

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF
THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND
CULTURAL AFFAIRS

LETTER

FROM

THE CHAIRMAN, THE U.S. ADVISORY
COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL
EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

TRANSMITTING

THE SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION,
PURSUANT TO SECTION 107 OF PUBLIC LAW 87-256



SEPTEMBER 21, 1964.—Referred to the Committee on Foreign
Affairs and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1964

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS,
August 1, 1964.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: Attached is the second annual report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. It is submitted in accordance with the requirements of section 107 of Public Law 87-256 which states in part "the Commission shall submit annual reports to the Congress."

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. GARDNER, *Chairman.*

THE SECOND ANNUAL REPORT
TO
THE CONGRESS

FROM
THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND
CULTURAL AFFAIRS

AUGUST 1964

**U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL
AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS**

John W. Gardner, *Chairman*, president, Carnegie Corp. of New York.
Roy E. Larsen, *Vice Chairman*, chairman, executive committee,
Time, Inc.

Walter Adams, professor of economics, Michigan State University.

Luther H. Foster, president, Tuskegee Institute.

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president, University of Notre Dame.

Walter Johnson, professor of history, University of Chicago.

Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor, University of California at Los
Angeles.

Mabel M. Smythe, principal, New Lincoln High School, New York,
N.Y.

Pauline Tompkins, general director, American Association of Uni-
versity Women, Washington, D.C.

James A. Donovan, Jr., staff director, Washington, D.C., 20520.-

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

I. INTRODUCTION

An enduring peace is not just the absence of war, not just a kind of vacuum. Tensions between nations are inevitable, and a lasting peace depends upon widely accepted arrangements for resolving those tensions in a just, orderly, and nonviolent way. Such a state of affairs does not require that nations love each other nor even that they trust each other completely, but it does require some base (however modest) of understanding and tolerance. Without that base, extremes of anger, hatred, or fear will all too easily push conflict beyond the possibility of orderly resolution.

Exchange of persons is probably the most effective means that has ever been found for creating such a base of understanding. It is not a sentimental gesture. It is not an effort to be generous to foreign students and visitors, nor just a means of providing Americans a personally enriching tour or period of residence abroad. It is a hard-headed investment in our future and the world's future. If the American people ever really come to understand that fact they will surely invest in these programs far more heavily than they do now.

This is the second annual report of the Commission. The chief activity in the first year was an appraisal of the effectiveness of educational exchange programs that the Department of State had sponsored over the previous 15 years, and the first annual report presented the results of that appraisal. (The report was later reprinted under the title "A Beacon of Hope.")

II. COORDINATION

An Executive order, issued June 26, 1962, assigned responsibility for various functions of the Fulbright-Hays Act not only to the Secretary of State but to the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Director of the U.S. Information Agency. In addition to these activities authorized under the act, many Government agencies are carrying on international educational activities under other authorizations. Thus, there is a problem of coordination. *Even before the passage of the Fulbright-Hays Act, President Kennedy called attention to this problem when he said on February 27, 1961:*

This whole field (international educational and cultural affairs) 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.

At its first meeting the Advisory Commission strongly reemphasized the need for coordination, and said that unless this field did receive the "imaginative policy development, unification, and vigorous direction" called for by the President, "the work of the Commission would be arid."

Much has been done in the past 2 years to coordinate international educational and cultural activities, but much remains to be done. Here are some of the constructive steps that have been taken:

A. COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Perhaps the most significant step took place on January 30 of this year when the Department of State established the Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, an interagency policy coordinating body at the sub-Cabinet level. The responsibilities of the Council are—

to strengthen the coordination of educational and cultural policies for Government programs which are essentially international in purpose and impact (including the development of better communication among agencies with programs of this type and the more effective use of common resources);

to provide a forum for the discussion of problems which affect other Government agencies with domestic programs having international implications; and

to act as the parent body for other interagency committees and working groups which deal with specific matters or problems which are related to the Commission's area of general concern.

Chaired by the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, the Council includes among its members representatives of AID, the Office of Education, USIA, the Department of Defense, the Peace Corps, and an observer from the Bureau of the Budget.

B. INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

A remarkable variety of Government agencies and private organizations are engaged in English language teaching overseas. These programs, sometimes overlapping and conflicting, have long needed orderly appraisal.

An interagency committee on English language teaching overseas composed of representatives of AID, USIA, the Department of Defense, the Peace Corps, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and chaired by a representative of the Department of State, now meets about once a month to discuss problems and exchange information. The committee is working with the Bureau of the Budget on a survey of Government English language programs. The survey, when completed, will provide accurate statistics on the magnitude of the Federal Government's activities in this field.

10. GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL BOOK PROGRAMS

The Commission has followed with interest the activities of the Government Advisory Committee on International Book Programs. The need for such a group was called to the attention of the Commission at its first meeting in April 1962. One month later, in a speech before the American Booksellers Association, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy called on the book industry to form a committee to work with the Government "to consider how we can get more and better American books read by more people—particularly students—in the uncommitted nations of the world." Through the initiative of Mr. Curtis G. Benjamin, chairman of the board of McGraw-Hill Book Co., such a committee was formed, and was appointed by the Secretary of State under the authority of Public Law 87-256.

The Committee consists of leaders of the book publishing industry, representing various divisions of that industry. (For a list of members, see app. 1.) The Government representatives to the Committee are Lucius D. Battle, Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State; Dr. Leona Baumgartner, Assistant Administrator for Technical Cooperation and Research, Agency for International Development; and Donald M. Wilson, Deputy Director, U.S. Information Agency.

The Committee has held bimonthly meetings with representatives of the Government agencies concerned with book programs overseas. It advises the Secretary on the coordination of international book programs, both between agencies and between Government and industry. In matters relating to the distribution of American books abroad, it brings Government policies to the attention of the book industry, and problems of the industry to the attention of Government.

Here are some of the ways in which the Committee has proven useful:

(1) The Committee has, through its trade organizations, urged the book industry to set lower rates for the sale of foreign language rights to the Government than those usually quoted to commercial interests. As a result, the USIA has been able to procure Spanish-language rights at less cost than previously.

(2) The Committee has recommended to the industry that discounts more generous than usual be allowed on the sale of books to be used by the Government in specific pilot projects abroad. Cooperating publishers have made it possible for the central book fund of AID to increase the number of books included in such pilot projects (e.g., the establishment of student rental libraries abroad, the distribution of technical and scientific works in the developing countries).

(3) The Committee has encouraged the coordination of Government book programs to avoid duplication of effort and unnecessary expenditure of funds. One result was that the Peace Corps and USIA combined their programs for soliciting donations of books from publishers. Their joint efforts produced a large increase in the flow of donated books.

(4) The Committee's recommendations have brought USIA and AID into closer consultation on their book translation programs and have resulted in an agreement between the two agencies as to the proper responsibilities of each.

(5) The Committee has worked internationally with the book industry and Government to make each more aware of what the other is doing and both more aware of what other countries are doing.

It is hoped that through the recommendations of the Committee more American books will be made available abroad, through commercial as well as Government channels. It is in the national interest that private industry be strengthened in oversea operations, both American and local. To the extent that this can be done, particularly in the developing countries, there will be less need for future Government subsidy. For the time being, however, commercial interests cannot provide the needed books at prices which foreign readers, particularly, can afford. Therefore, the Government will need to study its programs to make the best use of the funds at its command and to draw upon the advice of the industry in doing this.

D. INTERAGENCY COORDINATION OF YOUTH ACTIVITIES

Over the past 2 years an interagency group has been meeting, under the chairmanship of Assistant Secretary Battle, to coordinate Government programs that bring U.S. representatives into communication with youth abroad. Behind this concern is the conviction that young people, particularly in the developing areas, play a significant role on the political scene, and that many of them will assume positions of power and influence in the not-too-distant future. The interagency group has reviewed not only the programs undertaken abroad by individual posts, but the effect of the educational exchanges that bring thousands of foreign students and trainees to this country under State Department, AID, and Defense Department programs.

E. INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ATHLETICS

Sports have long played a role in international relations, and in recent years there has been a sharp increase in the number of international meets on a regional and worldwide basis. To coordinate activities of a number of Government agencies, an Interagency Committee on International Athletics was created. It is chaired by the Department of State and includes representatives from the Department of Justice, Department of Defense, Department of Interior, USIA, the Peace Corps, and the President's Council on Physical Fitness.

F. INTERAGENCY GROUP ON RESEARCH IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

An interagency group consisting of individuals responsible for research programs in nine U.S. Government agencies has met informally several times during the past few months to exchange information on current research projects. In addition to providing for the exchange of information and ideas, the group seeks to stimulate cooperative research endeavors among the participating agencies.

G. OVERSEA SCHOOLS POLICY COMMITTEE

On December 30, 1963, the Department of State formed an Overseas Schools Policy Committee for Elementary and Secondary School Activities, made up of representatives of the Department and AID.

One of its purposes is to develop a comprehensive overseas school program that (1) will meet current and long-range educational needs of dependents of U.S. Government employees serving overseas as well as those of non-government personnel carrying out activities under the AID Act, and (2) will increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries.

Effective July 1, 1964, the overseas elementary and secondary school activities of AID and the Department of State have been coordinated in a single office under the jurisdiction of the Assistant Secretary of State for Administration. This continues the cooperation begun last year in assistance to oversea schools. A program planning officer has been designated in the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs to insure appropriate attention to the purposes of the Fulbright-Hays Act in the planning and execution of the schools program.

H. COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY

Formal liaison has been strengthened between the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs and the Department's Policy Planning Council. Assistant Secretary Battle has asked that the Bureau's policy review and research staff maintain continuing contact with the Council to insure that the exchange programs are coordinated with the broader spectrum of foreign policy plans. In addition, the reorganization of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs along geographic rather than functional lines has brought it in closer contact with the geographic bureaus. Thus, arrangements exist for international educational and cultural affairs to operate in the mainstream of the Department's business.

This enumeration of efforts toward coordination would not be complete without reference to the fact that the Commission itself has played a part in such efforts. During the year under review, the Commission met on various occasions with representatives of USIA, AID, the Peace Corps, and the new Interagency Council. And in almost all of its deliberations the Commission holds to an interagency point of view.

III. A BEACON OF HOPE

As indicated earlier, the Commission's first annual report was later reprinted under the title "A Beacon of Hope" and given extensive circulation. Since the report aroused wide interest, it may be useful to describe the progress made on some of the matters mentioned in it.

THE FOREIGN GRANTEE

A. More women grantees

In the report the Commission noted that the Department was seeking to increase the percentage of women grantees, and the Commission commended these efforts. In the time that has elapsed since the publication of the first annual report, it has been difficult to obtain sufficient data to discern a definite trend one way or the other as regards this recommendation. The Commission still hopes it will be possible, without departing from established standards in the selection of grantees, to make more grants to women. It believes that these can be fully as valuable as grants to men in achieving the aims of the exchange program.

B. English language proficiency

The Commission pointed out that adequate command of English is essential to a successful academic experience, but also emphasized that if we limit selection to those who have a thorough grasp of English we eliminate many talented young people who may be important future leaders in their own countries. To resolve this dilemma, the Commission recommended that the English language requirement be somewhat relaxed at the point of selection, but that adequate time be provided for intensive language training before the grantee undertakes university work. The Commission urged establishment of new training facilities for this purpose, either overseas or in this country, preferably here.

In commenting on this recommendation, a large number of embassies agreed that the English language requirement is a principal cause for elimination of potentially important student grantees, and that intensive training might make it possible to give some of these a successful experience in this country. But the oversea posts did not generally believe that the intensive training could be most effectively administered in the United States. They tended to favor predeparture training. As things stand now, however, local training facilities are either entirely inadequate or the courses offered under them are not sufficiently intensive to prepare students for academic work in the United States. Estimates from the field suggest that a predeparture training program for 300 to 400 grantees over a 4-month period would require an additional \$100,000 annually.

In this connection, it is worth noting that in Latin America binational centers can provide English language training more cheaply than such training is provided anywhere else in the world. If these centers were given scholarship funds, they could greatly increase their effectiveness.

The Department sponsors postarrival language programs for selected grantees, but the scale of the effort is very modest compared to the need. The Commission still believes that vigorous efforts to establish facilities or to use existing facilities either for predeparture or postarrival language training would pay substantial dividends.

C. Field selection centers

The Commission urged establishment of field or regional selection centers to correct present inadequacies in selection and academic placement of foreign students. Errors in selection and academic placement can be serious. The Commission recommended that the Federal Government join with private organizations in establishing a worldwide network of field centers to assist both Government and private agencies in selection and placement of foreign students. It was suggested that the centers be set up under private auspices. Such centers could not only help in selection, but could make available to foreign applicants full information on U.S. educational institutions, living conditions, costs, and the availability of scholarships. The centers could also furnish U.S. colleges and universities with information on the educational systems and standards of the student's country as well as information on the student's own qualifications.

A few such centers have come into being at the initiative of private organizations, such as the African-American Institute and the Institute of International Education. Assistant Secretary Battle has

initiated conversations with key private organizations in order that any future development of such oversea centers not involve unnecessary duplication of effort. But we have yet to see the emergence of a plan for the development of oversea centers adequate to America's needs for the next decade and beyond. It seems clear that we shall eventually require a worldwide network of such centers. It would be sensible to face up to the need now.

Field reactions to the Commission's recommendation urged that any new centers be planned in such a way as to build on the strength of existing and well-tested mechanisms such as the present binational centers and binational commissions. In some cases a relatively modest increase in funds could permit these existing instrumentalities to extend their services greatly. The Department of State is requesting \$295,000 for fiscal year 1965 to improve the selection and oversea counseling of non-Government-sponsored students—an increase of \$195,000 over the current fiscal year.

D. Adequate notice to grantees

The Commission pointed out that many former grantees believed they should have been allowed more time to prepare for their trip. Several factors have contributed to this situation. Procedures established by the Department for processing candidates have contributed to tardy announcements of grantee awards. Colleges and universities in the United States and abroad are partly at fault for failing to make early internal decisions on candidates. The delay in appropriations by Congress each fiscal year is another factor.

The Department is making a serious effort to improve its own procedures in order to give grantees more time to prepare for their trips. It hopes to accelerate the processing of grantees by encouraging direct communication between oversea selection boards and agencies in this country, by enforcing more rigid deadlines for student application, and by establishing a more systematic follow-up program for pending applications.

E. Placement, orientation, programing

1. *Placement.*—The Commission stressed the need for improved academic placement of Government-sponsored and nonsponsored foreign students. We are happy to report that a considerable effort has been made to accomplish such improvement, particularly for Government-sponsored students.

In 1963, the Department made a grant of \$11,440 to the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers to enable that organization to continue publication of its "World Education Series," which describes the educational systems in different countries. The publication is most useful in evaluating the credentials of students. The Department has taken steps to provide all of the major posts abroad with current reference books and counseling materials.

In the fall of 1963 the Institute of International Education and the College Entrance Examination Board initiated a series of meetings with college admissions officers to establish uniform admissions standards for foreign students, both undergraduate and graduate.

Also in 1963 the Department sent a group of experts in the counseling of foreign students to advise our missions in the Far East, Near East, and Africa. They met with admissions officers of local higher education institutions as well as with candidates for student grants.

The Department also helped sponsor a project to improve counseling services for Latin American students by inviting to the United States a group of Latin Americans engaged in counseling work. While here, they conferred with admission officers and other university officials engaged in the placement of students. In addition, the Department transferred to USIA the sum of \$10,000 to improve local counseling services for foreign students in countries other than the United States.

2. *Orientation.*—Perhaps the most substantial innovation was the action of the Department in transferring to the Institute of International Education the sum of \$125,000 to provide orientation opportunities for nongrant students (i.e., students who come to this country without official Government grants). These funds enabled a small percentage of non-Government-sponsored students (about 550) to receive predeparture and stateside training and orientation. In 1964, because of budgetary considerations, support to this program was cut back to \$50,000, most of which will be spent on stateside training and orientation for nongrant students. The cutback is regrettable. The gravest failures in educational exchange today are among the very large number of nongrant students, who receive none of the counseling, orientation, and placement assistance that is given to Government-sponsored exchange students.

3. *Programing.*—The Commission pointed out that the leader grant, which has clearly proven its value, is necessarily expensive and is the sort of grant that should be done well or not at all. The Commission said there was an urgent need for more careful planning of short-term leader tour programs to meet individual needs, for more careful routing of visitors outside the big cities and well-worn circuits, for more visits to smaller American towns and in American homes, for longer stays at each stop, and for more allowance of free time for reflection. The Commission also pointed out that there is a real need for visits to centers of constructive change in race relations in the South.

The Department has undertaken a number of measures to strengthen the program. It initiated a series of meetings with major public and private agencies (e.g., the Department of Labor, the Governmental Affairs Institute, the Council of Leaders and Specialists, and the National Social Welfare Assembly) to discuss the individual handling of leader programs. These meetings have proven successful and will continue on a semiannual or annual basis. In cooperation with the National Council for Community Services for International Visitors (COSERV) the Department is continuing to encourage meetings of local and regional community groups to discuss ways of assisting the foreign visitor.

The Commission, in its first annual report, recommended that an effort be made to route more visitors outside the "big cities and well-worn circuits" of tourism. Although the grantees of earlier years (whose views were sought by the Commission) may have been confined to such "well-worn circuits," the Commission was not aware of how much is currently being done to vary the pattern. The big cities are usually included on the itineraries of leaders and specialists at their specific request, but the itineraries of practically all these visitors include a visit to at least one smaller city or town. During the 4 to 7 days spent in each of the larger cities, visitors also have an opportunity to go to one or more smaller towns or farming areas within a

50 to 75 mile radius where they may stay overnight or for a weekend as guests in a private home. Because these latter stops do not appear on the itineraries of the visitors, it has been assumed by some, mistakenly, that they do not get to the smaller communities. COSERV is encouraging development of this type of "satellite." With the rapid increase in interest of more citizens in small cities and towns in the foreign visitor program, opportunities for visitors to get acquainted with Americans at the grass roots level are being constantly expanded.

F. Follow-up

The Commission recommended that our embassies make greater efforts to maintain contact with grantees who have returned to their own countries. The field missions responded enthusiastically to this recommendation, but pointed out that restricted budgets and personnel ceilings made it impossible to extend their activities further. The Department allocates \$200,000 annually for follow-up activities and finances a program through which professional journals may be sent to former grantees (\$75,000 this year). Expansion along the lines recommended by the Commission would require additional funds—certainly no less than an additional \$100,000. The Commission urges the provision of these funds.

THE AMERICAN GRANTEE

A. Quality of American grantees

One of the most controversial and widely discussed points in "A Beacon of Hope" was the Commission's statement that "the quality of American professors and lecturers is not consistently as high as it should be." The Department in collaboration with the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils is reviewing its U.S. professor program with a view to insuring a better caliber of grantee. The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs has recently completed a study of stipends for U.S. professors recommending that grant benefits be increased. The U.S. Office of Education and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs have been instructed by the Board of Foreign Scholarships to strengthen interviewing, screening, and selection procedures and the orientation of participants. The Board will meet with representatives of these agencies in the fall to discuss specific steps to accomplish these ends.

The Department has taken two important steps to improve the caliber of American grantees who go abroad on short-term grants. It has restructured the Division for Americans Abroad along functional rather than geographic lines to facilitate the processing of information on prominent Americans and their specialities. And it has established a Committee on American Leaders and Specialists to screen qualified candidates. The Committee must now approve all persons sent abroad under the American specialists program.

Some of the Commission's most severe criticism was leveled at the teacher interchange program. The Board of Foreign Scholarships has completed an evaluation of this program.

B. Travel costs for dependents

The Commission pointed out that it is difficult to recruit outstanding American teachers and professors for oversea service when the grants do not include travel costs for dependents. The grantee

must either leave his family at home or draw on his own savings for their travel costs—or ask his home university to supplement the grant. The Commission urged that Congress take immediate steps to remove this major obstacle to securing first-quality American grantees.

Unfortunately, the Department has been unsuccessful in obtaining funds for dependents' travel. In its fiscal year 1965 budget, it again requested the modest funds that would be necessary for this purpose, but the House Appropriations Committee turned the request down. The Commission still believes that the presence of complete families in the oversea community can be a vital asset in the achievement of the aims of the program, quite apart from the significant contributions made by able grantees themselves.

ADMINISTRATION

A. Relations with private contract agencies

The Commission recommended that a fresh appraisal be made of the most important private contract agencies in order to assess their effectiveness. The Department of State has just concluded such a study. The study is not an attempt to appraise individual contract agencies, but provides an excellent description of the contract relationship and a clear statement of the policies that should govern that relationship. On balance, the study reinforces the Commission's view that private contract agencies are indispensable contributors to the Government's educational and cultural exchange programs. They do much to insure the awarding of grants on merit rather than for political considerations; they provide highly specialized competencies otherwise unavailable to the Department; and they generate and make available substantial private funds which serve to reduce the cost to the U.S. Government. The study found that the private contract agencies were on the whole doing an effective job.

The Department of State has taken a number of concrete steps to tighten up its dealings with the contract agencies and to provide a closer review of their services. It believes that each of the principal agencies should be urged to have an up-to-date management survey of its organization and procedures. The Department also believes it would be useful to have an exchange of information (possible under the auspices of the new Interagency Council) among Federal agencies responsible for contract negotiations with nonprofit agencies, in order to establish comparable criteria for service contracts.

B. The role of the cultural affairs officer

The Commission recommended that attention be given to the role of the cultural affairs officer. A good many CAO's believe that the assignment is a blind alley from the career standpoint, and it has been asserted that they are unduly burdened with visitors and paperwork so that they cannot accomplish their cultural duties effectively. Thanks to the initiative of the Hazen Foundation, a study is now being undertaken that may shed light on this problem. The foundation has made a grant to the Brookings Institution to finance the project. The study is being made by Dr. Charles Frankel, professor of philosophy at Columbia University.

C. Standardization of per diem

The Commission pointed out that there existed a wide discrepancy between the several agencies of the Government—the State Department, AID, and others—in maintenance or per diem allowances paid to foreign visitors of similar rank. Such variations sometimes led to embarrassment, sensitivity, and misinterpretation on the part of foreign guests. The Commission is happy to report that as of September 1963, the Department of State assumed full responsibility for determining per diem rates affecting foreign visitors sponsored by AID and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. New maximum rates have been established for those foreign leaders whose status and importance warrant special consideration. The new rates authorize (a) per diem allowance not to exceed \$35 for leader grantees who require special treatment (i.e., head of a department or ministry); (b) per diem allowance in excess of \$35 in individual cases to be determined by the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs (e.g., a vice president, a deputy prime minister). Foreign leader grantees whose status does not warrant special treatment will normally receive \$20 per diem. The Department has also prepared a study on increasing the per diem rate for foreign specialist grantees. The increase has been approved in principle by AID.

D. Cost-of-education grants

The Commission recommended that universities accepting students on government-sponsored exchange programs be provided with "cost-of-education" grants to make up the gap between tuition and the full cost of educating the foreign student. Even in the case of American students, the full cost of education is substantially in excess of tuition charged (even in high tuition institutions), and the excess is even greater for foreign students because they usually require additional administrative services. In response to this recommendation, the president of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs sought the views of 52 colleges and universities deeply involved in the handling of foreign students. The overwhelming majority strongly favored cost-of-education grants. There were, however, a number of institutions which did not favor them, mainly on the grounds that such grants might carry strings the institutions would find objectionable.

The Department of State has opposed and continues to oppose the philosophy underlying cost of education, believing that it violates the spirit of partnership and joint responsibility that has characterized relationships with institutions of higher education in the educational exchange program since its inception. The Department also points out that in the light of current congressional budgetary restrictions, additional expense of cost-of-education grants would mean that the Department would have to reduce its total number of student grantees by a significant proportion.

The Commission recognizes the difficulties and does not wish to press its own views dogmatically, but is not inclined to revise the original recommendation. We are entering a period in which the colleges and universities of the United States will be under extremely heavy pressures to find room for additional American students. The resources of these institutions will be strained to the limit, and there is always the possibility of a negative reaction toward the influx of foreign students, either on the part of the universities themselves or

on the part of the public. Any such reaction would be substantially diminished if it could be shown that the foreign student—at least the Government-sponsored foreign students—does not constitute a financial drain on the institutions themselves.

COORDINATION

In "A Beacon of Hope" the Commission placed heavy emphasis on the need for coordination. Recent progress in meeting that need has been fully reported in the preceding chapter.

The Commission recommended greater coordination not only among Government agencies but between the public and private sectors. It pointed out that there was particular need for reappraisal of the relations between the Government and the universities. The latter institutions have collaborated extensively with Government agencies in international activities, but the collaboration has been accompanied by considerable tension and misunderstanding. During the past winter, the Government-university relationship was examined thoroughly on one particular front. At the request of David Bell, the Administrator of AID, Mr. John W. Gardner, Chairman of this Commission, served as chairman of the Task Force of AID-University Relations. The task force conducted a 7-month study, and Mr. Gardner prepared a report on the subject entitled "AID and the Universities."

MILITARY EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

The Commission expressed the view that the thousands of military visitors brought to the United States by the Department of Defense each year (approximately 15,400 in fiscal year 1964) should have a broader exposure to the social, economic, and political life of the United States. The Commission is pleased to note that the Department of Defense is taking a much broader view of training conducted under its military assistance programs. Following a joint review with the Department of State and USIA, the Secretary of Defense has asked the services and commanders to modify training programs, manuals, and facilities in such a way as to give foreign military trainees a balanced understanding of our society, institutions, and ideas. Some of the subjects to be added to curriculum are U.S. Government institutions; the judicial system and the doctrine of judicial review; the role of the opposition in a two-party system; the role of the press, radio, and television in American life; the position of minority groups in the United States; the diversity of American society; agriculture; the economy; labor; and education.

GEOGRAPHICAL EMPHASIS

The Commission expressed concern over indications of a cutback in the exchange-of-persons program in Europe. The signs of such a trend are still in evidence, and the Commission reiterates its strong opposition to any such cutback.

Any slackening of educational and cultural efforts in Western Europe would be contrary to the interests of the United States. The relationship with other nations of the Atlantic community remains the cornerstone of American foreign policy. This was strongly affirmed by President Kennedy and has been reaffirmed by President Johnson.

For the foreseeable future Western Europe will be an economic and political power center of decisive significance. The maintenance of a broad base of understanding with the Western European nations will strengthen the capacity of the United States to meet its responsibilities and achieve its aims in other parts of the world.

Educational and cultural exchanges can play a vital role in maintaining that broad base of understanding. The mutuality of interest in these exchanges is clearly demonstrated by the initiation of joint financing arrangements with several Western European countries during the past 2 years and the prospect of more such agreements in the near future.

More than any other area, Western Europe offers the conditions under which educational and cultural exchanges can achieve their full potential both as an instrument of American policy and as a catalyst for intellectual discourse. In other areas, it is necessary to develop such activities step by step as the program base and absorptive capacity of the country is broadened. In Western Europe the reservoir of persons who can profit by an educational exchange experience is great and is constantly being replenished.

As for Americans who participate in exchange programs, they still favor Western Europe over any other foreign area. The number of candidates for grants in Western Europe is great in proportion to the number of openings, while difficulties are encountered in filling American grantee quotas in other areas. More than 50 percent of all funds for exchange-of-persons activities in Western Europe were used for grants to U.S. citizens. The sending of large numbers of educators, professors, and graduate students to study abroad in Western Europe has added a depth to their teaching of the liberal arts. For this reason, any decline in Western European programs would be a loss to American education.

Since economic assistance programs have long since been terminated in Europe, educational and cultural exchanges have an especially broad role to play. It is a very different role from that which we play in the developing nations. And it is a role that cannot be played adequately if undue emphasis is given to "public relations." Our programs with Western Europe must reflect a high degree of cultural and intellectual excellence and integrity. Ever since the inception of the Marshall plan, leftist and neutralist forces in Western Europe have sought to depict the United States as materialistic, self-seeking, shallow, and immature. And recently a new European chauvinism has come into being which provides fertile soil for those views. To the extent that the United States can demonstrate its intellectual vigor, mature scholarship, and scientific and cultural achievement, it can in some measure counterbalance such hostile propaganda. These aims can be accomplished by sending to Europe well-selected Americans who will exemplify the best in American life and scholarship and by enabling present and rising European leaders to acquire a first-hand, objective appreciation of American policies, motivations, and institutions.

In the light of these facts, the Commission wishes to reiterate its earlier concern and to make the following recommendations:

(1) That U.S. Government financial support of educational and cultural exchange programs with Western Europe be maintained at least at present levels.

(2) That the Department, in planning programs for Western Europe, seek to promote the mutual interest of the United States and Western European nations by developing cooperative schemes, including joint financing of programs.

(3) That program plans not lose sight of the long-range objectives stated in section 101 of the Fulbright-Hays Act (statement of purpose) and that they be geared to a high level of intellectual and cultural attainment.

IV. CULTURAL PRESENTATIONS

In the fall of 1962 Assistant Secretary Battle turned to the Commission for advice and counsel concerning the cultural presentations program. Mr. Roy E. Larsen, Vice Chairman of the Commission, and Mr. Glenn G. Wolfe, a Foreign Service officer, undertook a study of the program, and on December 17, 1962, their report, endorsed by the full Commission, was submitted. As Mr. Battle himself has said:¹

The report marked a decisive turning point in the program. First, it recognized, and sanctioned, the gradual emergence of the program from its original competitive character: when it was launched as the "President's Special Program" in 1954, it was in effect a response to the Soviet cultural offensive. After 8 years, it had matured enough to merit a higher and more difficult challenge. Messrs. Larsen and Wolfe suggested a new—and, I think, admirably expressed—statement of purpose * * * "to reflect abroad the state of the performing arts in America, both in terms of creative cultural vitality and the desire and capacity of a free people to support the development of a flourishing national culture."

The report recommended that the Department of State—
 resume responsibility for direct management of all phases of the cultural presentations program;
 revitalize and expand the role of the Advisory Committee on the Arts;
 establish a formal policy of long-range planning for the program;
 and
 increase importantly the public recognition given to those who participate in the program.

In line with the first recommendation above, the Department of State canceled its contract with the American National Theatre and Academy and resumed full responsibility for direct management of all phases of the program.

The Advisory Committee on the Arts has been reconstituted and is today a group of great professional distinction. (The names of current members appear in app. 2.) Among the Committee's early acts was to recommend to Mr. Battle the appointment of reconstituted panels of experts in drama, music, academic music (music groups from schools and universities), and the dance. (The names of these experts also appear in app. 3.)

The recommendation to engage in long-range planning has been worked out through close collaboration between the Advisory Committee and the State Department's Office of Cultural Presentations. Periodic meetings of the Advisory Committee with area specialists of the Department and of USIA enable the Committee to reach conclusions on the types of performing arts to be sent to each area of the world in the year or years ahead. Thus, the Committee advises as to whether a drama group, symphony orchestra, a university choral group, a modern dance group, or some other type of performing group should be sent to a certain part of the world. Later the panel

¹ Article in the Foreign Service Journal, February 1964, "Exporting the Performing Arts."

of experts nominate the particular group or individual to be sent and review the suitability of the proposed programs for the foreign audience concerned. The cultural presentations program has now been planned through June 30, 1966.

The problem of giving greater recognition to those who participate in the program remains to be worked out. The Department is aware of the disruptions in the schedules of important theatrical and musical groups when they are asked to go abroad for several months, and the interruption in the educational careers of some of the academic groups when they travel abroad. The willingness of performing artists to serve their country in this way is worthy of commendation, and the Commission reiterates its hope that some way may be found to give formal recognition to their contributions.

V. CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

In October 1963 Assistant Secretary Battle asked the Advisory Commission to make a study of the functions, program, and operation of the East-West Center (as it is usually called). Mr. Roy Larsen, Vice Chairman of the Commission, and Prof. James M. Davis, of the University of Michigan, undertook the study. Their report, endorsed by the Commission, was delivered to the Department of State on March 16, 1964.

While the report is full of praise for accomplishments to date in the Center's 3-year history it points out clearly that the Center will continue to face obstacles in the fulfillment of its goals unless rather basic changes are made.

NATIONAL REVIEW BOARD

The most important recommendation in the report is that the Center have an advisory and review body to be known as the National Review Board. The purpose would be to provide an instrumentality through which the *national* character of the Center (and the interest of the Federal Government in the Center) could receive formal expression. The status of the Center as a national institution has been clear from the time of its founding. The Federal Government provides the funds for the Center, and the Secretary of State is held accountable by Congress for seeing that those funds are responsibly used. The National Review Board would meet at least twice a year and would advise the Department on all aspects of policy in regard to the Center.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE UNIVERSITY

Even before the Center came into being there was lively debate as to what its relationship should be to the University of Hawaii. That debate has continued. Some have argued for complete separation of the two, some for complete integration, and others for a solution between the extremes. An earlier study of the Center by a committee under the chairmanship of Clark Kerr recommended that the Center be under the administrative responsibility of the president of the University of Hawaii. In its present report the Commission urges a return to the spirit and letter of the Kerr com-

mittee's recommendations, some of which seem to have been lost sight of in the recent past. Specifically, the Commission recommends that the present relationship between the East-West Center and the University of Hawaii be maintained and that the Chancellor of the East-West Center, although administratively under the president of the university, should have authority in matters directly concerning the Center and should be accountable for the Center's results.

PROGRAMS OF THE CENTER

As for the programs operated by the East-West Center, the Commission found much to commend. The Center's activities in student exchange constitute the largest program and the one that generates the most interest. During 1963 some 11,000 inquiries were received from Asia, resulting in 6,000 applications. Two hundred and five grants were made. More than 1,400 inquiries from the United States were screened to produce 103 grants. Most of these grants involve travel and study on the mainland as well as study at the University of Hawaii. The largest numbers of students are enrolled in tropical agriculture (54), Asian studies (37), and education (34). There is ample opportunity for these students to associate with the American students at the University of Hawaii.

The Center's Institute for Technical Interchange conducts non-degree programs of relatively short duration. The selection of persons to receive these grants emphasizes regional and institutional needs rather than individual needs. In the fiscal year 1962-63, there were 56 grants in education, 44 in tropical agriculture, 32 in public safety, 28 in public administration, 16 in industry, 12 in public health, 7 in labor, 6 in community development, and 13 in transportation.

Among other activities of the Center are a program of scholars-in-residence for mature persons of outstanding ability and achievement, a program of conferences and symposiums, a research translation program, and a publication program.

PROBLEMS OF ORGANIZATION

As it is presently organized the Center is made up of three major institutes (student interchange, technical interchange, and advanced projects). The Commission report raised a question as to whether this tripartite organizational structure was in the process of rigidifying, to the detriment of the Center as a whole. The report recommended establishment of the post of Deputy Chancellor to replace the present Vice Chancellor for Administration. The job of the Deputy Chancellor would be to centralize routine services for the three institutes without reducing their responsibility for the substantive side of their operations. The Deputy Chancellor would be responsible for the day-to-day operations, would supervise the total program, coordinate operating departments, and act for the Chancellor in his absence.

BUDGETARY PROBLEMS

The budgeting process for the East-West Center is perhaps its most complicated administrative problem. The earlier Kerr report said that "the Center is not to be considered a hasty short-term expedient but rather a long-term effort to build a program of lasting worth with appropriate Federal financial support." The Commission heartily

endorses this view and recommends that the Center's budgets be based on a plan of orderly growth. The Commission suggests that the level of stabilized operations would assume the completion of all Center buildings now in (or close to) the detailed planning stage and that in the future budgetary planning and budget requests by the East-West Center bear a close relationship to advance plans. As a corollary to this end the Commission believes that 3-year budget projections for the Center would work to its best interests. It was recommended that for the 3 years 1965-67 there be a total appropriation of approximately \$25,500,000 including \$4,300,000 for capital construction. By fiscal year 1970 the Federal Government's annual commitment for the Center's operation should be approximately \$10,500,000.

VI. OTHER ACTIVITIES

In its 2 years of existence, a great-part of the Commission's energies have been absorbed in producing the three major reports mentioned earlier ("A Beacon of Hope," the report on the cultural presentations program, and the report on the East-West Center). But these do not begin to exhaust the scope of the Commission's activities.

A member of the Commission, Walter Johnson, professor of history at the University of Chicago, prepared a report entitled "American Studies Abroad." The Commission has distributed 8,000 copies of the report to interested persons and organizations in the United States and abroad. In addition, Dr. Francis J. Colligan, director of the policy review and research staff of CU, sought and obtained specific reactions to the recommendations in the report from scholars here and abroad and has submitted an interim report.

As indicated earlier, the Commission has had a number of meetings with top officials of USIA, AID, and the Peace Corps. It is vitally important that the Commission be familiar with the efforts of every agency playing a major role in educational and cultural affairs, and it will continue to pursue this goal.

One activity that perhaps can never be adequately reflected in official reports is the never-ending effort of Commission members to keep themselves fully informed concerning the Nation's farflung ventures in educational and cultural exchange. In pursuit of this objective Commission members have traveled widely in all parts of the world. If they are traveling on Commission business they submit reports to the Commission in writing or orally, or both. Written reports are distributed within the Department, to other interested agencies, and to Foreign Service posts when relevant.

The Commission is now 2 years old, and its role is still evolving. In some measure, its future effectiveness will be determined by the extent to which it is used by Congress, by the executive branch, and by groups outside the Government. The Commission is prepared to undertake special studies of critically important problems in the exchange field. It is prepared to serve the interests of coordination, not only among Government agencies but between Government and private groups. And, perhaps most important, it is prepared to serve as a forum for discussion of the most pressing issues in the field of educational and cultural exchange. In line with this last function, we invite all agencies and groups, public or private, who are concerned with international educational and cultural exchange to regard the Commission as a resource.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1

MEMBERSHIP LIST OF GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL BOOK PROGRAMS

Curtis G. Benjamin, *chairman*, chairman of the board, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.
Jerome Hardy, publisher, *Life* magazine.
John Howe, assistant to the publisher, Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.
William Kelty, assistant general manager, Reader's Digest.
Freeman Lewis, executive vice president, Pocketbooks, Inc.
Andrew McNally III, president, Rand McNally & Co.
Harry R. Most, president, W. B. Saunders Co.
M. R. Robinson, president, Scholastic Book Services.
Franklin Watts, president, Franklin Watts, Inc.
W. Bradford Wiley, president, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
Thomas J. Wilson, director, Harvard University Press.

APPENDIX 2

MEMBERSHIP LIST OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE ARTS

Roy E. Larsen, *chairman*, executive committee, Time-Life, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Lew Christensen, president, San Francisco Ballet, San Francisco, Calif.
Oliver Rea, Jr., Tyrone Guthrie Theatre, Minneapolis, Minn.
George Szell, music director, Cleveland Orchestra, Cleveland, Ohio.
Dean Warner Lawson, School of Fine Arts, Howard University, Washington, D.C.
John Brownlee, director, Manhattan School of Music, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Peter Mennin, president, Juilliard School of Music, New York, N.Y.
George Seaton, director-producer, MGM Studios, Culver City, Calif.
Miss Nina Vance, Houston, Tex.
Theodore Roszak, New York, N.Y.

APPENDIX 3

MEMBERSHIP LIST OF PANELS OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON THE ARTS

DANCE PANEL

Miss Rosamond Gilder, *chairman*.
William Bales, chairman, Dance Department, Bennington College, Bennington, Vt.
Miss Ann Barzel, Chicago, Ill.
George Beiswanger, Philosophy Department, Georgia State College, Atlanta, Ga.
Miss Isadora Bennett, New York, N.Y.
William L. Christensen, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Miss Emily Coleman, New York, N.Y.
Mrs. Janet Reed Erskine, Barrytown, N.Y.
Hy R. Faine, executive secretary, American Guild of Musical Artists, New York, N.Y.
Miss Martha Hill Davies, chairman, Dance Department, Juilliard School of Music, New York, N.Y.
Mrs. Nancy Lasalle, New York, N.Y.
Miss Lillian Moore, New York, N.Y.
John Rosenfield, Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex.
Walter Terry, dance critic, New York Herald Tribune, New York, N.Y.

MUSIC PANEL

- Leopold Mannes,¹ *chairman*.
 Dr. Howard Hanson, director, Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester,
 Rochester, N. Y.
 Jay S. Harrison, senior editor and critic, Musical America, New York, N. Y.
 Edwin Hughes, executive secretary, National Music Council, New York, N. Y.
 Dr. Raymond Kendall, dean, School of Music, University of Southern California,
 Los Angeles, Calif.
 Arthur Loesser, Cleveland Heights, Ohio.
 John S. Wilson, Princeton, N. J.
 John Rosenfield, Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex.
 Mark Schubert, executive director, Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts,
 New York, N. Y.
 William Schuman, president, Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, New York,
 N. Y.
 Nicholas Slonimsky, Boston, Mass.
 Dr. Carleton Sprague Smith, New York, N. Y.
 Dr. Harold Spivacke, Chief, Music Division, Library of Congress, Washington,
 D. C.
 Dr. Marshall Stearns, president, Institute of Jazz Studies, New York, N. Y.
 Virgil Thomson, New York, N. Y.

DRAMA PANEL

- Miss Nan Martin, *chairman*, New York, N. Y.
 Robert Whitehead, vice chairman, New York, N. Y.
 Robert Dowling, New York, N. Y.
 Hal Holbrook, New York, N. Y.
 Edward Kook, New York, N. Y.
 Jerome Lawrence, Malibu, Calif.
 Kevin McCarthy, Beverly Hills, Calif.
 Joseph Mielziner, New York, N. Y.
 Dick Moore, New York, N. Y.
 Chester Morris, New York, N. Y.
 Donald Oenslager, New York, N. Y.
 Alan Schneider, Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y.
 Peggy Wood (Mrs. William Walling), New York, N. Y.

ACADEMIC MUSIC PANEL

- Dr. Raymond Kendall, *chairman*, dean, School of Music, University of Southern
 California, Los Angeles, Calif.
 Dean Orville J. Borchers, School of Music, Southern Methodist University,
 Dallas, Tex.
 Duane A. Branigan, director, School of Music, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
 Dean Thomas Gorton, School of Fine Arts, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
 Dr. Howard Hanson, director, Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester,
 Rochester, N. Y.
 Dr. Wayne S. Hertz, chairman, Department of Music, Central Washington State
 College, Ellensburg, Wash.
 Dr. Helen M. Hosmer, director, Crana Department of Music, State University
 Teachers College, Potsdam, N. Y.
 Dr. Wiley L. Housewright, professor of music education, Florida State University,
 Tallahassee, Fla.
 Dr. Warner Lawson, dean, School of Fine Arts, Howard University, Washington,
 D. C.
 Dr. William Revilli, conductor of bands, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor,
 Mich.
 Dr. Edwin Stein, dean of School of Fine and Applied Arts, Boston University.
 Dr. Louis G. Wersen, director of music education, School District of Philadelphia,
 Philadelphia, Pa.

¹ Deceased.