

**THIRD SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES**

LETTER

FROM THE

**CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE
DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

TRANSMITTING

**THE THIRD SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON THE EDUCA-
TIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED UNDER
THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCA-
TIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948 (PUBLIC LAW 402,
80TH CONG.) FROM JULY 1 TO DECEMBER 31, 1949**



**APRIL 18, 1950.—Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs
and ordered to be printed**

**UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1950**

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE,
Washington 25, D. C.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange submits herewith its third semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) from July 1 to December 31, 1949. The first report of this Commission was submitted to the Congress on February 4, 1949 (H. Doc. 56, 81st Cong., 1st sess.); the second, on December 29, 1949 (H. Doc. 431, 81st Cong., 2d sess.).

This report fulfills the requirements of section 603 of the above-mentioned act, which states that this statutory 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 purposes and objectives of this Act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations.

The membership of this Commission is as follows:

Harvie Branscomb, Chairman.

Mark Starr, Vice Chairman.

Harold Willis Dodds, member.

Edwin B. Fred, member.

Martin R. P. McGuire, member.

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

Very truly yours,

HARVIE BRANSCOMB,
*Chairman, United States Advisory Commission
on Educational Exchange.*

**THIRD SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES
ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE**

**TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE PERIOD JULY 1 TO DECEMBER 31, 1949**

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

**Educational
Cultural
Scientific
Technical**

**Submitted in accordance with the provisions of Section 603
Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress**

(The Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948)

v

CONTENTS

	Page
I. Bilateral programs of international exchange conducted or serviced by the Department of State.....	1
II. The Commission's relationship to the bilateral programs.....	1
III. General appraisal of the Department of State's work in connection with bilateral exchange programs.....	4
IV. Recommendations to the Secretary of State and action taken:	
Educational exchanges with Yugoslavia.....	5
The need for clarification of the basic objectives of the educational exchange program.....	5
The question of the establishment of new USIE offices in 1950....	7
Foreign opinion of the level of American cultural achievements...	8
Appendix I. Review of the educational exchange program in southern Europe and the Near East—Report by the Chairman of the Commission...	9
Appendix II. Letter of November 23, 1949, from the Acting Secretary of State to the Chairman concerning the role of the Commission.....	16

THIRD SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS OF THE COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

I. BILATERAL PROGRAMS OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE CONDUCTED OR SERVICED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

In addition to its support of cooperative international exchanges through the United Nations and its specialized agencies, the United States is conducting directly a number of programs of exchange on a country-to-country basis.

The Department of State has a major role of policy leadership and coordination with respect to all of these exchanges. In addition, the Department has other responsibilities ranging from the direct conduct of certain programs to assistance and facilitation of exchange programs of other Federal agencies. The Department also facilitates and assists the exchange projects of numerous private organizations.

Those bilateral Government exchange programs for which the Department of State has primary responsibility¹ include the following:

Program	Authorization
Program under the Buenos Aires Treaty (convention for the promotion of inter-American cultural relations): Provides for exchange of professors, teachers, and students, between the United States and 16 other American Republics.	Buenos Aires Treaty of Sept. 16, 1937.
Philippine rehabilitation program: Provides grants for Philippine citizens for training in the United States in scientific, technical, and public service fields.	Public Law 370, 79th Cong. (as amended by Public Law 832, 80th Cong.).
Program under the Fulbright Act: Provides for the exchange of students, teachers, professors, and research scholars between the United States and certain other countries (financed by foreign currencies obtained from the sale of surplus United States war materials).	Public Law 584, 79th Cong.
Institute of Inter-American Affairs program: Provides a United States agency to collaborate with countries of the American Republics in planning, financing, and executing special technical programs.	Public Law 369, 80th Cong. (as amended by Public Law 283, 81st Cong.).
Smith-Mundt program: Provides for a world-wide program of educational, cultural, scientific, and technical exchange of persons and materials between the United States and other cooperating nations.	Public Law 402, 80th Cong.
Program for exchanges with Finland: Provides for a program of exchange of persons, educational, scientific, and technical materials between the United States and Finland; to be financed by payments on World War I debts by Finland.	Public Law 265, 81st Cong.
Chinese student-aid program: Provides United States financial assistance to needy Chinese students in the United States.	Public Law 327, 81st Cong.
German educational exchange program: Provides for exchange of persons and materials with the western zone of occupied Germany.	Do.

II. THE COMMISSION'S RELATIONSHIPS TO THE BILATERAL PROGRAMS

The Commission on Educational Exchange was established by Public Law 402 for the purpose of formulating and recommending to the Secretary of State educational exchange policies and programs for carrying out the objectives of Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress, which are—

¹ Those educational exchange programs for which the Department of State is responsible under the terms of the governing laws or other instruments of authorization.

* * * to enable the Government of the United States to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries.

The educational exchange program which is carried out under the authority of Public Law 402 and for which the Commission has statutory responsibility is a world-wide Government-financed operation for the exchange of persons and materials, as well as for Government facilitation and stimulation of the exchange program of private organizations and agencies. The scope of Public Law 402 activities for fiscal year 1950 is shown in the following accompanying tables:

Table 1. Funds available for fiscal year 1950 by area of the world.

Table 2. A listing of diplomatic posts with USIE (United States Information and Educational Exchange) offices as of December 31, 1949.

In accordance with congressional intent as set forth in committee reports² the Commission has assumed the same general responsibility for the program of educational exchanges with Finland (conducted under Public Law 265, 81st Cong.) that it has for activities carried out under the authority of Public Law 402.

In addition to its responsibilities for the program conducted under Public Laws 402 and 265, the Commission has agreed, at the request of the Department of State, to act in an advisory capacity for all programs of international exchange, insofar as such programs contribute directly or indirectly to the objectives of Public Law 402. (See appendix II, p. 16.) In such capacity the Commission advises and assists the Secretary of State but has no authority over any of the "non-Public Laws 402 and 265" programs which include the Philippine rehabilitation program, the Chinese student-aid program, and other programs listed on page 1 of this report.

Therefore, the Commission's activities and reports will emphasize, but not be confined to, problems encountered in planning for and conducting educational exchanges financed from funds appropriated under the authority of Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress, and Public Law 265, Eighty-first Congress.

For 1950 the Commission plans to give consideration to the following major problems, which involve many of the Department's programs of international exchange:

A 5-year projection for the educational exchange program (policy and program plans).

United States educational resources for the Government's exchange programs (Point IV, the German program, Public Law 402, etc.).

The Commission's relationships with private organizations, including the appointment of specialized advisory committees under section 801 (6) of Public Law 402.

Orientation in United States institutions and way of life for all United States Government exchange programs.

Basic education in Point IV countries.

Educational exchange programs in special areas (Germany, Finland, Spain, etc.).

Evaluation of the Department's international exchange programs (development of criteria and techniques).

Foreign opinion of the level of American cultural achievements.

² H. Rept. No. 1195, Foreign Affairs Committee; S. Rept. No. 740, Foreign Relations Committee.

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES

TABLE I.—Scope of the world-wide educational exchange program conducted under the authority of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) (Smith-Mundt Act)

[Funds available in fiscal year 1950 as reported to the Commission by the Department of State on Apr. 1, 1950]

	Europe	Near East and Africa	Far East	American Republics	Total
1. Libraries, cultural centers, and related activities.....	\$461,586	\$208,992	\$311,226	\$703,158	\$1,684,962
2. Exchange of students, teachers, professors, and leaders, and related activities ¹	341,570	332,297	518,142	453,291	1,645,300
3. Scientific and technical cooperation.....	-----	440,173	116,560	2,081,647	3,238,380
Subtotal (program funds).....	803,156	981,462	945,928	3,838,096	6,568,642
4. Department of State domestic administration and servicing, and facilitation of private programs ²	-----	-----	-----	-----	1,718,832
Total, Smith-Mundt program.....	803,156	981,462	945,928	3,838,096	8,287,474

¹ Includes funds for exchange of students under the Buenos Aires Treaty.

² Covers cost of domestic operations, including professional and technical services; screening, placement, and guidance of foreign grantees; orientation services; services to private and Government programs; and cost of direct management and administration.

NOTE.—The figures shown do not include the cost of operating overseas missions, such as salaries of American and local employees, rent and utilities, travel, representation and living allowances, etc.

TABLE II.—Listing of diplomatic posts with USIE offices (information and educational exchange activities were carried on at overseas posts as of Dec. 31, 1949) (Public Law 402, 80th Cong. funds)

EUROPE (INCLUDING BRITISH COMMONWEALTH)

Austria (Vienna)	Norway (Oslo)
Belgium (Brussels)	Poland (Warsaw)
Bulgaria (Sofia) ¹	Portugal (Lisbon)
Czechoslovakia (Praha, Bratislava)	Rumania (Bucharest)
Denmark (Copenhagen)	Spain (Madrid, Barcelona, Seville, Bilbao)
Finland (Helsinki)	Sweden (Stockholm)
France (Paris, Lyon, Lille, Strasbourg, Bordeaux, Marseille)	Switzerland (Bern)
Algeria (Algiers)	Trieste (Trieste)
Great Britain (London, Glasgow)	U. S. S. R. (Moscow)
Hungary (Budapest)	Yugoslavia (Belgrade)
Iceland (Reykjavik)	Australia (Sydney, Melbourne)
Italy (Rome, Milan, Naples, Palermo, Turin, Florence, Bologna, Genoa)	New Zealand (Wellington)
Netherlands (The Hague)	Union of South Africa (Pretoria, Johannesburg)

NEAR EAST AND AFRICA

Afghanistan (Kabul)	Kenya (Nairobi)
Angola (Luanda)	Lebanon (Beirut)
Belgian Congo (Leopoldville)	Liberia (Monrovia)
Burma (Rangoon)	Libya (Tripoli)
Ceylon (Colombo)	Morocco (Tangier)
Cyprus (Nicosia)	Mozambique (Lorenco Marques)
Egypt (Cairo, Alexandria)	Nigeria (Lagos)
Ethiopia (Addis Ababa)	Pakistan (Karachi, Lahore)
French Morocco (Casablanca)	Syria (Damascus)
Gold Coast (Accra)	Saudi Arabia (Jidda)
Greece (Athens, Salonika, Patras)	Tanganyika (Dar-es-Salaam)
India (New Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta, Madras)	Tunisia (Tunis)
Iran (Tehran)	Turkey (Ankara, Istanbul, Izmir)
Iraq (Baghdad)	Aden (Aden)
Israel (Tel Aviv)	French West Africa (Dakar)

¹ USIE operations closed since December 31, 1950.

TABLE II.—*Listing of diplomatic posts with USIE offices (information and educational exchange activities were carried on at overseas posts as of Dec. 31, 1949) (Public Law 402, 80th Cong. funds)*—Continued

FAR EAST	
China (Hong Kong, Taipei)	French Indochina (Saigon, Hanoi)
Indonesia (Djarkarta, Surabaya, Medan)	British Malaya (Singapore, Kuala Lumpur)
Thailand (Bangkok)	Philippines (Manila, Cebu, Davao, Iloilo)
Korea (Seoul, Pusan, Chunchon, Koo-song, Inchon, Taejon, Chonju, Kwangju)	
AMERICAN REPUBLICS	
Argentina (Buenos Aires, Rosario, Mendoza, La Plata, Tucuman)	Ecuador (Quito, Guayaquil)
Bolivia (La Paz)	El Salvador (San Salvador)
Brazil (Rio de Janeiro, Bahia, Porto Alegre, Recife, Sao Paulo, Belem, Fortaleza, Victoria)	Guatemala (Guatemala City)
Chile (Santiago, Concepcion)	Haiti (Port-au-Prince)
Colombia (Bogota, Medellin, Barranquilla, Cali)	Honduras (Tegucigalpa)
Costa Rica (San Jose)	Mexico (Mexico City, Guadalajara, Monterrey)
Cuba (Habana, Santiago de Cuba, Camaguey)	Nicaragua (Managua)
Dominican Republic (Ciudad Trujillo)	Panama (Panama City)
	Paraguay (Asuncion)
	Peru (Lima)
	Uruguay (Montevideo)
	Venezuela (Caracas)

Summary, Dec. 31, 1949

Area	Countries	Posts
Europe.....	26	45
Near East and Africa.....	30	39
Far East.....	7	22
American Republics.....	20	40
Total.....	83	146

III. GENERAL APPRAISAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE'S WORK IN CONNECTION WITH BILATERAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Because of the instability of the postwar period and changing conditions in all areas of the world, numerous difficulties are encountered in the conduct of Government-supported bilateral exchange programs.

The Commission also wishes to call attention to the very complex relationships which the Department must maintain with individuals and organizations in order to conduct the various programs effectively and carry out the intent of Congress. Such relationships are necessary in order to insure proper and careful selection of Americans and foreign nationals being exchanged under private and Government programs. The Department has found it necessary and desirable to maintain active contacts with more than 800 colleges and universities in all States and Territories of the United States and with more than 600 private organizations throughout this country. In addition, the Department must give direction and assistance to 16 binational educational commissions established in as many countries under the terms of the Fulbright Act. The Department also cooperates actively with various committees on study and training which have been established in other countries to participate in the selection of foreign nationals

who come to the United States for study and training under private and Government auspices.

Because these exchange programs conducted by the Department are administered by people and deal with people, the human element is involved. This means that there may be mistakes of judgment, delays, and other instances where exchange projects are not handled to the complete satisfaction of all concerned. The Commission considers, however, that the Department, in cooperation with private agencies, is progressively solving many of the problems involved.

The Commission's appraisal of the Department's conduct of the various exchange programs is based on its observations over a period of approximately 2 years, as well as the review by the Chairman of the educational exchange operations in Italy, Egypt, Greece, Yugoslavia, Switzerland, France, and Spain. His comments on the existing program are attached for the information of the Congress in appendix I (p. 9).

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND ACTION TAKEN

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES WITH YUGOSLAVIA

The following is the text of the Commission's recommendations of December 12, 1949, to the Secretary of State:

On October 19, 1949, the Commission on Educational Exchange recommended *inter alia* that the United States not engage in any Government supported programs of educational exchange with the countries of eastern Europe until their governments give evidence of a desire to cooperate in the mutually helpful and friendly spirit required by the Smith-Mundt Act (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.).

It now appears that Yugoslavia is desirous of establishing on a basis of reciprocity and friendship such exchange relationships. The Commission on Educational Exchange therefore recommends that the Secretary of State:

(1) Take steps to initiate selected projects of educational exchange between the United States and Yugoslavia with appropriate screening, selection, and other procedures to safeguard the national security.

(2) Facilitate and continue such exchanges on a reciprocal basis satisfactory to the Department of State provided that, and so long as, the Government of Yugoslavia gives evidence of its desire to cooperate with the United States in this matter in the friendly spirit of the Smith-Mundt Act.

On February 1, 1950, the Under Secretary of State acknowledged the receipt of this recommendation and informed the Commission that the proposal is being considered by the United States Embassy in Belgrade.

THE NEED FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE BASIC OBJECTIVES OF THE EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

On March 31, 1950, the Commission submitted, in its report to the Secretary, covering the period October 1 to December 31, 1949, the following recommendations concerning the basic objections of the educational exchange program:

Basic to all considerations of the educational exchange program is the question of objectives. There is need for the Department of State to develop a sharper definition and to insure a clearer understanding of the objectives. It is recommended that this be done and that the Commission's views, given below, be taken into consideration. We shall appreciate the Department's comments on these views.

Four different interpretations of the purposes of the program were encountered by the Chairman of the Commission during his visit last summer to southern Europe and certain countries of the Near East and African area. While not necessarily contradictory, they result in divergence of interest and emphasis on the part of those responsible for administering the program. Some of these differences of opinion are also encountered in Washington.

According to one view the purpose of this program is to transplant American methods and techniques to other countries, to "Americanize" them, in fact, as one representative stated it. A second view is that its purpose is to acquaint other nations with the accomplishments of the United States in the fields of scholarship and the fine arts in order to impress them with our cultural achievements. A third view is formulated in altruistic terms: This program is to help other countries meet their problems of education and should be guided, therefore, by local needs. A fourth view sees the educational exchange program as a special form of the information program of the State Department. It would weigh each undertaking only in terms of its immediate impact, as well as our foreign policy objectives in a particular country at the time.

It is important that these differences of view be resolved, not only from the standpoint of the administration of the program, but also from the standpoint of public understanding and support of it.

The broad purpose of this program has been stated in Public Law 402 of the Eightieth Congress, the Smith-Mundt Act. In the words of the act, its purpose is "to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries." This general statement, however, can be broken down into several more specific ones.

In the first place, a program of educational and cultural exchange certainly includes making other nations aware of United States resources in technology and economics, but also of American social organizations, cultural activities, and moral strength. The ignorance about us even in countries with which we have had many contacts is often astonishing. "Is it true," asked a Yugoslav last summer, "that in the United States even the workers have automobiles?" Knowledge of the resources of the United States will lead to increasing use of her goods and products, contacts with her institutions, and a growing awareness of the values to be gained by friendly relationships and mutual cooperation.

Secondly, and more important, is the task of providing an understanding of the character and motives of the United States and confidence in her purposes. This is of the first importance. It cannot be achieved by declarations of the purity of our motives, nor can it be bought with gifts. It can only be secured by enabling other peoples to know our country and our people, our democratic processes, our political principles, our problems, and our ideals, and letting them judge for themselves. Confidence, in other words, must come from personal contacts and knowledge. Its opposite is suspicion, which is the product of ignorance and uncertainty.

In the third place, it must be kept in mind that educational and cultural exchanges, in addition to creating understanding and confidence, have values of their own in that they are mutually beneficial to all who take part in them. It would be a mistake to conceive of the educational exchange program solely in terms of what others may learn about us. It is a two-way street. The United States stands for a world which exchanges freely not only its goods but also its ideas, and it will profit along with other nations in the development of that kind of a world.

If these are the basic objectives of the educational exchange program, certain consequences follow.

In the first place, few undertakings could more effectively support and forward the foreign policies of the United States. It will do this, not by propaganda for specific objectives, but rather by bringing about growing understanding of American life, confidence in this country's broad objectives, and a desire to be associated with her in working toward these ends. These are the indispensable conditions for continuing cooperation between free and democratic peoples. A second consequence is that the emphasis will vary as countries differ in their development. While all these purposes will always be present, the emphasis in countries out of touch with the United States and strongly influenced by nations closer to them might fall upon providing a knowledge of our national resources. Yugoslavia is a case in point. On the other hand, with a country like Great Britain, which has many relationships with the United States and a highly developed culture, the emphasis will fall on the objectives of the American people, the ways in which our social and political institutions function, and the mutual advantages of cultural exchanges.

A third consequence of the principles set forth is that this educational exchange program is not a program of beneficent educational paternalism. Its task is not to assume the educational obligations of other countries. To be sure, the objectives of understanding and of assistance will often overlap. One can go further and say that understanding with another people can perhaps be achieved best by contacts and associations in areas of their special needs and interests. The guiding principles, however, need to be kept clear, otherwise we shall find ourselves assuming obligations which are not properly ours, and in the end arousing resentment for interfering in purely internal affairs. Closely associated with this is another half-truth, namely, that the object of the program of educational exchange is to make friends for the United States. Obviously that is a desideratum of all parts of our foreign policy, and it can reasonably be expected to be furthered by this program. There is, however, no short cut to genuine friendship. Like happiness, it is a byproduct of other things. The friendly attitude, which the United States desires and reciprocates, will be a result of our genuine desire to know other peoples and have them know us and to be associated with them in activities of common concern.

The educational exchange program is not an effort to "Americanize" other nations. Such a policy could be successful only until it were found out. The program is reciprocal in character, as the Congress wrote into the provisions of the Smith-Mundt Act.

The tendency of some individuals to define educational and cultural relations in terms of academic undertakings and fine arts has been referred to above. If the broad objective is understanding between the peoples of these countries and of the United States, the program cannot be confined to these areas. It must be concerned with whatever are the significant forces and movements which can interpret the United States to other peoples. The American system of public schools and free libraries, the organization of the typical American home with its lack of servants and its use of labor-saving devices, the great philanthropic record of the American people—these and many other aspects of our social and cultural life have their place in any interpretation of America. But having said this, one must go on to say that the arts have their place also in this program, if a way can be found to deal wisely with them.

A broad program of the sort which has been outlined is of obvious importance and value to the United States. As a great world power, we will continue to be the object of constant criticism and judgment. For a number of reasons—the Communist journals being only one of the factors—we are not getting a good press in Europe as a whole. Direct contact with American life and American thought is the best corrective of misinformation, misunderstanding, and suspicion. Europe is sick of propaganda. We have the opportunity of providing something better. Even in countries where political relationships with this country are strained, there is a widespread popular desire to know more about the United States and our way of life. Probably no nation in history ever had so receptive a field for the establishment of ties of a nonpolitical character with other peoples. It is the unanimous opinion of this Commission that an educational exchange program with other countries will yield immediate and lasting benefits to this country and to the achievement of world peace.

We believe the clarification of aims and objectives is one of the most important responsibilities of the officers in charge of this program, and we urge that steps be taken to achieve this.

There has been insufficient time for the Department to act upon this recommendation concerning the basic objectives of the program.

THE QUESTION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW USIE³ OFFICES IN 1950

On November 23, 1949, the Department of State informed the Commission that provision had been made for the opening of 12 new USIE offices at diplomatic posts during 1950 in selected cities in Europe, the Near East, and the Far East, but that plans were subject to revision in the light of rapidly changing conditions in eastern Europe and the Far East.

³ Programs under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.).

After a great deal of consideration of this plan, in the light of its study of the basic objectives of the program, the Commission recommended to the Secretary of State in its quarterly report for the period October 1 to December 31, 1949, that the Department not engage in a program of general expansion until certain fundamental questions now under consideration by the Department and the Commission have been settled. These questions relate to whether this program should be realigned so that it is carried out on a larger, more effective scale in a few countries or be continued with the current, or greater, geographic coverage. Other questions deal with what activities will prove most efficient in the long run in achieving the ends which are sought.

The above recommendation as well as others contained in the Commission's report to the Secretary were submitted on March 31, 1950; hence there has been insufficient time for the Department to submit to the Commission a formal report of action taken.

The Commission has been informed by responsible officers of the Department, however, that the Department is acting on the basis of the considerations stated in the above recommendation. These considerations are still under active discussion both by the Commission and within the Department and the Commission will report further on this matter to the Congress.

FOREIGN OPINION OF THE LEVEL OF AMERICAN CULTURAL ACHIEVEMENTS

On March 31, 1950, the Commission recommended to the Secretary in its report for the period October 1 to December 31, 1949, that, pending a complete study of the above-mentioned problem, grants be made to key individuals in the fine-arts field. Excerpts from the text of this recommendation follow:

Among the prejudices concerning the United States to be found in other countries, one of the most firmly established is the view that this country is mechanical-minded, materialistic, and essentially "uncultured". This, like any belief which tends to undermine other nations' respect for this country, is of interest to both the Department and the Commission * * *

The Commission has felt, particularly in the light of communications from some of our overseas missions, that this problem should not be ignored. It recognizes the many difficulties involved in a fine-arts program designed to convince other peoples by a series of exhibits, concerts, and other activities of American achievements in the fine-arts fields. It has asked the Department of State to make studies of the problem. Meanwhile, it recommends that in those countries where this prejudice is particularly strong or is felt to be of special importance, grants be made under the category of leaders and specialists to key individuals in the fine-arts fields to visit the United States. These individuals would then be able to study developments in their respective fields and to determine whether or not the criticisms are justified.

There has been insufficient time for the Department to act upon this recommendation.

APPENDIX I

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE COVERING HIS TRIP TO COUNTRIES OF SOUTHERN EUROPE AND THE NEAR EAST IN THE SUMMER OF 1949

A broad program of educational exchange is of obvious importance and value to the United States. As a great world power, we will continue to be the object of constant criticism and judgment.

For a number of reasons—the Communist journals being only one of the factors—we are not getting a good press in Europe as a whole. Direct contact with American life and American thought is the best corrective of misinformation, misunderstanding, and suspicion. Europe is sick of propaganda. We have the opportunity of providing something better. Even in countries where political relationships with this country are strained, there is a widespread popular desire to know more about the United States and our way of life. Probably no nation in history ever had so receptive a field for the establishment of ties of a nonpolitical character with other peoples. It is the unanimous opinion of those consulted in the countries visited that an educational exchange program with these countries is desirable and will yield immediate and lasting benefits.

By what activities or programs can such an objective best be achieved in the countries of western and southern Europe and the Near East? Up to the present we have had no organized educational program in these countries except the maintenance of libraries of American books. It was this problem which I was asked to study especially. Of the many activities which might be undertaken, which ones give the greatest promise of effecting understanding and facilitating international cooperation?

Several general principles should be put down first. In the first place, one has only to visit the countries involved in this study to realize that their conditions and problems are so different that no hard and fast program can be set up in Washington and administered without modification in the various countries. There is much to be said for the view that our representatives abroad are assigned to achieve certain objectives, not to carry out a program. Certainly there is every reason for encouraging these representatives in the field to use their own judgment and initiative in carrying out their work. The Department does this. Probably more can be done, however, in support of projects originating in the countries themselves, some of which might prove so useful as to be taken up into the general program. A second general principle is that the program as a whole should be directed at those who are, or are likely to be, influential in their respective countries. At best we shall never reach more than a fraction of the population of a country except in a most superficial way. An economical

choice of means, therefore, would be those likely to reach, not the greatest number, but the more influential. A third general consideration is that it would seem to be wiser to formulate a general program, limited to a few undertakings of significance, than to undertake many activities of lesser importance. More important, however, than any of these statements is the fact that this program is only in its beginning and that we really do not know the most effective means for bringing about understanding and respect between peoples. This is the most important problem which administrators of this program face, and answers to it can be reached only after careful studies in evaluation and much further experimentation. In the meanwhile, and as part of this process of evaluation and improvement, the following are recommended. They are the procedures which in our experience thus far seem to be the most effective.

At the head of the list of recommended activities stands the exchange of persons between these countries and the United States. This is the judgment of all consulted. The individual who comes to the United States, and, in reverse, the citizen of our country who goes abroad, speaks thereafter from his own knowledge and convictions. He is likely to establish friendships and professional contacts which will continue for perhaps his lifetime the influence of his visit. Again and again it has been demonstrated that our best ambassadors abroad are those individuals who have had a useful and happy experience in this country.

This exchange of persons should be of two kinds. Student scholarships have demonstrated their value from the standpoint of international understanding. The scholarships, so far as any Government funds may be concerned, should be limited to graduate students. These advanced students, if carefully selected, will be better prepared to take advantage of their opportunity, will be far enough along in their preparation to be marked young men with assured careers ahead of them, and upon their return will proceed, in most instances without loss of time, to positions of influence, if not of prominence. In Egypt, to take a single example, one is struck by the number of young men occupying positions, secondary in rank but of real importance both in the universities and in government posts, who have studied in the United States in recent years. The second type of exchanges recommended is that of adult leaders and specialists responsible for the direction of important activities in their countries. The grants to these latter should enable them to visit the United States for periods of from 6 weeks to 3 months to study American institutions and methods in their respective fields. These would include journalists, engineers, labor leaders, medical leaders, artists, and others. The Greek Government is now considering the establishment of a number of vocational schools for young Greeks. They would like to have the officials responsible study how such schools are organized and administered in the United States. Spain at the moment is expanding its hydroelectric output and would like to have some of their experts study American distribution systems. In Italy the director of a well-known orchestra would like to study certain American techniques in this field, a recognition of American music which would be highly valuable. All such exchanges would establish mutually valuable relationships between this country and others.

In those countries which have signed Fulbright agreements, the Fulbright grants will provide the base for any program for the exchange of persons. The educational exchange program will not, of course, duplicate these scholarships. Supplementation is necessary, however, in two respects. In the first place, the Fulbright awards are not usable for specialists and leaders except in special cases. The opportunities in this field which repeatedly offer themselves are too useful to be neglected. The second addition to the Fulbright program which is acutely needed is dollars for foreign graduate students given Fulbright awards for study in this country. The Fulbright funds are all in foreign currencies and cannot be transferred to this country. The result is that under this program American students going abroad can be financed, but only the transportation costs of individuals coming to our shores can be paid. As a result, Government officials said to me repeatedly this summer, "The Fulbright program is a one-way street." Yet it is even more to our interest to have young Frenchmen, Italians, Greeks, and others coming to our universities and learning about the United States than to have our nationals study abroad.

In the ECA countries a number of study or travel grants are currently being supplied by that agency. In France alone, for example, more than a thousand such grants are anticipated for the current fiscal year. The Greek Mission has projected for 1949-50 some 75 grants for civilians to come to the United States. These agencies see clearly the value of providing training opportunities in the United States for young people who give promise of being the future leaders of these countries. The occupation authorities in Germany also have provided funds for a large number of student scholarships. This undertaking is not an academic theory or conceit. It is a tested and realistic means for securing continuing cooperation between peoples of different minds and languages. What is needed is a stable, carefully planned, and limited program rather than a temporary, emergency effort in this respect.

A second activity generally recommended is that the United States libraries maintained in each of the countries be continued and their service improved. These libraries are difficult to appraise on a statistical basis. In the countries visited they contain from 3,500 to 12,500 volumes. Readers number from 200 per day upward. Each main American library visited has from one to four subordinate book collections in cities other than the capital. The largest group of readers in most of these libraries is comprised of university students. The number of American readers in the libraries was never found to exceed 20 percent. Usually it was less. The recommendation of these libraries is based on several considerations taken together. In the first place, the student use of the libraries supplements and expands the student-scholarship program, which at best will always be sharply limited in numbers. If small book collections, easily available in contrast to most European libraries, can succeed in directing the attention of these future leaders to the vigor and distinction of American science and scholarship at so small a cost per reader, the undertaking would seem to be worth while. In the second place, there are many incidents which suggest that the libraries are indispensable in each country as a source of accurate information about the United

States. Recently in Paris a Communist paper seized upon a statement in an American publication that 9,000 volumes had been published in this country during the previous year. It printed the figure, contrasted it with the figure of 25,000 volumes in France, and commented on American lack of interest in reading. The article was called to the attention of the American librarian who looked up the figures, showed that the 9,000 figure was for a special type of publication, and that the comparable figures for France and the United States were 25,000 and 45,000. The demonstration was so clear that the Communist paper published a correction—in small print, to be sure. The third consideration is that the libraries render so many different kinds of service that were they discontinued, some substitutes would probably have to be devised for them. They provide our own embassy officials with materials they need. They serve as outlets for the distribution of pamphlets sent out by a number of Government offices. In ECA countries they are consulted by importers wishing to see trade lists of American firms. The librarians answer large numbers of reference questions concerning the United States. They supply music scores to directors of orchestras, thus aiding the introduction of American music. These and other activities are in addition to the supply of books to individual readers.

The libraries, however, need to give attention to the question of their scope and future development. The very fact that they render so many different services and in so many fields of knowledge, means that they will inevitably outgrow their quarters and budgets unless some proper principle of limitation is established and adhered to. The best solution seems to be that the libraries be defined as current collections, and that books more than 10 years old be withdrawn and donated to a local university or other library. To this policy there would be two exceptions. A selected list of American literary classics numbering 250 titles has been prepared and sent out to the libraries. This list might be expanded by a proper advisory library committee and the titles so approved retained without reference to their date of publication. The same procedure might be followed in the field of American history and political thought. Such a definition of the libraries as current collections, with the addition of what might be called the American classics, will enable them to remain fresh and useful without at the same time becoming annually more and more expensive. On the other hand, most of the libraries need additional staff for their reference and administrative work. Two trained librarians in each major library would seem to be the minimum for effective service and guidance.

The third general recommendation is that the showing of documentary films descriptive of American life continue to be regarded as one of the more useful instruments of the educational program. The interest in these films is great. They are exhibited in our own offices, but their greatest usefulness is through schools, clubs, and other local organizations. Their distribution seems limited chiefly by the lack of projectors available in schools and elsewhere. In Italy, for example, in May of this year, the number of individuals who reviewed the films supplied by the Department of State totaled more than 900,000. The films however can be improved. Our representatives urge that a better balance be secured between the technological and other phases of American life. Aside from this the chief criticism

seems to be the lack of sufficient range in the type of films prepared to permit selection in the various countries appropriate to the conditions. The same film can rarely be equably usable in Salonika and in Paris. Closely related to the film program, and logically an extension of it, is the preparation and distribution of photographic exhibits of life in America. In Yugoslavia, for example, where the showing of documentary films was virtually prohibited, the Belgrade office made most effective use of exhibits of enlarged photographs. Before the windows and in the hall displaying these exhibits, a group of attentive Yugoslavs was always to be seen. In countries where the illiteracy rate is high, the photographs, like the films, offer a mass approach to the people. In more developed countries the exhibits are popular for school use. While the photographic exhibits are, in the writer's view, of less importance on the whole than other undertakings, they are impressively useful in certain situations.

A fourth major activity which is recommended has not been a major element of our previous program in Latin America, and as yet there is no fixed pattern for its execution. It is desirable that we render such assistance as we can to several types of educational work in foreign countries which deal with the United States. The logic behind this is obvious: What is said about the United States by the teachers and scholars of a country is more effective than what is said about it by its own official representatives.

In virtually all the countries of western Europe, English is taught in the secondary schools, usually on a voluntary basis. In Switzerland, for example, a choice is given the student between English and Russian; in many schools of Spain it is still a choice between English and German. The teachers of these English classes have a special professional interest in the United States, but they have little material to work with. Officials of our Paris office have, with the approval of the French authorities, conducted three conferences for these teachers, each of 2 or 3 days' duration. These conferences held in Marseilles, Strasbourg, and Paris were well attended and those present were keenly interested. The program dealt with general aspects of the United States, such as its school system, and its sports and recreation, not with problems of pedagogy. The teachers reported a need for maps of the United States and for brief accounts of American history and literature, which they could use to make their classes more interesting. Such classes would be natural outlets for our films also. A program of consultation with, and assistance of an educational character to these teachers of thousands of students is of obvious value.

On the level of the universities a similar opportunity exists. Continental universities have not devoted much attention to the American scene—American literature being treated as a part of English literature and American history as a part of modern western history—but the interest in American subjects is growing. There are various ways in which this growing interest can be supported. Travel and study grants to faculty members interested in the United States should have high priority. In a number of universities American lecturers on special subjects will be welcomed. In Fulbright countries this can be supplied by means of the Fulbright teaching awards, elsewhere by grants under the Smith-Mundt Act. This growing university interest can be illustrated by the recent establishment of a chair of American law in an important French university, and by recent developments in other countries.

In the Near East this support of educational activities dealing with the United States takes a different form. No one who has traveled in that region can fail to discover the great influence of a number of American schools, of which Robert College in Istanbul and the American University of Beirut are well-known examples. These schools draw students from the leading families in their respective countries. They are nonsectarian in control. Instruction in the lower grades is the native language; in the upper years, in English. Almost half of the instructors are American teachers. At one time half the cabinets of four Arab States were graduates of Beirut University. I was told by one of the leaders of the Greek underground during the war that a striking number of the key individuals in that movement had formerly been students in the American College in Athens. If these schools should cease their work, American influence in the Near East would be immeasurably weakened. There are several ways by which these schools can be assisted. At present it is being done chiefly by Fulbright awards by which nationals in each country are enabled to study in these schools, and by assignment of American Fulbright teaching fellows to them. Support of the schools in this region which meet the criteria laid down by the Department should, in my judgment, continue as a part of our educational exchange program.

SUMMARY

The above statements outline an educational exchange program which is not elaborate but which would have, it is believed, significant results. It consists of four main projects: (a) Bringing to the United States for study or observation in their special fields students on the threshold of successful public careers, and influential adult leaders; (b) maintenance in European countries of library collections of the best current American thought; (c) presentation of important phases of American life through carefully prepared documentary films and exhibits; and (d) assistance to those engaged in educational programs abroad which deal with the United States. As stated above, the usefulness of each of these instruments will vary according to the cultural and other conditions of each country. In addition to these four general programs there will be, of course, other undertakings of special value in particular countries.

Two lines of activity which have been carried on in Latin America need to be studied carefully before general adoption in Europe. One of these is the organization and instruction of classes in English. In Europe so much English is spoken and the tourists supply such incentives for its study that it would seem unnecessary for the Government to enter into this fathomless sea. Additional argument is that English, as remarked above, is taught as an elective in most of the better secondary schools, and that the British Council also offers courses in the language in virtually every city in which we would consider organizing them.

The second technique employed in South America concerning which the writer urges caution in adoption for Europe is that of the cultural institute. This follows largely from the above, since the cultural institutes are usually built around classes for the teaching of English, and provide additional lectures, music programs, and social events.

Such institutes should be well done if undertaken by our Government. The greater distance of the United States places us at a disadvantage in providing exhibits and programs, as compared with Britain or France. A formally organized institute will impose a heavy burden of housing and management. Occasional lectures and programs which are desired can be provided in connection with the American libraries without the necessity of establishing formal institutes. Special circumstances would modify this recommendation. A well-organized local group willing to serve as sponsors, the availability without additional costs of a considerable number of American lecturers and artists, and the offer of support by private agencies, might make such an undertaking practical and no great additional burden upon our staff.

APPENDIX II

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 23, 1949.

HARVIE BRANSCOMB, Ph. D.,
*Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational
Exchange, Department of State, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR DR. BRANSCOMB: It was a great pleasure for me to talk with you on November 10 about the work of the Advisory Commission of which you are chairman.

In your letter to me and in our discussion, you raised certain questions which you feel should be settled before the Commission can make its plans for the coming year. May I repeat what I said to you, that the Secretary and the Department as a whole wish to look to the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for advice on all international exchange policies and programs of the Department, not only those concerned with the educational exchange services authorized by Public Law 402, but also those relating to other departmental programs which contribute to the fulfillment of the objectives of Public Law 402. As you know, all of the Department's international exchange programs are related either directly or indirectly to Public Law 402 objectives of increasing understanding of America abroad and of insuring better understanding between the people of the United States and those of other countries.

I also want to confirm my statement to you that the Department will take immediate steps to devise the best means by which your Commission may be kept fully informed as to developing policies and programs in the Department in which the Commission should have an interest. Steps will also be taken to insure that the problems presented to you will be those upon which you can bring to bear your experience in private life. I assure you that your Commission will receive full cooperation from all officers in the Department in obtaining information and assistance necessary to your work.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that the Secretary and the Department attach great importance to the work of your Commission. We are convinced that the effective conduct of foreign relations must depend upon the active and continued interest of all our citizens and particularly upon the sound judgment of experienced members of public advisory groups such as those on your Commission.

I was very glad to have the opportunity of talking with you on problems which are our mutual concern as I am anxious to do everything possible to make our educational exchange activities an even more significant part of the conduct of our foreign policy.

Please do not hesitate to call on me whenever you think I can be of assistance.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB, *Acting Secretary.*