee on the Arts, and the Board of Foreign Scholarships. My own persuasion, which springs from service on the Commission, is that there should be but one overall advisory commission to the Secretary of State and the Congress. I believe that this should be a commission of from 9 to 11 members (rather than the present 5). I believe that the Secretary of State should be empowered to create, as needed, subcommittees of the commission to cover specialized areas of interest (the arts, science, American schools abroad, technical and vocational training, etc.). Furthermore, I believe that these subcommittees should each have, as at least one member, a member of the overall advisory

ommission. Such a mechanism would guarantee that there would be unified dvice to the Secretary of State and to the Congress, but that this unified overall dvice would be based upon the opinions of experts in the several fields.

I believe the Board of Foreign Scholarships should be left intact and separate rom the aforementioned advisory commission. Its terms of reference are basicly not advisory but operational in that it actually selects recipients.

The above proposal distinctly separates the operational support for the Department of State on the one hand, and comprehensive advisory support on the other.

In general, I would state that if your bill, or a significant portion of it, is enacted nto law, this will mark a major step forward in the conduct of this new and ourth dimension of our foreign policy—educational and cultural affairs.

VI. Activities of the Advisory Committee on the Arts

A. JOINT MEETING WITH THE BOARD OF FOREIGN SCHOLARSHIPS AND THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

At its 12th meeting, a joint session was held on Tuesday morning, February 29, 1961, with the above-named groups. Messrs. Bowles and Coombs met with these three groups for the first time and discussed their new responsibilities in connection with the educational and cultural exchange programs, and plans for the future.

B. JOINT MEETING WITH THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

These two groups met in joint session on Tuesday afternoon. During the session there was a general discussion of the functions of the Commission and the Committee, the relationship of the two, and the bills introduced in the present session of the Congress providing for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the people of the world through educational and cultural exchanges. Both groups were in general agreement with the provisions of this proposed legislation and expressed the view that there should be some sort of legislation passed which would in effect more clearly define the relationship between the Committee and the Commission.

C. COMMITTEE'S PARTICIPATION IN HEARINGS CONDUCTED BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS ON THE MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACT (S. 1154)

As in the case of Dr. Murphy and Mrs. Hawkes, Mr. Sumner McKnight Crosby was invited to participate in the public hearings on S. 1154.

Mr. Crosby commented on several of the proposals contained in this bill which he considered extremely significant, the passage of which would "make it possible to display the talents and achievements of a growing American culture to much greater advantage."

He called specific attention to a problem dealing with the chairmanship of the Art Committee. Under existing legislation, the Chairman of this Committee is designated by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange from among its members. He stated that—

as a result of the difficulty in finding a person, a competent person, who could devote adequate time to both groups, we have had to serve more than half of our existence or half of our meetings without an official Chairman. The provision

in section 106(c)(1) [of S. 1154] wherein appointments of all members and selection of the Chairman of this Committee shall hereafter be made by the President would correct this unsatisfactory situation.

The complete text of Mr. Crosby's testimony is given in the printed report mentioned in section V of this report.

D. RESIGNATION OF MR. GILMORE D. CLARKE

On April 27, 1961, Mr. Clarke submitted his resignation as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Arts to the Secretary of State. He was a charter member of this Committee, having been first appointed on January 15, 1958, for a 1-year term. His 2-year term of office expired on January 15, 1961, and he had been serving until the appointment of his successor in accordance with the Committee's terms of reference. In submitting his resignation he said he finds it difficult to give the necessary time to the work of the Committee inasmuch as he has certain added responsibilities that demand a great deal of attention. He has recently been appointed a consultant for the New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp. as well as a member of the Commission for the U.S. Navy in connection with the proposed expansion of the Naval Academy. In view of these additional responsibilities, and more particularly since his term of office has expired, he felt it was appropriate to take this action at this time.

APPENDIX

TOWARD A NATIONAL EFFORT IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

A report prepared by Walter H. C. Laves, Chairman, Department of Government, Indiana University, at the request of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange

CONTENTS

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

MARCH 28, 1961.

Dr. FRANKLIN MURPHY,
Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. MURPHY: It gives me great pleasure to submit herewith a report on the policy and programs of the U.S. Government in the area of educational and cultural affairs, prepared by me at the request of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.

The report was largely completed by early February and does not attempt, therefore, to reflect or appraise the changes in policy and program effected since January 20, 1961. Since I became personally involved at your request in several other studies as well as in plans for legislative changes related to the subject of this report, there is a certain overlap and similarity with these in its content and recommendation. This involvement also explains in part the delay of more than a month in submitting my report.

I wish to acknowledge the advice of not only the Commission itself, but of many members of the staffs of various governmental and private agencies. Particular mention should be made of the assistance of Warren M. Robbins, James A. Donovan, Jr., and others of the staff of the Advisory Commission in the Department of State.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER H. C. LAVES, *Chairman.*

TOWARD A NATIONAL EFFORT IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

I. Introduction

During the last 20 years the U.S. Government has become involved in a wide range of wholly new activities in the conduct of foreign relations. These include programs in education, science, culture, information, and broadly, technical assistance.

The origin of these programs goes back to the 1930's when, in order to counteract Nazi activities in Latin America, the Government developed a program of educational, cultural, scientific, and technical cooperation. Information activities were also included and later materially increased as a part of a worldwide information program designed to win support abroad for war aims.

In 1945, large-scale educational, cultural, and information activities programs became part of the occupation program in Germany, Austria, and Japan. In 1947, the urgency of European economic recovery led to the Marshall plan, in part a technical assistance program with educational and scientific aspects. In 1946 a new kind of instrument for governmental assistance to international educational, scientific, and cultural cooperation developed in the form of the Fulbright program, supplemented 2 years later by the Smith-Mundt Act. As the tremendous needs of new countries became clear during the decade 1950–60, emphasis upon international educational, scientific, and cultural assistance and related informational activities assumed greater proportions in our foreign relations through a wide variety of technical assistance programs which went far beyond our growing educational and cultural cooperation with countries of Western Europe. Meantime, through the United Nations and its specialized agencies we participated with other governments in developing multilateral technical assistance programs. Of special significance was the leadership provided by the United States in the creation of UNESCO as a worldwide center for the advancement of knowledge, promotion of mutual understanding and assisting in educational development.

The rapid growth of Government programs was preceded by very extensive nongovernmental programs in many of the same fields of education, science, culture, and technical assistance carried on by missionary groups, some of the foundations, some institutions of higher learning, and corporations.

The new tasks of Government led to the creation of new agencies and brought a host of complicated organizational, personnel, and financial problems, not the least of which concerned the relationship which Government programs should have to the work of private agencies.

The present report was requested by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. It was to examine the policies and inter-

national programs of the U.S. Government in the broad area of education, science, culture, information, and the educational component of technical assistance. This meant a study, at the very least, of the interrelationship among programs carried on by the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the International Cooperation Administration, and more than a dozen other Federal agencies and several score nongovernmental organizations.

The more a rationale was sought for these relationships and for what was actually being done abroad by the Government, the more obvious it became that both governmental and private activities had to be examined against the common background of the broad sweep of American foreign relations.

The breadth of this study and the limited resources available for it precluded study of programs in depth or in their operations abroad. The fast changing domestic and international political scene has made it difficult at times to arrive at findings and recommendations which were not already under consideration or reflected in changes already being introduced. A series of conferences called by the Special Assistant to the Secretary of State on governmental-private relations in educational and cultural cooperation were underway. Some half dozen other special reports touching upon international educational and cultural affairs were found to be in process under other governmental and under private auspices. In the months following the 1960 elections, a variety of studies were begun by the new administration. A major undertaking by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to codify existing legislation affecting educational and cultural programs has also been underway.

Involvement in several of these and other efforts has necessarily led to modification of the original plan for the scope of the present report and to a certain overlap in its content and recommendations with reports already published. The bulk of this report was prepared prior to Inauguration Day, 1961.

The report begins with a brief look at the nature of contemporary international relations, the objectives of U.S. foreign policy, and the relation to them of educational, scientific, cultural, technical assistance, and information activities. It suggests four basic policies that should guide programs, and it outlines the scope of programs that are needed as part of the U.S. Government's effort. It concludes with recommendations for action that would remove critical weaknesses and should make possible the attainment of a much more effective national effort.

For purposes of simplifying language, the phrase "educational and cultural" is used to comprise the whole range of educational, cultural, scientific, and information activities, and the educational component of technical assistance, unless the context clearly conveys a different meaning.

The term "private" is used to mean any activity undertaken outside the Federal Government. This distinction serves to separate the Federal Government with its exclusive control of foreign relations from State and municipal governments as well as from nongovernmental efforts.

II. Conclusions

Much has been accomplished and learned during these first decades of U.S. governmental activity in international educational and cultural affairs.

Important technical assistance of an educational character has been provided in Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, and Europe. Thousands of American scholars, students, and teachers have been given opportunities to study abroad, and thousands of foreign visitors have been brought to the United States as students, scholars, leaders, specialists, and technical assistance participants, under Government grants.

Significant techniques and programs have been developed to convey to the people of other countries a more adequate picture of the American people—their beliefs, values, and aspirations as well as their way of life.

Many important new links have been fashioned in the chain of communication between American and foreign universities, scholars, and leaders through governmental programs of many kinds. Literally tens of thousands of Americans have been personally involved in private and governmental programs with, and in, other countries, gaining thereby new insights into world affairs and a better understanding of other peoples and their cultures. Our own educational resources—our schools, colleges, libraries, universities—have become more adequately oriented toward the international world of which we are a part. And as a nation we have, through these and other governmental efforts, become more deeply involved in important cooperative relations with other countries and with the international organizations.

These facts do not, however, provide grounds for complacency. Although the United States has probably contributed more than any other nation to postwar educational and cultural programs and has shown more consistent commitment than others, the magnitude of the task is such that even this considerable effort has been wholly inadequate.

Today, our own educational institutions still lag far behind in their capacity to produce citizens properly educated for effective participation in the complex international life of our time.

The frightening susceptibility of other peoples to propaganda directed against us and the corresponding susceptibility of the American people to propaganda against foreign countries shows how far we all are from having achieved the real knowledge and understanding of each other that are basic to effective international cooperation.

The inadequacy of both policy and programs in our cultural relations with other countries is apparent, wherever we look. Latin America probably provides the most clear-cut illustration. In spite of a long common heritage of political independence and a century of relatively peaceful coexistence behind the natural protection of two great oceans, we and the people of the other 20 American Republics have never really entered into a full-fledged partnership for mutual development, save during the few critical years of the Second World War. Today, communication for mutual benefit at the level of schools, colleges, universities, the professions, commerce, or government is still halting and inadequate. We have not begun to approach

the progress recently made by Western Europe toward political and economic unity. Our youth and that of the other American Republics do not look to each other for inspiration and help. Our educational, social, economic, and political developments have proceeded largely in isolation from each other. To many people in the United States, it is still a matter of detached, casual interest rather than deep concern that many of the countries of the hemisphere are politically unstable and that many face crises so fundamental as to threaten their national independence.

In Africa, where our long delay in becoming involved is more understandable, the problems of independent national development facing the new countries have been dramatically spotlighted by months of crisis, and we have suddenly become acutely aware that our tools and resources are grossly inadequate for the demands made upon them.

In the Middle East and Asia, our effort has been more effective than in Africa, and has built upon early experience in both Latin America and Europe, but no one can say that it is yet adequate. We are still fumbling with techniques, ideas, resources, and mechanisms of cooperation. There is an obvious lack of both of commitment and of ready resources with which the needs can be fulfilled.

The truly overwhelming need for help in economic, social, and political development in all these geographic areas calls for a correspondingly great effort on our part, through educational, technical, and cultural means as well as economic means. The need has thus far been met, rather, by an effort that is faltering, fragmented, and inadequate in size.

Certain basic weaknesses, that today preclude the kind of effort we should be making, result largely from the almost accidental growth of most international educational, scientific, and cultural programs in which the United States is involved.

What the Government now does in educational and cultural cooperation is essentially a patchwork of activities developed under the impetus of many separate initiatives and financed from a variety of appropriations. It is carried on by a multiplicity of agencies lacking in sufficiently purposeful coordination of policy, program planning, and administration. Except in the case of certain programs under the Mutual Security Act (technical assistance), our educational and cultural activities enjoy a low priority in the administration of our foreign relations. Even the technical assistance program falls far short in its administration and in the magnitude of what is needed.

Insufficient concern is shown for the development of the educational, scientific, and cultural resources of the United States itself as an objective of the Government's international educational and cultural efforts. Long-range commitments cannot be made, though they are necessary to developing educational and cultural cooperation. Financial support is inadequate, both in global program terms and in terms of individual activities. Relationships between the governmental and private sectors, though rapidly developing, are not yet such as to achieve maximum productivity in the national effort. Finally, what we do seems often to be inadequately related, bilaterally or through international organizations, to the efforts of other governments, and thus to lose the advantages which reciprocity and mutuality can contribute.

The kind of national effort that is needed at this stage may be briefly described in the following terms:

(1) It must unequivocally declare our national commitment to the advancement of education, science, and culture, and our faith that these are principal factors determining the character, direction, and speed of social change in human progress.

(2) It must show conviction that the advancement of our own welfare is identified with and dependent upon the advancement of the welfare of all other people.

(3) It must be planned and administered in closest cooperation with other countries, sometimes binationally, sometimes through the United Nations and other international organizations as may be most effective in attaining agreed objectives.

(4) It must effectively relate the energies and efforts of the governmental and private sectors in the United States in a manner consistent with our democratic, pluralistic society.

(5) It must have a dramatic quality in its objectives that will draw the attention and inspire the confidence of people throughout the world and deeply involved people of the United States.

(6) It must be designed to attain major identified objectives within the foreseeable future and within the lifetime of people living today.

(7) It must be assured financial support of a magnitude commensurate with the tasks to be performed.

(8) It must include a commitment of sufficient duration into the future to permit productive efforts to be planned and executed in the long-term perspective required by needs.

(9) It must be qualitatively the best that we can offer both in program content and in all aspects of its administration.

(10) It must project abroad the dynamism, experimentation, liberalism, that are typical of the United States and that coincide with the desires of dynamically growing new states throughout the world.

III. Summary of Recommendations

A. PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

It is recommended—

(1) That the President personally and vigorously identify to the American people and to Congress the crucial importance of international educational and cultural programs and that he give continuous support to such programs in the conduct of U.S. foreign relations (p. 66).

(2) That the President establish an organizational structure within the executive branch which will assure consistent and purposeful national action in international educational and cultural affairs (pp. 66–67).

(3) That the authority of the Secretary of State for policy direction in the full range of educational and cultural affairs (including education, science, culture, information, and the educational aspects of technical assistance) be clearly affirmed and supported by the President (p. 67).

(4) That an Under Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs be designated to direct the development of policies and of programs consistent with them, and to advise on the allocation of funds to the component parts of the total program (p. 68).

(5) That the President direct the U.S. Office of Education to prepare programs designed to broaden the international orientation of curriculums at all levels of American education. One means of doing this should be a greatly enlarged and broadened National Defense Education Act program (pp. 56–57).

(6) That the President direct the preparation of a plan for utilizing foreign currency accumulations from the sale of agricultural surpluses for establishing one or more mutual educational development funds (pp. 71–72).

B. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

It is recommended—

(1) That Congress codify the legislation relative to international educational and cultural affairs, including information and the educational aspect of technical assistance (p. 75). That in this connection the many advisory commissions and committees on educational and cultural affairs be reviewed with a view to consolidation or clearer definition of functions in keeping with the organization developed for educational and cultural affairs (p. 74).

(2) That Congress give full legislative support to a coherent, long-range, Government-wide program of international educational and cultural cooperation developed by the executive branch (pp. 75–76).

(3) That the Congress repeal any legislation which prevents the executive branch from carrying on a positive information program for the American people about the nature and importance of international educational and cultural cooperation (p. 76).

C. POLICY AND PLANNING GUIDANCE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

It is recommended—

(1) That the Secretary of State provide firm policy guidance for international educational and cultural programs in the following respects (pp. 26–28):

(*a*) Recognition that this relatively new aspect of U.S. foreign relations has become one of urgent and critical importance.

(*b*) Recognition that our international programs of education, science, culture, information, and technical assistance are so closely interrelated that they must have integrated policy guidance.

(*c*) Recognition that, to an ever increasing extent, these educational, scientific, and cultural programs must be planned and, to a considerable extent, administered in close cooperation with other countries, the United Nations, and other international organizations.

(*d*) Recognition that private and governmental activities in this field are complementary, and that it is a function of Government to increase the interest, responsibility, and participation of nongovernmental agencies.

(2) That the Secretary of State establish appropriate mechanisms for country and regional planning among all agencies responsible for international programs in education, science,

culture, information, and the educational aspects of technical assistance (p. 68).

(3) That the Secretary of State develop an adequate program of research regarding the relation of educational and cultural affairs to the conduct of foreign relations (p. 70).

D. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

General recommendations applicable to the program as a whole are as follows:

(1) That the Government limit its programs to those for which it can assure high quality of content and of administration.

(2) That all the major types of programs now carried on be continued.

(3) That much greater efforts be made to interrelate in planning and administration the various parts of the educational and cultural effort included within this report: education, science, culture, information, and the educational component of assistance to newly developing countries.

(4) That virtually all programs be increased in magnitude and be more adequately financed.

(5) That much greater emphasis be placed upon—

(*a*) Programs designed to improve the education of the American people for their role in world affairs (p. 57).

(*b*) Programs designed to strengthen democratic institutions abroad (p. 65).

(*c*) Programs designed to assist new and emerging countries in their educational development (p. 58).

(6) That much greater emphasis be placed upon collaboration with other countries and with the U.N., UNESCO, OAS, and other international organizations in planning, administration, and financing of programs (p. 27).

(7) That continuing efforts be made to relate the private and governmental sectors in a more unified national effort (p. 26).

(8) That a deliberate program be undertaken to inform the American people about the scope and importance of our international educational and cultural programs and the opportunities which these afford for individual contributions (p. 76).

Detailed recommendations are made in the text below concerning the following specific activities: Fulbright programs, page 30; foreign students, page 32; binational and international schools, page 35; relations with UNESCO, page 37; strengthening professional educational and cultural contacts, page 38; encouraging democratic development, page 63; information centers, page 41; inexpensive American books, page 42; American studies, page 44; English language training, page 45; U.S. specialists abroad, page 46; cultural presentations, page 47; mass media, page 48; foreign leaders and specialists, page 49; American understanding of foreign cultures, page 54; assisting newly developing countries, page 58.

IV. The World Setting for Educational and Cultural Relations

This appraisal is concerned with U.S. Government policies and programs in the field of international educational and cultural rela-

tions. These policies are formulated and these programs carried out not in a vacuum but in the actual context of contemporary international relations and in pursuit of very definite objectives. A realistic appraisal, then, must consider first the nature of the world scene in which they operate and the purposes which they are intended to serve.

A. THE NATURE OF THE WORLD SCENE

Modern international relations are not merely, or even primarily, governmental. They include also a vast network of private relationships among individuals, agencies, and organizations: relationships carried on across national lines for a great variety of purposes—commercial, scientific, educational, industrial, financial, cultural, religious, or professional. Every aspect of modern life is becoming world-oriented, and as people everywhere become more and more interdependent, national boundaries become, in a sense, less and less significant.

Far from becoming obsolete, however, national sovereignty remains everywhere the dominant political concept—indeed, the most fervently desired goal of many peoples just achieving their independence. The world is made up, therefore, of nations politically independent but otherwise deeply interdependent, increasingly forced to seek the security, health, education, and economic welfare of their own citizens within a world context rather than a strictly national one.

The crucial question in such a world is whether the sovereign states can develop voluntarily the cooperation necessary to cope with the evergrowing common agenda of business that transcends national boundaries: business ranging all the way from the successful regulation of air travel, the control of epidemics, or the adjustment of competing trade interests to the avoidance of total destruction by nuclear war.

It is not surprising that the practice of voluntary cooperative action toward common objectives has been most fully developed among the democratically-oriented, industrialized countries of the West. In these countries the internal governmental patterns, however varied, are based upon the premise that individuals and groups adjust their respective interests to achieve a common course of action, and the habit of making such adjustments in a reasonably peaceful way is well established. Moreover, it is because the individual citizens of these countries are most deeply involved in the network of worldwide private relationships that cooperation of national governments becomes necessary.

At the end of the Second World War, a concerted effort was made to involve in the process of organized cooperation all the world's sovereign states, and mechanisms were established in the U.N. and the specialized agencies for making cooperation worldwide in scope. Within the past 15 years nearly all the world's independent nations have become members of these organizations. Thus, for the first time in history, the institutional means exist for joint voluntary action by all the nations toward agreed-upon ends.

It is not the lack of institutions but rather the lack of agreement on ends and means that has resulted in the mounting tensions, the enormous burdens of military preparedness, the paralyzing uncertainties of the past decade.

The ideological and other conflicts between the two major power blocs involve not only deep-lying disagreements concerning the rights of individuals and the relationship between the individual and society, but also profound differences concerning the relationships between nations. These differences call into question the very principles of voluntary cooperation and peaceful adjustment upon which the United Nations system is founded.

The continuing conflict between the two great power groups keeps the whole international scene in a state of actue instability, and massive military power is maintained on both sides, creating tensions which could explode into war at any moment. The nature of the conflict is such that no fundamental resolution appears likely within the foreseeable future; the ability to live with conflict and still continue the seemingly endless search for ways to resolve it may be the ultimate test for survival.

Contrasting with the ideological preoccupations of the Communist and the anti-Communist blocs are the special concerns of a third great group of countries that have recently emerged upon the world scene; the underdeveloped countries, many of them newly independent, comprising nearly a third of the world's population, have as their driving purpose the achievement of their aspirations for agricultural and industrial development, for better health and education, and for a higher standard of living in general. They lack the political, technical, and governmental experience as well as the financial resources for realizing these hopes without cooperation from other nations in the world community. The continuing and even widening gap between the welfare of these peoples and that of the more industrialized countries creates a source of frustration that threatens both internal and international peace.

The impact of the Communist/anti-Communist conflict upon the developing countries is an important source of instability in the international relations of our time. Both major blocs recognize the potential power of the new countries and seek to enlist their support. To some of the developing countries, communism seems to offer a simple formula for dealing with the highly complex problems of development because they lack the experience and sophistication necessary to recognize the hazards inherent in the formula. To others, the ideological struggle seems irrelevant to their situations, except as an opportunity to enlist the aid of both sides in their own struggle to achieve modernization as quickly as possible. The interplay of all these forces produces a welter of cross purposes that can result in utter chaos within an individual country, and that compounds the confusion in the total world scene.

Meanwhile, the world agenda of problems demanding effective concerted action grows more complex and more urgent from day to day. The existing mechanisms for joint cooperative action remain relatively ineffective. What is lacking is the broad foundation of common values, mutual trust, and shared objectives that is indispensable for effective voluntary cooperation in any society, whether it be that of a family or of a whole world.

The hope of achieving such a foundation on a worldwide scale depends, in part, upon the determination with which each individual nation attempts to create it by deliberate effort. Certainly the slow, unconscious evolutionary processes that have produced the com-

munity of interest and values in the Western World cannot be expected to prevail automatically in the face of the deliberate divisive forces operating in the world scene today. The democratically oriented nations above all have a supreme stake in the rapid expansion of the world community of interests and values, because their own societies are based upon concepts of individual liberty and peaceful cooperation which rule out resort to force except in self-defense, and they can maintain their essential identity only in an environment which permits change through persuasion, adjustment, and agreement rather than coercion.

As the reality of world interdependence has come home to the American people with ever-increasing force, especially since the Second World War, the objectives as well as the means of U.S. foreign policy have undergone profound changes. Traditional purposes such as promoting the security, prestige, and prosperity of U.S. citizens through the conduct of relations with other countries continue to be central objectives, but it is now recognized that they call for far more than the essentially defensive measures that formerly seemed sufficient.

Defensive military preparations against attack are no longer adequate as security measures: they must be backed up by worldwide support, not only of governments but also of peoples who understand and share our objectives.

In promoting a healthy U.S. economy, the U.S. Government finds itself involved in ever more complex international arrangements to stimulate trade, to encourage the development of other countries' economies, to create and strengthen multinational financial institutions, and a host of other activities—all positive measures designed to create a world economic situation in which a world-oriented U.S. economy can thrive.

Thus the pushing out of the horizons of the American people has brought about new emphasis upon positive foreign policies directed toward creating a favorable world environment; strengthening the bonds between ourselves and the friendly, democratically oriented countries of the West; reducing cold war tensions and establishing communications with the people of the U.S.S.R. and other Communist countries; promoting the economic welfare of the United States within the context of a world economy; assisting the developing countries to achieve productive economies and stable, dynamic societies; strengthening the procedures and institutions of international cooperation—all of these have become necessary, positive foreign policy objectives. And to each of these objectives educational and cultural exchange programs can make a unique and indispensable contribution.

B. THE CONTRIBUTION OF EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL PROGRAMS TO THE ATTAINMENT OF MAJOR FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES

1. Strengthening the bonds among Western countries

Strengthening the bonds of understanding and cooperation between the United States and the more developed democratic countries poses special problems that are sometimes not fully appreciated. Because the ties uniting these countries are largely the result of a common cultural heritage and a long history of complex interrelationships,

there is a tendency to take them for granted and to overlook the need for sustained, deliberate effort on all sides if genuine unity of purpose is to be achieved.

Since all the countries of the Western group are highly industrialized, they form the core of the emerging world economic community, with its difficult problem of trade competition, financial interdependence, and industrial collaboration across national boundaries.

Since most of them are military allies, they form the core of the free world's defense against totalitarian aggression, subject to all the complex stresses and strains which military collaboration entails.

Since they took the initiative in the founding of the United Nations and built into its charter both the philosophical assumptions and the social mechanisms of democracy, they remain the core of the world's political community as well, despite the shifting balance of forces within the U.N. If the organization is to survive and retain its essential character, these countries which are most experienced in the arts of political cooperation must exert a united leadership strong and positive enough to defeat the forces that would destroy its effectiveness, and to win the confidence of newly independent nations in its membership. But here, too, disruptive forces—both external and internal—are at work to prevent unity of purpose. As the immediate external threat apparently shifts from military aggression to the subtler forms of ideological and economic attack, the unity imposed by clear common danger tends to crumble, and old differences and disagreements tend to reappear—aggravated, no doubt, by deliberate subversion and also by honest uncertainty as to the best course to pursue in the face of new tactics.

If the Western, democratically oriented nations are to play their crucial roles effectively in the economic, military, and political affairs of the world community, they must somehow manage to subordinate their differences and achieve a basic unity of purpose in relation to both the Communist countries, and the underdeveloped, relatively uncommitted countries.

Such a unity of purpose requires, obviously, the closest consultation between governments, and much can be done to improve the situation in this respect. But governmental consultation alone is not enough. Since the governments in this particular group of countries are responsive to the will of their citizens, genuine unity of purpose must be based upon a broad foundation of popular understanding and agreement. This requires not only the fullest possible exchange of information about each other, but also the deliberate fostering of collaboration across national boundaries among the innumerable private and public groups that make up our respective societies, in the joint pursuit of their own scientific, artistic, professional, or occupational objectives. It is through such collaboration on concrete problems that mutual trust is created and habits of cooperation formed. Government programs that facilitate and encourage these natural processes of interchange and cooperation thus go to the very heart of the problem of achieving unity in the Western World and the total world community.

2. Broadening the peaceful and mutually beneficial relationships with Communist countries

Educational, scientific, and cultural contacts, both bilateral and multilateral, constitute at present the most hopeful means through

which we can make progress, however slow, toward piercing the Iron Curtain and toward the ultimate participation by the Communist countries in world affairs in a cooperating rather than a disrupting role.

Within recent years beginnings have been made in the fine and performing arts and in various fields of scholarship. So far, these exchanges have been only with Eastern European countries and the U.S.S.R. These exchanges serve to establish a small area of genuine communication between individual artists, scholars, technicians, and students—an area which may, in time, be broadened to involve much larger segments of the population. These contacts, supplemented by information programs, may serve to correct to some degree the erroneous image of the United States which the Communist governments convey to their people, and to increase our own knowledge of the Communist societies, their values, history, cultural, and scientific achievements. They may also serve to lay the foundations for limited cooperation in relatively nonpolitical areas where joint action can be mutually beneficial—such cooperation as took place in the International Geophysical Year, for example.

Whether these measures offer hope of more peaceful relations in the political area, no one now can say. It is clear, however, that for the foreseeable future, significant contacts with the people of Communist countries are likely to be limited to those in education, science, and culture, and that these will, therefore, be the major means toward the important foreign policy objective of establishing more tolerable relationships with the Communist bloc nations.

Both in terms of developing the foundation for world cooperation and of promoting more specific objectives of American foreign policy, our continued isolation from the people of mainland China is undesirable. Carefully developed programs of educational, scientific, and cultural cooperation might provide here, as with the U.S.S.R., a beginning for communication.

3. Promotion of the economic welfare of the United States in the context of a world economy

Our own economic development has depended upon the growth of our educational, scientific, cultural, and technological resources, and we have always relied heavily upon ideas and people abroad for assistance. Educational and cultural programs are an essential means for making such resources available to us by conscious effort rather than merely by fortunate chance.

The modern American economy is closely geared into the world economy through imports, exports, loans, branch factories, governmental aid by grants and loans, and through large U.S. military installations abroad. There is a highly sensitive mutual relationship between our prosperity and developmental prospects and those of other countries and of the world at large. Educational and scientific programs contribute to the strengthening of the world economy just as domestic educational and scientific programs have helped to develop our own economy.

A striking example of this contribution was seen in the Marshall plan in Europe. The spectacular success of this plan resulted not only from the transfer of capital but also from the effective transfer of skills and techniques of management and production from the United

States to other countries, a transfer effected by both governmental and private efforts on a vast scale. The resulting economic development of Europe has provided new markets for American industry, new products for the American people. It has made it possible for European countries to assume a larger share of Western defense costs, and it is making possible the assumption by Europe of larger responsibilities in the development of new countries in Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. Thus the economic welfare of the United States has been materially strengthened by the international educational and scientific effort involved in the Marshall plan, which included the development of persons and institutions through study, research, exchange of scientific information, and short-range training programs.

Current events have demonstrated the acute need for worldwide cooperative research in such diverse economic subjects as internationals monetary theory, the institutional requirements for economic development, or the effects of labor standards upon international trade competition. This research takes place under both private and public auspices, and its potential contribution to sound economic foreign policies makes it a matter of urgent governmental concern.

4. The development of more productive economies and democratic and dynamic institutions within the new countries

The most fundamental task facing the new countries is that of developing the human resources indispensable for political, economic, and social growth. The development of human resources is primarily the task of education in its broadest connotation. Short-term technical training, long-term assistance in the development of institutions essential to carry forward the task—these are all contributions that must be made by experts in fields like medicine and health, education, agriculture, labor and business and industry, and public administration. Such an effort must, of course, be accompanied by basic information programs designed to make available the truth about ourselves to other peoples and about them to the American people. The individuals to be reached in the total effort are primarily students, leaders, professional groups. An especially important group to be included in educational programs are military officers who, due to preferred training and social status, will have important roles to play in civilian as well as in military affairs.

Programs involving the fine arts and humanities have an especially important place in our relations with newly developing countries. To many of these peoples, especially those that have an ancient tradition of civilization, their cultural heritage is of extraordinary significance; it sometimes represents the one national asset which establishes them on a footing of equality with other countries, counterbalancing to some extent the economic and other deficiencies of which they are acutely aware. Genuine exchanges can make use of this asset not only to enrich the general cultural milieu but also to provide a basis for communicating our own values and finding common ground for joint action on common problems.

5. Strengthening the procedures and institutions of international cooperation

It is hardly necessary to point out the contribution of educational and cultural exchange programs to the development of the procedures and institutions required for international cooperation. This contri-

bution is most direct, of course, when the programs are themselves carried out through international mechanisms such as UNESCO or U.N. technical assistance.

No less important, however, is the indirect contribution made by any program which serves to enlarge the area of common values, concepts, and habits of thought and action among the diverse peoples that make up the United Nations and other international organizations. Without such a groundwork of understanding and agreement, the best of mechanisms must remain ineffectual; with it the instruments for carrying out common purposes can evolve naturally out of imperfect beginnings.

In directly furthering such foreign policy objectives as the five described above, educational and cultural exchange programs also contribute indirectly but positively to the general objectives of security, prestige, and prosperity for the United States.

V. Policy Guidance for the Governmental Effort

Only with clear policy guidance can necessary programs be planned and developed. Only with clear policy guidance can administration of programs be sufficiently effective. It is in very large measure the absence of such policy guidance that has made our governmental effort inadequate in the past.

Four policies are basic to the achievement of a governmental effort which is consistent with the objectives of U.S. foreign policy discussed in the previous section.

A. What is most needed is a clear policy determination that this aspect of the official conduct of U.S. foreign relations is a key element contributing to the advancement of our national welfare, to our position in international affairs, and, to a substantial degree, to our national security. Some Government activities—for example, technical assistance and information programs—are now recognized to be vital to the national interest, but even they have been seen largely in a short-term, immediate crisis context. Throughout the broad area of educational and cultural cooperation, the prevailing postwar attitude of the Government has remained one of providing resistance to immediate Communist threat, much as the Government's earliest educational, cultural, informational, and technical assistance programs were devised as responses to the Nazi threat in Latin America. The character of educational and cultural programs as an integral part of foreign relations has not been adequately recognized either in the executive branch or in Congress. The programs have, therefore, lacked dynamism. They have been financially starved. They have been lacking in long-term purpose.

B. A second policy determination needed is that programs in education, science, culture, information, and the educational component of technical assistance are basically interrelated aspects of foreign relations and must, therefore, be subject to integrated policy guidance. They have important common objectives, and they draw upon related national resources of skill, knowledge, and talents. Making policies and programs for each of these areas of action in isolation from the others makes no more sense than isolated policy-making for exports, imports, loans, shipping subsidies, tourism, and other aspects of international economic relations. It makes no more

sense than the competitive planning of national defense within separate branches of the armed services.

The present lack of joint effort among the agencies responsible for the various programs without central policy guidance impedes seriously both the identification and the attainment of national objectives.

Integration of policymaking does not necessarily mean integration of organization or of administrative mechanisms. It does mean that all programs must be considered parts of a total effort intended to serve in the most efficient way possible the overall policy objectives of the United States.

C. A third policy decision needed involves the recognition that many of the broader objectives of U.S. foreign policy which would be furthered through educational and cultural cooperation are not objectives of the United States alone. They are sought by many other peoples throughout the world, and have been defined as common goals in the United Nations Charter.

As a matter of policy, our national effort should be seen, therefore, as a contribution to joint efforts with other countries, whether carried on unilaterally, bilaterally, or through the United Nations and other international organizations. To the greatest extent possible and consistent with our national interest, our governmental effort should be based upon joint planning and even joint administration with other countries concerned.

This collaborative approach is essential, whether the objective of the programs is primarily one of providing assistance, of increasing genuine exchanges of knowledge, of promoting understanding needed by nations for working together across national frontiers, or of strengthening our own educational, scientific, and cultural resources.

A more positive policy of collaboration with other countries would strengthen our national effort by giving evidence of the universality of the values underlying it. It would emphasize the genuineness of our commitment to these values irrespective of political motivation. It would help reduce frictions that inevitably come from the fact of our own size and the large proportion of contributions we must always provide. It would serve to commit and involve other nations in the making of policy and of program decisions and thus permit them to share in the successes or failures in the efforts we make. It would increase the opportunity to emphasize as a primary objective the development of institutions within and among countries. It would serve to underline the reciprocal benefits to be achieved by cooperation through almost the whole range of educational, scientific, cultural, and technical cooperation. It would reduce the danger of competing and overlapping as more countries contribute assistance to the newly developing countries. Finally, it would increase the possibilities for encouraging larger contributions by other countries—perhaps also permitting positive steps toward reducing in the future the very large proportion of the U.S. contribution.

D. A fourth policy needed, and in many aspects the most difficult to define, concerns the relationship between the Federal Government's action and other, essentially private [1] action, in international educational and cultural cooperation. Our national strength derives

[1] The term "private" or "private sector" is used throughout this report to include all action that is not carried on by the Federal Government. It includes programs which are financed by States and municipalities as well as by private contribution. It includes both profit-making and philanthropic institutions.

from the combination of a pluralistic society and a democratic system of government. But if the activities initiated by essentially autonomous groups representing philanthropy, business, or scholarship and by government are to complement each other in the common national interest, there must be unending adjustments and compromises between different or even conflicting objectives. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the area of international educational and cultural activity.

Traditionally, educational, cultural, scientific, and technical cooperation with other countries has been undertaken by private initiative in the United States. In practice, however, after a century and a half of predominantly private initiative in the development of international educational and cultural contacts, the Government has been compelled to develop extensive action programs.

The result of our historical experience is great sensitiveness on the part of some portions of the private sector concerning its independence from foreign policy direction. There is a belief still widely held that if that part of the private sector which engages in educational, cultural, and scientific pursuits responded to Government advice or persuasion in the substance of its international activities, the essential character of education, science, and culture would be in danger of corrosion. Sometimes this view is accompanied by a fear that any deviation of the private sector from pure professional motivation would threaten the entire foundation of this national resource and, in turn, diminish the power, prestige, and influence of the United States abroad.

But the practice of governmental involvement in international educational and cultural activities has been a response to a very real national need. This involvement, as pointed out previously, bears directly upon important foreign policy objectives of the American people.

Government, as the only responsible agent to speak for all the American people in their official relations with foreign countries, must provide leadership that gives the Nation a sense of purpose and of responsible involvement in the present world community. Such leadership includes both the identification of goals and the allocation of national energies and resources in their attainment. Only government can determine the allocation of public national resources—money, men, materials—to the attainment of these goals.

In addition, government has the important function, through its conduct of relations with other governments, of facilitating the work of the private sector abroad, including often the reaching of formal agreements with foreign governments and international organizations.

The policy that is needed on the part of government is one of continuing consultation with the private sector in all its multiplicity of agencies and interests. It is to be hoped that the private agencies, including universities, professional associations, foundations, et cetera will find more effective means, both for achieving consensus and for making their common voice heard.

The four governmental policies outlined above are basic to an effective national effort by the United States in the context of modern international relations. Only steadfast insistence upon them at all levels of government will insure that the national effort will be adequate to our responsibilities and opportunities.

VI. Program Scope and Content

The general foreign policy objectives of the United States clearly call for a variety of programs designed to contribute in specific ways to the attainment of the national purpose.

A. Some should be designed primarily to advance knowledge and to strengthen the world community of education, science, and culture.

B. Some programs should be designed primarily to develop abroad an understanding of U.S. culture and institutions.

C. Some programs should be designed primarily to develop among the American people understanding of other peoples and their cultures and institutions.

D. Some should be designed primarily to make available specialized knowledge and skills to countries at different levels of development.

E. Finally, some programs should be designed to strengthen the development of democratic societies and institutions in other countries.

Over a period of some 20 years, a multitude of educational and cultural activities that serve these various purposes have been undertaken by the U.S. Government, and their number is steadily increasing. If the programs in existence today were carried on under positive policy guidance, in accordance with clearly coordinated plans and with adequate financial support, they would in fact constitute an impressive total effort.

In the following pages generally describing these programs, emphasis is placed upon the ongoing programs and the necessity of continuing most of them as the basis for future program development. Where appropriate, recommendations are given as to improvements that should be made and additions that seem required.

It should be emphasized that the grouping of programs is not intended as a rigid classification, and it should be obvious that almost all activities have multiple effects and indirectly serve many purposes. But the distinctions suggested by the grouping must be recognized if the total effort is to be purposeful.

A. PROGRAMS PRIMARILY DESIGNED TO ADVANCE KNOWLEDGE AND STRENGTHEN THE WORLD COMMUNITY OF EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND CULTURE

Educational, scientific, and cultural resources provide the foundation for the advancement of human welfare. All developing societies have therefore sought by private and governmental means to strengthen these basic resources. It is not surprising that with the growing interdependence of nations and improvements in international communication most countries have come to recognize that their individual advancement is assisted by educational, scientific, and cultural progress of other countries.

The Government of the United States has recognized the importance of the strengthening of the world community of education, science, and culture through several activities in educational and cultural cooperation. Best known are the so-called Fulbright exchanges of scholars, researchers, and students, the national and international schools abroad, and U.S. participation in UNESCO.

1. Fulbright scholars

The principal U.S. governmental program designed to strengthen the community of scholars is the Fulbright program. Authorized under Public Law 584, 79th Congress, and reinforced by the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Smith-Mundt), the program is designed primarily to enable American scholars, researchers, students, and teachers to study and lecture abroad, and to permit foreign researchers, scholars, and teachers to study and lecture in the United States. The Fulbright Act of 1946 provided for the use of foreign currencies accumulating from sale of war surpluses to finance the Americans abroad while the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480 of the 83d Cong.), provided similar funds from sale of agricultural surpluses. The Smith-Mundt Act of 1948 provided limited dollar support for such grantees as well as dollars to meet costs in the United States of foreign scholars. Under the Fulbright program, Americans can be sent only to countries in which foreign currency balances resulting from surplus disposal are available. The funds for Smith-Mundt dollar costs are determined by annual congressional appropriations.

The very substantial contribution made by the Fulbright program is best shown by the fact that from its inception through 1959 it permitted over 9,000 American college students to study abroad and nearly 14,000 foreign students to study in the United States; more than 1,700 American advanced researchers to go abroad and more than 3,700 foreign researchers to come to the United States; nearly 3,000 American teachers to go abroad and about the same number of foreign teachers to come here; over 2,000 American university lecturers to go abroad and about 900 foreigners to come here. Including grants to foreign students to attend American-sponsored schools abroad (3,800) and to foreign specialists to come to the United States, the number of Fulbright grantees amounted to the very impressive totals of 16,131 American and 25,889 foreigners—a grand total of 42,020 persons primarily concerned with the advancement of knowledge.

The great strength of the Fulbright Act lies in two features: (1) The recruitment and selection of Americans to go abroad by open competition through the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils and the Institute of International Education (in addition to the Office of Education, which selects teachers) and (2) the planning and administration of the program abroad by binational educational boards made up of both professional and governmental personnel. Through these two features, the primary orientation of the program to the advancement of scholarly, artistic, and other professional objectives is assured.

By its nature it is a program best suited to exchanges of individual students, teachers, and scholars who pursue educational and academic interests in other countries. It is inevitable that the numbers of qualified persons for such exchanges will be higher in the developed than in the newly developing countries. This is reflected in the fact that the Fulbright exchanges with newly developing countries have been concentrated upon lecturers going from the United States and students from the developing countries coming to the United States.

As the underdeveloped countries strengthen their educational, scientific, and cultural resources, and as scholars in the United States come to see more research opportunities in the underdeveloped areas

of the world, the importance of exchanges of the Fulbright type will become more apparent. Meantime, this program should seek deliberately to nourish scholarly development in the underdeveloped countries by promoting exchanges that contribute to the development of academic institutions—especially universities and technical colleges of high quality.

The contribution of the Fulbright program to the advancement of knowledge and strengthening of the world community of education, science, and culture has been largely in terms of providing opportunities for individuals to study and to lecture. Their contribution abroad and upon their return, whether they are foreign or American grantees, has been basically determined by their individual competence and initiative. However, significant efforts have also been made to develop projects involving groups of scholars over a period of time, as for example in the development of English language and American studies programs.

While making a highly significant contribution, the Fulbright program for teachers, scholars, and researchers cannot be considered, in its present form, an adequate effort. It was a wise insight that saw, in the funds available abroad from disposal of various surpluses, a valuable asset that could be invested in this highly productive scheme for educational and cultural cooperation. However, the countries with which the exchanges can be arranged are limited to those where there happen to be surpluses for sale. Thus it cannot be said that the Fulbright exchange program represents a systematic effort toward strengthening the world community of education, science, and culture. A really purposeful approach would require determination of what is needed, where the weaknesses are, what can be done outside the Government by private agencies including universities and foundations, and finally, what it is that the Government should and can do. Such a purposeful approach would identify objectives to be served within the United States, as well as abroad, and would consider even more than is now the case how grants to individuals can serve the development of institutions. It would presumably also reveal what complementary needs must be met in terms of books and other equipment. It would, finally, lead to estimates of the cost of a program of worldwide proportions.

It is recommended—

(1) That a careful appraisal be made of the actual need of government programs and funds in providing opportunities for academic exchanges between the United States and individual countries, taking into account the availability of funds not only from sale of surpluses but also from other sources in the United States and abroad. In making this appraisal means should be found for associating in its interested private persons and agencies of the United States as well as professional and governmental representatives from the countries concerned.

(2) That dollar appropriations be provided to carry out necessary governmental programs at a level that insures high quality of participants and the meeting of all appropriate related expenditures for grantees and for program administration. In particular, provision should be made for financing accompanying dependents of grantees.

2. Foreign Students in the United States

The Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts also provide financing for governmental programs to bring students (as distinct from scholars, teachers, and researchers) to the United States for general study purposes.

What the Government does to bring foreign students to the United States is small compared with the private effort. Only 5.5 percent of the present foreign student population in the United States is estimated to come under U.S. Federal Government programs. (The balance are financed, 4.6 percent by foreign governments, 89.9 percent from foreign and domestic private sources.) But because of the great importance of the foreign student as an influence upon understanding between the United States and their native countries, the Federal Government should assist in making the study experience of all foreign students in the United States as profitable and effective as possible. This includes U.S. Government grantees, foreign government grantees, American and foreign private grantees and wholly independent, self-financed foreign students. It is a proper concern of the Government that foreign students be well selected, under whatever auspices they may come here. It is a proper concern of the Government that the institutions in which foreign students enroll are equipped to provide them with a productive educational experience. The Government should see to it that foreign students are encouraged to go to universities so prepared, and should find ways of helping the less-developed colleges and universities to improve their facilities. It should also find means to help colleges and universities secure financial support to care for foreign students, and if private funds are not available, Government grants should be provided. It is a proper concern of Government that a well-rounded opportunity to learn about the United States should be provided for foreign students in addition to their academic studies and irrespective of their fields of specialization. It should work with private agencies and educational institutions to achieve this. It is also a proper concern of Government that upon their return to their homes the foreign students have opportunities to maintain the educational and social contacts developed in the United States. The Government should encourage and assist private agencies in developing these opportunities.

There is unquestionable need for a larger scale Government program to bring foreign students to the United States, as is evidenced by the continuing widespread lack of understanding of the United States on the part of student groups in all parts of the world. No simple formula should be followed, such as to double or treble the present number of foreign students. A plan is needed, based upon the requirements of our relations to individual countries, taking into account how we can best help their projected educational development plans (as in newly developing countries of Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America) and the availability of educational facilities for their students at home; the projected utilization of the American experience by returned students; the opportunities for study elsewhere than in the United States; the availability of private resources to bring foreign students to the United States; the capacity of American educational institutions to provide the opportunity needed by foreign students, and perhaps most important, their capacity to counsel foreign students wisely and provide them with an appropriate social environment.

Taking these factors into account, the U.S. Government can determine to what degree it should assist in bringing larger numbers of foreign students to the United States, from where, and for what purposes. Against the background of such an analysis also can be determined the adequacy of present programs of the Department of State which bring foreign student leader and seminar groups to the United States.

(*a*) *Special foreign student programs*

Two special programs have been developed to bring to the United States small, carefully selected groups of foreign students currently enrolled in universities of their own countries. The purpose of both of these programs is to provide foreign students with an opportunity to get a relatively quick introduction to student life in the United States, thus perhaps laying foundations for further association on a student or professional level, or for future study in the United States and for a better insight into American life. In view of the widespread lack of understanding of the United States prevailing among large portions of foreign student populations these programs are of special potential importance in developing the world community of scholarship.

(1) *Latin American student leader seminars.*—In 1960, 11 student leader seminars were carried out with 11 Latin American countries—Argentina (2 groups), Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. These seminars represent a continuation of the group of 10 seminars first carried out in 1959 as a part of the Department's special program with Latin American made possible by the $2 million appropriation for that area.

The basic seminar plan consists of bringing to the United States for 6-week programs groups of Latin American student leaders who spend about 4 weeks on a university campus where they participate in a seminar in their field of professional interest, and also receive a general introduction to American life. In addition, about 2 weeks are devoted to planned program travel to places of general and professional interest. Most groups consist of 15 students and one faculty member. Each group attends one American university, to which the Department of State transfers all funds required for the project. The university sets up a special program and assigns a project coordinator who supervises the entire program, makes a preliminary visit to the other country to visit the participating university or universities there and to screen candidates, meets the group in Puerto Rico (a 3-day stopover there being an integral part of most of the projects), and accompanies the group from Puerto Rico to the mainland and on their planned program travel. The university programs are conducted in the participants' native language in order to insure maximum effectiveness, as a knowledge of English is not a primary selection criterion.

(2) *Student leader program.*—Another program, begun in 1958, provides for groups of students from several faculties of a university to come to the United States. Visits are usually of about 30 days, occurring most often at the time of the visitors' university vacation. During the last year some 78 projects carried out involved 900 student leaders from 38 countries. Of these, 718 students were from Latin America, 132 from Europe, 25 from Africa, 18 from the Near East, and 6 from the Far East.

The program offers an excellent opportunity for binational cooperation, since faculties of the foreign universities participate actively in the selection of grantees and are encouraged to make requests and recommendations concerning the nature of the projects.

Five national program agencies cooperate with the U.S. Government in carrying out the program: the National Social Welfare Assembly, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the African-American Institute, the Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students, and the American Friends of the Middle East.

It would probably be desirable to increase the length of the visits by students under both of these programs wherever possible, and to raise the unit amount of each grant to allow for wider travel within this country. This would contribute to a broader picture of America for each student leader, and make it possible at the same time for a greater number and variety of American organizations and individuals in different sections of the country to participate in their programing. It would also be desirable within the framework of the student leader program, for the students to remain for longer periods of time at particular universities. Wider travel of State Department officers in observing, organizing, and coordinating projects would facilitate broader community and university participation in them, and also help to increase awareness by the American public of the presence of these foreign visitors.

It is recommended—

(1) That a careful appraisal be made of governmental programs and of funds needed to bring foreign students to the United States, taking into account the availability of funds from other sources within and outside the United States. This appraisal should be undertaken jointly with private agencies in the United States who are familiar with both our capacities and our needs, and with the cooperation of interested private and governmental agencies abroad who are concerned with the educational development plans of their countries.

(2) That adequate appropriations be provided to finance governmental grantees in a manner that assures maximum opportunity for a satisfactory educational experience in the United States.

(3) That the Government promote with a high degree of urgency the establishment by American educational agencies of more effective means for careful selection of foreign students to enter American educational institutions.

(4) That the Government promote by all suitable means the development of adequate academic standards among U.S. educational institutions that admit foreign students.

(5) That the Government encourage educational institutions to provide all foreign students with special opportunities to learn about the culture and institutions of the United States.

(6) That the Government encourage educational institutions to assist foreign students to maintain their academic contacts in the United States after their return home, and to provide them with continuing professional assistance.

(7) That much more attention be given to providing means for young university students to come to the United States to observe critically our way of life. Such visits must be of sufficient

duration and planned with great sophistication. These efforts should be supplemented by efforts to encourage visits by American students to the foreign universities from which visitors came and to encourage continuing contact between young Americans and their counterparts in the academic world abroad.

3. Binational and international schools

One of the most challenging efforts to develop links between American and foreign educational institutions are the binational and international schools abroad that receive financial support from the U.S. Government.

The binational schools are found primarily in Latin America where 53 have been established since 1943. A direct outgrowth of the U.S. efforts to counteract the influence of schools established by Nazi Germany, but now conducted for much broader reasons, the binational schools have many different characteristics in the organization of curriculums, nationality of teachers and of students, and manner of financing. However, their common characteristic is that they are nonprofit community schools and that they are managed by boards composed of nationals of the host country and the United States and financed by funds coming from these two countries but largely from tuition. They have curriculums that serve the multiple interests of the community in which they are established and of the Americans and other nationals residing there. The current enrollment in these schools is over 16,000 students representing many different nationalities.

The schools in Latin America are assisted in the United States with respect to securing teachers, materials, and other professional advice by the Inter-American School Service under an annual grant made by the Department of State to the American Council on Education. Insofar as these schools are well managed they provide a rare opportunity for American children, resident in Latin America, to secure high quality education in a setting that is international, with a curriculum that is culturally broader than typical American schools provide and with instruction provided in both English and Spanish (Portuguese in Brazil). Comparable opportunities are, of course, offered to students of other nationalities resident in the host countries as well as to the children of the host country itself. A great potential opportunity exists for American teachers to secure experience in teaching abroad but important issues regarding salary and professional status have not yet been resolved. Attendance by substantial numbers of pupils from the full range of Latin American society is seriously impeded in many countries not only by lack of scholarships but by the prevailing rigid social stratification that makes difficult attendance at the schools and full utilization of the educational experience.

Relations between these binational schools and educational institutions in the United States, especially schools of education and universities, are provided through the Inter-American School Service and accreditation is arranged by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Outside the Western Hemisphere, there are 80 or more international schools, of a similar kind but of quite different origins, with an estimated total enrollment of 20,000 students, of whom about

13,000 are Americans and the remainder distributed among 75 different nationalities. These schools are found in 49 different countries of Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and Africa.

These schools, almost all of them founded by Americans but often with teachers and students of many different nationalities, mostly use English as the basic language of instruction. They owe their origin to the rapidly growing community of foreign families found throughout the world on assignments of governments, the United Nations agencies, private business, foundations, and various other private agencies. Almost all of the families face serious problems for their children who plan to complete their education at home, and therefore find need for special schooling facilities other than those found in the country of temporary residence.

An International Schools Foundation, with headquarters since 1955 in New York and Washington, provides assistance to the schools in finding teachers and teaching materials and assists in solicitation of funds.

The advantages of the educational experience provided by these international schools are similar to those provided by the binational schools in Latin America with, perhaps, greater advantages due to the even more international clientele. Like the binational schools, they provide an extraordinary opportunity at an early age for children of American or other nationalities to develop comprehension of each other's way of life and cultures, thus laying foundations that may importantly contribute to the achievement of international understanding. The schools meet a major need of American personnel residing for short periods of time in foreign countries. The curriculum in the majority of instances is American in its basis with suitable modifications to meet local requirements and to take advantage of special educational opportunities.

The financial contribution of the U.S. Government to some schools has been largely from foreign currency balances available under Public Law 480 and from mutual security funds that permit grants in furtherance of the work and objectives of the International Cooperation Administration. No general funds have been available to support these schools as important outposts of American education, or as resources for the education of American children abroad unless they happen to be where there are foreign currency balances or where there is an ICA program of sufficient proportions. In Moscow, for example, the international school, a unique center for 117 children of 21 nationalities including 43 Americans, has been starved for want of funds.

The contribution of the binational and international schools is unique in providing children of Americans stationed overseas with necessary educational facilities and a common educational experience with students of many nationalities, thus giving them a base of mutual understanding which cannot but redound to the benefit of their own nation as well as of the world community as a whole. They can provide a demonstration place for American educational methods. With proper assistance and carefully developed relations with educational institutions in the United States, the international schools as well as the binational schools can become an important means for raising the level of education in institutions both abroad and in the United States.

It is recommended—

1. That to the fullest extent possible, and assuming the maintenance of high educational standards the United States contribute substantially to the support and expansion of the binational and international schools. Such funds are needed both in the form of capital grants and in the form of low-interest-rate loans. Funds are needed not only for the schools abroad but for the servicing operations in the headquarters in Washington and New York.

2. That every effort be made to assure access to the educational opportunities offered by these schools to qualified children of all races, creeds, and economic status and on a broader basis than is now the case.

3. That increased efforts be made to extend opportunities for professional educational benefits from the development of these schools to educational institutions in the United States.

4. That increased efforts be made to develop a systematic relationship among these schools, permitting transfer of students and teachers, and to develop much closer professional relations between American educational institutions and the schools so that both students and teachers can be exchanged. Toward these ends a national conference may be needed.

4. U.S. participation in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

The United States was a major contributor to the creation of UNESCO as an international means to promote peace through cooperation in education, science and culture, and mass communications.

The United States has participated in all of UNESCO's undertakings. In accordance with UNESCO's constitution, we have a National Commission for UNESCO to advise the Government on its policy in relation to UNESCO. We have had from the start a seat on the Executive Board of UNESCO and have maintained official representation at the headquarters in Paris. Many Americans have served in the Secretariat of the Organization and in its activities.

The programs sponsored through UNESCO have included many designed specifically to strengthen the educational, scientific, and cultural community. These have increased communication among artists, scholars, and educators through publications, professional organizations, conferences, and special enterprises such as research centers and regional offices. Agreements have been reached among governments to improve international copyright protection and to reduce tariff duties on educational and scientific materials and equipment. Substantial efforts have been made in cooperation with the U.N. agencies to assist newly developing countries in strengthening their educational systems.

In spite of our initial enthusiasm for UNESCO and our participation in developing its programs, there has been a marked isolation of U.S. policy and program formulation on UNESCO affairs from the main centers of policy determination in the Department of State, and particularly from U.S. bilateral educational development planning.

The principal reason for this isolation has been a basic failure to recognize the opportunity afforded the United States by the almost universal membership of this organization, whose objectives coincide

with U.S. policies to strengthen the world's educational, scientific, and cultural community, to assist in the development of new nations, and to increase knowledge about each other among all nations. The U.S. Government has not developed a conceptual framework within which our policy in international educational and cultural affairs could be carried out through a carefully planned combination of bilateral and multilateral means. Thus, our participation in UNESCO bears no direct relationship to the educational and cultural programs carried on by USIA, ICA, or the State Department. There has recently been great concern, for example, over the need for expanded educational development programs in Latin America, but relatively little recognition that this might be achieved through large-scale support of UNESCO's major project on Latin American educational development.

The lack of a conceptual framework within which multilateral and bilateral efforts are related is also illustrated by the failure to recognize the potentially significant role of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, as a public advisory body designed to assure wide participation by citizen groups in international educational and cultural affairs and to develop grassroots support for these activities. Numerous separate advisory commissions and committees on educational and cultural exchanges, information, and the arts continue to exist. These have different memberships, are related to different parts of the Government, and have given little evidence that they are aware of each others' existence or of the existence of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. They reinforce the separateness of both policy and program in the multilateral and bilateral efforts.

It is recommended—

(1) That the policies of the United States toward UNESCO and its programs be systematically examined in terms of their relation to general U.S. policy and to the other programs of the United States in international educational and cultural affairs, with a view to making them part of an integrated whole.

(2) That the role of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO be appraised in its relation to the governmental and private effort in international educational and cultural affairs.

(3) That greater emphasis be placed upon U.S. cooperation with other governments through UNESCO in the full range of educational and cultural affairs.

5. Other means of strengthening the world community of education, science, and culture

The universal respect for distinction in scholarship, the arts, education, science, and technology and the extraordinary progress made in the United States in all these fields in the setting of our kind of democratic society, should lead us to strengthen in every possible way our bonds with the world community of education, science, and culture. We can afford to take almost every conceivable initiative in this field so long as we maintain high quality in American participation.

International professional conferences meeting in the United States provide opportunities not only for developing professional contact between American and foreign scholars but also for the latter to observe at first hand the place that scholarship and professional development enjoy in American society.

American professional society meetings provide similar opportunities for developing closer relations between the American and foreign academic worlds. If young and promising as well as distinguished older scholars from a wide range of countries could attend these meetings in substantial numbers, it would do much to strengthen the world community of scholarship.

Corresponding arrangements should encourage fuller participation by younger as well as established American scholars in professional meetings held abroad.

The traditional U.S. Government policy regarding support to international professional organizations has not favored substantial contributions, and has seriously handicapped American cooperation and the effectiveness of such organizations in knitting more closely the world community of education, science, and culture. The tremendous advantages to the United States from the International Geophysical Year, sponsored by the International Council of Scientific Unions, dramatically illustrate what might be done through continuing cooperation with nongovernmental organizations in various fields.

American universities can foster closer relations with individual foreign universities for exchanges of faculty, strengthening of curriculums, and promotion of joint research. The university contract system utilized by ICA has made a major contribution in this respect, but in many situations grants would probably be more effective than contracts because they would increase flexibility and the possibilities for professional development.

It is also suggested that the Government encourage American universities to sponsor series of professional conferences or seminars in various parts of the world for the purpose of bringing together American scholars and graduate students with relatively small groups of foreign scholars and graduate students for scholarly discussions. The foreigners might come from within regions small enough to permit easy traveling and still include persons from half a dozen countries. The purpose of these conferences would be to develop closer professional relations between American and foreign scholars. The Salzburg Seminar and the Pacific Science Conference may provide useful prototypes.

Greater reliance upon binational agencies located in other countries and representing academic interests of the host country and the United States, patterned after the Fulbright binational boards, would encourage the development of cooperative educational and cultural programs.

Continuing efforts are needed to facilitiate educational, scientific, and cultural exchanges with the U.S.S.R. and with the countries of the Soviet bloc, especially if they can be permitted to develop along strictly professional lines and as quickly as possible, without insistence upon the restrictive policy of absolute reciprocity. At the same time the continued isolation of American and mainland Chinese scholars from each other sould be a matter of concern and attention.

It should be noted that a substantial increase in the traffic of scholars to the United States in recognition of our high professional reputation in all fields of knowledge is one of the best ways of demonstrating also the strength of our democratic pluralistic society. But

to be able to capitalize upon these national assets we must first clear up visa regulations which through unnecessary embarrassment to foreign scholars reduce the attractiveness of a visit here.

It is recommended—

(1) That the U.S. Government let it be known to American professional organizations in education, science, and culture that it will provide financial assistance, including travel grants to foreign participants, for international professional conferences holding meetings in the United States, provided these do not exceed one meeting for any one organization in 5 years.

(2) That the U.S. Government reexamine its policy regarding financial support to international professional organizations and increase significantly its contribution to them.

(3) That funds be made available for grants to American universities to develop on a continuing basis closer cooperative relations with foreign universities for exchanges of faculty, strengthening of curriculums, and promotion of joint research.

(4) That funds be made available for American universities to organize professional seminar-conferences to be held in other parts of the world, focused upon limited scholarly issues and attended by invited foreign and American scholars, young instructors, and advanced students.

(5) That greater reliance be placed in all scholarly international programs upon binational or multinational agencies, thereby reducing the political flavor which easily enters into governmentally sponsored programs.

(6) That Government funds be made available to nongovernmental American professional societies to bring foreign scholars to American professional society meetings and that special efforts be made to include young scholars.

(7) That funds be made available to permit larger numbers of promising young American scholars to attend foreign and international professional meetings.

(8) That continuing efforts be made to develop educational, scientific, and cultural exchanges with the U.S.S.R.

(9) That systematic efforts be pursued to determine when it may be feasible to begin to develop educational, scientific, and cultural contacts with mainland China.

(10) That American educational institutions be involved by the U.S. Government at the earliest possible stages of planning for educational and cultural programs with other countries.

B. PROGRAMS PRIMARILY DESIGNED TO DEVELOP UNDERSTANDING ABROAD OF U.S. CULTURE AND INSTITUTIONS

The degree of understanding that exists among the people of other countries concerning our way of life and the nature of our values directly affects the attainment of all U.S. foreign policy objectives. Greater understanding of the United States is particularly essential to the effectiveness of our participation in the work of the United Nations and other international organizations, and to successful cooperation generally in dealing with worldwide economic, political, and social problems. The task of promoting such understanding is not one that can be left to private initiative, though governmental activity will doubtless continue to be complementary to private efforts.

Information or cultural centers

The U.S. Government today operates 168 information (or cultural) enters in 73 countries of the world. Designed to focus attention pon the products and institutions of American education, science, ulture, and technical skill, they consist at a minimum of a library f books and periodicals on almost all aspects of American life. They enerally also sponsor lectures on U.S. history, government, and lomestic and international political affairs; exhibit American art, cience, technology, and literature; conduct seminars and discussion roups; and promote English language instruction. In brief, they are kind of window to America in a foreign community which no private American agency is prepared to provide.

These centers draw some 26 million visitors a year. Their book irculation figures amply demonstrate that they attract a cross section of people of all vocations, professions, and age levels, and that students nake particular use of their facilities. The libraries, each with a representative collection of from 10,000 to 20,000 books and periodicals about the United States and international affairs, circulate some 1,700,000 English and 600,000 foreign language books over 8 million times a year.

Although the centers are essentially outposts of American culture in the broadest sense of the word, their importance to bilateral educational and cultural cooperation is clearly manifested by the extent of local national participation in their activities. In some countries the libraries fill a particular educational need in the absence of other public libraries. Local governments in some countries have given extensive financial support to provide modern buildings or to carry on various programs of educational value.

To be distinguished from U.S. information centers are the so-called binational centers, some 128 in number, to which the United States also gives support in certain countries, principally in Latin America.

The adequacy of the number of these centers has to be judged in terms of the size of the populations which they serve, the character of other resources available through which people of each country can secure knowledge and impressions of the United States, and the need for such centers as part of the total U.S. program in each country.

In all of Africa, there are 34 centers (with 8 additional ones to be opened soon); in the Near East, 27; in the Far East, 43. In Latin America there are 10 (in addition to 101 binational centers); 51 in Western Europe, and 3 in Eastern Europe. In many countries ignorance about the United States is of such proportions that effective cooperation is difficult and the opportunity for misrepresentation of the United States for any purpose is easy. Moreover, in the same countries the growing involvement of the American people in a wide variety of technical, educational, and cultural activities makes it desirable to have centers through which some of these can be carried on.

While care must be taken not to create concentrations of U.S. activities that can easily become targets for attack, it is clear that an increased number of centers is required. Such an increase should not be effected, however, at the expense of existing centers elsewere in the world which have a continuing function to perform.

If a new center is to be opened, it should be with the understanding that it will be a relatively permanent American-supported institution.

Expansion of physical facilities should also not be made without assurance that they will be adequately manned on a continuing basis.

The content of existing libraries must be kept constantly up to date with sufficient funds to insure that they contain collections of reading and reference materials fully representative of American culture.

In some countries the official designation of these centers is "U.S. cultural center" rather than "U.S. information center." The term "cultural center" more accurately reflects the activities which the centers carry on and at the same time is more acceptable, since the term "information" has an unfavorable connotation in some places.

Binational cultural centers with joint management and joint support may be more acceptable in many countries as focal points for the various cultural, educational and technical assistance programs in which Americans cooperate.

It is recommended—

(1) That adequate funds be provided for the establishment of U.S. cultural or information centers in all countries or areas where there is a demonstrated need;

(2) That existing centers be maintained at an effective and efficient level of operation, and that personnel (both American and indigenous) provided for these centers be sufficient to insure adequate supervision and use of their facilities;

(3) That their official designation be changed wherever possible from "U.S. information center" to "U.S. cultural center";

(4) That, where appropriate, efforts should be continued to achieve binational centers with joint management and joint support.

2. Availability of inexpensive American books

The current worldwide demand for American books (particularly textbooks), in English and in translation, far outruns the present capability of the U.S. Government and the American publishing industry to supply them. This demand is the result of increasing interest throughout the world in American civilization, the growing recognition of the quality of contemporary American literature, the rapidly expanding use of English as a second language, and the need by foreign educational systems for inexpensive teaching materials. The vastly increased interest of the new nations in intellectual development, and the determined effort of both the Chinese and the Russians to capture this interest, give urgent importance to programs for making American books available abroad at reasonable cost.

The U.S. Government carries on several activities which make American books more accessible to foreign people through the information libraries, and presentations of book collections are made to foreign universities and schools. Large quantities of educational materials are made available by the International Cooperation Administration as an adjunct of the technical assistance programs.

Two major U.S. Government programs designed to facilitate the commercial distribution of books warrant special consideration and careful appraisal with a view toward greater support and expansion to meet the needs described above. These are the book translation program and the information media guarantee program, both administered by USIA.

The purpose of the book translation program is to promote the translation and distribution abroad of books which illustrate impor-

tant aspects of American life and culture or which contribute significantly to the exposure of Communist theory and practice. Since its inception in 1950 the program has assisted in the publication of 5,750 foreign language editions totaling approximately 55 million copies. Under its auspices, books have been published in 50 languages throughout the world. In fiscal year 1960 a total of 6,593,558 copies of 558 foreign editions was produced in 33 languages.

The U.S. Government does not publish these books itself but rather provides assistance to foreign publishers to enable them to bring out editions of American books. This assistance may take the form of negotiating with copyright owners for foreign language rights for the local publisher, absorbing translation and promotion costs, or agreeing to purchase part of the foreign edition. Copies acquired in this manner are later used for presentation to institutions and influential individuals in the countries concerned and to stock information libraries.

In addition to the dollar-supported activities cited above, the book translation program also carries on under the authority of Public Law 480 a special textbook publication program supported by U.S.-owned foreign currencies where they are available. This program has had notable success in supporting the publication of otherwise unavailable textbooks in such countries as India, Pakistan, and Yugoslavia.

Under the informational media guarantee program, American exporters of books and periodicals (and other information media as well) are enabled to sell their materials in foreign countries having a shortage of U.S. dollars. Foreign importers make payment in local currency which may then be exchanged for U.S. dollars from a revolving fund established in 1949 at the inception of the program. From its initial level of $28 million this fund has dwindled, due to rising overhead and administrative costs, interest payments, and the losses involved in currency exchange, to around $8 million. Although the Congress is authorized by law to make full annual restoration of the depletion of the fund, it has replenished only partial amounts each year, which has resulted in a decreasing level of operation for the program at the very time when worldwide demand for American books is increasing rapidly.

Since 1949 the program has been carried on in 18 of the 29 countries with which bilateral executive agreements have been made. At the present time it is in operation in the following countries where there are dollars available for the purpose: Poland, Yugoslavia, Turkey, Israel, Pakistan, Burma, Vietnam, Indonesia, and the Philippines. It had previously operated in Taiwan, Chile, Spain, Italy, Austria, Germany, Holland, and Norway. Some of these countries are still urgently in need of American books, and there is a critical need for them also in a number of the Latin American and African countries.

The need for active and expanding book programs becomes particularly evident in view of the increasing availability throughout the world of Soviet and Chinese publications in inexpensive editions. For example, in Buenos Aires alone, 500 Soviet titles are scheduled to be printed this year in Spanish in 10,000 copies each, a total of 5 million books at an estimated cost of $1 million. This output is roughly the equivalent of the present total yearly outlay of USIA for its worldwide book translations program. The 55 million books that have been

published with support from the book translation program since its inception is only about half of what communist bloc countries are now publishing for free world distribution each year.

If the United States is to compete realistically with world communism for the intellectual as well as the political leadership of the world, the program to put needed books into the hands of foreign peoples must be greatly expanded.

It is recommended—

(1) That adequate funds for a continuing program of book translations, particularly of American classics, important out-of-print books and textbooks, should be a specified part of the budget of each USIS country operation;

(2) That the special textbook publications program, which has thus far been carried on only in those countries where U.S.-owned foreign currencies are available, should be given full dollar support and greatly expanded in every country where interest in American textbooks already exists or can be developed;

(3) That complete restoration, indeed, expansion of the now virtually depleted revolving informational media guaranty fund be made in order to promote the sale of American books in foreign countries, and that there be sufficient assurance of program continuity to make possible efficient and economical long-range planning;

(4) That much better coordination be effected by USIA and ICA in the future preparation and distribution of books and teaching materials by both agencies, not only to achieve more economical use of our own resources but also to simplify relationships with foreign governments.

3. American studies

An essential element in advancing sound understanding of the United States in foreign countries is opportunity for academic study of American civilization in these countries. Although courses in American history, literature and language are found in many foreign universities and secondary schools, their content is frequently obsolete, and instruction has often perpetuated among successive generations of students inadequate or erroneous interpretations of America. Foreign educators as well as Americans have come to realize that much more cooperative effort is necessary to develop in secondary schools and universities abroad the means for gaining a proper understanding of American civilization.

To assist in this effort, the U.S. Government has helped universities to recruit qualified American professors, presented American book collections to university libraries, and awarded grants for the purchase of collections selected in each case by a binational committee composed of representatives of the university and of the U.S. embassy. It supports academic journals which provide publication outlets and encourage scholars specializing in American studies, and it may underwrite the publication of outstanding theses on aspects of American civilization. The government also arranges for U.S. specialists, Fulbright professors, or other visiting Americans to lecture at university seminars. Other activities in support of American studies have included the commissioning of a union catalog of American materials available in libraries and other institutions throughout a given country, the strengthening of interuniversity affiliations between

he U.S. and foreign institutions, and miscellaneous projects such as pecial seminars, exhibits, discussion groups, and the preparation of adio, press, television, or motion picture materials to serve as udiovisual aids.

On the secondary school level, seminars, conferences and lecture series are arranged for foreign teachers of English, literature, and history, bringing them into contact with American exchange teachers. Foreign teachers are also brought to the United States to study and teach in American schools. American materials and teaching aids are presented to schools and teachers. Translations of low-priced American textbooks and literary selections are made readily available for purchase and use in school systems or by individual teachers.

The Government has engaged in these programs because of the clear need to stimulate greater foreign academic attention to American studies. In principle, however, assistance in the development of American studies programs in foreign universities should be left as far as possible in the hands of universities and other educational groups where professional competence, mutual respect, scholarly cooperation, and long-term commitment can develop the basic relationships that must underlie this kind of effort. Government initiative frequently introduces political considerations which are prejudicial to sound academic development.

The private responsibility has been recognized most recently in a Ford Foundation grant to the American Council of Learned Societies to promote American studies abroad, but so far its program is limited to Europe. There is urgent need for a corresponding initiative in Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. Financial support may still be needed from the Federal Government, but it should be in the form of grants to American educational agencies functioning on a purely professional basis with colleagues abroad.

It is recommended—

(1) That the Government actively encourage private scholarly agencies to cooperate with foreign schools and universities to strengthen studies of American history, culture, and social science;

(2) That Government funds be made available as needed, preferably in the form of grants to private American educational agencies qualified to develop programs of this kind;

(3) That continued professional assistance in establishing these programs be given through Fulbright awards, both to foreign scholars wishing to study in the United States and to American scholars, carefully selected for their outstanding intellectual competence in aspects of American literature, art, history, politics, and similar subjects who will lecture or teach abroad. These must be not only highly qualified professionally but carefully selected for their ability to adjust to the educational setting of the foreign country and to lecture in the prevailing language.

4. English language training program

The English language is spoken today as either a first or a second language in over 100 countries with populations totaling more than 800 million people. Clearly established as the first language of the world, it is often the principal means of communication among the people of Asia, Africa, and even continental Europe.

Interest in English and the demand for instruction in it have become so great that the Soviet Union itself has offered to provide training in English in its programs with developing countries.

It is obviously in the interest of the United States to assist in every way possible in developing the means for meeting this worldwide demand.

There appear to be three kinds of needs with which Government programs should be concerned, whether the actual administration of the activities is in public or private hands: (*a*) Strengthening the English language training provided at various levels of the educational systems in foreign countries, including teacher training and providing teaching materials; (*b*) various kinds of adult English language training, including training for the purpose of conveying technical skills and knowledge in technical assistance programs; (*c*) promoting academic studies of linguistics.

All three now receive attention under several different Government programs: the State Department administered Fulbright program; ICA educational development and technical assistance programs; and USIA programs to increase the ease with which other people can learn about the United States. The Department of Defense also has extensive English language programs as part of its technical training in cooperative military programs.

Great confusion prevails today among these agency programs in scope, methods of instruction, and purpose. In view of the shortage of qualified English language teachers and the urgent need for speedy and effective teaching of English in most parts of the world, the competition among the agencies, each claiming its special competence, borders on the ridiculous. There should be one place in each mission abroad and a corresponding point of direction in Washington through which the effort of the United States is planned and carried out with maximum effectiveness. The chance existence of individual agency language programs, initiated in response to special needs that developed over the years, is no basis for determining national policy. What is needed is a single program in each country which utilizes the best methods of teaching, prepares adequate teaching materials, and facilitates the recruitment of competent professional help from private agencies.

It is recommended—

> That mechanisms be created to coordinate and if possible consolidate the planning as well as the operation of English language activities, both in Washington and in missions abroad.

5. U.S. specialists program

One of the most effective ways to acquaint professional and specialized groups in foreign countries with developments in American scholarship and specialized knowledge is to send highly qualified Americans abroad on short visits of 30 to 90 days. Their purpose is not, as in the case of Fulbright grantees, to engage in research or to lecture as part of regular academic programs, but to meet with selected groups for presentation or discussion of important developments in the United States in education, science, and culture. This might be in botany, folklore, linguistics, history, law, social welfare, or any comparable field. The specialists generally lecture for university and specialized audiences, lead or participate in seminars or conferences, and consult with colleagues and officials of foreign

governments about special problems regarding which American advice has been solicited.

The vast majority of persons who have traveled abroad as U.S. specialists appears to have demonstrated their effectiveness in promoting a broader and more accurate understanding of the United States. Since 1949, when the program was initiated, approximately 3,300 persons have visited foreign countries as U.S. specialists, including such persons as Thornton Wilder, Chief Justice Warren, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Carl Sandburg, Saul Bellow, and Willard Libby. Embassies report that interest in their visits and demand for their specialized knowledge increases steadily, and that in fact one of the most pressing needs is for an adequate number of qualified and eminent Americans to lecture in U.S. Information Centers, at foreign universities, etc., and to develop close contacts with professional people in foreign countries.

The key to successful administration of the U.S. specialist program is a highly qualified staff of adequate size in Washington which possesses broad professional awareness and the ability to develop a substantial reservoir of "prestige" participants representing the top strata of American professional life. If a high level of quality is maintained, such a program can make a major contribution to the development of understanding of the United States. It can, however, be disastrous either through poor selection of American talent, or through careless programing of the visitors when they are abroad.

It is recommended—

> That a survey be conducted of the actual program needs for U.S. specialists in each foreign country; that the amount of money needed to program the number of persons required be determined and budgeted for; and that a realistic appraisal be made of actual staffing needs in Washington and abroad in order to conduct such a program with care, dignity, and efficiency.

6. Cultural presentations

The President's special international program for cultural presentations is a cooperative undertaking of the U.S. Government, the American National Theater and Academy, and foreign commercial entrepreneurs which makes possible the presentation of American cultural attractions in foreign countries where, due to prohibitive costs, they would otherwise be unavailable. The program is administered by the Department of State in Washington and the U.S. Information Service overseas. Subsidy, in the form of guaranteed receipts, is provided to commercial agents handling the events.

Under this program leading American symphony orchestras, ballet companies, musical productions, legitimate theater performances, ice shows, string quartets, soloists, etc., have given foreign audiences a chance themselves to judge the quality of American culture.

The success of the cultural presentations program has been substantial. The performances of "Porgy and Bess," of the New York Philharmonic, the Philadelphia Symphony and other great American orchestras, of the Jerome Robbins Ballet, to cite only a few examples, have consistently received enthusiastic acclaim in the countries where they have appeared. The cumulative effect of hundreds of such events in many countries shows that cultural presentations are an essential part of the governmental effort to increase abroad understanding about

tne United States. They help positively to counteract the widespread stereotype of the United States as a cultural desert.

Despite the manifest success of the presentations program, it has not thus far been given the financial support warranted by its importance.

The program has operated for 7 years at the annual level of expenditures established in 1954, in spite of several significant developments which clearly call for increased financial resources. For example, since the program's inception the United States has entered into a cultural agreement with the Soviet Union calling for the exchange of specified numbers of presentations. This obligation must be met from an amount of funds set prior to the new agreement. Similarly, new opportunities for cultural presentations in other Soviet-bloc countries were not anticipated. Moreover, since the program's inception, more than 20 new independent states have emerged, and our relations with these and other newly developing countries have become critical to the U.S. position in world affairs. No new funds have been provided to take these developments into account, nor to compete to any adequate degree with the increased worldwide cultural offensive by the Soviets.

It is recommended—

> That on the basis of an accurate appraisal of the actual need and absorptive capacity for American cultural presentations in each foreign country, adequate funds be provided to carry on a program of the magnitude required.

7. News and other mass media

Among the educational and cultural influences that contribute to the attitudes of American and other peoples toward each other, the news services and other mass media play an important role. They cannot be excluded from the planning of educational and cultural programs merely because the techniques developed in the mass media are different from others employed, for example, in formal education.

Actually, the mass media may provide important and complementary influences significantly contributing to the strengthening of other educational and cultural programs. It is in this sense, no doubt, that President Eisenhower's Committee on Informational Activities Abroad spoke of the "information system" by which the American people communicate with others abroad, and included within the system mass media programs, libraries, cultural presentations, and educational exchanges.

Since that Committee, under the chairmanship of Mansfield Sprague, undertook a detailed study of U.S. activities including publications, magazines, films, television, and the Voice of America—a study that extended over a period of nearly a year—it would be presumptuous to attempt a separate evaluation of their part in the U.S. educational and cultural effort.

It is recommended—

> That the Sprague report be examined in close relation to the present report when action is taken to achieve a more effective total educational and cultural effort. Its recommendations bear upon policy, program content, and requirements for better administration.

8. The foreign leader and specialist program

Under the foreign leader and specialist program, the U.S. Government each year invites selected individuals of recognized importance in foreign countries to visit the United States. Its purpose is to increase the number of influential, and potentially influential, persons in each country who, as a result of their observations and experiences, can be expected to further a more valid interpretation of the United States and to increase understanding of it. In identifying outstanding national, provincial, and local figures in various fields, the program differentiates between "leaders" and "specialists."

Leaders.—In this category are persons who may be expected to have influence on political, educational, and social developments in their countries. It includes heads of state, officials of provincial governments, mayors, members of parliament, cabinet ministers, supreme court justices, university presidents or rectors, heads of labor unions, editors and publishers, and similar persons. Grants, providing for travel to and within the United States and per diem allowances, are usually for periods of 30 to 90 days. Recipients have the opportunity to confer with Americans having similar interests, visit institutions, and study and observe any facet of American life which interests them.

Although the majority of visitors under the leader program come as individuals, a certain number are invited in groups, for example, groups representing NATO and SEATO countries, or groups of journalists from Latin American countries.

In addition to the persons awarded official grants to visit the United States under this program, a substantial number who come here under other auspices also receive government assistance and, in some instances, partial grants to help them plan and carry through their itineraries. These "voluntary" leaders actually receive the same program services as the regular grantees.

The Department of State contracts responsibility to three agencies to arrange and handle the administrative details involved in the visits of most of the foreign leaders to the United States. These are the American Council on Education, the Governmental Affairs Institute, and the Bureau of International Labor Affairs of the U.S. Department of Labor.

Specialists.—The foreign specialists, who comprise a smaller group in this program, are selected from among artists, teachers, journalists, radio and television experts, public servants, and the like. Although the primary purpose of their visits, like that of "leaders" visits, is for them to become better acquainted with American life and culture, the programs arranged for them are different. Usually specialists have an opportunity to obtain practical experience in their professional fields while in the United States. Their grants are usually for periods of from 3 to 6 months to allow time for travel following a working assignment. Some projects involving foreign specialists are jointly sponsored by private agencies such as newspapers, radio or television stations, public libraries, etc. In addition to the three agencies which the Department uses to administer the leaders program, various universities, the National Social Welfare Assembly, and other private organizations are also called upon to help carry out this program.

At the present time approximately 1,500 foreign leaders and specialists visit the United States each year on leader and specialist

grants, and an additional 1,300 are given partial financial or facilitative assistance. The number is obviously very small in proportion to the number of countries in the world and the size of their populations.

The success of the program for leaders and specialists depends upon selection of individuals who are in a position to translate the experience and perspective gained in America into positive influence in their own countries. It should not be expected, of course, simply because a member of a foreign parliament, for example, has visited the United States on an official grant, that he will necessarily be disposed to vote in favor of measures or policies desired by the United States. The purpose of such exchange visits is not to buy friends but rather to make it possible for the individual to acquire sound and extensive knowledge about the United States and a degree of appreciation of its general international role which will transcend the changing issues of the day

The key to the development of an effective leader and specialist program is the care and professional knowledge with which it is carried out. Like other similar programs, the leader and specialist program cannot function efficiently, economically, and with lasting effect unless it has adequate funds and qualified staff.

Proper orientation of visitors is another important requisite. Orientation must necessarily be suited to individual needs and interests and must have as its primary purpose background knowledge upon which an accurate evaluation of American life can be made.

The program at its present level of operation does not have sufficient funds at its disposal to provide for appropriate attention and treatment in the United States for distinguished foreign visitors and to permit a certain percentage of leader grantees to be accompanied by their wives. If necessary expenses are to be properly covered, per diem allowances need to be in line with the higher cost of living in the United States.

The inadequacy of representation funds continues to be one of the principal hindrances to the long-range effectiveness of the leaders and specialists program. The necessity of extending small but important amenities to foreign visitors cannot be fulfilled by salaried Government officers who are inevitably their official hosts. One thousand dollars a year is authorized by Congress as the total representation allowance for the entire exchange of persons programs conducted by the Department of State. This amounts to about 15 cents for each of the approximately 7,000 grantees under the various programs. In order to provide even an average of $10 for representation for the 1,500 leader or specialist grantees alone, an amount of $15,000 would be needed. This sum, a tiny fraction of the amount already invested in transportation and other costs, would make possible those smaller gestures of courtesy which would give more lasting meaning to the exchange visit.

Increased funds are also needed for selected book presentations to visiting leaders and specialists and for the purchase of tickets to theater, opera, or other cultural performances. Regardless of their own professional fields, grantees should be given the opportunity to attend such performances in order to gain a balanced picture of American life and culture.

Since many leaders or specialists travel to the United States without adequate knowledge of English and must be accompanied by an interpreter-escort, and also because increasing numbers of grantees,

articularly from the African and southeast Asian countries, would enefit from the presence of an escort even though they may know nglish, it is extremely important that qualified persons be sought ut for this function and properly trained for it.

Many study tours of the United States by foreign leaders and specialists have been planned and executed at a pace which served to onfirm for the visitor the stereotype of America as a land of haste nd superficiality. The importance of opportunity for official visitors o rest briefly, reflect, and possibly write, about their impressions of he United States while they are still here cannot be too greatly tressed. Such reception resources as those of Tregaron and the Vashington International Center, the Aspen Institute of Humanistic tudies in Colorado, etc., might be used for this purpose and also for he purpose of conducting seminars and meetings of grantees from everal countries at one time.

A serious continuing weakness in both the leader and the specialist programs is that visitors do not get close enough to American life to comprehend its major strength, namely its pluralistic and democratic character. This cannot be learned from fast traveling from city to city, visting factories, skyscrapers, and natural wonders. Programs to bring foreign visitors into touch with the mainsprings of our deeply individualistic and yet public-spirited and socially conscious society are difficult to arrange; yet without this insight the foreign visitor has not grasped the spirit of America, nor has he really begun to understand what makes us act as we do in both national and international politics. The arranging of the tours of visitors calls for a high degree of professional skill far beyond booking tickets and arranging appointments. Most of the contracting private agencies responsible for tours are aware of this aspect of their task, but only continuing attention to it and adequate time and funds will produce the kind of guidance that contributes to attaining the objectives sought in bringing distinguished people to the United States. In this connection the Government's relations with the variety of community organizations which provide the hospitality must be strengthened. Some financial assistance should probably be available to those community organizations which actively cooperate in the program.

A serious overlap now exists between the specialists program operated by the Department of State and USAI (USIS) on the one hand, and the ICA specialized training program on the other. Both are recruiting abroad for persons who wish, through intensified study opportunities in the United States, to strengthen their technical skills and, at the same time, to increase their knowledge about the United States. The subjects of specialization are basically the same. The agencies which in the United States are responsible for arranging programs are often the same, notably in the case of HEW which at the same time handles large groups of educational specialists for both agencies—some persons from both groups being from the same country. This is an illustration of the organizational and administrative confusion now prevailing, especially in regard to programs in newly developing countries.

It is recommended—

(1) That a careful country-by-country appraisal be made of the number of foreign leaders and specialists it would be desirable and possible to bring to the United States during the next decade

and that the amount of money and size of staff, both in Washington and abroad, be carefully determined with necessary additional appropriations made on a gradually increasing scale over a period of years. To the extent that overseas, Washington, and private American facilities are able to absorb increased numbers of grantees, the program should be greatly increased from its present level.

(2) That visitors of this kind be adequately prepared in advance for making the most of their visit to the United States.

(3) That means be found to extend to visitors the essential courtesies without subjecting them to embarrassments of redtape and bookkeeping, and that adequate per diem and representation funds be authorized for the purpose.

(4) That care be given to providing competent escort interpreters for the visitors.

(5) That much greater efforts be made to give visitors an opportunity to observe the character of American life in more fundamental aspects than is revealed by quick tours of natural wonders, big industry, and big cities.

(6) That duplicating efforts of agencies, especially USIA and ICA, in recruiting specialists abroad be eliminated.

9. The influence of activities primarily intended for other purposes

The kinds of programs described above are especially suitable to increasing understanding by other nations of the culture and institutions of the United States. They will, of course, have other effects as well, and will therefore always be complementary to the activities described below which are designed primarily for other purposes. By the same token, many of these other Government programs also contribute toward the end of influencing understanding of the American people. For example, all programs that bring teachers, researchers, technicians, technical assistance participants, or performing artists to the United States for any purpose provide them with first-hand experience and impressions of the American people which they inevitably retain upon their return home and which they communicate to fellow citizens. Similarly, all programs which take Americans abroad for whatever primary purpose inevitably provide people of other countries with impressions of the United States.

Foreign students coming to the United States primarily to advance their own knowledge constitute an especially important means whereby people in other countries learn about the United States, its culture, and its institutions. Indeed, there are those who believe that the primary purpose for which the United States should bring foreign students here is to influence their attitudes toward us and to influence indirectly through them the opinions of their fellow countrymen. In this report foreign student programs have rather been classed with programs designed primarily to advance knowledge. Nevertheless, it must be clear that every foreign student in the United States will, upon his return home, be a source of information and interpretation about the American people and their way of life. Because periods of study are likely to be fairly long, the impressions gained are likely to be more comprehensive and deeper than those gained by short-term visitors. Because students are relatively young, the knowledge and understanding they acquire in the United States will be an influence

at home for many years to come. The likelihood is great that among foreign students in the United States will be found important leaders of tomorrow in their own countries. For all these reasons it should be, as suggested later, a matter of great concern to the U.S. Government that the potential influence of every foreign student upon his country's understanding of the United States be fully recognized by the American people as their hosts.

10. Unprogramed influences upon foreign understanding of the United States

In considering Government programs undertaken for the purpose of increasing understanding of the United States abroad, it must always be remembered that among the other influences affecting this understanding there are some so massive and powerful that they can easily outweigh whatever the Government undertakes to do.

American motion pictures shown abroad, estimated to occupy 60 percent of the total screening time, are highly effective influences: the images they convey, whether true or distorted, become deeply and emotionally imbedded in the minds of foreign people.

American tourists and others who travel abroad have a continuing personal impact that is likely to be far more persuasive and lasting than that of the Government programs just discussed. U.S. citizens who live abroad, around one and three quarter million people, are only a small percentage of our total population, but they bulk large in their foreign setting as visible examples of Americans. Members of our Armed Forces and civilian Government employees are particularly subject to scrutiny as representatives of American life and culture.

The way foreign visitors are treated in our cities, communities, and homes has a significant impact as their experience is communicated to their fellow citizens. Far outnumbering the foreigners whose visits are arranged under the Government programs described above, hundreds of foreign government representatives and private visitors acquire, through the treatment accorded them, impressions that are transmitted to their home countries and may importantly influence public opinion there. A notable illustration is the difficulty encountered in matters of housing and eating accommodations by non-Caucasian visitors.

The impact of all these influences upon the understanding which others have of us is clearly so great that by comparison the impact of governmental programs must often appear insignificant. The U.S. Government therefore cannot be unconcerned with them, and must make an effort to increase the positive contributions which they make toward our larger national goals.

The basic need is of course to strengthen the educational background of all Americans, so that they may be better equipped to live in the tightly interrelated world of our time. This is discussed in more detail below.

Continuing attention should be given to briefing, orientation, and wise supervision of civilian and military governmental personnel going abroad.

In respect to private American citizens abroad, large numbers are sensitive to their responsibilities as guests in foreign countries, but there are many of whom this is not true, especially those who expect

foreign settings to provide outlets for conduct not condoned at home. Informal efforts have been made by the Federal Government through such means as pamphlets issued with passports, to remind the tourist of his important influence and his status as a guest abroad. Our responsibility in world affairs argues for continuing governmental efforts in this respect and positive steps to invite the help of private groups and organizations. Our vast travel interest could become a most constructive force for developing understanding of our way of life.

In respect to motion pictures, the central issues of concern to the Government are whether films sent abroad harmfully misrepresent the United States, its people, and institutions; enable enemies of the United States to derive aid or comfort from their showing; give offense to groups or persons in other countries, or have pernicious effects abroad which may cause antagonism toward the American people. These are very real grounds for concern, and the Government does, in fact, keep in touch with the motion picture industry to try to reduce such adverse effects. Undoubtedly many persons in the industry are sensitive to the national interest in this regard, but it is fairly clear that more persuasion should be exercised by the Government and private bodies to achieve greater cooperation.

Much more subtle and difficult to deal with is the problem of the unbalanced or unreal view of American society conveyed abroad by pictures produced as entertainment for American audiences. The production of pictures is an art as well as a business, and distortion of "reality" may be an essential element in their imaginative, artistic quality. Difficulty arises when pictures which provide entertainment and welcome escape from reality for an American audience are accepted as literal portrayals of American life by people who lack the corrective experiences of the everyday milieu in which we ourselves are immersed. For this there probably is no remedy, though encouragement by the U.S. Government of large-scale distribution of documentary films and positive information programs can help restore the balance.

C. PROGRAMS DESIGNED PRIMARILY TO INCREASE AMONG AMERICANS UNDERSTANDING OF FOREIGN CULTURES AND INSTITUTIONS

Just as important as achieving understanding of the American people by others is the obverse—developing understanding of foreign cultures and institutions by us. The American people need this understanding in order to meet their world responsibilities intelligently, and in order to cooperate effectively with people of all nations in dealing with common problems.

Aside from the strictly academic Fulbright program, the governmental educational and cultural effort has in the past been focused chiefly upon influencing people abroad. The Nazi threat in Latin America in the 1930's and then the Communist threat spreading throughout the world after the war gave to the governmental effort an outward orientation and defensive character that tended to draw attention away from the problem of ropmoting American understanding of other peoples. It was apparently assumed until recently, when the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) was passed, that there was no need for governmental programs for this purpose,

and that educational institutions, the mass media, and other agencies within the private sector would provide the help necessary.

It is true that these influences have brought about an impressive widening of the horizons of the American people, a process accelerated for many people by firsthand experience abroad in military or other government services, or in private business.

It is true also that Government programs that have brought foreign leaders, students, and specialists to this country have resulted in greatly increased foreign contacts for many Americans.

However, the deep involvement of the United States in international affairs today and the urgent need for a more rapid adjustment of American attitudes and thinking to changing world conditions require that the Government assist for more substantially in developing understanding by the American people of the worldwide environment in which we live. Only part of this problem involves the use of educational and cultural exchanges, and it is this part alone that is of direct concern to this report.

For example, there are only limited opportunities for foreign performing and creative artists to come to the United States, either individually or in groups, and this limits our opportunity to know of developments in the arts abroad.

There are real difficulties involved in providing governmental assistance in this respect. Political pressures upon government may endanger the application of high standards of quality in selecting individual foreign artists or groups to come to the United States. There may be a tendency to reduce funds for American performances to go abroad, in order to finance those to be brought to the United States.

Nevertheless, it does seem important that a more deliberate governmental effort be made to encourage visits to the United States of foreign artists as part of the effort to strengthen our understanding of other peoples. Some of the professional and political pitfalls may be avoided by careful utilization of private agencies in the United States, of international nongovernmental professional groups such as the International Theater Institute, of UNESCO, or of the Organization of American States. Private entrepreneurs and other private agencies should, of course, be encouraged to bring more foreign artistic talent to the United States and other governments should be urged to assist oversea tours of their own nationals.

Much more positive efforts should be made to program visits by invited foreigners (leaders, specialists, scholars) in such a way that their contacts with Americans are increased and made more purposeful.

Government action should also include greater emphasis upon utilizing returned American scholars, specialists, students, and persons who have served in technical assistance programs so that their knowledge and insights into foreign cultures can be more widely shared with other Americans.

A major need is for governmental help in reorientation of the whole educational process, formal and informal, by which Americans are prepared for their responsibilities in international relations. U.S. educational institutions, including those of both secondary and higher education, are in need of a concerted effort to close the gap between the knowledge and understanding demanded of our citizens by our

world position and the actual content of the curriculums and other educational programs. The recent report on "The University and World Affairs" [2] has forthrightly decribed the magnitude of this task at the university level.

The need for positive governmental concern with this problem can hardly be overemphasized. It is only through the educational process that the American people as a whole can achieve the level of maturity necessary for playing their crucial role in determining the foreign policy of a democratic nation. It is only through the educational process that Americans as individuals can acquire the general background and special training essential for the multitude of roles they may be called upon to play in relation to other peoples—whether as hosts to foreign visitors, as tourists abroad, as overseas personnel in business, professional or governmental activities, or simply as molders of public opinion in their own communities concerning international relations.

It is only through substantial improvement in our educational process that we can hope to make lasting progress toward adequate preparation of Americans for their inescapable involvement in the whole world's affairs.

The National Defense Education Act program already aims at the objective of a people better educated for their world role in the fields of foreign languages, science, and area studies. The need, however, is far broader, and it is urgent that much more rapid progress be made in reorienting the entire curriculum. This should be a primary and immediate responsibility of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Insofar as private resources are inadequate, the Federal Government should make substantial funds available, a portion of which should be used to relate international educational and cultural activities to the achievement of this purpose.

A substantial contribution to the development of our educational institutions could be made by a much more purposeful utilization of the Fulbright program, expanded in scope and so administered as to serve more directly the needs of the American colleges and universities as well as of individual scholars. Special program proposals developed by American universities should be requested, and the present Fulbright program would need much larger dollar funds to draw upon, to increase the number and magnitude of stipends and to extend the program to countries which are not now included.

The secondary school teacher exchange program under the Fulbright program should be materially increased, both to bring more foreign teachers into our schools and to give more American teachers an educational experience abroad.

The involvement of universities in ICA activities for developing educational institutions abroad has proved highly productive in strengthening American institutions as well as providing technical assistance to other countries. Where feasible, however, it would be desirable to supplement or replace the contract system by grants to American universities for developing relations with foreign universities.

There is, of course, no way so effective for orienting our educational process toward the world around us as providing the actual experience of living abroad. Opinions differ as to the age when such experience is most productive, but it is probably most satisfactorily arranged in

[2] The Ford Foundation, 477 Madison Ave., New York 22, New York, December 1960.

connection with college studies. The proposal that every college student should have the opportunity of spending at least one semester abroad as part of his education is clearly not out of keeping with the nature of the world in which we live, though the possibility of its realization may seem remote. It should be an objective of Government to give encouragement, including financial help, to soundly planned professional enterprises that would forward the attainment of such an objective. A much larger Fulbright student scholarship program would be one form of such aid.

The recent decision by the Government to involve large numbers of qualified college graduates in service programs overseas (Peace Corps) should be followed up by assistance to the colleges in improving their resources for training qualified candidates for such service. Subsequent efforts should be made to utilize the foreign service experience of Peace Corps members as a stimulus for advanced academic study and possibly academic careers as teachers, after their return to the United States.

It is recommended—

(1) That funds be made available to finance programs that bring to the United States larger numbers of foreign performing and creative artists, individually or in groups, and that these funds should be additional to those provided for sending American cultural presentations abroad.

(2) That greater attention be given, in the programing of visits by invited foreign guests, to increasing opportunities for Americans to come into contact with them and to learn about the countries from which they come.

(3) That the Government develop more effective means to encourage Americans returning from foreign study and professional or other experience to share their insights, knowledge, and experiences with other Americans.

(4) That means be developed for large-scale assistance, with Government funds administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to aid secondary schools, colleges, and universities in the reorientation of their curricula toward wider understanding of international affairs.

(5) That the academic Fulbright program be substantially increased in scope, and administered with the intent of strengthening American educational institutions as well as assisting individual scholars.

(6) That the exchanges of teachers between American and foreign secondary schools be substantially increased.

(7) That the involvement of American universities in cooperative educational programs with foreign universities in newly developing countries be substantially increased, through the contract mechanism of ICA where appropriate, and through direct grants to promote effective professional cooperation by American universities with foreign institutions.

(8) That the Fulbright student program be broadened and increased to enable more American college students to study abroad.

(9) That planning for the Peace Corps deliberately envisage the contributions which experience in the corps may make in encouraging advanced study afterward and careers in teaching and research.

D. PROGRAMS PRIMARILY DESIGNED TO MEET THE EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL NEEDS OF NEWLY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Assistance to newly developing countries constitutes today the largest part of the entire educational and cultural cooperation effort of the United States abroad.

The achievement by the people of newly developing countries of viable political systems within dynamic societies is today, in many respects, the most pressing world problem. These countries, spanning most of Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, comprise a population of no less than 1¼ billion people, not including mainland China.

The fundamental task facing these countries is an educational one—educational in the broadest sense, including formal school and university education, adult education, and education in technology, entrepreneurship, and public administration

The growth of these countries hinges upon a high investment in the development of educational resources and in the training and education of people at all levels of administration in government, industry, and education; professional personnel in science, medicine, engineering, and agriculture; technical personnel in all these fields; teachers for all levels of schooling, etc. The capital for this investment must come largely from outside and largely in the form of grants and subsidies. It must come in the form of persons, equipment, teaching materials, and opportunities for study and training abroad.

To cope with this task requires planning of truly massive programs based on clearly identified priorities of educational development, designed to achieve goals related to various stages of national, economic, political, and social development. The planning needs to be done by the countries themselves in collaboration with outsiders who wish to help. The Government of the United States is and must continue to be deeply involved in this process.

The United States has, of course, been involved in giving assistance of this kind for over two decades. It began most systematically with a Government effort in Latin America immediately before World War II which comprised programs in educational, scientific, and cultural development and a wide variety of technical assistance efforts in agriculture, health, technology, business, and public administration.

Since the war, new needs developed in all parts of the world for U.S. governmental programs supporting educational development abroad. The occupation programs in Germany, Austria, and Japan were a significant development in giving the United States experience of this kind, even though the purposes were directly related to completion of the war effort. The Marshall plan also had a large educational component in terms of the training facilities and observation tours in the United States which it provided.

The most important development, however, was the point 4 program begun in 1949 and the support we provided in the development of the United Nations technical assistance programs.

The scope of the point 4 program has included a large educational component reflected in training activities for individuals and groups in newly developing countries, and in activities to develop educational institutions in the fields of agriculture, health, public administration,

and both primary and secondary education. The program has brought to the United States thousands of individuals for short and longer term training. It has taken thousands of American technicians and specialists abroad on both short and longer term technical assistance assignments. It has relied largely upon technical and professional resources in the private sector, including universities, industry, engineering, business, management specialists, and others, sometimes employed by the U.S. Government and sometimes under contract arrangements.

ICA, the present administering agency of point 4 programs operated in 1960 in 57 countries. In 50 of these it conducted educational development programs. In 24 countries ICA has been assisted by no less than 57 American universities and technical schools, all dealing with some aspect of education as technical knowledge and 33 of these specifically concerned with the professional field of education—teacher training, vocational training curriculum development, and teaching materials. Most of the university programs entailed sending professional persons abroad and bringing many hundreds of participants for specialized educational programs in the U.S. education programs have focused upon developing institutions within the aided countries. All of the education programs have been at least indirectly related to programs to develop agriculture, health, industry, labor, transportation, public administration or community development. The central concept underlying all educational programs is that of the project with institutional development at least theoretically at its center, rather than the training of individuals for their own sake.

Other educational and cultural program activities in newly developing countries have been relatively less extensive than those carried on under mutual security legislation (ICA today) and have not been very adequately related to the latter.

The Fulbright program, for example, conceived originally in the context of Western European academic settings, has remained relatively unimportant quantitatively in the newly developing countries. The reasons are not hard to find, as a draft paper prepared by the staff of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils has recently pointed out. The special needs of the underdeveloped countries are concentrated in critical fields like English language teaching, school administration, and biological, medical, and applied sciences, where there is a scarcity of personnel also in the United States. Living conditions for American personnel tend to be less attractive in underdeveloped countries and hence do not readily attract scholars and teachers with primarily research and teaching interests. Educational differences are so great, in contrast to the similarity of American and European conditions, that Americans find it difficult to adjust their interests and their abilities for teaching and lecturing or research. Lack of knowledge about the new countries and general lack of professional communication make it difficult to plan and administer exchanges. Financial requirements tend to be much higher for Fulbright scholars in underdeveloped countries, and costs of administering Fulbright programs with these countries are much larger because information is lacking, planning must be more carefully done, cost of deliberate recruiting of American candidates are higher, and supervision is more costly.

But the most important reason for the weakness of the Fulbright program effort in these countries has been the lack of funds available in the types of currency upon which this program depends, and the unwillingness on the part of the colonial powers, in the early stages of the Fulbright program, to make available a larger share of funds for use in their colonial areas.

In the Western European context in which the Fulbright program was begun, the institutional framework for scholarly exchanges and the climate for scholarly activity existed to a degree and in a manner familiar to American scholars. European scholars correspondingly found familiar and congenial settings for their work when they came to the United States. As already suggested, these conditions for effective scholarly exchange do not generally prevail in newly developing countries. Although interest is growing among American scholars in pursuing studies and in lecturing in newly developing countries, due to improved communication and for other reasons, the creation of conditions necessary to scholarly development at the university level must be a much more clearly defined objective in U.S. Government programs. If the Fulbright program, which is the primary commitment of the U.S. Government to the development of scholarly exchanges, can be adjusted to this objective, it could be the most suitable vehicle because of its outstanding reputation, its professional selection process, and its binational management abroad. Such a new and purposeful emphasis would require adjustments in the prevailing practice of selecting scholars primarily for individual scholarly objectives; program planning would need to be related to the major long-term educational development plans of individual countries; and major increases in appropriations would be needed to overcome present handicaps resulting from reliance upon the chance availability of funds generated by surplus sales.

Supplementing such a new emphasis in the Fulbright program, the Government should encourage a deeper involvement of American universities, foundations, and other private institutions in assisting the development of universities and scholarship in all the newly developing countries. The excellent beginning through ICA contract arrangements with universities should be pursued further with a view to establishing even more suitable means by which individual American universities, or groups of them, can more systematically pursue efforts in cooperation with the new countries to develop institutions of higher learning.

The involvement of American universities and other private contracting institutions in providing academic, technical, and other specialized help to newly developing countries has not only served to make vast new American professional resources available abroad: it has importantly contributed to an awakening of American universities to their responsibilities in world affairs, to the need for reexamining their own capacities to meet these responsibilities, and to the manifold opportunities for initiative in strengthening the educational foundations of the newly developing countries. In this way, what is done in programs primarily designed to assist newly developing countries contributes to our own understanding of other countries and to the strengthening of the total educational and cultural world community.

Due to inadequate Government-wide planning of our educational and cultural effort in individual countries, other activities such as the leaders and specialists programs, cultural presentations, English language training, and the work of information and cultural centers have not been developed in such a way as to complement effectively and on a sufficient scale the educational efforts under the point 4 program. In many developing countries, military officers represent the most influential and best organized of the elite groups from which Government and other administrators can be drawn. The officer training programs provided by the U.S. Department of Defense thus represent an important means for developing more than military competence in the leadership of the new countries. These programs should be designed to help provide them with a philosophy of the government-citizen relationship which releases individual initiative and mobilizes energies toward the constructive development of dynamic political and economic systems. For this purpose, the Department of Defense might well rely more upon special competencies of American universities in connection with those foreign officer training programs that take place in the United States.

Private voluntary organizations play an especially important part in the educational and cultural commitment of the American people to newly developing countries. They range across the whole spectrum of foundations and other philanthropic agencies, universities and educational organizations, missionary societies, and a wide variety of other voluntary groups. The relating of these interests of the American people to the urgent needs of newly developing countries depends in part upon governmental policy and assistance.

The excellent cooperation developed among private agencies and the U.S. Government in planning for meeting the needs of east Africa illustrates the way our multiple resources can be related to the needs of new countries and of our foreign relations. It also illustrates the way in which the American contribution can be related to that of other countries—in this case, the United Kingdom. It is essential that joint efforts with other donor countries include such joint planning.

As other countries such as West Germany make larger contributions to assistance for developing countries, it is critically important that careful joint planning be undertaken immediately so that the professional and educational resources of each country can most effectively plan their part.

The United States contributes significantly to the educational and cultural advancement of newly developing countries through many agencies of the United Nations—WHO, FAO, ILO, UNESCO, Special Fund, UNEPTA, World Bank, International Atomic Energy Agency—and through other international organizations such as the Colombo plan, OAS, NATO, and SEATO. This kind of cooperation with other governments in a common effort must obviously continue and should be increased as rapidly as the agencies can absorb responsibility. For educational development purposes, we should seek no arbitrary percentage relationship between our contribution and that of others. The U.S. special contribution to UNESCO of $1 million for educational development in Africa should be considered as an example for the future. The advantages of multilateral cooperation are many and need not be outlined here.

What is essential, however, is that the country (or regional) focus of our interest in the problems of newly developing countries be always kept clearly in mind and that, therefore, the coordination of national and international efforts be a continuing concern. This is extremely difficult, not only because of the multiplicity of U.S. agencies in each country but also because of the even greater multiplicity of international agencies functioning in the same country. When to those are added the several outside governments giving aid, and the frequently uncoordinated effort among national agencies of the receiving countries, the prospects for chaos are truly frightening. The United States should cooperate actively with other members of the U.N. to develop greater unity at least among the international agencies, as we also try to find one voice to speak authoritatively for the United States.

It is not within the resources for this study to examine the governmental effort in specific geographic regions. The sad story of deteriorating relations with Latin America for over a decade is ample evidence, however, of the total inadequacy of what has been done—and this in spite of the fact that the entire U.S. Government program in educational, scientific, and cultural cooperation and technical assistance had its origin in Latin America. Inadequate attention to educational development, at all levels, has delayed dangerously long the process of providing new generations with hope and developing intellectual resources that are needed to support economic, social, and political development.

Changing world events, the large increase in numbers of new nations quite unprepared for independent existence, and U.S. experience to date have revealed dramatically that the huge, essentially educational contribution demanded of the United States calls for far more conscious planning on a Government-wide basis to determine what the United States can and should contribute to each country's development. This plan must involve a long-term commitment to continue assistance through clearly defined stages of progressive development.

The immensity of the task and of the contribution that will be required by the United States over many years to come makes our present effort appear miniscule. It must be greatly augmented by larger appropriations of funds.

It is recommended—

(1) That the U.S. long-term commitment to assist in the educational development of newly developing countries be made unequivocally clear in both Presidential and congressional statements.

(2) That continuing and intensified efforts be made to assist the newly developing countries to appraise their own capacities and to determine their needs and goals, and to determine their ability to utilize external assistance.

(3) That in developing plans for giving assistance the U.S. Government be sensitive to changing political conditions and to newly emerging political leadership within the countries asking for aid.

(4) That to the fullest extent feasible the United States support cooperative assistance programs with other countries and through the United Nations, UNESCO, the OAS, and other international agencies.

(5) That continuing efforts be made to involve ever more participation by the American private sector, including educational institutions and private organizations, in cooperative educational and cultural programs in newly developing countries.

(6) That primary attention in educational and cultural programs in these countries be given to the development of political, economic, social, educational, scientific, and cultural institutions which will be the foundation for continuing national development of the new countries.

(7) That the administration of programs of assistance to newly developing countries be guided by the objective of attaining viable political, economic, and social systems that permit the new countries to participate in world affairs on the basis of the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, and avoid making political commitment to ourselves the real or apparent objective of our assistance.

(8) That special continuing efforts be made to improve the quality of U.S. personnel involved in programs and to insist upon more effective working and living relationships between them and the people of the host countries.

E. PROGRAMS TO ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE KIND OF SOCIETIES IN WHICH DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS CAN EVOLVE AND FUNCTION SATISFACTORILY

Basic to all the objectives of the American people, in both foreign and domestic policy, is our belief in responsible government within a democratic society. As we insist upon our right to choose our own form of government, so we should always respect the same right for others. But the kind of society as well as the form of government chosen by others, and the manner in which they are chosen, are nevertheless matters of concern to us. The degree to which they and we can meet the obligations of membership in the United Nations and the manner in which we carry on our relations with each other are determined in large measure by the forms of our respective political institutions and the values upon which they are based.

In short, without in any way denying to others the right of political self-determination which we cherish for ourselves, we cannot be uninterested in the political and institutional choices which others make; indeed, it is a proper function of the conduct of our international relations and programs to assist wherever possible in efforts of other countries and peoples to develop or to strengthen political institutions that are consonant with our own.

The relevance of programs of international educational and cultural cooperation to this objective is obvious. In our experience, educational, scientific, cultural, and technical development takes place most favorably in the climate of a pluralistic society with democratic government related to the world community through the United Nations and other democratically constituted institutions. It is for this reason that policies governing our programs of educational and cultural cooperation should emphasize both reliance upon the private sector and genuine collaboration with other countries and their governments. It is for this reason, too, that the conception underlying most of our programs is that education, science, and culture are socially useful

resources to be applied to the betterment of mankind. We see these intellectual resources as essential tools with which free people can work cooperatively and voluntarily, within democratic societies, toward national and world community goals.

Many of the educational and cultural program activities described earlier help to explain to other peoples these values and institutions of American life. Some also assist other people, especially in newly developing countries, to develop institutions and practices themselves that will help achieve societies based on democratic premises.

The manner in which we carry on our educational and cultural programs can exemplify our democratic beliefs and practices. The method of the Fulbright program is a good illustration of this, with its use of binational boards in foreign countries to determine the scope and magnitude of the program, and the close cooperation in the United States between private professional groups and the U.S. Government in the selection process. Another excellent illustration is the Joint Commission for Rural Reconstruction in China (Formosa) which emphasizes jointness in both the planning and the administration of aid programs. Still another illustration is participation of the United States with other countries through the United Nations in the joint planning and administration of technical assistance programs. Sensitivity by American officials to the independence and pride of other countries in the planning and administration of all our programs abroad can give practical demonstration of a concept basis to our kind of democratic society.

Foreign leaders, scholars, students, and specialists brought to the United States to observe our country at firsthand should be given more opportunities to observe directly the many ways in which citizens at the community level take initiative in cooperative efforts to deal with public problems. This is insufficiently done at present, in part because of lack of funds, but also because the importance of such experience for the development of democratic societies abroad is not fully recognized. A larger effort to reach through leader grants the politically sensitive and progressive elements of foreign populations can greatly increase the usefulness of these grants in influencing democratic development.

The ICA training program in the United States, a major educational undertaking affecting more than 7,000 persons coming to this country in 1 year, should emphasize opportunity for exposure to and close observation of the democratic character of the society that has produced these skills.

Specific ICA programs in developing countries to assist the emergence of community instruments for dealing with pressing social and political problems should receive far greater emphasis.

The Department of Defense officer training program, which brings to the United States annually more than 25,000 foreign officers, provides an extraordinary opportunity for orientation concerning the role of the military in a democracy. At the same time, American military personnel abroad should be oriented to understand this civilian relationship in the United States and to interpret it to foreign military personnel with whom they associate.

American voluntary organizations with significant citizen education experience, such as the League of Women Voters, should be systematically involved to develop cooperative programs with groups show-

ing similar interests, especially in underdeveloped countries, in order to help strengthen the democratic foundations of their societies.

The present people-to-people program comprises some of the elements of such a program. It could, by means of cooperation between U.S. voluntary organizations with people in other countries having comparable interests, be a more dynamic effort to illustrate the vitality and significance of voluntary cooperation among likeminded citizens with a common purpose. Significant private efforts along this line already exist, such as the experiment in international living and the American Friends Service Committee. In a broader sense, of course, private cooperative efforts of all sorts provided the fabric of international relations long before government became involved in conscious programs of educational and cultural cooperation.

Government can assist, in this context, not so much through specific program projects as through reminding American individuals and organizations of opportunities to aid in developing voluntary cooperation in other countries and thereby to help provide the basis for democratic government and international cooperation.

The Government's role should be essentially that of the telephone exchange—perhaps not as mechanical as the modern dial system, but more like the humanly wide-awake operator of earlier days who was interested in establishing contacts (and occsaionally "listening in"), but it should also seek out ways of developing contacts that would be useful, putting people in touch across international boundaries.

Official U.S. personnel generally—not only public affairs officers and cultural affairs officers—often need special education on the nature and importance of this aspect of American society and on ways to show in practice what it means. Local community agencies providing hospitality for foreign visitors should be carefully selected with this ability to convey democratic concepts very much in mind.

It is recommended—

(1) That in the administration by the United States of its international educational and cultural programs, continuing attention be given to the use of democratic methods and in particular to providing opportunities for joint planning and administration with other countries.

(2) That in all programs bringing foreign visitors to the United States, greater emphasis be placed upon bringing them into direct contact with American people, where the democratic and pluralistic character of our society can be observed.

(3) That in our programs to assist newly developing countries greater emphasis be placed upon activities which can serve to strengthen democratic institutions and processes at all levels of the governmental process, especially in programs for educational development.

(4) That the training programs for foreign military officers, carried on by the Department of Defense, place emphasis upon democratic concepts and the relationship of the military to civilian life in democratic societies and that for this purpose the resources of American educational institutions be utilized.

(5) That American military personnel overseas, especially in advisory roles to foreign governments, be properly oriented to an understanding of the proper role of the military in democratic societies.

(6) That deliberate efforts be made to relate voluntary organizations in the United States having high professional competence, to corresponding groups abroad, especially in newly developing countries, so that they can be helpful in strengthening nongovernmental resources for responsible citizen action.

(7) That special efforts be made to insure that U.S. Government officials serving abroad, and their families, have an understanding of the pluralistic and democratic character of American society and of the ways by which these characteristics can be reinforced in other countries.

VII. Administrative and Organizational Requirements

Some comments on basic administrative and organizational requirements for an effective national effort are appropriate, even though this report is not primarily concerned with making detailed recommendations on this subject. The propriety of these comments stems from the simple fact that policy and program cannot be administered effectively except within the framework of sound governmental organization.

A. EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP

The most important requisite for good administration is Presidential leadership. This is needed in order to have public understanding of the importance of this aspect of our foreign relations, to help the Congress provide necessary legislation and appropriations, and to assure other nations that the United States is unequivocally committed to furthering worldwide educational, cultural, scientific, and technical development. But most important is the direction which Presidential leadership provides for the executive branch.

Even the most enthusiastic Presidential support will be ineffectively translated into purposeful action unless responsibility is placed clearly in the Secretary of State to see that the President's objectives are pursued on a Government-wide basis both in Washington and abroad. This, in turn, requires within the Department of State a high position capable of achieving coordinated governmental action. If such a position is identified by the President and the Secretary of State at a level comparable to that established for policy direction in economic affairs, the full resources of the National Government can be mobilized in purposeful action.

A further requirement is clear direction by the President to the National Security Council and the Bureau of the Budget to support the policies developed under the direction of the Secretary of State.

In short, without continuing reaffirmation of Presidential concern for this aspect of our foreign relations, and insistence upon integrated policies supported by coordinated action, the educational and cultural cooperation effort of the Government will not be adequate to the national need.

B. SOUND ORGANIZATION

Presidential leadership can be translated into effective administrative action only within sound organization. Such organization has been lacking throughout most of the history of U.S. governmental concern with international educational and cultural affairs. The programs now being carried on are an outgrowth of many separate

initiatives dating back to 1938 and undertaken at various times since then in response to special needs. Thus the principal agencies concerned today—the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the International Cooperation Administration—are responsible for programs which were developed separately but which are today closely related in their impact in individual countries. These three agencies, in turn, rely upon assistance from over a dozen other Government agencies, as well as from many private agencies.

Continuing attention to administrative tangles, both in Washington and abroad, that have developed out of this patchwork approach, helped to clarify the areas of agency responsibility. The work of the Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for International Educational and Cultural Relations, appointed in 1959, contributed to an identification of issues and resulted in improvements in organization within the Bureau he directed in the Department of State.

What is lacking, however, is a clear Government-wide organizational structure within which integrated policies are developed to determine what educational, scientific, cultural, informational, and technical assistance activities should be carried out in our relations with individual countries. Therefore it has remained unclear what kinds of agencies were needed and how their various assigned functions could best be related in actual administration, and governmental relations with individual countries abroad and with the private sector at home have lacked clarity, consistency, and purposefulness.

Recommendation of an organizational plan was not envisaged as part of this report. It will suffice, therefore, to suggest merely some of the ways in which organizational improvements might be made. All educational and cultural activities of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State might be transferred to USIA along with the educational components of technical assistance. Another way would be to transfer to the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State all the cultural and informational activities now in USIA except the Voice of America and certain other "fast media" activities and also give to the Bureau the educational components of technical assistance now found in ICA. If it is deemed wise to continue the dominant role of ICA in educational development, which is likely to remain the largest component in U.S. international educational affairs, it might be wiser to transfer to ICA the closely related activities of USIA and of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. In that case the more strictly economic development activities of ICA, involving large-scale engineering and building projects, might be established in a separate agency. A much clearer concept is needed of the role of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in international educational programs.

Whatever structure is developed in Washington, it is essential that similar lines of responsibility be established within U.S. missions abroad. Whatever administrative decision is taken by the President should be reflected clearly in legislative authorization and appropriations by Congress.

It should be underscored that the critical issue is the organization of the Government in a manner that insures purposeful action within the bounds of human resources and funds that will always be limited. We must cease looking upon our educational and cultural programs as

a series of relatively independent agency programs carried on by each to the best of its ability and focused upon its own particular objectives.

Basic to developing a sound organization is, as suggested earlier, the clear assignment of policy responsibility within the Department of State, and this should be at a level comparable to that determined for policy coordination in international economic affairs, i.e., at the level of an Under Secretary of State. Educational and cultural affairs are now a major aspect of U.S. foreign relations comparable in importance to economic affairs, and should be so recognized in bureaucratic status.

C. THE NEED FOR GOVERNMENT-WIDE PLANNING

If the governmental effort in educational and cultural affairs is to be purposeful and effective, its planning must be focused upon U.S. relations with individual countries and regions. It must take into account the objectives of our relations with each country, the needs of the country itself, and our own resources. It must be related to the plans and activities of other governments with which we cooperate or compete. Finally, planning must provide a timetable according to which it is proposed to attain both broad and specific objectives.

Without Government-wide planning, there can be no assurance that individual agency programs are interrelated toward the achievement of our national goals and the cumulative magnitude of our worldwide commitments. Without such planning, the proper allocation of our limited resources among countries and among types of programs (academic exchanges, educational development, cultural exchanges, and information) cannot be assured. Without such planning, budgetary limitations upon either annual or long-term programs must remain essentially arbitrary and unrelated to the attainment of precise objectives. Without such planning, the adequacy of what is done by other countries toward common goals cannot adequately be taken into account nor the relationship between our own contribution and that of other friendly countries. Finally, without such planning it is virtually impossible to estimate effectively the respective needs and responsibilities of the private and governmental sectors. Planning of U.S. educational and cultural programs in these terms does not now take place on a Government-wide basis.

The vastness and complexity of the structure of Government apparently defies this kind of coordinated planning in Washington, even in this single aspect of our foreign relations. Through the mechanism of the Operations Coordinating Board, an unsuccessful attempt was made to achieve Government-wide coordination of operations. Its papers, prepared with Presidential approval in keeping with decisions of the National Security Council, were intended to gear all U.S. operations to a unified set of objectives. The activities of the respective agencies—USIA, ICA, the Departments of State, Agriculture, Commerce, Defense—within any given country were to be tailored to meet needs as they developed, but while the programs of these agencies might have adhered to the OCB papers, there was no basis for insuring that the several agency programs would themselves be related to each other.

There are program planning staffs in each of the operating agencies—CU, ICA, USIA—but interagency planning with a country focus

seems to be lacking. Even within the Department of State the planning of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs seems only incidentally related to the work of the central policy planning staff.

Considerable progress has been made in developing at the level of U.S. embassies abroad something like country plans, but these frequently are composites of agency country programs and do not constitute an integrated program based upon integrated policies of the U.S. Government as a whole toward the given country. Planning by the agency representatives in the missions, e.g., USIA, State, ICA, and Defense, is determined in accordance with agency instructions from Washington developed within the limits of agency budget allocations and without benefit of a governmentwide plan focused upon the individual country. Theoretically, the country desk in the Department of State would be the logical single point in Washington where effective support for mission country planning ought to be provided. This does not now appear to be the case.

The chief of mission is the key to effective governmentwide planning. He has a manageable staff directly responsible to him. He is in a position to consult closely with the government to which he is accredited, and he can determine the degree of support given to that government by important leadership groups emerging within the country. To perform his planning function he probably should have a special staff officer who has no particular agency loyalty.

Finally, it should be noted that planning, to be effective, must be geared to the budgetmaking process. Given the absence of governwide planning, it is not surprising that budgets are prepared without real knowledge of need on either a country or a worldwide basis. In fact, the typical budget preparation process has been to determine a governmentwide ceiling and then to allocate portions among agencies. The latter then prepare programs to fit the agency ceiling. In the absence of an actual determination of total educational and cultural program needs in the framework of which the budget requests of the respective agencies could be submitted, it is impossible for the Bureau of the Budget to establish ceilings on any other basis than a fiscal view of Government operations.

In the case of the Department of State, the budget share of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs is determined by the Department's budget office. The Department's educational and cultural programs are not appraised for budgetary purposes as a share of the total governmentwide budget allocation for educational and cultural programs, but rather in competition with administrative and other costs of the Department of State. In the case of ICA, the technical assistance budget is determined in relation to the defense support and military aspects of mutual security, and not in relation to the educational and cultural budget requests of State and USIA. The Agency shares of the total executive budget request for educational and cultural activities are not considered by the same subcommittees of Congress and are defended individually by the separate agencies.

How much it would cost to carry on the kind of total educational and cultural effort that the foreign policy interests of the United States require is, therefore, really not known to anyone. It is fairly clear, however, in view of this process, that whatever is now done is probably insufficient.

Integration of agencies or of operations may or may not be necessary. It is well known that different kinds of activities draw different kinds of talents and types of personnel and that each agency develops gradually a tone, spirit, or philosophy which is vital to successful operation. This must not be lost for the sake of mere logic and neatness of organizational charts. However, integrated country or regional planning must be achieved, even if it requires consolidation of agencies.

An essential ingredient of planning is continuing research and evaluation. Most of the objectives of governmental programs in education and cultural cooperation have an urgency which demands purposefulness and effectiveness. We still know too little about the processes of communication between cultures, of attitude formation, of educational development in relation to other aspects of national development. Continuous research and evaluation concerning these processes and methods are needed as guides to intelligent long-term planning of Government programs.

It is recommended—

(1) That under the direction of the Secretary of State, renewed efforts be made to develop real country program planning on a governmentwide basis at all U.S. missions abroad, and that appropriate means be established to reinforce these efforts by a supporting mechanism in Washington that insures budgeting based on realistic country planning.

(2) That a reappraisal be undertaken of the adequacy of research facilities to provide the basis for planning of programs, and that private research resources be drawn more fully into these efforts.

D. QUALITY AND STATUS OF OFFICIAL PERSONNEL

Governmental programs can be no better than the quality of the personnel responsible for their administration in Washington and abroad.

Quality is a product of many factors, including recruitment, selection, status, compensation, and supervision. Given dynamic and challenging programs, the Government can always draw upon the best talents of the American people for its educational and cultural programs.

An evaluation of personnel quality was not within the scope of this study, and no detailed comment is therefore appropriate. However, it must be pointed out that the growing involvement of Government in this area of foreign relations clearly places increasing responsibilities upon administrators to maintain a standard of personnel quality which permits effective relations between Government and the professional private sectors in both the United States and foreign countries. U.S. governmental representatives must always enjoy the respect of those with whom they have contact. If they do not, it is better not to carry on educational and cultural programs at all.

Without in any way attempting a judgment on the quality of present governmental personnel in these educational and cultural programs, it may be suggested that a careful review should be undertaken to determine whether in fact the recruitment and selection processes and the status and compensation provided for personnel correspond to the importance of educational and cultural affairs in our foreign relations.

In view of the low priority accorded the educational and cultural program during the last 20 years, it is likely that a systematic review would reveal a number of critical improvements needed at this time. Special attention, for example, should be given to the positions provided in the Foreign Service and in the regular civil service for personnel concerned with educational and cultural affairs and to the desirability of developing additional specialized career services for the kinds of programs carried on by USIA and ICA.

E. QUALITY OF PROGRAM

Administrative emphasis upon quality of program content is a necessary requirement to assure the kind of governmental effort needed today. As the demand develops for greater magnitude of program and greater speed of action, and as we feel increasingly the pressure of large-scale educational and cultural offensives from the U.S.S.R. and mainland China, the temptation will be great to sacrifice quality for the sake of quantity. It cannot be overemphasized that only programs that are of the highest possible quality are worthy of the attention and financial support of the United States Government. Poor quality is not only unworthy of governmental sponsorship but becomes a counterproductive factor within the total effort abroad and damages the reputation of the United States. It is better not to have educational and cultural programs at all than to have poor ones.

The quality of administration is the key to quality of program. The administrators need protection against pressures that would diminish quality. They need adequate financial resources to achieve quality. The administrative setting must provide opportunity for thoughtful planning of governmental action. There must be time and facilities for careful selection of cultural presentations, students, scholars, leaders, specialists, technicians, and for their briefing, orientation, and supervision. There must be ample and easy means for consulting and using professional competence available outside the Government.

A climate of quality depends ultimately upon Presidential and other top governmental leadership and the tone which it sets.

F. ADEQUACY AND FLEXIBILITY IN FINANCING

To determine how large an appropriation is needed to finance the kind of effort required of the Government today is beyond the purview of this report.

Whatever is determined to be the magnitude of the financial need, there are certain handicaps in present financing arrangements which are in need of correction.

The usual practice of annual appropriation makes difficult long-term commitments by the U.S. Government to cooperation with other countries and with private organizations and individuals in the United States. It discourages the United States and the countries to whom we give assistance from undertaking long-term careful planning necessary to efficient and economical administration.

The lack of flexibility in appropriations makes difficult and often impossible the most efficient use of funds under Presidential direction. There have been many cases in which projects in response to un-

expected international developments, as for example in Africa, could not be undertaken because funds were tied to agencies not equipped with technical skill, while the agency with the skill and program plans lacked the funds.

The practice of relying upon foreign currency balances to finance certain current programs, such as the Fulbright program, has resulted in a decline in program magnitude as available currencies were exhausted, and has led to excluding many countries from some of the programs because of the chance unavailability of foreign currencies.

The use of large accumulations of foreign currencies from agricultural surplus sales is the subject of considerable confusion, due to interagency competition, to the attitudes of foreign governments and to the relationship these balances bear to the bookkeeping of the Commodity Credit Corporation which held title to the agricultural products whose sale produced the foreign currency balances. As a result, planning for the constructive use of these funds for educational and cultural programs has involved great difficulties, and opportunities have been missed at just the time when these funds could make a significant contribution to educational development abroad.

It is recommended—

(1) That appropriations for educational and cultural programs, as defined in this study, be made on a "no-year" basis to permit obligation and expenditure of appropriations over an indefinite period of years in accordance with most effective planning and program administration.

(2) That appropriations be made in a manner that permits the President to transfer funds among agencies in keeping with most effective administration.

(3) That annual appropriations for educational and cultural programs be made in dollars, leaving to the President the utilization where appropriate of foreign currency within the limits of the dollar totals.

(4) That attention be given to the possibility of establishing mutual education development funds in individual countries where there are foreign currency accumulations from agricultural sales, and that each fund be administered by a binational board similar to those established for Fulbright programs and representative of American and foreign governments and educational institutions. Similar funds should be established in other selected countries insofar as foreign currency balances are found to be transferable to them.

G. RELATING THE GOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE SECTORS

The total American international educational and cultural effort is both private and governmental. It is essential, therefore, that there be means for relating the governmental and private efforts to each other.

This cannot be achieved by blueprints, legislation, rules, or any mechanical process. It depends, rather, upon close and continuing consultation based upon recognized common interests, mutual confidence, and understanding of the variety of objectives that motivate our plural society.

There has been widespread cooperation between Government and the private sector, and the record is an impressive demonstration of

how an intensely pluralistic democratic society deeply committed to private action in preference to governmental, has been able to develop, with most of the world, highly effective educational and cultural relations. The communities of America and its schools and universities, business and industrial firms, foundations, national professional councils and associations, religious and other philanthropic bodies are all involved in this network. They are involved in the programs that bring visitors to this country and in program activities abroad. They are, to an impressive degree, involved in consultations with governments in Washington and abroad.

The understanding between Government and the private sector has been growing, even though on particular issues there is often friction—issues such as the degree of initiative and independent leadership that can and should be exercised on each side. The private institutions do not wish to be coordinated by Government. But the Government also does not wish its responsible action in the national interest to be jeopardized by possible private initiatives conceived without adequate concern for their effect upon the national interest. Coordination may be a distasteful word, and perhaps cooperation is a more acceptable term, but the interrelationships of governmental and private action must insure the purposeful use by the American people of their limited resources in a manner consistent with the national interest.

Recent experience in parts of Africa, where American educators are working closely with educators of the African countries and of the United Kingdom and in collaboration with their respective governments in planning programs of educational development, gives excellent evidence of the mutuality of interests involved and of the possibilities for achieving coordinated action.

Steady insistence within the administrative structure of Government upon seeking continually the fullest possible involvement of the private sector in relation to governmental planning and operation both in Washington and at our diplomatic missions is a necessary requirement. The Morrill committee report "The Universities and World Affairs" suggests positive steps that are needed among the educational institutions, if they are to respond effectively. Other reports and the conferences sponsored by the Department of State with representatives of universities and of business have made further suggestions for those agencies.

However complicated the task of achieving this kind of consultation between the private and public sectors, it must remain a fundamental objective of administration if the total resources of the American people are to be related purposefully to the attainment of national objectives.

H. ADVISORY COMMISSIONS

Reflecting the unclear organization of the Government for an effective educational and cultural effort is the multiplicity of public advisory commissions and committees and the lack of clarity concerning the role each should play.

The Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange was established under the authority of Public Law 402, 80th Congress, 1948, to advise the Secretary of State on international exchange programs and policies, and it reports semiannually to the Congress.

The Advisory Committee on the Arts was established under the authority of Public Law 860, 84th Congress, 1956, to advise and assist the Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, to advise the President in discharging his responsibilities under his cultural exchange program, and to advise the Secretary of State whenever he considers this necessary for carrying out the purposes of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act.

The U.S. Advisory Commission on Information was established under Public Law 402, 80th Congress, 1948, and continued under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953. It advises the Director of USIA on its programs and it reports to the Congress.

The Advisory Committee on Cultural Information established under the authority of Public Law 402, 80th Congress, advises the Director of the U.S. Information Agency and the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information on policies and problems related to cultural programs for which the USIA has responsibility.

The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, established under Public Law 565, 79th Congress, 1946, advises the U.S. Government on UNESCO policies and programs.

The Music Advisory Panel advises the Advisory Committee on Cultural Information and the Director of the U.S. Information Agency on music policies and programs and advises USIA in the coordination of its music policies with the President's special international program, the East-West contacts program, and nongovernment organizations engaged in music activities abroad.

The Broadcast Advisory Committee was established under authority of Public Law 402, 80th Congress, 1948, to advise the Director of USIA on international broadcasting policies. It also advises on international television policies and programs.

The overlap in the concerns of these advisory bodies is obvious from their titles, and is even more manifest from the language of their authorizing legislation and of their recommendations issued from time to time. Yet each is served by administrative staffs in the agencies they advise. The Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange and the National Commission for UNESCO both advise the Secretary of State and each has its own staff.

The role which the commissions or committees are supposed to play does not always appear to be as clear as it should be. Some seem to serve as public relations devices to strengthen executive action. To some extent their advice is sought because it is really needed. To a limited extent some serve as useful channels of communication to the public at large.

It is recommended—

(1) That a careful analysis be made of the purposes to be served by public advisory commissions in this area of our foreign relations.

(2) That an Advisory Commission on Educational and Cultural Affairs be established to advise the Under Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs whose appointment has been previously recommended. Such a Commission should probably not exceed 11 members. Authority should exist to establish committees under the Commission on specific subjects such as information, educational development, the arts, science, social sciences, or on educational and cultural affairs in geographic areas

such as Africa, Latin America or Asia. There should be a single secretariat to serve the Commission under the direction of the Undersecretary of State. The relation between this Commission and those directly concerned with operations, such as the Advisory Commission on Information and the Board of Foreign Scholarship should be made clear. Some consolidation of committees or commissions should be possible but whatever is done in this respect must be related to the basic organizational structure developed within the executive branch.

VIII. Legislative Requirements

During the past 14 years, as the U.S. Government has taken on new areas of responsibility in the fields of cultural, educational, and information activities, various pieces of legislation with different objectives have been enacted to enable agencies of the executive branch to carry on international operations. For example:

(*a*) Educational development and technical assistance activities are engaged in by the International Cooperation Administration under mutual security legislation to provide for the academic and defense needs of other countries.

(*b*) A great variety of educational exchange activities are conducted under an amendment to an act originally intended to provide a means of disposing of World War II surplus property (Public Law 584, 79th Cong., Fulbright).

(*c*) Educational, cultural, and information activities are carried on by both the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency within broad expressions of purpose under the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.).

(*d*) Educational aid and exchange is also carried on under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act through funds made available by the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.)

(*e*) Some cultural and information programs are carried on under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 by the Departments of State and Commerce and the U.S. Information Agency (Public Law 860, 84th Cong.).

(*f*) Some programs for the exchange of educational and technical personnel and of books and technical equipment are authorized under a joint congressional resolution of August 1949 enabling the use of Finnish World War II debt payments.

(*g*) Limited educational training has been given to tens of thousands of foreign persons during recent years by the Department of Defense as part of its military training program under defense and mutual security legislation.

Obviously, these many programs conducted by several agencies cannot be sufficiently coordinated to support effectively U.S. foreign policy objectives. The need is clear, therefore, for unifying legislation which takes note of the interrelatedness of programs, determines appropriations for each in relation to the others, provides for the interchange of funds where called for, and provides means for insuring that the programs are conducted with a minimum of duplication and that they are mutually consistent.

Such unified legislation would permit a concerted national effort. It would permit long-term commitments that increase efficiency of operations and would provide the basis for realistic financing independent of the chance availability of foreign currencies. The scope of unified legislation should be broad enough to include all international educational, cultural, and informational activities.

Under consideration at the present time by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is a draft for new legislation (S. 1154) which would substantially serve the needs outlined above. The draft, however, would tend to perpetuate the split between those educational and cultural activities carried on by the Department of State in cooperation with the U.S. Information Agency on the one hand and other educational and cultural activities carried on by the USIA and its USIS posts overseas. It also leaves inadequately related to the programs of both of these agencies the educational component of technical assistance carried on by the International Cooperation Administration. The inherent relationship of all these activities in a unified national effort is, therefore, not properly recognized.

One major shortcoming to which the proposed legislation does not address itself is found in the present congressional prohibition of any activities by the executive branch to publicize or promote understanding within the United States of international educational and cultural programs. Ultimately these programs can succeed only if the American public understands their scope and the reasons why they are important to our national welfare.

It is recommended—

(1) That the legislation proposed (S. 1154) be supported in amended form to permit a more complete consolidation of the national effort in international educational and cultural affairs.

(2) That legislation which prevents the American people from being informed about this important aspect of governmental activity be repealed.

O