

**EXCHANGE PROGRAMS AND
THE NATIONAL INTEREST**

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SEPTEMBER 14, 2000

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/senate>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

69-748 CC

WASHINGTON : 2001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JESSE HELMS, North Carolina, *Chairman*

RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana	JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware
CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska	PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland
GORDON H. SMITH, Oregon	CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
ROD GRAMS, Minnesota	JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts
SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas	RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin
CRAIG THOMAS, Wyoming	PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
JOHN ASHCROFT, Missouri	BARBARA BOXER, California
BILL FRIST, Tennessee	ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey
LINCOLN D. CHAFEE, Rhode Island	

STEPHEN E. BIEGUN, *Staff Director*
EDWIN K. HALL, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

ROD GRAMS, Minnesota, *Chairman*

JESSE HELMS, North Carolina	BARBARA BOXER, California
SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas	JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts
BILL FRIST, Tennessee	RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin

CONTENTS

	Page
Bader, Hon. William B., Assistant Secretary, Bureau for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, Washington, DC	2
Prepared statement	5
Responses to additional questions submitted for the record	8
Byrne, Carol Engebretson, Executive Director, Minnesota International Center, Minneapolis, MN	33
Prepared statement	36
Denton, James S., Executive Director, Freedom House, Washington, DC	19
Prepared statement	24
Johnson, Marlene M., Executive Director and Chief Executive Officer, NAFSA: Association of International Educators, and Chairman of the Board of Directors, Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Washington, DC	27
Prepared statement and additional material submitted for the record	45
Mueller, Sherry L., Executive Director, National Council for International Visitors, Washington, DC	31

EXCHANGE PROGRAMS AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2000

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:07 a.m. in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Rod Grams presiding.

Present: Senators Grams and Sarbanes.

Senator GRAMS. Good morning. I would like to bring this hearing to order. Thank you all very much for being here this morning. I am looking forward to the testimony of our witnesses and also, of course, to your answers.

Good morning, Assistant Secretary Bader. I want to thank you all, and all of our witnesses, as I mentioned, on the second panel for attending this hearing on Exchange Programs and the National Interest. I hope that you are going to forgive me if I extend a special welcome to my fellow Minnesotans this morning, that is Carol Byrne and Marlene Johnson, who will be testifying before this committee as well this morning. So welcome.

It is an appropriate time to evaluate how exchanges are working, now that a year has passed since the U.S. Information Agency [USIA] was consolidated into the State Department. Moreover, a full decade after the end of the cold war, I think it is an appropriate time to assess how closely exchanges are tied to U.S. national interest and foreign policy goals.

I supported the reorganization of our foreign policy bureaucracy in order to provide a more coherent framework to advance the national interest and to ensure respect for American leadership abroad. National prestige is reinforced and enhanced when we operate with a coherent, concise, and understandable foreign policy, and I am convinced that by being under State Department control ultimately the role of exchanges has the potential to be enhanced by having exchanges regarded as part of a comprehensive package of tools to respond to foreign policy challenges.

Now, that being said, concerns remain. Exchanges tend to be undervalued by the executive branch. I had to fight to modify President Clinton's reorganization plan so the exchange functions were not combined with information activities into a single bureau, and it is unclear whether there is adequate support for exchanges within the State Department to ensure the exchange budgets will not be reduced when pitted against other priorities.

We know that international exchange and training programs serve to complement and strengthen traditional diplomacy. These programs are inexpensive, cost effective, and a way to assist in building democratic institutions and promoting American values throughout the world.

So if everyone agrees that these benefits exist, why then is support for exchanges in question? Well, I will be blunt: because in the world of politics there is always pressure to sacrifice programs, like exchanges, which yield long-term benefits for activities that will reap only short-term gains.

Let me also say this: Exchanges I believe do make a difference. I'm convinced that a major reason why Minnesota is so outward looking and so engaged in the international arena is because of the active participation in national exchanges of so many of our universities and private voluntary organizations. The best way to combat harmful isolationist sentiments is to directly involve thousands of American citizens each year in exchange programs at the grass-roots level, and the best way to promote democracy and freedom abroad is to use our Nation's greatest asset, and that is our people, to advance our goals.

I want to underscore that point. Exchanges are not just for increasing understanding. They are first and foremost for promoting America's national interest. Now, if we are going to do that effectively, I think we need to take a critical look at the programs currently being funded and look for creative ways to improve their performance.

I have enjoyed working with Sherry Mueller of the National Council for International Visitors [NCIV] and Carol Byrne of the Minnesota International Center to find a way that the Sister Cities Program could be enhanced through a partnership with the National Visitors Program. I will introduce a proposal to fund the Grassroots Exchange and Training Program in the next State Department authorization bill.

So once again, I just wanted to take time this morning to thank you for agreeing to testify today. I look forward to exploring ways to strengthen and enhance our international exchange programs.

So again, welcome to all our guests. Dr. Bader, I would like to give you the floor for your opening statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM B. BADER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, BUREAU FOR EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, DC

Dr. BADER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, and thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for that very powerful and important statement. The role of this committee, and you, in ensuring that the consolidation worked as far as the exchange program, was essential. I am very pleased to accept the committee's invitation to participate in today's hearing on the oversight of the educational and cultural exchange programs.

Just on a personal note, I must say I am very pleased and delighted to be back here at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, a place I spent many years, and feel very good about that and that time. I am also extremely pleased that today's hearing has such wonderful and distinguished representatives of the private vol-

untary organizations. They are in my view, and I know it is widely shared, the very heart of what we are in exchange programs, and certainly they are the voice.

Slightly less than 2 years ago, Mr. Chairman, it was my great honor to appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as the President's nominee to serve as Associate Director of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. On that occasion I expressed my deep belief in the importance of exchanges based on prior experience in the government and the private sector, and indeed based on my own experience as a Fulbrighter.

The past 22 months as head of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs have confirmed this belief and has deepened my appreciation of the effectiveness of the exchange programs managed by the Department. The Bureau's mission as stipulated by Fulbright-Hays is quite clear: to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries. In April of this year the President reinforced that mission with a Presidential Memorandum on International Education Policy.

Each year some 6,000 Fulbrighters study, teach, and research a variety of academic subjects, enriching themselves and their countries. At the same time, thousands of up and coming professionals come to the United States under the International Visitors Program and engage American counterparts on many of the same subjects, but usually with a focus that is more practical than academic.

Completing this picture are the scores of citizen exchange grants linking global organizations across the United States with overseas counterparts.

What makes these programs work is the richness, the variety, and the just old-fashioned plain big-heartedness of grassroots America. I am delighted that the representatives of some of those organizations are appearing before the subcommittee today.

Scores of American voluntary organizations and thousands of volunteers make sure these foreign visitors meet their counterparts, whether their field is genetically-engineered organisms or local government. Future leaders encounter American openness at a stage in their lives when they have the energy, the freedom, and the time to learn about us firsthand. Later, the tyranny of bureaucratic inboxes and, for some, the protective cocoon of senior leadership make it more difficult to have this type of contact. Results are striking.

Many of the visitors to this country are foreign students. And 450 U.S. educational advising centers, working in partnership with American universities, help bring a half a million students to the United States each year. Partnerships between American and foreign universities develop the quality of teaching in the United States and overseas, and bring, may I say, an estimated \$9 billion into American communities annually. I cannot say enough good things about the American volunteers and nongovernmental organizations that make these exchanges work.

The benefits of all these exchanges to the American government and American society are in my view enormous. Alumni return to their countries as engines of positive change. Moreover, we estab-

lish contact early on with individuals who will one day shape the future of their countries.

One of the oft-cited but still compelling indicators that the right people are participating in these programs is the track record on heads of state, a quite extraordinary figure. Forty-six current and 148 former heads of government or chiefs of state have been on these programs. These results are often the consequences of decisions made decades earlier. For example, the first civilian to become Minister of Defense in Indonesia was a Fulbrighter at Berkeley in 1969—that probably prepared him to be a Minister of Defense. He was also later a Fulbright scholar at Georgetown in 1985. We must plan now to have benefits later.

Right now the alumni are doing important work. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record a recent Wall Street Journal article¹ on Mr. Zlatko Lagumdžija, who leads Bosnia's Social Democratic Party, the one major party trying to cut across ethnic lines. He was a Fulbrighter in 1988 and 1989. Interesting enough, his interlocutor, the High Representative in Bosnia, an Austrian, Wolfgang Petritsch, was also a Fulbrighter 15 years earlier. This is an example of the delayed impact, but an important impact.

If I may, I would make one additional observation on the Balkans, Mr. Chairman. Let me note for the record that on some occasions the impact is more immediate. For example, we brought representatives of the Croatian opposition parties to the United States over the strenuous opposition of the Tadjman regime. Within a year, they were running the country. Examples like this are dramatic.

In addition to the case studies and feedback on the actions of specific individuals, there are other indicators that the Bureau programs are advancing the national interest. In a recent survey on public diplomacy, ambassadors urged us to augment the existing programs and rated exchanges very highly. The two largest Bureau programs, Fulbright and the International Visitors Programs, received near-perfect scores. Independent external evaluations are also very encouraging.

Despite the good news on the impact of our programs, I do not want to suggest the sky is cloudless. Rapid change in the outside world complicates the adjustment process. The former Soviet Union is now 12 separate countries. Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania are independent. The old Yugoslavia has separated or disintegrated into five separate states. In these countries, security issues and transition from communism to democracy affect vital American interests. There is no shortage of tasks that we could undertake.

Mr. Chairman, in the Newly Independent States [NIS], it is only additional funding provided under the Freedom Support Act for exchange activities that permits us to conduct robust public diplomacy in that part of the world. There are over 50,000 alumni already of these exchanges within the NIS, potentially an enormous resource. It is no exaggeration to say that in large measure the future of their countries is riding on their shoulders. Needless to say, the nature of their future has profound implications for us.

¹See page 7.

We are proud of these programs, Mr. Chairman. It is important to note that the Bureau's appropriated funds, that is our base funds, cover only 21 percent of the total Bureau programs in the NIS. The balance is covered by Freedom Support funds. Without this funding, we would have to let priorities go unmet and cut back dramatically on Bureau programs in other regions to continue to meet the need in the NIS.

Mr. Chairman, we need to prepare for the future. Closed societies will open. We do not know yet the precise where and when, but we know it will happen. Public diplomacy is an exceptionally flexible instrument. It is deeply subversive to authoritarian systems. It has proven its effectiveness in societies in transitions and is well suited to new issues.

We do believe, Mr. Chairman, we have brought into the State Department assets that greatly fortify traditional diplomatic readiness. Through our programs, we will help make available to the rest of the world the richness of American life. In Wall Street parlance, we are long-term investors with a special interest in emerging markets.

We look forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the committee as we plan for the future, and I would be most happy to take any questions you may have. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Bader follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM B. BADER

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee:

I am pleased to accept the Committee's invitation to participate in today's hearing on oversight of educational and cultural exchanges.

Slightly less than two years ago it was my great honor to appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as the President's nominee to serve as Associate Director of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, at the time located in USIA. On that occasion I expressed my deep belief in the importance of exchanges, based on prior experience in government and in the private sector—and indeed based on my own experience as a Fulbrighter. The past twenty-two months as the head of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, now back in the State Department, have confirmed my belief and have deepened my appreciation for the effectiveness of the exchange programs managed by the Department.

The Bureau's mission, as stipulated in the Fulbright-Hays Act, remains “. . . to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries . . .” In April of this year the President reinforced this mission with a presidential memorandum on international education policy. The main components of our effort are familiar to all—Academic Exchanges (primarily Fulbright), the International Visitor (IV) program, and Citizen Exchanges. I was familiar with the Fulbright program but knew much less about International Visitors and Citizen Exchanges when I started this job. Since then I have seen first-hand how these programs not only complement and reinforce one another, but also add to the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy. The President's FY 2001 budget will enhance this effectiveness.

Each year some six thousand Fulbrighters study, teach, and research a variety of academic subjects, enriching themselves and their countries. At the same time thousands of up-and-coming professionals come to the United States under the International Visitor program and engage American counterparts on many of those same subjects but usually with a focus that is more practical than academic. Completing this picture are the scores of Citizen Exchange grants linking local organizations across the United States with overseas counterparts on issues of importance to the United States.

What makes these programs work is the richness, variety, and just plain bighartedness of grass-roots America. I am delighted that representatives of some of those organizations are appearing before the subcommittee today. Nonprofit organizations in states across the country, including Minnesota, have received millions

of dollars to run high-school exchange programs, business training, and International Visitor programs as partners of the Bureau. They and other organizations work with the State Department and the Department of Education to implement the presidential memorandum on international education I cited earlier. In addition approximately fifteen hundred American organizations administer J-visa exchange programs in connection with international exchange programs that they manage. Authorizing organizations to administer J-visa exchange programs is a function the Bureau embraced last year as a result of the USIA-State Department consolidation.

Scores of American voluntary organizations and thousands of volunteers make sure that foreign visitors meet their counterparts—whether their field is genetically engineered organisms or local government—and learn to see the United States in a nuanced way. Future leaders encounter American openness at a stage in their lives when they have the energy, the freedom, and the time to learn about us first hand. Later the tyranny of the in-box and, for some, the protective cocoon of senior leadership make it more difficult to have this type of contact. The results are striking. From that point onward both visitor and host will think differently about things international. They will test stereotypes and hearsay against the reality of their own direct, personal experience. This is no small matter. In today's world, decision-making is increasingly decentralized, and decisions made in one country resonate elsewhere. It is in the American national interest that such decisions be made on the basis of accurate perceptions.

Many of the visitors to this country are foreign students. Four hundred and fifty advising centers, working in partnership with American universities, help bring a half million students to the United States each year. These future leaders learn about our country at a formative period in their lives, and American students benefit from their presence. Partnerships between American and foreign universities develop the quality of teaching in the United States and overseas and bring nine billion dollars into American communities annually. I cannot say enough good things about the American volunteers and non-governmental organizations that make these exchanges work. It is not coincidental that time and again visitors are so impressed by the activism, volunteerism, and can-do attitude of ordinary citizens. It is, I think, one of the most important aspects of our society, one many of us take for granted. Our "diplomacy of inclusion" also makes an impression, I believe. In Bureau exchanges we actively encourage the involvement of traditionally under-represented groups, including women, ethnic minorities, and those with disabilities.

The benefits of all these exchanges to the American government and American society are, in my view, enormous. Alumni return to their countries as engines of positive change. Moreover we establish contact early on with individuals who will one day shape their countries' future. One of the often cited but still compelling indicators that the right people are participating in our programs is the track record on heads of state—46 current and 148 former heads of government or chiefs of state. These results are often the consequence of decisions made decades earlier. For example the first civilian to become minister of defense in Indonesia was a Fulbrighter at Berkeley in 1969 and a Fulbright scholar at Georgetown in 1985. We must plan now to benefit later.

Our alumni not only occupy important positions, but we know that at times a well designed program in the United States can have a profound impact on events, as in the case of F.W. deKlerk, who credits his IV experience with changing his mind on race relations in South Africa. And right now our alumni are doing important work. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record a recent Wall Street Journal article on Mr. Zlatko Lagumdžija who leads Bosnia's Social Democratic Party—the one major party trying to cut across ethnic lines. He was a Fulbrighter in 1988-89. Interestingly his interlocutor as High Representative in Bosnia, Wolfgang Petritsch, was also a Fulbrighter, 15 years earlier. This is an example of delayed impact.

If I may make one additional observation on the Balkans, Mr. Chairman let me note that on occasion the impact will be more immediate. For example we brought representatives of the Croatian opposition parties to the U.S. over the strenuous objections of the Tudjman regime. Within a year they were running the country.

Examples like these are dramatic. More typical are the thousands of other alumni who are making important contributions in less visible ways. They defend human rights, practice sound journalism, counter AIDS, combat trafficking in persons, lobby for good governance, promote the rule of law, and advance reconciliation. In short, they are building civil societies from the bottom up. In addition the broader constituencies reached by Bureau programs increasingly influence and constrain governments. NATO enlargement and food standards are two recent examples. By engaging those who frame the intellectual agenda—from curriculum designers to

television anchors—we promote comprehension of the U.S. and provide a broader context for understanding our policies.

In addition to case studies and feedback on the actions of specific individuals there are other indicators that Bureau programs are advancing the national interest. In the recent survey on public diplomacy ambassadors urged us to augment existing programs and rated exchanges very highly. The two largest Bureau programs—Fulbright and IV—received near perfect scores.

Independent, external evaluations are also encouraging. For instance, a recent survey of the Humphrey program for mid-career professionals substantiated the quality of the exchange, its impact on the careers of participants, and their high regard for the U.S. More surprisingly perhaps, it also revealed that ninety-five percent of alumni continue to collaborate with American colleagues. This is precisely the sort of international networking and multiplier effect our programs seek to foster. We are placing greater emphasis on professional evaluation of our programs, Mr. Chairman, and we would be happy to share the results with you and your committee.

Despite the good news on the impact of our programs, I do not want to suggest that the sky is cloudless. Rapid change in the outside world complicates the adjustment process. The former Soviet Union is now twelve separate countries. Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania are independent. The old Yugoslavia has shattered into five separate states. In these countries security issues and the transition from communism to democracy affect vital American interests. There is no shortage of tasks that we could undertake.

Mr. Chairman, in the NIS it is only additional funding provided under the Freedom Support Act (transfers from USAID) for exchange activities that permits us to conduct the robust public diplomacy required in that part of the world. Young faculty work with U.S. mentors to develop new courses on governance, journalism, and other critical subjects. Entrepreneurs see first-hand how American small businesses create wealth and promote choice. The best and brightest high-school students participate in the Future Leaders Exchange Program (FLEX), targeted at the next generation in the NIS. The cream of the successor generation attend American high schools and experience democracy first-hand in our families, our classrooms, and our communities. There are 50,000 alumni of these programs in the NIS—potentially an enormous resource. It is no exaggeration to say that in large measure the future of their countries is riding on their shoulders. Needless to say, the nature of their future has profound implications for us.

We are proud of these programs, Mr. Chairman. It is important to note that Bureau appropriated funds (base funds) cover only 21 percent of total Bureau programs in the NIS. The balance is covered by FSA funds. Without FSA funding, we would have to let priorities go unmet or cut back dramatically on Bureau programs in other regions, to continue to meet the need in the NIS.

Mr. Chairman, we need to prepare for the future. Closed societies will open. We don't know the precise "where and when" but we know it will happen. Public diplomacy is an exceptionally flexible instrument. It is deeply subversive to authoritarian systems. It has proven its effectiveness in societies in transition, and it is well suited to new issues that stimulate broad public engagement.

We believe, Mr. Chairman, we have brought into the Department of State assets that greatly fortify traditional diplomatic readiness. Through our programs we help make available to the rest of the world the richness of American life and experience, furthering mutual understanding in the process. In Wall Street parlance we are long-term investors with a special interest in emerging markets.

We look forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman, and the other members of the committee as we plan for the future. I would be happy to address any questions you may have. Thank you.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Wednesday, June 28, 2000]

THE WEST MIGHT HAVE ITS MAN IN BOSNIA

COMPUTER-SCIENCE PROFESSOR LEADS ONLY MAJOR PARTY THAT BRIDGES ETHNICITY

(By Matthew Kaminski)

SARAJEVO, BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA.—Wanted: moderate leader for splintered state. Ideal candidate would pursue market reforms, crack down on corruption and reconcile warring ethnic groups.

It is a hard bill to fill in the Balkans. Now, as Kosovo rumbles, the Western allies think they might have their man in Bosnia, after nearly five frustrating years of trying to hold that country together.

Zlatko Lagumdžija, a 44-year-old computer-science professor, wouldn't say so. He led the country's only major party that bridges ethnicity to a surprisingly strong showing in recent Bosnia-wide municipal elections: His Social Democrats, or SDP, look to build on that performance in November's national poll.

The SDP is cutting into support for nationalist parties that obstruct efforts backed by the U.S. and European Union to forge a single state out of three ethnic ghettos in Bosnia. Muslims, Croats and Serbs were the antagonists in the 1992-95 war; Muslims and Croats joined forces in 1994 and uneasily share a federation in the western half of Bosnia. The Serb republic makes up the other half.

The international community is looking for an exit strategy for its 20,000 peace-keeping troops and thousands of bureaucrats. Is the SDP it? If his electoral success continues, senior Western officials say, Mr. Lagumdžija is the face of a pluralistic, united Bosnia. This kind of country, they believe, wouldn't sink back into war.

"He could be a politician in a Western European country; that in itself spells the difference," says Wolfgang Petritsch, the high representative, a sort of Western overseer in Bosnia.

Recent history doesn't bode well. Many of the wartime leaders stayed on when fighting stopped, legitimized by frequent elections. The \$5 billion in foreign aid was channeled into an economy beholden to the state. The SDP can't match the three nationalist parties' powers of patronage.

"What I'm out to do is break the system," says Mr. Lagumdžija, who started out in the now defunct Communist Party. But now he plays the outsider. During the April campaign for city councils, he touched a popular nerve with attacks on the ruling parties', alleged corruption and for dragging Bosnia into war.

The SDP carried the Muslim-Croat Federation, attracting 29% of the popular-vote, compared with 20% for the ruling Party Democratic Action (SDA), according to an analysis of 145 municipalities by the Center for European Policy Studies. Support came mainly from Muslims in bigger cities. The SDP received only a smattering of ballots in Republika Srpska, the Serbian half of the country, and from Croats, a fifth of the population, most of whom live in western Bosnia. Nationalist parties continued their domination in both areas.

But the SDP's performance shook up the political scene in the Muslim-dominated Federation, where the party won 19 mayorships. Earlier this month, the SDA's aging leader, Alija Izetbegovic, announced his resignation from Bosnia's three-person presidency.

As the largest ethnic group, Bosnian Muslims must show the way forward, says Mr. Lagumdžija, and Bosnia's other nationalities will follow.

As in Serbia, where the opposition also controls many cities, real power rests higher up. The well-funded SDA holds the purse strings through its hold on regional administrations—up for grabs in November's elections.

RESPONSES OF HON. WILLIAM B. BADER TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
FROM SENATOR BARBARA BOXER

Question. I understand that there are high-quality, well-established programs like Amity Institute, which the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs has up till now been unable or unwilling to find a place for in the current J-1 visa regulations. This situation has threatened the unnecessary demise of some of these programs. How does the Bureau plan to deal with programs like Amity Institute to ensure that you do not terminate valid, necessary programs simply because of regulatory technicalities?

Answer. The Bureau is committed to giving full consideration to any program which enhances mutual understanding as envisioned under the Fulbright-Hays Act. Toward this end, the Bureau will continue to work with Amity Institute in order to ensure that its foreign language volunteer program can continue to operate; while this could not clearly be done under existing regulations, it will be possible through amendments.

Question. How does the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs plan to address the specific problem that Amity faces in regard to its foreign language teacher program? Will this program continue unhindered next year?

Answer. Amity is interested in conducting a foreign language program using volunteers to assist qualified teachers in primary and secondary classrooms in the United States. There are no regulations to provide for this activity. The Department

is therefore preparing regulations for a new category. In the meantime, the Amity Pilot program will continue without interruption until formal regulations are in place.

Question. I understand that Amity's program will require that a new classification be created under the J-1 Visa Program. When will this new classification be made?

Answer. The activity being conducted by the Amity Institute's foreign language volunteers does not fall squarely within any of the existing Exchange Visitor Program categories. The Bureau is developing a category to accommodate this activity and is in the process of drafting the necessary regulations to put it in place. It is estimated that this process, which involves a public notice and comment period, will take a few months. We will move it along as expeditiously as possible in consultation with Amity.

Question. Have overseas staffing levels for public diplomacy positions—the former USIS positions—remained consistent? Is the State Department committed to maintaining these levels, especially for cultural affairs officers who handle exchanges?

Answer. Overseas staffing levels for public diplomacy program positions have remained consistent during this first year of integration, and no reduction of public diplomacy positions is proposed in FY 2001. The Secretary is committed to preserving and strengthening the public diplomacy program. We plan to maintain the level of public diplomacy staff and resources, including cultural affairs officers who handle exchanges.

Senator GRAMS. Thank you very much, Assistant Secretary Bader. I appreciate that, and your request to have that article included in the record will be as you request.

Assistant Secretary Bader, I am going to begin with a question on the budget for international exchanges. As you know, during the 1990's the educational and cultural exchange programs accounts appropriations reached a high of \$366.8 million back in fiscal year 1994. Why has the administration only requested \$225 million for the next fiscal year?

Dr. BADER. Let me begin, Mr. Chairman, by saying you are right on point with respect to the funding for these programs. The amount we have today for exchanges is one-third less than we had in constant dollars in 1993. So we really do have a shortfall. It is particularly important to understand how to fill the shortfall because of what I have just mentioned, this emergence of new states that we have to serve, a quarter more new states. In the world that we are in right now, we have to have the kinds of programs and the funds for programs to meet critical situations, surge activities, and the like.

The President's request of \$225 million, which has not yet passed the full Senate, meets the President's net request, though the distribution of funds differs a bit from the request. I would just note here that the bill merges the North-South Center appropriation with educational and cultural exchange programs without cross-walking the funds, thus effectively reducing the President's request by \$1.7 million, which is something we should perhaps all look at.

To answer your question, I think we are now obviously in a time of reduced resources. We are always looking for more. We were very pleased with the President's request. We were indeed very pleased with the fact that the Senate appropriation moved forward with the \$225 million. The House level at \$214 million provides a 5 percent increase.

I would say that right now, if we could reach as close as possible to that \$225 million for 2001, we will be able to meet those kinds of requirements and programs we wish to have. We do in fact, Mr.

Chairman, have what you might call a very aggressive plan for exchanges. We hope that the Congress will support it.

Senator GRAMS. I look forward to working with you on the next appropriations process dealing with this budget. So thank you.

On reorganization, now that exchanges have been administered by State for about a year, could you describe for me this morning how operating the exchanges within the Department of State has benefited either the exchange program or, as I talked about in my opening statement, U.S. foreign policy?

Dr. BADER. I feel very strongly, Mr. Chairman, that moving these assets and programs into the State Department is a major step forward. We have been very well and warmly received in the Department. I should say, very much thanks to this committee, we have returned to the State Department with the integrity of exchanges and our separate appropriation intact. This is in fact terribly important.

What are the advantages of being there? I think they are significant. It gives us an opportunity to coordinate early and often with the other bureaus of the Department. I feel very strongly that we now are in a position to be in at the planning stages with respect to supporting U.S. foreign policy objectives, to be able to do those consistent with our legislative mandate, and to preserve the integrity of the program.

What else can I say about the Bureau's consolidation and how it has gone thus far? Well, we continue to be dependent on our cultural officers and our public affairs officers in the field and local staffs. They are really the golden thread out to the field. We would not be able to function and to find future leaders if we did not in fact have those officers.

One of my greatest concerns in the consolidation process is whether we will in fact be able to have the attention of those officers in the field. We are making great strides to convince, if you will, the old State Department, that those officers have to be on point. This is something we have to be very attentive to. Without those officers in the field being attentive and being evaluated on the success of these exchange programs, the consolidation in fact will have a real deficit. That is something we have to be very careful about.

I see, Mr. Chairman, that the other bureaus of State Department are now beginning to acknowledge the importance and vital role of public diplomacy. I think this has been one of the successes, one of the many successes, of Under Secretary Lieberman.

As with any merger, there are a number of bumps in the road. One of them in particular is administrative operations, which has been a very difficult area in this year of transition. We have to at least come to understand the administrative practices of the Department so that they will understand ours. The USIA ethos and operating style was quite remarkable to me in terms of being able to turn programs, dollars, and people around very quickly. This is not easy to do in the State Department. But we are all learning.

So what we are trying to do is to take what I consider quite marvelous best practices in USIA and combine those with best practices of the State Department to best serve the programs. There remain some issues of process and functions. However, I think the in-

tegration and the consolidation, certainly for the purposes of the exchange programs, have been a net plus. There is much to be worked on, but much has been done.

Senator GRAMS. Moving in the right direction.

Also on the budget issue, reorganization of the foreign policy agencies was supposed to result in some budget savings. Has there been a reduction in administrative costs and overhead in your Bureau since reorganization?

Dr. BADER. The administrative cuts in my Bureau were made before we went to the State Department, so we are still carrying them in certain areas, such as in the Exchange Visitor J-visa program and others where we are really short staffed. Have there been savings? I would say there have been efficiencies. We have not seen savings thus far with respect to our administrative budget.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that struck me when I took over the Bureau is the fact that we were managing programs with inter-agency transfers but were not in fact receiving full cost recovery for that administrative effort. We are now doing so and this should reduce our administrative costs.

So no, you really will not see with the exchange programs, a dramatic decrease in administrative expenses. But we are running a tight ship and with this cost recovery for interagency administrative services we provide, the overall line for administrative expenses will actually decline in time.

Senator GRAMS. Thank you.

The committee has also been informed about problems in grants management, that the system at State is markedly worse than the consolidated system at USIA. So I guess I would ask you, what measures is the State Department making to improve grants management?

Dr. BADER. Our grants management system, has in its outline and in its methodology, has not in fact changed as we have gone into the State Department. There has been a problem in the State Department of actually moving money. We have had situations where our grantees simply have not received their checks on time. But, the grants management problem is a problem of disbursement as far as I am concerned and, thanks to some very good people, I think we are beginning to make a real dent in that. But again, there is more to be done. It is a problem of adjustment of two systems, one that was extremely flexible, the other that had a different pace and pattern.

Senator GRAMS. In May the State Department published a field survey of public diplomacy where U.S. Ambassadors were asked to rate the usefulness of the exchange programs. I would like you to outline the five programs in your Bureau which were rated at least useful?

Dr. BADER. Least did you say, Mr. Chairman, least useful?

Senator GRAMS. Were rated as least useful.

Dr. BADER. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. Let me get that survey.

[Pause.]

What you are referring to, Mr. Chairman, is in May of 2000 the State Department published a field survey of public diplomacy pro-

grams, and some ECA programs were given high marks by ambassadors while others were low ranked. If that is what you are getting at, let me go directly to it.

Senator GRAMS. Also, what I am referring to is this table that was part of the report from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, May 2000, as you mentioned.

Dr. BADER. Right.

Senator GRAMS. I will enter this into the record as well to go along with your answer. But go ahead.

[The material referred to follows:]

Table 1—Field Survey of Public Diplomacy Programs
(Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs—May 2000)

Product/Program	No. of Users	Average Rating	No. of mentions in 5 MOST Useful	No. of mentions in 5 LEAST Useful
Fulbright U.S. Scholars	116	4.7	37	2
Fulbright Visiting Scholars	104	4.6	28	
Fulbright Students	105	4.6	37	3
Fulbright Teacher Exchange	42	4.2	0	3
Humphrey Fellowship Program	83	4.5	9	2
College/University Affiliations	76	4.0	1	6
Overseas Research Centers	17	4.2	0	3
Educational Advising Services	114	4.3	4	8
Study of the U.S.	102	4.3	6	2
English Language Officers	63	4.3	3	5
English Language Grantees	56	4.0	3	5
English Language Specialists	47	4.0	0	2
English Teaching Forum	96	3.9	0	12
English Teaching Materials	76	4.0	0	6
Direct English Teaching Program	11	4.5	3	5
Individual International Visitors	114	4.8	64	1
Group International Visitors	116	4.8	64	3
Voluntary Visitors	109	4.4	14	1
P.L. 402 (Technical) Training	3	3.3	0	8
American Cultural Specialists	78	4.0	2	6
Jazz Ambassadors	58	4.3	4	7
Cultural Programs Grants	73	3.8	1	5
Film Service	54	3.5	0	16
Performing Arts Calendar	39	2.9	0	26
Citizen Exchanges Grants	80	4.1	4	4
Amer. Center for Int'l. Labor Solidarity	2	4.0	0	8
Amer. Council of Young Pol. Leaders	49	3.7	1	7
Sister Cities International	59	3.1	0	22
Pepper Scholarships	0	—	0	4
Sports Exchanges	10	2.7	0	14
Institute for Representative Govt.	10	3.4	0	3
Cultural Property Heritage Protection	29	3.7	1	7

Table 2—Usefulness Ratings of Worldwide Products and Programs
(In Order From Highest to Lowest)

Product/Program	No. of Users	Average Rating
Individual International Visitors	114	4.8
Group International Visitors	116	4.8
Fulbright U.S. Scholars	116	4.7
Washington File—Overall	122	4.6
WF—Official Texts/Transcripts	121	4.6
U.S. Speakers and Specialists	118	4.6
Information Resource Center Support	113	4.6
Online Databases	112	4.6

Table 2—Usefulness Ratings of Worldwide Products and Programs—Continued
(In Order From Highest to Lowest)

Product/Program	No. of Users	Average Rating
Fulbright Students	105	4.6
Fulbright Visiting Scholars	104	4.6
Humphrey Fellowship Program	83	4.5
Direct English Teaching Program	11	4.5
Voluntary Visitors	109	4.4
Washington File—Foreign Language	50	4.4
Educational Advising Services	114	4.3
Study of the U.S.	102	4.3
English Language Officer Programs	63	4.3
Print Publications—Foreign Language	63	4.3
Jazz Ambassadors	58	4.3
Electronic Journals—Foreign Language	51	4.3
WF—U.S. Press Items for Internal Use	117	4.2
Web sites	115	4.2
Fulbright Teacher Exchange	42	4.2
Overseas Research Centers	17	4.2
Citizen Exchanges Grants	80	4.1
Information USA	110	4.0
Reference Services from Washington	106	4.0
Foreign Press Centers	82	4.0
American Cultural Specialists	78	4.0
College/University Affiliations	76	4.0
English Teaching Materials	76	4.0
English Language Grantees	56	4.0
Digital Video Conferences	52	4.0
English Language Specialists	47	4.0
Amer. Center for Intl. Labor Solidarity	2	4.0
WF—Chronologies/Fact Sheets	111	3.9
English Teaching Forum	96	3.9
Book Publication and Translation	68	3.9
Print Publications—English	115	3.8
Bibliographic Services from Washington	89	3.8
Cultural Programs Grants	73	3.8
Foreign Broadcast Facilitative Assistance	53	3.8
Foreign Broadcast Special Coverage	45	3.8
Electronic Journals—English	111	3.7
WF—Op-eds by USG Officials	109	3.7
Support for Mission Home Pages	90	3.7
Amer. Council of Young Pol. Leaders	49	3.7
Cultural Property/Heritage Protection	29	3.7
WF—Staff-Written Backgrounders	107	3.6
WORLDNET Interactive Dialogues	93	3.5
Tele Conferences	70	3.5
Film Service	54	3.5
WF—Staff-Written for Placement	90	3.4
Listservs	65	3.4
Copyright Clearances	62	3.4
Technology Partnerships	14	3.4
Institute for Representative Government	10	3.4
P.L. 402 (Technical) Training	3	3.3
Sister Cities International	59	3.1
Photo and Graphic Images	27	3.1
Performing Arts Calendar	39	2.9
Sports Exchanges	10	2.7

Dr. BADER. Allow me to talk just briefly about the good news. The two programs accounting for 75 percent of the budget, the Fulbright and the International Visitor programs, received exceptionally high ratings, and that is very gratifying.

You have rightly pointed to the other side of the coin. I will assure you that I am not interested, underline, not interested, in retaining a marginal program, and a low rating is surely a signal that we need to re-examine the value of that program. In some cases it very well may be that a program has outlived its usefulness and we have to take a look at this.

In other cases, however, it may be that a program is designed to run without drawing upon the increasingly precious time of the U.S. Embassy staff. I do not want to push this too far, Mr. Chairman, but the impact of these programs may more easily escape the attention of mission staff because the programs are actually doing precisely what they were intended to do. In other words, they are not rated very highly by the embassy because they are not on the embassy horizon.

Mr. Chairman, if I may be so bold as to say that some of the low-ranked programs are congressional earmarks and this obviously creates problems all around.

Senator GRAMS. That is getting pretty bold. No, go ahead.

Dr. BADER. You have my word and my Bureau's word we are going to look skeptically and, indeed, agnostically at these low-ranked programs and you will have and the committee will have a report on this, and I will undertake that.

Senator GRAMS. To justify their existence or maybe reform what they are asked to do?

Dr. BADER. Yes, exactly.

Senator GRAMS. One of the findings of the report is that there is no mandate for the elimination of any worldwide product. I do not see how the survey data backs that up. Would you describe how that conclusion was reached?

Dr. BADER. Actually, I have no idea, because it is not a well-founded conclusion. These programs are every year, and virtually every day, in the process of consideration about their effectiveness. So, putting aside the question for the moment of earmarks, we have a full and unfettered right to vary these programs, improve these programs, or eliminate these programs.

Senator GRAMS. We have been joined by Senator Paul Sarbanes, and I have got just a few questions here. Were you prepared?

Senator SARBANES. Why don't you go on.

Senator GRAMS. OK. I will only take a couple more minutes.

Dr. Bader, in response to congressional hearings and debates on international exchanges in fiscal year 1996, the administration sought an inter-agency working group to be established to avoid duplication of exchanges by many agencies that were involved with them.

Now, on July 15, 1997, President Clinton issued Executive Order 13055, creating the Inter-Agency Working Group [IAWG], on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training. With the Inter-Agency Working Group in operation for about 3 years now, what improvements in cooperation among agencies involved in exchanges have occurred?

Dr. BADER. Mr. Chairman, this activity is something about which I am extremely pleased in the way that it has developed. As you noted, this was the result of an Executive directive. If I am not off the mark, it also has a congressional mandate as well. So I think

it is very strongly based. Its intention was very clearly to give agencies opportunity to come together. Actually, there are 20 U.S. agencies that are represented on the Inter-Agency Working Group along with the National Security Council and the Office of Management and Budget.

There is a small staff. I think it has done extremely good work in two areas. One has been in the category of improving cooperation and giving an opportunity to all these agencies to report in a common matrix, what they are doing. The second is to give illumination to the fact of whether there may be duplication or the like.

You might have noted, this committee might have noted, that the IAWG received the Hammer Award for its good work.

There are a number of things that this committee needs to do further. We now do individual country studies and surveys. We send inter-agency teams out to the field to various countries to see how these programs are coming together.

I have to say as I look at all of this that this Inter-Agency Working Group was long overdue. We are now working to see how we can further eliminate duplication and increase cost effectiveness. I think it is a real success story. It is also now moving to a point where one place has the data on all exchange programs and training programs. The IAWG staff is able to bring that data forward to the State Department and to other organizations'. Its data base shows what is actually going on in exchanges in countries and therefore we are able to put together coordinated responses to needs in the field.

It is done well. Like anything else, we can work harder at it.

Senator GRAMS. In another area, the au pair program, I understand that one of the au pair sponsoring organizations has submitted a request for designation of a new program, Educare in America, which would be an enhancement of the standard au pair programs and would also help provide companionship and assistance to American families with children who are at school full-time.

So my question, Dr. Bader, is what is the Department's position on this proposed program and when, if any, action can be expected on the request for this designation?

Dr. BADER. Mr. Chairman, you are speaking here of the American Institute for Foreign Studies [AIFS] and the Educare program?

Senator GRAMS. Yes.

Dr. BADER. Right. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken with Bob Brennan of AIFS. In fact, he is here today. Let me be very direct about it. The Bureau intends to work with Bob and AIFS to address the specific issues that are involved in this operation, where participants will pursue their academic courses and receive an amount of compensation appropriate for a program of this sort. This is the important part. The concept has the support of the Bureau. We intend to work collegially with all the designated organizations and to move on this somewhat hybrid au pair program. It will be done.

Mr. Chairman, I think this may be the opportunity to say that there has been criticism about the slowness of our office for designation of programs for J-visas. Part of the problem is the chal-

lenge of sheer volume. We are talking right now of J-visas at a level of 280,000 a year. We are talking about dealing with some 1,500 organizations, and we are talking about doing it all with a staff of perhaps 12. The volume of exchange visitor visas is rising. It has more than doubled over the last 10 years.

Right now—and we are moving on this in response to interest on the part of the Secretary of State—we are putting together a working internal group at the State Department, which will give a report to the Secretary of State in 60 days, not that long from now, on the management issues that are involved in this.

We intend to make the process better and we intend to get to a point where we will make determinations sooner and more efficiently. We have had problems with timing. We have had problems with communication. I intend to improve things. Finally, with respect to this particular program, it shall be done.

Senator GRAMS. Thank you very much.

I would like to yield now to Senator Sarbanes.

Senator SARBANES. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Unfortunately, I am going to have to depart because we have a joint session to hear from the Prime Minister of India, another form of international exchange.

First of all, I want to underscore how important I think these exchange programs are, and I want to commend the chairman for holding this hearing in order to review the situation and to underscore some strong congressional support for these programs. We are working hard to try to get you an adequate appropriation and it seems to be moving better in the Senate than in the House, and I hope we will be able to carry that through to a successful conclusion.

I want to underscore, I think, the terrific job that Bill Bader is doing. I think he has brought a great deal of cohesion and organization into the program since he has moved in as the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. It is a very complex responsibility. Of course, he has to interact with a whole range of groups in the private sector, who are themselves important parts of making the program work and often bring to it a tremendous contribution in terms of volunteer time, energy and support.

But it does create a complicated mosaic for the Secretary to have to deal with, and I appreciate his efforts to rationalize the system, as I would put it, and also to seek once again to build support for it across the country. I think it is true we sort of fell off of these exchange programs. In fact, it was not too long ago we were fighting just to keep them alive, including the Fulbright program, which is of course perhaps the most visible of all of them, although there are a whole range of them. It was not all that long ago that we were in a fight here in the Congress in order to save the Fulbright program and these other exchange programs.

I do think the pendulum is swinging back, and people are coming perhaps to appreciate the importance of these programs. Lots of people are doing it. Does the Library of Congress program with the Russians come under your bailiwick, or is that operating all by itself somewhere?

Dr. BADER. It does not operate all by itself out there. It is a program that in the first year of practice is moving Russians in rather large numbers into the United States, primarily from governments in the Duma and the oblasts.

Senator SARBANES. They get a tremendous citizen response across the country.

Dr. BADER. Absolutely.

Senator SARBANES. It is incredible how people are responding. They are taking them in, showing them around. I have groups in my State that are heavily invested in this program and people come and stay with them for a week. People take a week off to shepherd them around and so forth and so on.

Dr. BADER. This was very much Senator Stevens' idea and he pushed it and had the capacity, as they say, to ensure that there were funds for it.

Senator SARBANES. That happens when you are the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Dr. BADER. To answer your question, Senator Sarbanes, that program is run out of the Library of Congress. Jim Billington has given it great leadership. This second year of operation, the funds have come from the Freedom Support Act and Ambassador Taylor. We are very pleased with this program. We support it in every way we can. But it is being managed by the Library of Congress, I think very well indeed.

Senator SARBANES. Well, thank you again for what you are doing.

Mr. Chairman, thank you. And I apologize to the next panel that I am not going to be able to stay and hear their testimony. But we will certainly take the time to read it.

Senator GRAMS. Thank you very much, Senator Sarbanes.

Just a couple of quick questions to wrap up, Dr. Bader. On the Fulbright, as we mentioned, are you aware that there are countries which will not let the State Department Inspector General audit Fulbright commissions, even though the U.S. Government provides the funds? Do you find this acceptable? If not, what are you going to do to get access?

Dr. BADER. Senator, I will say that I am not aware of that. Do any of my colleagues back here—

Senator GRAMS. The Inspector General noted Germany and Japan specifically, so I was just wondering.

Dr. BADER. Senator, I think I will take that question and give you a response for the record.

[The following response was subsequently received:]

Regarding the question of whether or not the State Department IG has been denied access to audit Fulbright Commissions, we know of no such instance. In all cases that we are aware of, Fulbright Commissions cooperate with visiting State Department Inspectors. In some of the 51 binational agreements that are the bases for the operations of Fulbright Commissions, there are stipulations that U.S. inspectors may do audits or program evaluations at the invitation of the Commissions' governing boards. This is generally forthcoming with minimal discussion, but the autonomous nature of each of the Boards requires some respect by the visiting inspectors of that status.

Senator GRAMS. Very good. I appreciate it.

One other thing. I think it is important to see democracy promotion as a goal of exchanges serving tangible national interests. This is not altruism. More nations becoming market democracies will make for a more benign world for the United States to deal with, fewer dictatorships likely to threaten their neighbors and us with military means, and more reliable trading partners.

So how much of the budget for exchanges is directly connected to making more nations democratic over time?

Dr. BADER. I would have to get a figure on that. I will see to it that the committee has the specifics on this. But I would say it is very clear that we have a large number of programs that do that. It is part of State Department's task, which we are involved in. We have programs to support democracy in many countries. Right now there are several of them, for example, in the Balkans. It is a very clear mission and objective for this Bureau to strengthen democracies.

I have always felt that the path in transition countries to market economies has to be complemented with an improvement in democratic institutions, and that is the way we approach it. But I will give you, for the record, some specifics on this matter.

[The following response was subsequently received:]

NATIONAL INTERESTS/PROGRAMS MATRIX

The following table lists the program activities conducted by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in FY 1999. Use this matrix to assign your program's estimated percentage of involvement in meeting strategic goals attributable to national interests.

Program/Activity	National Security	Democracy/ Human Rights	Economic Prosperity	Law Enforcement	Mutual Understanding	Other National Interests ¹
Fulbright/Humphrey	X
Study of U.S.	X
Affiliations	X
Advising	X
EFL	X
Muskie	X	X	X
CAORC	X
South Pacific	X
Disability Exchanges	X
CASP	X
International Visitors	X	X	X	X	X	X
Citizen Exchanges	X	X	X	X	X	X
CBYX	X
Pepper	X
Mansfield	X
U.S./Mexico	X
CEEEP	X
IRG	X
Tibet	X
East Timor	X
Womens World Cup	X
Special Olympics	X
China/Korea	X
National Youth Science Camp	X
Freedom Support/SEED	X	X

¹ Others include American Citizens and U.S Borders, Global Issues (Environment, Population, Health). Humanitarian Response.

Senator GRAMS. I think overall the program helps to promote democracy, because of the interchange.

Dr. BADER. Absolutely.

Senator GRAMS. So I would appreciate those answers.

That is all the questions I have, Dr. Bader. Anything you would like to add?

Dr. BADER. Thank you, Senator and Mr. Chairman. I would just close by saying for my side how appreciative the Bureau is of the support of the committee, particularly during this consolidation period. It has made all the difference in the way we are able to function in the State Department.

I would just say that, if we get the kinds of support we need from the Congress and the public in terms of backing these programs, that it is a very good road ahead for exchanges. It is essential to the American vision and the American future to have strong and vibrant exchange programs. They make sense. Your statement was right on point and I hope it will be read widely.

Thank you, Senator.

Senator GRAMS. Thank you very much, Dr. Bader. I appreciate your time and your answers and, on behalf of the committee, I also want to commend you for the work you are doing. Thank you very much.

I would like to now call our second panel: Ms. Carol Byrne, executive director of the Minnesota International Center in Minneapolis; Dr. James Denton, executive director, Freedom House in Washington, DC; Ms. Marlene Johnson, executive director and chief executive officer of NAFSA: The Association of International Educators, and chair, Alliance for International Education and Cultural Exchange, here in Washington; and also Dr. Sherry Mueller, the executive director, NCIV, the National Council for International Visitors, here in Washington, DC.

I want to welcome all of you to the panel. Thank you very much for taking your time to be here, and I guess we will start from left to right. Mr. Denton, I guess that puts you in the hot seat. So your opening statement for the panel. Thank you.

**STATEMENT OF JAMES S. DENTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
FREEDOM HOUSE, WASHINGTON, DC**

Mr. DENTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good morning and thank you again for inviting me to testify before the Subcommittee on International Operations on the subject of exchange programs and the national interest of the United States.

I am appearing this morning as the executive director of Freedom House, a nonpartisan and nonprofit organization that promotes political and economic freedom around the world. In 1941, led by Eleanor Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie, Freedom House was founded by a distinguished group of American policy and opinionmakers to persuade the American people of our Nation's responsibility to vigorously defend Europe's democracies during freedom's darkest hours of the 20th century. Now, nearly 60 years later, our mission remains largely the same: to promote American leadership in the defense and expansion of the borders of freedom around the world.

In keeping with the founders' vision, today Freedom House is led by a bipartisan board of directors comprised of leading Democrats and Republicans, business and labor leaders, scholars and journal-

ists. Our chairman is Betty Bao Lord, an internationally recognized human rights activist and author. Among those serving with her are close advisers to the past four American Presidents, including Dr. Brzezinski, Ambassador Jeane Kilpatrick, Ambassador Paul Wolfowitz, and Tony Lake. From labor and business, we count on the board Sandra Feldman, the head of the AFT, and Steve Forbes; and from the media we have Morton Kondracke, Mara Liasson, Peggy Noonan, and P.J. O'Rourke. All serve on the board together.

All of these Americans, whose political loyalties and views will differ on any wide range of issues, are united and committed to their view that American leadership in international affairs is essential to the cause of freedom. Likewise, all are united in the view that the expansion of freedom is in the national interest of the United States because freedom creates the conditions for a more stable and prosperous world.

Here in the United States, Freedom House conducts research and publishes books, reports, and articles to educate American policy and opinionmakers on the challenges to freedom around the world. Through this public education role, Freedom House urges our elected leaders to maintain America's vital leadership role in the world and its affairs and to implement policies which are true to our Nation's values and our interests and goals, and to protect and expand the borders of freedom.

In addition to this research and public education role in the United States, Freedom House also conducts a large portfolio of what we call democratization programs, which account for about 70 percent of Freedom House's \$7.5 million budget. These programs take several forms, but generally speaking they are intended to promote good governance, independent media, and free market economic development.

The programs themselves take the forms of exchanges, which include longer term, what we call professional internships, which are generally 2 to 3 months long, here in the United States, or shorter term, 2, 3-week programs which we would call study tours or mini-internships.

The second category of activities that Freedom House conducts in terms of democratization programs are sub-grant programs, which usually support NGO's that are active in the development of government policy or monitoring of human rights or media rights.

The third category would be onsite technical assistance, which is almost always conducted by American professionals who are volunteering to serve and almost always are serving for a minimum of 3 months in the region.

The fourth category is sponsorship of conferences and training, seminars and workshops.

Even though exchanges account for less than 10 percent of our annual budget this year, I believe that these exchange programs are the central and most important of all the democratization programs which Freedom House is involved with.

The democratic revolution that began in Poland in 1989 represented a spectacular victory for the Western ideas of freedom and democracy. As these revolutions swept across Eastern Europe in 1989 and then the Soviet Union in 1992, these events changed the

political, economic, and social map of the world in ways that could not have been anticipated even a few short years before.

As Freedom House considered ways to support the transformation from communism to democracy, we understood that we could not teach the new leaders of Eastern Europe what it means to be free. It was, after all, their vision of freedom that had sustained them during the long, dark hours of communism. Likewise, we found that the new leaders understood in theoretical terms how a democratic and free market society operated.

But at the same time, we also understood that these new leaders had no road maps, no practical application for the theory that could guide them on their journey. While there were more than enough variations on the Leninist blueprint on how to turn capitalism into communism, there was no plan for the reverse at the time.

It was this passage from the theoretical to the practical dimension of democratic life that presented the greatest challenge to the new generation of leaders as they set out to transform their societies. Freedom House responded by committing itself to bridging the theoretical and the practical by developing a totally new kind of international exchange program, something we called the professional internship program.

The plan was quite simple: identify the region's future leaders, bring them to the United States and arrange for them to work side by side with their American counterparts for several months. It was basically an immersion plan designed to give the participants the practical experience and skills necessary to understand the inner workings of a functioning democratic and free market system.

Incorporated into Freedom House's program was our belief that practical on the job training is the most efficient means of transferring the skills, the working knowledge, and the expertise necessary to equip these new leaders.

Since that time, together with the National Forum Foundation, which merged with Freedom House in 1997, Freedom House has sponsored and organized exchanges for about 900 young leaders from Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Of these, about 650 participated in that longer professional internship program, 10 to 12 weeks long, while the remaining 250 have participated in some variation of the classic study tour program.

Since 1989 our programs have targeted three sectors of society which we believe continue to be key to the region's successful transformation to democracy: good governance, one sector, and through that we identify and support political and NGO leaders that are active in public policy development; independent media, and through that of course we are working with journalists as well as managers of the independent media; and the third category, free market development, working with individuals that are responsible for establishing the legal framework, policies, and infrastructure that is necessary to create a free market environment that is conducive to genuine investment, capital growth, and entrepreneurialism.

In the past 10 years, with this practical training approach, the participants of the Freedom House exchange programs have worked in hundreds of offices across the United States—in U.S.

congressional offices, State governments and local governments—where they have worked with their counterparts and come to understand the meaning of transparency, how to draft legislation, how to monitor the authorization process, how to participate in the authorization process, what an open hearing is all about and why it is important, working with the media and constituents.

Then, in hundreds of media outlets across the United States, journalists from the emerging democracies have worked with their counterparts in the news rooms and in the editing offices, in the producing offices of broadcast and print news. They attend editorial meetings, observe the assignment process, conduct interviews with newsmakers, while learning new investigative reporting techniques, which has become increasingly important with the level of corruption that we are seeing in the region.

Business managers in media outlets have learned how to enhance their company's commercial viability by developing organizational budgets, designing advertising strategies, making sales calls, and so on. To us it seems quite simple and normal in the course of everyday life, what advertising is all about, but being mindful that it was illegal for about 45 years in Eastern Europe, it becomes more important to understand why that is an essential function to ensuring the viability, the commercial viability, and therefore the independence of individual media outlets.

In the area of market development, the fellows have worked in stock exchanges, regulatory agencies, entrepreneurial incubators, trade and business associations, venture capital firms, banks, and so on.

Mr. Chairman, following their 3 months of immersion in the American work environment, but before the participant returns home, we conduct a formal evaluation. We have a record of each of the evaluations that have been submitted. They invariably observe that their American experience was the most productive professional experience in their lives. Some often use the term "reborn" to describe their new perspective and understanding.

Perhaps the most important thing, however, is that these young leaders return home with a new optimism that they pick up here in the United States, confident that they have the vision and the know-how to roll up their sleeves and get started with the task ahead.

But perhaps the best evidence of Freedom House's success in helping to develop the region's new generation of leaders can be seen in the increased responsibility that is taken on by the program alumni after they return home. Among the former participants of these exchange programs, specifically the internship, professional internship program, we count now four cabinet ministers, including the current Foreign Minister of Bulgaria, six vice ministers, half a dozen ambassadors, over 60 members of parliament, mayors and city council members, the press spokespersons for eight heads of state or government in the region, and numerous senior advisers to heads of government.

None of those people that I have just mentioned held those positions before they came into this program. Many assumed those roles at lightning speed upon their return.

Our alumni can also be found in each of the region's most influential print and broadcast media outlets throughout the former East bloc. Each day they report to audiences, national audiences across their country, on the events of the day as well as, of course, including reporting U.S. news on U.S. policy.

It is self-evident that the 900-plus alumni who have returned home represent a critical and enormously influential cadre of policy, opinion, and business leaders. Now that they are equipped with their U.S. experience, they represent a valuable network that is helping to navigate their countries through the rapids of transformation.

In addition, the alumni are to a person better informed about America and more likely to understand and support American policy in the years ahead.

This year, as one of the largest American NGO's working in the region, Freedom House will sponsor another 50 U.S. exchanges. This happens to be about 20 percent less than in previous years. In addition to the exchange programs, as I mentioned, we conduct other activities. In the area of sub-grants, we will award about \$2 million in sub-grants to nongovernmental groups in the region, much of those funds going to support get-out-the-vote programs in countries like Serbia, Croatia, and Ukraine.

Freedom House will sponsor hundreds of days of onsite consulting in senior government offices and NGO's throughout the region, and we will also sponsor an array of workshops and seminars and regional exchanges on issues ranging from investigative reporting of cross-border crime and corruption to linking reform-oriented think tanks in Central and Eastern Europe with their counterparts in Russia and Ukraine.

As I mentioned earlier, this year the exchange component of Freedom House's program will represent less than 10 percent of our budget. Yet, based on my 12 years working and traveling in the former East bloc and having designed and managed one of America's largest democratization program portfolios I believe that without a doubt the exchange programs, when properly targeted and managed, represent America's most powerful tool in the toolbox of democracy programs to transform the former Communist world.

It is a critical building block upon which to develop further collaboration and cooperation as well.

Mr. Chairman, it has been 10 years since the Berlin Wall fell, liberating the former captive nations of Eastern Europe, and it has been 8 years since the Soviet Union collapsed. I understand that this subcommittee must continuously evaluate the situation in the region of the emerging democracies, along with America's interests and objectives, and to develop strategies to achieve those objectives.

It is clear that some of the emerging democracies are on an irreversible path to full membership in the community of Western democracies. The progress, when you consider it has only been 10 years, has been breathtaking in a number of cases. Successive and fair elections have taken place and peaceful transfer of power has become routine in Central and Eastern Europe and, while the governments of the new democracies will continue to debate the role of government in their economies and the best way to bring growth and prosperity, it is important to realize that the basic economic

restructuring has taken place in the region. Indeed, today the economies of Hungary and Poland are among the fastest growing in Europe.

Yet, as you well know, the picture is not so rosy everywhere. Much of the region remains in two worlds, one dead and the other struggling to be born. Throughout the former Soviet Union, most significantly in Russian and the Ukraine, and of course in south-east Europe, progress has been incremental at best. The situation is volatile and even explosive because of the region's ethnic and nationalistic hostility and history. Dictators reign in several countries and they are not far beneath the surface in others. The desperate economic conditions, largely as a result of incomplete or phony reform programs, the rampant corruption, the public psychology, the porous borders, and of course the threat of proliferation, all mandate that America remain thoroughly engaged and vigilant throughout the region.

Mr. Chairman, when one assesses what has worked in those countries where the assistance programs seem to have failed to produce meaningful results, I would speculate that in virtually every case, that when you look closely at those countries, the alumni of these exchange programs, as small and insignificant as they may seem in the larger picture of the critical problems that these regions face, represent a ray of hope for our future relations with these countries. I know that is particularly true, by the way, in my opinion in the Ukraine and in Serbia.

Mr. Chairman, we congratulate you from Freedom House on your leadership on these important issues and I thank you for asking me to address this committee today. We at Freedom House stand ready to support your efforts and of course to respond to any questions you might have. Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Denton follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JIM DENTON

Good morning, and thank you, Mr. Chairman, for inviting me to testify before the Subcommittee on International Operations on the subject of exchange programs and the national interests of the United States.

I am appearing this morning as the executive director of Freedom House, a non-partisan, non-profit organization that promotes political and economic freedom around the world.

In 1941, led by Eleanor Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie, Freedom House was founded by a distinguished group of American policy- and opinion-makers to persuade the American people of our nation's responsibility to vigorously defend Europe's democracies during freedom's darkest hours of the Twentieth Century. Now, nearly sixty years later, our mission remains largely the same—to promote American leadership in the defense and expansion of the borders of freedom around the world.

In keeping with the founders' vision, today Freedom House is led by a bipartisan board of directors comprised of leading Democrats and Republicans, business and labor leaders, scholars and journalists. Our chairman is Bette Bao Lord, an internationally recognized human rights activist and author. Among those serving with her are close advisors to the past four American presidents, Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, Ambassador Paul Wolfowitz, and Tony Lake. From labor and business, Sandra Feldman and Steve Forbes; and from the media, Morton Kondracke, Mara Liasson, Peggy Noonan, and PJ O'Rourke serve on the board. All of these Americans, whose political loyalties and views will differ on any number of issues, are united and committed to the view that American leadership in international affairs is essential to the cause of freedom. Likewise, all are united in the view that the expansion of freedom is in the national interests of the

United States because freedom creates the conditions for a more stable and prosperous world.

Here in the United States, Freedom House conducts research and publishes books, reports, and articles to educate American policy and opinion makers on the challenges to freedom around the world. Through this public education role, Freedom House urges our elected leaders to maintain America's vital leadership role in world affairs, and to implement policies—which are true to our nation's values, interests, and goals—to protect and expand the borders of freedom.

(About ninety percent of Freedom House's research and publications activity is funded by private donors, among them, the Bradley Foundation, the Soros Foundations, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, The Lilly Endowment, and the Smith Richardson Foundation. USAID also supports specific Freedom House research and analysis on democratic development in the former East Bloc.)

In addition to this research and public education role in the U.S., Freedom House also conducts a large portfolio of “democratization programs,” which accounts for about 70% of Freedom House's \$7.5 annual budget. These programs take several forms, but, generally speaking they can be categorized as:

1. “exchanges” which include longer term (2-3 months) professional internships or shorter term (2-3 weeks) study tours or mini-internships;
2. sub-grant programs, usually supporting NGOs active in the development of government policy or monitoring human and media rights;
3. on-site technical assistance; and
4. the sponsorship of conferences and training workshops.

Even though our exchange programs account for less than 10% of our annual budget this year, I believe these exchange programs are the central and most important of all democratization programs.

The democratic revolutions that began in Poland in 1989 represented a spectacular victory for the Western ideas of freedom and democracy. As they swept across Eastern Europe in 1989—and the Soviet Union in 1992—these momentous revolutions changed the political, economic, and social map of the world in ways that could not have been anticipated even a few short years before during the Cold War.

As Freedom House considered ways to support the transformation from communism to democracy, we understood that we could not teach the new leaders of Eastern Europe what it means to be free. It was after all their vision of freedom that had sustained them during the long night of communism. Likewise, we found that the new leaders understood in theoretical terms how a democratic and free market society operated. But, at the same time, we also understood that these new leaders had no roadmaps, no practical application for the theory that could guide them on their journey. For while there were more than enough variations on the Leninist blueprint for turning capitalism to communism, there was no plan for the reverse process.

It was this passage from the theoretical to the practical dimension of democratic life that presented the greatest challenge to the new generation of leaders as they set out to transform their societies. And, Freedom House responded by committing itself to bridging the theoretical and the practical by developing a totally new kind of international exchange program, something we called a “professional internship” program. Our plan was simple: identify the region's future leaders, bring them to the United States, and arrange for them to work side by side with their American counterparts for several months. It was an immersion plan designed to give the participants the practical experience and skills necessary to understand the inner workings of a functioning democratic and free market system. Incorporated into Freedom House's program was our belief that practical, on-the-job training is the most efficient means of transferring the skills, working knowledge, and expertise necessary to equip these new leaders.

Since that time, together with the National Forum Foundation (which merged with Freedom House in 1997), Freedom House has sponsored and organized exchanges for about 900 young leaders (average age 32) from CEE and the former Soviet Union. Of these, about 650 participated in the longer term (10-12 week professional internship program) and the remaining 250 participated in a variation of the study tour program (2-3 weeks).

Since 1989, our programs have “targeted” three sectors of society which we believe continue to be key to the region's successful transition to democracy:

1. political and NGO leaders active in public policy development,
2. journalists and managers from independent media, and

3. individuals responsible for establishing the legal framework, policies, and infrastructure to create a free market environment conducive to investment, capital growth, and entrepreneurialism.

In the past ten years, the participants in this exchange program have worked in hundreds of U.S. congressional, state, and local government offices across America where they have help to draft legislation, write reports on human rights, organize public hearings, prepare press releases, and respond to constituent concerns. Working in hundreds of media outlets across America, journalists from the emerging democracies have worked with reporters on their beats, and with editors, and managers and producers of the news. They attend editorial meetings, observe the assignment process, and conduct interviews with newsmakers while learning new investigative reporting techniques. Business managers of media outlets have learned how to enhance their companies' commercial viability by developing organizational budgets, design advertising strategies, making sales calls, and so on. Financial analysts, business development specialists, and stock exchange directors and regulators alike have worked in American exchanges, regulatory bodies, entrepreneur incubators, trade and business associations, in private public financing partnerships, venture capital firms, and banks.

Mr. Chairman, following their three months of immersion in the American work environment, before the participant returns home, we conduct an evaluation. We have a record of each evaluation submitted that invariably observe that their American experience was the most productive professional training experience of their lives. Some even use the term "reborn" to describe their new perspective and understanding. Perhaps the most important thing, however, is that these young leaders all return home with new optimism, confident that they have the vision and know-how to roll up their sleeves and get started on the task ahead.

Perhaps the best evidence of Freedom House's success in helping to develop the region's new generation of democratic leaders can be seen in the increased responsibility taken on by the program alumni after returning home. FH counts among its former participants four cabinet minister (including the current foreign minister of Bulgaria), six vice ministers, several ambassadors, over 60 MPs, mayors, and city council members, and the press spokespersons for eight heads of government or state, and numerous senior advisors to heads of government. Our alumni can also be found throughout the region's most influential print and broadcast media outlets. Each day they report to audiences on events in their country, their region—as well as reporting on U.S. news and U.S. policy.

It is self evident that the 900-plus alumni who have returned home represent a critical and enormously influential cadre of policy, opinion, and business leaders. Now, equipped with their U.S. experience, they represent a valuable network that is helping to navigate their countries through the rapids of the transformation. In addition, the alumni are, to a person, better informed about America, and more likely to understand and support American policy.

This year, as one of the largest American NGOs working in the region, Freedom House will sponsor another 50 U.S. exchanges—which is about 20% less than in previous years. In addition to our exchange programs, Freedom House will award over \$2 million in sub grant programs particularly to think tanks throughout CEE and Ukraine as well as NGOs active in get-out-the-vote programs in Ukraine, Croatia, and Serbia. Freedom House will sponsor hundreds of days of on-site consulting in senior government offices and NGOs throughout the region. And, we also will sponsor an array of workshops, seminars, and regional exchanges on issues ranging from "investigative reporting of cross-border crime and corruption" to "linking reform oriented think tanks in CEE Russia and Ukraine."

As I mentioned earlier, this year the "exchange" component of Freedom House's program will represent less than 10% of our budget. Yet, based on my twelve years working and traveling to the former East Bloc (over fifty times), and having designed and managed one of America's largest democratization program portfolios, I believe without a doubt that exchange programs, when properly targeted and managed, represent America's most powerful tool to transform the former communist world. It is a critical building block upon which to develop further collaboration and cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, it has been ten years since the Berlin Wall fell liberating the former captive nations of Eastern Europe. And, it has been eight years since the Soviet Union collapsed. I understand that this Subcommittee must continuously evaluate the situation in the region's emerging democracies, along with America's interests and objectives, and to develop strategies to achieve those objectives.

It is clear that some countries are on an irreversible path to full membership in the community of Western democracies. The progress has been breathtaking in a

number of cases. Successive and fair elections have taken place, and peaceful transfer of power has become routine in most of CEE. And, while they will continue to debate the role of government in the economy and the best way to bring growth and prosperity, the basic economic restructuring has taken place in much of CEE. Indeed, today, the economies of Hungary and Poland are among the fastest growing in Europe.

Yet, the picture is not so rosy elsewhere. Much of the region remains between two worlds, one dead and the other struggling to be born. Throughout the former Soviet Union, most significantly in Russia and Ukraine and, of course, in Southeast Europe, progress has been incremental at best. The situation is volatile, even explosive, because of the region's ethnic and nationalist hostility. Dictators reign in several countries, and they are not far beneath the surface in others. The desperate economic conditions (largely as a result of incomplete or phony reform programs), the rampant corruption, the public psychology, the porous borders, and of course, the threat of proliferation—all mandate that America remain thoroughly engaged and vigilant throughout the region.

But, Mr. Chairman, when assessing what has worked in those countries that have failed to make progress toward democracy and free markets, I would speculate that in virtually every case, the alumni of those exchange programs represent a ray of hope. I know that is true in Ukraine and in Serbia.

Mr. Chairman, we congratulate you on your leadership on these issues, and we stand ready to support your efforts, and to respond to any questions you might have.

Thank you.

Senator GRAMS. Thank you, Mr. Denton.

Ms. Johnson.

STATEMENT OF MARLENE M. JOHNSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, NAFSA: ASSOCIATION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATORS, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, ALLIANCE FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing and for inviting me to testify. I know it is hard to focus on these matters at this particular time of the year. All of us in the international education community appreciate your leadership in bringing us together to discuss an issue that may not figure prominently in the political debate swirling around us right now, but that does, we believe, fundamentally affect the national interest of this country.

I would like to focus briefly on two concepts, leadership and the national interest. In an earlier era we understood better that the ability of the United States to protect and advance its interests in the world depended fundamentally on our knowledge of that world and on our ability to promote international understanding, and we all remember the Senators who were prepared to stand up and exercise leadership on behalf of international education and exchange programs that serve these objectives.

Oddly, as the world has become more interdependent and more global, as the national interest of the United States has become more linked to events abroad, interest in international education programs in the Congress has declined. It is not that these programs have enemies, but they seem to be viewed as expendable in budget battles.

The American people, however, understand that our Nation's ability to lead, prosper, and protect our national security in the 21st century depends more than ever on international knowledge

and understanding. They need and we need champions who will fight for our programs in the legislative arena. You, Mr. Chairman, have been such a champion. We need more on both sides of the aisle.

Today I testify on behalf of the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange, of which I chair the board of directors, and NAFSA: Association of International Educators, of which I am CEO. The Alliance is a coalition of more than 60 organizations that sponsor international educational and cultural exchange programs. NAFSA, a member of the Alliance, is the largest professional association of international educators, with more than 8,600 members on campuses nationwide, as well as a growing membership overseas.

On behalf of the tens of thousands of citizens represented by these two organizations who make international education and exchange work on campuses and in communities all over the country, I thank you for being our champion, Mr. Chairman, and I express to you our hope that you will do even more in the future to fill the leadership vacuum that exists on our issues.

To be true to this constituency, Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that there is a lot more to international education than exchange. We have to internationalize our college and university curricula and classrooms, make sure that study abroad programs are linked to student academic programs, deepen and broaden foreign language instruction so that Americans are conversant in the world's major languages, maintain and increase our output of international specialists who will provide the next generation of expert knowledge, and support an ambitious agenda of international and global research in all disciplines to help us understand and shape globalization.

Exchanges are an indispensable part of all that, but they are not the whole picture, and we need to work on all of it to prepare ourselves for the new century.

We have tried to lay out the whole picture in a NAFSA-Alliance paper entitled "Toward an International Education Policy for the United States," which is appended to my statement. This paper represents our effort to articulate a post-cold war rationale for international education and exchange in the global world. Unlike most such efforts, it is deliberately short and to the point as a way of encouraging policymakers to read it. I commend it to you and I ask for it to be included in the record.

Senator GRAMS. It will be included. Thank you.

Ms. JOHNSON. The focus of this hearing is international educational and cultural exchange programs, including Fulbright, citizens exchange, international visitor programs, high school exchanges, and a broad range of privately funded exchanges that the State Department facilitates under the J-visa program. These programs establish the people to people ties between the U.S. and other nations that enable us to support American business interests and carry out U.S. foreign policy goals. These are the programs that establish the foundation for effective U.S. public diplomacy, economic competitiveness, and national security in the next century.

They also include overseas educational advising centers, which counsel foreign students seeking an education in the United States. These centers deserve much of the credit for the half a million foreign students and scholars who study here every year and for the billions of dollars that they and their families contribute to the American economy.

Foreign students and exchange visitors who come to the United States take American values and perspectives home with them, promote democratic institutions and market-based economies, make major purchasing decisions involving American products, and create partnerships with American enterprises. Many, as has already been mentioned, become important leaders in their societies, enhancing our diplomatic ties with a number of nations. Virtually all of them have a profound positive impact on our own security and prosperity.

In recent years, international education has become a major global issue. Education topped the agenda of the Summit of the Americas in 1998. In the past few years, the Governments of Australia, Great Britain, France and others have placed a major emphasis on recruiting international students and have dedicated millions of new dollars to that mission. This year the G-8 adopted a goal of doubling the number of exchanges in the next 10 years.

The United States lags far behind in terms of having proactive national policies to promote international education. Recently, however, there have been hopeful signs of increased national priority and attention to these issues. I have outlined a number of them in my prepared remarks and I will not repeat them here because the other presenters have reinforced them. Needless to say, it includes the USIA conference a couple of years ago, our own policy statement, the President's April 19 directive, Congressman Kolbe's resolution, and the Appropriations Committee statement on foreign policy priorities including exchanges of this fall. Of course, this fall and November we will for the first time be acknowledging U.S. International Education Week on the 13th to the 17th of November.

I have submitted material on each of these and I ask that they also be included in the record.

Senator GRAMS. Without objection, they will be included.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you.

Now, these hearings are highlighting the importance of one very important aspect of international education policy, exchange programs. We have come a long way in the period of a year or two, but we must not allow the momentum to die. So today I would like to suggest a few things that can be done to assure that international education and particularly educational and cultural exchange programs can meet the challenges we face as a Nation in this global area.

First, I ask you to establish a congressional caucus on international education, so that we will have a forum for promoting a long-term forward-thinking policy on international education. Sustained congressional leadership is essential to our success.

Second, I ask you to work to ensure that our Nation's flagship exchange programs, the ones that are tried and true, have healthy budgets so that they will have the resources they need to serve our

national interests. At a minimum, these programs need to be restored to the levels of funding they enjoyed before the severe reductions of the mid-nineties. In some cases, such as overseas advising centers, additional resources will be necessary to adequately meet the challenges posed by the increased and substantially increased foreign competition and foreign investment in recruiting international students.

Third, I ask you to join the nongovernmental sector in calling on the next administration for leadership. Congress needs to hold the next administration accountable for promoting our national interest with an international education policy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add one additional proposal that is not in the prepared remarks that you had before I sat down here, and I request permission to submit a revised statement for you tomorrow for the record.

Senator GRAMS. As requested, without objection.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you.

My fourth suggestion is that we are asking you to establish a vehicle to use Federal dollars to leverage private, corporate, and university support to stimulate an increase in the number of U.S. students studying abroad. As an example, I would simply mention to you a tremendous impact that many State legislatures, including Minnesota, had during the eighties by appropriating funds that were matched by private support that endowed chairs and professorships at public universities throughout the country.

All of these initiatives were based on the Oklahoma model and they resulted in millions of private dollars of investment in the long-term academic health of public universities. I believe that such an initiative could play a significant role in encouraging America's young people to study abroad.

We recognize that the Federal Government cannot do it all. Colleges, universities, community colleges, and our school systems must further internationalize their curricula and campuses and they must provide enhanced global opportunities for students and faculty. Higher education institutions, State governments, private foundations, nongovernmental organizations, local school districts, and community and business leaders all need to accept responsibility. They must increase their support for international education and they must forge creative partnerships to achieve these important national goals.

But the Federal role is crucial in setting a policy direction, creating a conceptual understanding within which members of the public can define their roles, and using Federal resources to leverage action at other levels. Those in Congress who understand the importance of international education have an important role to play in placing international education policy on the national agenda.

I hope this hearing will be followed by others early in the next Congress, and I call upon the next Congress to pass such a resolution outlining such a policy and urge the next administration to adopt it as the policy of the United States.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Johnson, including attachments, begins on page 45:]

Senator GRAMS. Thank you, Ms. Johnson.
Dr. Mueller.

**STATEMENT OF SHERRY L. MUELLER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL VISITORS, WASH-
INGTON, DC**

Dr. MUELLER. Senator Grams, thank you very much for inviting me to testify on the domestic impact of the State Department's International Visitor [IV] Program. I have the privilege of serving as executive director of the National Council for International Visitors, a nonprofit professional association for the private sector partners in the daily administration of the International Visitor Program.

Each year more than 80,000 volunteers, citizen diplomats, are involved in the activities of our program agency members and our 97 community-based member organizations throughout the United States. Our members organize the professional programs, the cultural activities, the home visits that these distinguished foreign leaders who participate in the international visitor program enjoy while they are in the United States. A list of our members by State is appended. You also have our membership directory and a new publication called "A Salute to Citizen Diplomacy."

When assessing the impressive results of the International Visitor Program or any exchange, for that matter, we tend to focus on the visitors themselves—the positions of prominence they attain, their accomplishments. To illustrate, former Prime Minister of Japan Kaifu when he was here as an international visitor learned about our Peace Corps program and invented years later the Japanese equivalent. Or recently we heard from the current Minister of Justice of Poland, who said that it was her IV experience that really deepened her understanding of democratic institutions and the functioning of a market economy.

We also focus on how the program improves our embassy personnel overseas ability to function and to do their jobs. It has already been underscored that in the most recent survey done of U.S. Ambassadors in fact the International Visitor Program is ranked at the top of the list. I would just remind that the last time the survey was conducted in 1993 the same results occurred.

But when discussing the national interest it is also imperative to focus on the domestic impact of these exchange programs, what do the U.S. communities get out of it. I have conducted some research on this and also have the privilege of spending about 20 percent of my time on the road visiting these citizen diplomats around the country.

Perhaps the most dominant reason or the best illustration of the reason that they are involved in the International Visitor Program can be illustrated by an adaptation of the original ad for the Pony Express rider, and you may remember this from your American history. The add went like this: "Wanted: Young, wiry, skinny fellows under the age of 18. Must be expert riders, willing to risk death daily. Wages, \$25 per week"—pretty good for 1860—"Orphans preferred."

Now, if I were to rewrite this ad for our members and the volunteers who become involved with the International Visitor Program,

it would go something like this: "Wanted: Young at heart of all ages. Must be eager to learn, well organized, and willing to risk breaking stereotypes daily. Wages, will not be discussed. Idealists preferred."

Our volunteers come from all walks of life and represent the diversity of their communities. But what they have in common is that they are all idealists. They care about promoting human rights, about improving civic participation, not only abroad but at home. In working on these programs, they really develop a particular appreciation for American democratic institutions.

Whether in Tennessee, Texas, California, or Wisconsin, whether farmers, bankers, doctors, teachers, these volunteers relish the opportunity to make a difference, as one of our members brochures phrases it, "one handshake at a time."

Their second major motivation is the education of their children. Through extensive schools programs and home hospitality, the children of these citizen diplomats enjoy a valuable supplement to their education. As a volunteer from Freeport, Illinois, phrased it: "My daughter can discuss intelligently places her classmates cannot find on a map."

Many volunteers are involved with the International Visitor Program to counter the "ugly American" image. The Arkansas Council for International Visitors was established in the early 1960's to counter the negative publicity surrounding the integration of Central High School. Founder Fred Darrow, with whom I was visiting just last week, observed that hosting newly independent African visitors helped advance integration in many U.S. communities.

The International Visitor Program still brings a whole variety of people together to host the foreign guests who otherwise would not have the opportunity to work together.

Still others are involved because they are responsible for economic development in their communities and they see exchanges as an opportunity to make valuable connections and to have certain cross-cultural experiences that are particularly valuable for representatives of small and medium sized businesses.

The International Visitor Program reaches a broad spectrum of the community. It involves a cross-section of institutions, individuals, who might never have the opportunity to study or travel abroad. "Travel by proxy" is the way one volunteer described her involvement.

After receiving the invitation to testify, I sent out a broadcast fax to our members inviting their statements. They sent wonderful articles and quotations and a few, some of them, are attached to my testimony, that illustrate the remarkable results of the International Visitor Program, and I hope those statements may be included in the record as well.

Senator GRAMS. Without objection, they will be entered.

Dr. MUELLER. Despite the tremendous constituent involvement in exchanges, the overall direct exchanges appropriation fell 31 percent, adjusted for inflation, since 1993. The International Visitor Program is down 34 percent since 1993. Fewer participants, shorter trips, mean that for the NCIV member organizations the program has diminished by approximately 40 percent.

During a recent visit to Nebraska, our volunteers spoke of declining numbers and their concern that fewer foreign leaders get to smaller and more rural communities, where they can have such a great impact and where they can learn about basic American values.

NCIV is a member of the Alliance. We enthusiastically echo Ms. Johnson's request for a congressional caucus and a national policy on international education. Citizen diplomats leverage an enormous amount of resources for exchanges locally, but they need your leadership at the national level.

NCIV members across the United States strongly support increased funding for all State Department exchanges. We urge that the International Visitor Program in particular not only be restored to its 1993 levels, but that it be expanded to cover inflation and new programmatic needs. Specifically, we request that you identify additional new money in fiscal year 2002 to fund the GREAT program, dubbed as the GrassRoots Exchange and Training Program, that would, under the auspices of the International Visitor Program, enable an additional 400 participants to come to the United States each year.

These new participants would be local officials, representatives of Chambers of Commerce, and other community leaders, who would spend the last week of their 21 days in the States in their current or in a potential sister city, to develop plans of action and strengthen those relationship. This addition to the International Visitor Program would serve as a model, generating synergy among exchange programs, and expand U.S. efforts to build stronger commercial and cultural ties between U.S. leaders and their counterparts abroad. A statement of support for the GREAT program from Sister Cities International is appended. Senator Grams, we appreciate your support for this new initiative.

If the world consisted of only 100 people, only 5 of them would live in the United States. It is imperative that we as a country learn to communicate and to work well with the other 95. The International Visitor Program and other exchanges do just that. Thank you for underscoring that fact by holding this hearing.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Mueller, including attachments, begins on page :]

Senator GRAMS. Thank you, Ms. Mueller. Thank you very much. Carol, welcome.

STATEMENT OF CAROL ENGBRETSON BYRNE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, MINNESOTA INTERNATIONAL CENTER, MINNEAPOLIS, MN

Mrs. BYRNE. Senator Grams, thank you for inviting me to testify today. My name is Carol Engebretson Byrne, the executive director of the Minnesota International Center [MIC]. Founded in 1953, MIC is a membership-based nonprofit, nonpartisan organization whose mission is to foster understanding between Minnesotans and the world. Public interest in the Minnesota International Center is soaring. Our membership has almost tripled in the last 3 years to 2,100 members, and our budget is \$965,000. We are affiliated with the World Affairs Councils of America, the National Councils for International Visitors, and NAFSA.

Our mission is carried out through three major programs. The world affairs program connects international events to the daily lives of Minnesotans by inviting experts on international issues to speak at public forums. Last year over 8,000 people attended the world affairs events.

Our schools program, International Classroom Connection, links international speakers and State Department international visitors to Minnesota classrooms K through 12 to bring inter-cultural perspectives throughout the entire curriculum.

The third program, the International Visitor Program, arranges for foreign civic and business leaders to meet their Minnesota counterparts to discuss issues ranging from legal reform to agricultural technology.

The Minnesota International Center is one of a network of 97 organizations nationwide that host State Department international visitors. Today I am here to underscore the importance of the International Visitors Program to our organization, our State, our country. The State Department views the International Visitors Program as the key component of its public diplomacy initiatives. The International Visitors Program is a professional leadership development program which promotes the exchange of ideas and expertise between mid-career international professionals and their U.S. counterparts.

The power of the program rests with the peer to peer connection. Its success rests in the number of connections that are made. In Minnesota in the mid-1980's we hosted a thousand international visitors on an annual basis. Each international visitor met with a minimum of five professional peers, for a total of approximately 5,000 personal peer to peer connections.

However, in the past years the number of visiting professionals has dropped significantly, from 715 in 1991 to 330 in 1999. That meant that last year just 1,600 contacts were made or 3,400 less than in the mid-eighties.

The Minnesota International Center views the International Visitors Program as critical to introducing our local leaders in business, government, the arts, and civil society to the next generation of leaders emerging in key countries around the world. Minnesotans are avid participants in the burgeoning global society and economy. In 1998, for example, Minnesota companies exported more than \$9.1 billion in agricultural and manufactured products. That figure makes it easy to grasp that more than 100,000 Minnesota jobs are related to the international economy.

We also need the program to add a vital international perspective to our local understanding of who we as Minnesotans are today. The vast wave of international immigration to the United States is rapidly changing the demographic makeup of Minnesota's population. In Minneapolis schools, for example, the number of students for whom English is not the native language has tripled since 1990.

Why is the International Visitors Program so important to Minnesotans and why do I believe this program deserves to be strengthened and bolstered? Because it gives Minnesotans at all levels of society an opportunity to engage in a dialog with others

of similar interests and learn how things are done in other countries.

The International Visitors Program is an efficient way to initiate and nurture critical international professional connections. Minnesotans greatly appreciate this program and as our State's economy grows we have a compelling desire to see it expanded. With our current community contacts, we have the potential to host two or three times the number of international visitors that we have today. We want more international visitors.

Every dollar invested in the program at the national level is leveraged many times over at the local level. We draw heavily upon volunteer support to both manage and implement the program. It is an example of public-private partnership at its best. Volunteers organize professional appointments, may transport international visitors to and from meetings, and host them for dinners and cultural events. More importantly, the people with whom the visiting professionals meet all agree to do so voluntarily. This network of local leaders contributes considerable time to the program at no cost.

Let me give you some examples of Minnesota officials and community leaders who have warmly embraced this program and recently met with our international visitors: former Attorney General Skip Humphrey, Guthrie Theater director Joe Dowling, St. Paul Mayor Norm Coleman, the staff of our own U.S. Senators, Rod Grams and Paul Wellstone, Congressman Jim Ramstad, Governor Jesse Ventura, executives from 3M, Honeywell, Medtronic, and Cargill, and dozens of mayors, county commissioners, education officials, medical personnel, and municipal elected officials statewide. All of these are active partners in nurturing a network of informed global leaders.

Where some of our other programs measure their success by the headlines they generate, the International Visitors Program works more subtly, in a behind the scenes manner. As a result, it is all the more powerful and influential. It is the work that goes on away from the TV cameras and microphones that produces lasting relationships between people and countries.

The International Visitors Program also has had a profound impact on our country's ability to influence positively and discretely the development of democratic principles and processes in other countries. Consider that many of the international visitors to Minnesota come from countries struggling to develop a viable democratic society. Whether in Eastern Europe, Africa, Asia, or Latin America, many of these visiting leaders come from countries lacking strong internal democratic traditions. They desperately need to learn how to implement the basics of a free society, how to establish an equitable system of justice, how to decentralize government decisionmaking so it best represents the interests of all members of their societies.

In Minnesota we arrange for visitors such as these to meet with their local government counterparts to learn how a representative democratic functions in one U.S. State. The implications of this type of activity are profound in terms of American foreign policy goals. Through the International Visitors Program, we are literally helping countries learn how to rebuild their nations in accordance

with the democratic principles that we as a Nation believe are essential to the peaceful functioning of a global society.

MIC members also leap at the opportunity to meet with our international visitors. It is not every day that one can host members of the South African Parliament, a Russian theater director, supreme court justices from Rwanda, or a Brazilian mayor at one's home for dinner. But MIC members have been able to do just that through the International Visitors Program.

These informal dinners in a home offer Minnesotans and visitors alike the chance to relax and exchange international viewpoints. For all participants, it is a chance to set aside any stereotypes they may harbor and learn something new about a new country.

As I mentioned earlier, there is much more we could do in Minnesota with a more robust International Visitors Program. One of the most discouraging outcomes of the funding cutbacks for the program has not only been the tremendous decline in visitors, but the necessity to drastically curtail the number of visitors we schedule for meetings with rural Minnesotans. Due to budgetary reasons, the State Department has in recent years reduced the amount of time visitors spend in the United States from 4 weeks to 3 weeks. In Minnesota this has meant fewer days on the ground for our visitors, with less and less opportunity to schedule visits to areas outside the metropolitan Twin Cities area.

Funding reductions can also erode the quality of the programs, such as interpreting services. Any reduction in the ratio of interpreters to visitors can diminish the quality of productivity of the meetings. This is another area that deserves greater support.

In conclusion, I would like to again express my gratitude for the opportunity to speak to you today. On behalf of the 96 organizations around the country that work with the International Visitors Program, I urge you to support a resolution calling for a greater national priority to international exchange in the United States, including most specifically higher levels of financial and public policy support for the International Visitors Program, including the GREAT program.

The International Visitors Program is a long-term investment in engaging the public and meeting our foreign policy goals.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mrs. Byrne follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CAROL ENGBRETSON BYRNE

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this subcommittee, thank you for inviting me to testify today. I am Carol Engbretson Byrne, the executive director of the Minnesota International Center. Founded in 1953, MIC is a membership-based, non-profit, non-partisan organization whose mission is to foster understanding between Minnesotans and the world. Public interest in the Minnesota International Center is soaring. Our membership has almost tripled in the past three years to 2,100 members and our budget is \$965,000. We are affiliated with the World Affairs Councils of America and the National Councils of International Visitors.

Our mission is carried out through three major programs:

- The World Affairs program connects international events to the daily lives of Minnesotans by inviting experts on international issues to speak at public forums. Last year over 8,000 people attended our World Affairs events.
- Our program for schools, International Classroom Connection, links international speakers and State Department International Visitors to Minnesota classrooms (K-12) to bring intercultural perspectives throughout the entire curriculum.

- And the third program, the International Visitors program, arranges for foreign civic and business leaders to meet their Minnesota counterparts to discuss issues ranging from legal reform to agricultural technology. The Minnesota International Center is one of a network of 97 organizations nationwide that hosts State Department International Visitors.

Today, I am here to underscore the importance of the International Visitors program to our organization, our state and our country. The State Department views the International Visitors program as a key component of its public diplomacy initiatives. The International Visitors program is a professional leadership development program, which promotes the exchange of ideas and expertise between mid-career international professionals and their U.S. counterparts. The power of the program rests within the peer-to-peer connection. Its success rests in the number of connections that are made.

In Minnesota in the mid 1980s, we hosted 1,000 International Visitors on an annual basis. Each International Visitor met with a minimum of 5 professional peers, for a total of 5,000 personal peer-to-peer connections.

However, in the past several years the number of visiting professionals has dropped significantly, from 715 in 1991 to 330 in 1999. That meant that last year just over 1,600 contacts were made—or 3,500 less than in the mid-80s.

The Minnesota International Center views the International Visitors program as critical to introducing our local leaders in business, government, the arts and civic society to the next generation of leaders emerging in key countries around the world.

Minnesotans are avid participants in the burgeoning global society and economy. In 1998, for example, Minnesota companies exported more than \$9.1 billion in agricultural and manufactured products. That figure makes it easy to grasp that more than 100,000 Minnesota jobs are related to the international economy.

We also need the program to add a vital international perspective to our local understanding of who we, as Minnesotans, are today. The vast wave of international immigration to the United States is rapidly changing the demographic makeup of Minnesota's population. In Minneapolis schools, for example, the number of students for whom English is not the native language has tripled since 1990.

Why is the International Visitors program so important to Minnesotans? And why do I believe this program deserves to be strengthened and bolstered to previous funding levels? It gives Minnesotans at all levels of society, an opportunity to engage in a dialogue with others of similar interests—and learn how things are done in other countries.

The International Visitors program is an efficient way to initiate and nurture critical international professional connections. Minnesotans greatly appreciate the program—and as our state's economy grows, we have a compelling desire to see it expanded. With our current community contacts, we have the potential to host two or three times the number of International Visitors that we have today.

We want more International Visitors. Every dollar invested in the program at the national level is leveraged many times over at the local level. We draw heavily upon volunteer support to both manage and implement the program. It is an example of public-private partnership at its best. Volunteers organize professional appointments, transport international visitors to and from meetings and host them for dinners and cultural events. More importantly, the people with whom the visiting professionals meet all agree to do so voluntarily. This network of local leaders contributes considerable time to the program at no cost. Let me give you some examples of Minnesotan government officials and community leaders who have warmly embraced this program and recently met with our International Visitors: former Attorney General Skip Humphrey; Guthrie Theater Director, Joe Dowling; St. Paul Mayor Norm Coleman; the staff of our own U.S. Senators Rod Grams and Paul Wellstone; Congressman Jim Ramstad; Governor Jesse Ventura; executives from 3M, Honeywell, Medtronic and Cargill; and dozens of mayors, county commissioners, arts officials, medical personnel and municipal elected officials statewide. All of these are active partners in nurturing a network of informed global leaders.

Where some of our other programs measure their success by the headlines they generate, the International Visitors program works more subtly in a behind-the-scenes manner. As a result, it is all the more powerful and influential. It's the work that goes on away from the TV cameras and microphones that produces lasting relationships between people and countries.

The International Visitors program also has a profound impact on our country's ability to influence positively—and discreetly—the development of democratic principles and processes in other countries. Consider that many of the International Visitors to Minnesota come from countries struggling to develop a viable democratic

society. Whether in Eastern Europe, Africa, Asia or Latin America, many of these visiting leaders come from countries lacking strong internal democratic traditions themselves. They desperately need to learn how to implement the basics of a free society, how to establish an equitable system of justice, how to decentralize government decision-making so it best represents the interests of all members of their societies, how to establish fair and open government purchasing systems. In Minnesota, we arrange for visitors such as these to meet with their local governmental counterparts to learn how representative democracy functions in one U.S. state. The implications of this type of activity are profound in terms of American foreign policy goals—through the International Visitors program we are literally helping countries learn how to rebuild their nations in accordance with the democratic principles that we as a nation believe are essential to the peaceful functioning of a global society.

MIC members also leap at the opportunity to meet with our international visitors. It is not everyday that one can host members of the South African parliament, a Russian theater director, Supreme Court justices from Rwanda or a Brazilian mayor in one's home for dinner, but MIC members have been able to do just that through the International Visitors program. These informal dinners in a home offer Minnesotans and visitors alike the chance to relax and exchange international viewpoints. For all participants it is a chance to set aside any stereotypes they may harbor and learn something new about another country.

As I mentioned earlier, there is much more we could do in Minnesota with a more robust International Visitors program. One of the most discouraging outcomes of the funding cutbacks for the program has not only been the tremendous decline in visitors, but the necessity to drastically curtail the number of visitors we schedule for meetings with rural Minnesotans. Due to budgetary reasons, the State Department has in recent years reduced the amount of time visitors spend in the United States—from four weeks to three weeks. In Minnesota, this has meant fewer days on the ground for our visitors, with less and less opportunity to schedule visits to areas outside the metropolitan Twin Cities area.

Funding reductions can also erode the quality of the program such as interpreting services. Any reduction in the ratio of interpreters to visitors can diminish the quality of productiveness of the meetings. This is another area that deserves greater support.

In conclusion, I would like to again express my gratitude for the opportunity to speak to you today. On behalf of the 97 organizations around the country that work with the International Visitors program, I urge you to support a resolution calling for a greater national priority to international exchange in the United States—including most specifically higher levels of financial and public policy support for the International Visitors program including the GREAT Program. This program is a long-term investment in engaging the public and meeting our foreign policy goals. Thank you for your time.

Senator GRAMS. Thank you very much, Carol.

Before we begin a round of questioning, with the way the schedule is here in Washington, I have been kind of double-booked. I had another commitment at 10:30, but I have the folks here in the back room. So I am going to take just a quick break. I do not want to take very long, but I have to meet, including Mayor Dick Nelson of Warren, Minnesota, and Vice Mayor Rob Kleiner and a number of others. So I am just going to meet with them very briefly. So I will just take a quick break and then I will be back.

So we will just take a quick break and I will be right back.

[Short recess.]

Senator GRAMS. Thank you very much. I again apologize for doing some of these things out of order, but schedules are schedules. So I thank you very much for your consideration.

Just a few questions I would like to ask our panelists this morning. Again, I really appreciate your taking the time and your testimony and your concerns and suggestions. So maybe we will just start and maybe go back counterclockwise and we will start with Carol here for the first question. Again I want to thank you for being here today, traveling out.

The Minnesota International Center has been recognized nationally for its excellent work with the International Visitors Program and I think it is important to hear about the role of exchanges from the perspective of the heartland in America. I have had the great opportunity to visit a number of times and with some of the visiting dignitaries, including from China recently, and also the Ambassador to the United States from Israel. That was a GREAT lunch the other day as well in Minnesota.

Carol, what has been the impact of these exchange programs on the people of Minnesota? In other words, do you see lasting effects from their contacts with these international visitors? I know you said there has been a great ratio with the professional peers in Minnesota meeting with such counterparts. What kind of lasting effects or benefits does it have, not only on the visitors but on Minnesotans as well?

Mrs. BYRNE. You know, Minnesota is a very interesting State because international exchange has always been very big. If you look at AFS, we have some of the largest number of international students at the high school. We also have one of the largest numbers of Peace Corps returnees. What happens with international exchanges like that and certainly with the International Visitors Program as well is that there is engagement between the public and the world, and they want to continue that.

I think that the fact that Minnesota is a State that looks outward, you see that kind of impact every day. With our members and with people that we come in contact with, we usually find that their interest in international issues was sparked by a personal connection. I think that there are a number of things that have happened.

One case in point would be the SADC conferences that have come to Minnesota, Southern African Development Community. That has come out of a contact from one international visitor from South Africa making a connection with Minnesota and strengthening those ties. You have seen those business connections that have grown as well.

So there are some ways that you can measure it, but there are many, many other ways that you cannot measure it. But you know that that is somebody that has developed a strong international mind set.

Senator GRAMS. I think, as you said, Minnesota looking outward really gave reason for the Minnesota International Center to be born and the things that you have done. It is from the interest of the people there.

Mrs. BYRNE. Right, exactly.

Senator GRAMS. This reflects that.

Mrs. BYRNE. And please note that our membership has tripled, almost tripled in 4 years. I think that that says a lot about how Minnesotans are feeling that they have a compelling need to be very connected, and the younger it starts the better.

Senator GRAMS. Dr. Mueller, I know we might take democracy for granted, but it is great to be able to invite people from other countries to come and, as I think all of you have mentioned, experience it firsthand and get a better understanding of workings of democracy and to take that back home and, not trying to maybe du-

plicate it, but it becomes a very important part of their thinking process.

How has the IV program that you have talked about helped promote democracy abroad?

Dr. MUELLER. I think for many people from parts of the world in transition, whether you are talking about East Europe in particular, it gives them that first exposure and a sense that there is another way to go about organizing society. I think some of us in America do not appreciate how isolated up until the falling of the Berlin Wall and the disintegration of the Soviet Union that that part of the world actually was.

I think even a very brief 3-week exposure can really change a lot of their stereotypes, a lot of their fixed ideas, both about who we are, but about how democratic institutions actually operate. There is no substitute for that actual experience, whether you are taking a Russian visitor to look at open houses on a weekend and say, which one do you want to go in, and then let us talk about how you get a mortgage for it if you were going to buy it. That kind of active experiencing of both a market economy and democratic institutions is irreplaceable. You cannot explain it to somebody in another context, and I think the International Visitor Program has been superb at doing that.

Another example in more of a human rights context would be F.W. deKlerk, for instance, coming here as an international visitor and having that change his ideas about the future of that country. I could give more examples along the way, but why do I not stop there in the interest of time.

Senator GRAMS. Just to followup on that, Dr. Mueller, the Sister Cities program, which as you know is very highly regarded in the State of Minnesota as well, was rated as one of the least useful programs in the field service of public diplomacy programs. So I would like to ask you, how will the new proposal that we have unveiled today help improve our Sister Cities program?

Dr. MUELLER. A few years ago, the then-executive director of Sister Cities and I had a chance to talk. In fact, we were preparing for a panel for the NAFSA conference. Her greatest challenge at the time was finding a way to move more delegations, to strengthen those Sister City relationships and make them more than relationships on paper. Some of the Sister Cities relationships are very strong.

Over my travels in the United States I have had a chance to meet with a lot of Sister Cities volunteers because they often are involved in our Councils for International Visitors as well. So I think the ability to bring more delegations here will strengthen those relationships and put meat on their bones, so to speak.

I also think there have been major changes in both the board composition as well as there is a brand new executive director of Sister Cities, with whom I have met and discussed the GREAT program. You saw their letter. I think they are on a very good course, and I do think the tremendous volunteer support they have across the country will be strengthened by having more foreign delegations to come and work with them more closely.

Senator GRAMS. Marlene, since the end of the cold war many question the need to have exchanges with European countries and

with Canada, claiming that the people from these regions would come to America without taxpayer funding. Has there been an effort to target other regions of the world for expanding U.S. exchange programs activity and, if so, how have they been successful?

Ms. JOHNSON. I think there has been a great deal of effort by both universities and colleges themselves, as well as the State Department, to look at moving students in both directions to the emerging countries, the emerging democracies. Certainly we support that. I just came back 2 days ago, in fact, from South Africa at a conference of sister organizations there that is trying to strengthen the capacity of South African universities to support study abroad programs for American students and to increase the capacity of those institutions to send students here for 1-year programs, not necessarily 4-year programs, which is how most of the international students come now.

There is a great deal of interest in that and a great deal of enthusiasm and leadership in that country for building the infrastructure in South Africa to support American students. There has been a substantial increase in the interest on the part of American students at many universities and colleges around the country.

I think that it is important to identify vehicles to encourage that kind of exchange in both directions, because it is not just that Americans need to meet international visitors and students in our own country, but we need to go there. We need to have more Americans studying abroad, both for short-term and long-term programs, if we are going to do our part to understand the world, just as we want them to come here and get a more personal understanding, more personally in touch with what a democracy means, what it means to have an election and have some people lose and still talk to each other the next day, and to transition governments, to build businesses, to build public-private partnerships, to support non-government associations or organizations like we are.

We represent an aspect of society that is just beginning to exist in most parts of the world, including in Europe. So I do not really share the notion that there is not a need for exchanges with Canada and with Mexico and with Europe. Quite the contrary, I think that, if I could be so bold, I think that we United States Americans are pretty ignorant if we think that Canada is the same as we are, and unfortunately we do think that they are the same as we are and that is a problem. Yet they are our most important trading partner.

So I would encourage us to speed up the exchange between the United States and Canada, but not at the expense of slowing down exchange with Eastern Europe or the former Soviet Union or Africa or Asia, because I think it is critical that we continue to build those relationships in both directions.

Senator GRAMS. My second language is Canadian, so I understand.

Ms. JOHNSON. Well, good. We are proud of you for that.

Senator GRAMS. I wanted to also ask quickly before I move on, are these roles of exchanges becoming more or less important because of really the globalization? I say that because I hear many parents lament that their children and then grandchildren are now working in Beijing or London or Moscow. So I mean, the job oppor-

tunities are global now, not just moving to San Francisco or St. Louis. So really we do have a great mobility worldwide for many job opportunities.

So are these exchange programs becoming more important or are they becoming less important because really it is becoming more of the way of life? Marlene?

Ms. JOHNSON. Well, I think they are becoming more important because it is becoming more a way of life, because the more we begin to engage in the world at a young age the more competent we will be to handle the challenges, to accept the challenges, and be successful in those global environments that we are required to do.

It is not just the people who are going to take a job in Beijing. It is the people in Wilmer, Minnesota, who are working for a company that is doing business internationally. I do not know if there is one in Wilmer exactly. Yes, there is one. I actually, I do remember that. I am losing touch with my old anecdotes a little bit here. I am getting a little rusty.

But there are international businesses of every size in every county in your State and my State, and that is true for most States in this country. I think that is why there is a lot more interest on the part of American parents to get their children learning other languages and really thinking about where they should be studying and what they should be studying, because they know, they know they are working with people whose first language is not English. They know that the products they are making when they go to work in the morning are being sold all over the world and that if we are going to be successful at buying and selling around the world our products—they know that the clothes they are wearing were made someplace else, too.

I mean, Americans are real smart. They just need some help understanding how to take all this new understanding of the world and do some things with our educational system and with our community involvement that helps advance what they know instinctively is required to have a successful future for themselves and their children.

Senator GRAMS. Thank you.

Mr. Denton, let me talk about promoting democracy. What is the administration's record on promoting democracy through these exchange programs?

Mr. DENTON. I cannot say, Mr. Chairman, that I have really done a serious study or assessment of that.

Senator GRAMS. Are you satisfied with it?

Mr. DENTON. Yes. I think that it is basically on track. But I must tell you, Mr. Chairman, I really do not follow the macro numbers in the way that you and your committee do. So I feel like it is a little bit above my pay grade to grade the administration on this. From my limited perspective, I think that this administration has done all right in this respect.

Senator GRAMS. Mr. Denton, your work with the National Forum Foundation and then Freedom House has focused on exchange programs in the area of the Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Again I will kind of reiterate a question I asked earlier: 10 years after the cold war, does that area remain

the most important sphere to focus on for exchange programs in your opinion, more important than others?

Mr. DENTON. You mean geographically?

Senator GRAMS. Yes.

Mr. DENTON. The most important region? Well, that is a tough one.

Senator GRAMS. I suppose it could be in the eye of the beholder.

Mr. DENTON. That is a tough one. I think that it would be a very bad time to let go of that region. There is a great deal of progress that has been made, but, as I mentioned in my comments, I think there are—well, it is very clear that there is still a great distance to go.

This particular region that we are talking about is highly volatile and it is right next to our Western European allies, where we have extraordinary trading relationships and so on. So from a national security standpoint, of course it is highly, highly important.

But on the other hand, I think that it would probably be a good idea for us to be thinking about ways to engage China in this respect for exchanges. There are problems. A lot of them do not return. I think we should be thinking that it will not be long from now before we might have opportunities to do this in Iran, where there has been some interesting progress made in recent years. Those areas would also be strategically important to the United States from a security and economic point of view, and also I think from a moral point of view, to try to strengthen the forces for reform and freedom in those countries.

But I guess that I would have to say that at this stage, if I were to prioritize the world where both there is need and opportunity to engage in a significant way the agents for reform, so to speak, then I would say that the priority would be the former Soviet Union, most particularly Russia and Ukraine, and then southeastern Europe.

Senator GRAMS. Ms. Johnson, I would like to ask, how long of a visit is important to make sure that there is maybe lasting friendships or bonds? Is it a 2-week visit? Does it have to be a 6-month visit? Is there something over history that tells us length of time is better than another?

Ms. JOHNSON. I think that educators would say that the longer the experience the better it is. We certainly as an association, my association is very interested in advancing programs that provide academic credit.

On the other hand, there is also a strong belief in the field that it is better to get people started, and if short gets them started inevitably they will have a second and third experience. I personally subscribe to that. I think that, while it is better to have immersion, because with immersion in a culture, learning what it means to be on your own and having to struggle with that language until you master it and figure it out on your own and live with the family for a while, that is immersion, and 2 weeks or 1 week is not immersion, and a vacation to Paris is not international education. It is a great time. I am all for it and I think we should encourage it, but I do not think it is international education and we should not pretend it is.

On the other hand, I think there are many examples at this table and in this room and beyond of short experiences that have had a tremendous impact on people's thinking and have caused them to go another time for a half a year or a year and even more.

So I think it is really important that we support the range, that we increase the range of opportunities, and that we have a national policy that really says it is important for all of our people to engage in the world. And for those people who do not study abroad, it is critical that our campuses and our communities are more internationalized, that the curricula and the other programs on a campus really keep advancing an international perspective, if we want all of our people, not just those who actually do study abroad, to be successful.

Senator GRAMS. Dr. Mueller, the advantages or virtues of a short-term program such as the international visitor program, the benefits from that? Even though it is maybe not as long as we might want, there are values? Or how would you sum up the International Visitors Program?

Dr. MUELLER. Well, I think it is tremendously important that people have an opportunity, as I indicated earlier, to have that first exposure. I share Marlene's perspective on this and I think the real challenge for Dr. Bader and you, is what is the right mix of exchanges that really does serve the national interest.

I think there is tremendous importance for the Fulbright program and academic exchanges, and likewise it is just awfully valuable to have the International Visitor Program because I think those linkages, as Ms. Byrne described them, the human connections, the web of human connections that are made even in a very short, relatively short visit, really do underpin other relationships that will come later.

I think the International Visitor Program is a tremendous catalyst. It is a tremendous first step, and in many cases it does perform, despite its short length, life-changing—has life-changing results.

Senator GRAMS. Thank you.

Carol, just one final question. I would like you kind of to describe for us, if you would, a typical program which an international visitor could expect to experience when he comes to Minnesota. I know we have done a lot of things with—we know quite a bit, Minnesotans know a lot about countries like Germany, Norway, Sweden, because we have a lot of family ties there. But what role have international exchanges had in focusing more attention on other regions, like Asia, Africa, the Mideast? So what would be a typical type?

Mrs. BYRNE. Well, this is a program that we are going to be doing in October, so we are in the planning of it. I will just give you that example. It is going to be a multi-regional group of journalists coming over. We love to host journalists in Minnesota. With this particular group, they most likely will meet with editorial boards, with the St. Paul Pioneer Press and the Star Tribune. Hopefully, we will take them to Monticello to meet with that newspaper, small town newspaper.

We are going to have a public forum for this group as well, and that is something that the State Department had asked. Often-

times—when we bring in a group of IV's, we want to leverage their visit with as many people as possible in Minnesota.

We might also schedule a visit for them to go to a school. This group is a very interesting IV group, composed of about seven Europeans. Excuse me, when I look back on it, we have got two journalists, one from Greece. We have also got some parliament members. So they are going to talk about Europe in transition.

Then, of course, we will arrange home hospitality. We usually try to only put at most two international visitors per family. So with that group of seven, they will meet with three different families as well.

So it will be whirlwind, 4 full days of Minnesota. The time will be very short, but I think the effects will be long-reaching.

One of the other points to just make about the International Visitors Program is that I really want to commend the State Department and embassies around the world for selecting such stellar individuals to come on this particular program. They come at such a high caliber that when they are in the United States they really can take advantage of those 3 weeks, as opposed to—I can speak on behalf of myself. When I was 17 I was an exchange student and it took me a lot longer to learn things than it does today. So I think the International Visitors Program is like an accelerated program.

When they leave, with the power of technology that it is today, with e-mail, et cetera, those connections will continue.

Senator GRAMS. I think it is just a good example of the benefits on both sides, I mean, for Minnesotans to have the visitors here and also for the visitors to have an exposure, not just to Minnesota but to America and democracy.

I want to thank you very much for your testimony and your answers. I appreciate your time. I also commend Secretary Bader for staying with us and listening to the testimony and taking in all the information. I know it is important to you in your work. So again, thank you all very much.

This hearing is over. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 11:10 a.m. the subcommittee was adjourned.]

PREPARED STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MARLENE M. JOHNSON

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing and for inviting me to testify. I know it's hard to focus on these matters at this particular time of year. All of us in the international education community appreciate your leadership in bringing us together to discuss an issue that may not figure prominently in the political debates swirling around us right now, but that does, we believe, fundamentally affect the national interest of this country.

Let me focus on those two concepts for a moment: leadership, and the national interest. In an earlier era, we understood better that the ability of the United States to protect and advance its interests in the world depended fundamentally on our knowledge of that world and on our ability to promote international understanding. And we all remember the Senators who were prepared to stand up and exercise leadership on behalf of international education and exchange programs that served these objectives.

Oddly, as the world has become more interdependent and more global—as the national interest of the United States has become more linked to events abroad—interest in international education programs in the Congress has declined. It's not that these programs have enemies, but they seem to be viewed as expendable in budget battles.

The American people, however, understand that our country's ability to lead, prosper, and protect our national security in the twenty-first century depends more than ever on international knowledge and understanding. They need—and we need—champions who will fight for our programs in the legislative arena. You, Mr. Chairman, have been such a champion. We need more, on both sides of the aisle.

I testify today on behalf of the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange, of which I chair the board of directors, and NAFSA: Association of International Educators, of which I am CEO. The Alliance is a coalition of more than 60 organizations that sponsor international educational and cultural exchange programs. NAFSA, a member of the Alliance, is the largest professional association of international educators, with more than 8,600 members on college and university campuses nationwide, as well as a growing membership overseas.

On behalf of the tens of thousands of citizens represented by these two organizations, who make international education and exchange work on campuses and in communities all over this country, I thank you for being our champion, Mr. Chairman, and I express to you our hope that you will do even more in the future to fill the leadership vacuum that exists on our issues.

To be true to this constituency, Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that there is a lot more to international education than exchange. We have to internationalize our college and university curricula and classrooms, make sure study abroad programs are linked to students' academic programs, deepen and broaden foreign language instruction so that Americans are conversant in the world's major languages, maintain and increase our output of international specialists who will provide the next generation of expert knowledge, and support an ambitious agenda of international and global research in all disciplines to help us understand and shape globalization.

Exchanges are an indispensable part of all that, but they aren't the whole picture. And we need to work on all of it to prepare ourselves for the new century.

We have tried to lay out the whole picture in a NAFSA-Alliance paper entitled, "Toward an International Education Policy for the United States," which is appended to my statement. This paper represents our effort to articulate a post-cold war rationale for international education and exchange in the global world. Unlike most such efforts, it is deliberately short and to the point, as a way of encouraging policy makers to read it. I commend it to you.

The focus of this hearing is international educational and cultural exchange programs, including Fulbright programs, Citizen Exchanges, the International Visitor Program, high school exchanges, and the broad range of privately funded exchanges that the State Department facilitates under the J visa program. These programs establish the people-to-people ties between the United States and other nations that enable us to support American business interests and carry out U.S. foreign policy goals. These are the programs that establish the foundation for effective U.S. public diplomacy, economic competitiveness, and national security in the next century.

They also include overseas educational advising centers, which counsel foreign students seeking an education in the United States. These centers deserve much of the credit for the half-a-million foreign students who study here every year, and for the billions of dollars that they and their families contribute to the American economy.

Foreign students and exchange visitors who come to the United States take American values and perspectives home with them, promote democratic institutions and market-based economies, make major purchasing decisions involving American products, and create partnerships with American enterprises. Many have become important leaders in their societies, enhancing our diplomatic ties with a number of nations. Virtually all of them have a profound, positive impact on our own security and prosperity.

In recent years, international education has become a major global issue. Education topped the agenda of the Summit of the Americas in 1998. In the past few years, the governments of Australia, Great Britain, France, and other countries have placed a major emphasis on recruiting international students, and have dedicated millions of dollars toward that mission. This year, the G-8 adopted a goal of doubling the number of exchanges in the next 10 years.

The United States lags far behind in terms of having proactive national policies to promote international education. Recently, however, there have been hopeful signs of increased national priority and attention to these issues.

- In the fall of 1998, the U.S. Information Agency and the Educational Testing Service hosted a joint conference on the state of U.S. leadership in international education. The conference report concluded that the United States is indeed losing its edge in international education, as other nations strategically and ag-

gressively establish national policies to promote international education. The report called on the United States to adopt such a policy.

- Last February, responding to that call, NAFSA and the Alliance released the statement I referred to earlier, calling for the establishment of a U.S. international education policy and setting forth what we thought such a policy should be.
- This statement provided an important basis for President Clinton's April 19 executive memorandum for the heads of agencies on international education policy, which Dr. Bader has discussed.
- On the heels of that memorandum, Congressman Jim Kolbe, together with a bipartisan group of co-sponsors, introduced a resolution based on the NAFSA-Alliance statement, stating the need for such a policy.
- The Senate Appropriations Committee, in its report accompanying the fiscal year 2001 CJS appropriations bill, noted that international exchanges are a foreign policy priority and urged the State and Education departments to give international education a higher position on the national agenda.
- In May of this year, Chairman Gilman of the International Relations Committee introduced a bill to increase study abroad opportunities for financially-disadvantaged students. We have worked closely with the Chairman on this bill, which is now before the Senate. I hope you will pass it.
- And for the first time, our nation will celebrate U.S. International Education Week on November 13-17, 2000.

I have submitted materials for each of these important developments for the record.

And now, these hearings are highlighting the importance of one very important aspect of an international education policy—exchange programs.

We've come a long way in the period of a year or two, but we have only just begun. We mustn't allow the momentum to die. Here is what we need to do to be sure that international education, and particularly educational and cultural exchange programs, can meet the challenges we face as a nation in this global era.

- First, I ask you to establish a congressional caucus on international education, so that we'll have a forum for promoting a long-term, forward-thinking policy on international education. Sustained congressional leadership is essential to our success.
- Second, I ask you to work to ensure that our nation's flagship exchange programs, the ones that are tried and true, have healthy budgets so that they'll have the resources they need to serve our national interests. At a minimum, these programs need to be restored to the levels of funding they enjoyed before the severe reductions of the mid-nineties. In some cases, we will need additional resources to adequately meet the challenges posed by increased foreign competition.
- Third, I ask you to join the nongovernmental sector in calling on the next administration for leadership. Congress needs to hold the next administration accountable for promoting our national interest with an international education policy.

We recognize that the federal government can't do it all. Colleges, universities, community colleges, and our school systems must further internationalize their curricula and campuses, and must provide enhanced global opportunities for students and faculty. Higher education institutions, state governments, private foundations, nongovernmental organizations, local school districts, and community and business leaders all need to accept their responsibilities, increase their support for international education, and forge creative partnerships to achieve these important national goals.

But the federal role is crucial in setting a policy direction, creating a conceptual understanding within which members of the public can define their roles, and using federal resources to leverage action at other levels. Those in Congress who understand the importance of international education have an important role to play in placing international education policy on the national agenda. I hope this hearing will be followed by others early in the next Congress. And I call upon the next Congress to pass a resolution outlining such a policy and urging the next administration to adopt it as the policy of the United States.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

TOWARD AN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES
 NAFSA: Association of International Educators Alliance for International
 Educational and Cultural Affairs
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

International education—imparting effective global literacy to students and other citizens as an integral part of their education—is important to meet three challenges facing the United States: national security and the management of global conflict, competitiveness in a global economy, and an increasingly multicultural society.

Several factors are of concern: declining U.S. competitiveness in the international student market; the extremely low participation of U.S. students in study abroad programs; the critical shortage of Americans' foreign language skills; and the declining priority given to exchange programs which, in the past, have done much to extend U.S. influence by educating the world's future leaders.

We propose that the nation commit itself to work toward several ambitious goals, including:

- Knowledge of a foreign language and a foreign area by all college graduates.
- Enhancing the educational infrastructure through which the United States produces international expertise.
- Recapturing 40 percent of the international student market and streamlining visa, taxation, and employment policies and regulations applicable to international students.
- Vastly increasing the number of U.S. students studying abroad; promoting ethnic, socioeconomic, and gender diversity in study abroad; and diversifying the locations, languages, and subjects involved in study abroad.
- Invigorating citizen and professional exchange programs and promoting the international exchange of scholars.

We ask that the President announce such an international education policy, take steps to ensure effective leadership and interagency coordination on the part of his administration, and seek broad participation by educators and others in the formulation and implementation of the policy. To view the entire statement, go to <http://www.nafsa.org/int-ed/22200.html>.

TOWARD AN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

February 22, 2000

SUMMARY

In the two decades following World War II, visionary leaders understood that the challenges of the cold war required that Americans be knowledgeable about the world, and they created international education programs to endow Americans with the skills necessary to compete in that environment. Today our nation faces global challenges that, although less stark, are at least as profound. Yet our commitment as a nation to international education—that is, to imparting effective global literacy to students and other citizens as an integral part of their education—is in doubt.

With the end of the cold war, the United States mistakenly drew the conclusion that it had the luxury of retreating from international concerns and focusing on domestic problems. In today's world, however, that is impossible.

- It is now clear that the end of the cold war did not mean an end to international, civil, and ethnic conflict. The defense of U.S. interests and the effective management of global unrest in the next century will require more, not less, ability on the part of Americans to understand the world in terms other than their own.
- Globalization is obliterating the distinction between foreign and domestic concerns. Most domestic problems in today's world are also international. The global economic and technology revolutions are redefining the nation's economic security and reshaping business, life, and work. The opening of global markets, the explosion of trade, the globalizing effects of Internet technology, and the need for U.S. business to compete in countries around the world require a global content in education in general, as well as specific foreign language and country expertise.
- The world is coming to us, whether we like it or not. Immigrants are changing the face of American society. Foreign-born experts now pace America's scientific

leadership. The American workforce is now multicultural, and customers for American products are found everywhere the Internet goes. These realities help fuel U.S. development, but they also create new needs, both for managers who can think globally and for tolerance and cross-cultural sensitivity in our neighborhoods and workplaces.

In short, international and cross-cultural awareness and understanding on the part of U.S. citizens will be crucial to effective U.S. leadership, competitiveness, prosperity, and national security in the next century. Yet—all the laws on the books notwithstanding—the United States effectively lacks a coherent, coordinated, operational policy for educating its citizens internationally.

What is needed is a policy that promotes international education in the broadest sense, including supporting the learning of foreign languages and in-depth knowledge of other cultures by Americans, promoting study abroad by U.S. students, encouraging students from other countries to study in the United States, facilitating the exchange of scholars and of citizens at all levels of society, and supporting the educational infrastructure through which we produce international competence and research.

We propose that the President announce and implement an international education policy that: (1) articulates the national interest in international education; (2) sets forth the goals and objectives of such a policy; (3) dedicates resources that are appropriate to these interests, goals, and objectives; (4) charges a high-level government official with lead responsibility for the promotion and implementation of the policy; (5) specifies the roles of appropriate government agencies in implementing the policy; (6) mandates interagency coordination under leadership of the senior official referred to above; and (7) creates an ongoing mechanism whereby international education professionals, business leaders, and state-level officials can offer advice and guidance on policy development and implementation.

WHY DOES THE UNITED STATES NEED AN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY?

Globalization expands the nation's need for international competence. To maintain U.S. security, well being, and global economic leadership, we need to increase the depth and variety of international expertise of Americans in government, business, education, the media, and other fields. While the Internet dramatically increases opportunities for global collaboration, technology alone cannot substitute for the expertise developed through serious study and substantive international experience.

In addition to increasing the global awareness of Americans, our international education interests also encompass the presence of foreign students in the United States. In the 1998-99 academic year, nearly 500,000 international students studied in the United States at the post-secondary level. They and their dependents spent more than \$11 billion on tuition, fees, and living expenses in U.S. higher-education institutions and communities, making international education the fifth-largest U.S. service-sector export.

But these students represent much more than an entry on the credit side of the U.S. current accounts ledger. To educate them is to have an opportunity to shape the future leaders who will guide the political and economic development of their countries. In American classrooms, dormitories, and living rooms, international students gain an in-depth exposure to American values and to our successful multicultural democracy, and they take those values home to support democracy and market economies. They develop an appreciation of American products and are likely to remain American customers throughout their lives. They enrich American campuses and provide many American students with their first-ever exposure to foreign friends and colleagues. The millions of people who have studied in the United States over the years constitute a remarkable reservoir of goodwill for our country, perhaps our most underrated foreign policy asset.

Yet because the United States does not have a proactive policy for attracting international students, we are beginning to lose our share of this market to those countries that do. Although we still dominate the international student market, the proportion of international students who choose to study in the United States has declined almost 10 percent since 1982; it now stands at just over 30 percent. The United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, among others, have announced or are implementing aggressive international student recruitment strategies that promise to make further inroads into current U.S. market share unless we adopt measures to reverse the trend.

America's success in attracting international students has not been matched by success in sending students abroad. The number of Americans who study overseas for academic credit is increasing; it topped 100,000 for the first time in 1998-99—a tribute to the efforts of international educators and certain colleges and univer-

sities. However, study abroad participants remain less than one percent of our roughly 15 million undergraduates and, as noted by the Institute of International Education, many students still do not have access to study abroad programs. Recent data also show an encouraging diversification of study abroad locations; nevertheless, we need to further increase the numbers of students studying outside of Europe, in world areas of growing importance to U.S. interests.

At a time when other countries understand that their citizens cannot be considered educated for the modern world unless part of their education has taken place abroad, the United States has no policy to promote global learning, nor do policymakers seem aware of the need for one. Research has demonstrated that study abroad greatly enhances and accelerates the learning of critical foreign languages. If American students are to be able to function effectively in the world into which they will graduate, it must become the routine—not the exception—for them to study abroad in high quality programs.

American foreign language skills are in critically short supply and will remain so until we take bold steps to enhance both participation in study abroad and the infrastructure for teaching foreign languages in our institutions. The U.S. government requires 34,000 employees with foreign language skills, and American business increasingly needs internationally and multi-culturally experienced employees to compete in a global economy and to manage a culturally diverse workforce.

The United States benefits from a great wealth of exchange programs, some federally funded but many more funded privately. They operate at all levels, from high school to higher education to the business and professional realms. Armies of American volunteers make these programs possible, hosting visitors in their homes and serving as resources and guides to their communities. Exchange programs uniquely engage our citizenry in the pursuit of our country's global interests, and offer opportunities for substantive interaction in the broadest possible range of fields.

These exchanges also offer unparalleled opportunities for intercultural learning. Many of today's world leaders first experienced America and its values through exchange programs—a priceless foreign policy asset. But these valuable programs are hemmed in by diminished policy priority and by bureaucratically imposed regulations that make them more difficult than necessary for nongovernmental and community organizations to manage.

To be an educated citizen today is to be able to see the world through others' eyes and to understand the international dimensions of the problems we confront as a nation—skills that are enhanced by international experience. The programs we put in place today to make international experience integral to higher education will determine whether or not our society will have a globally literate citizenry prepared to respond to the demands of the twenty-first century.

ELEMENTS OF AN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY

An international education policy that effectively promotes U.S. interests in the twenty-first century should do the following:

International, Foreign Language, and Area Expertise

Such a policy should recognize that future generations of Americans will live in a borderless world, and must therefore be vastly more capable than any previous generation of understanding other peoples and cultures and communicating in the world's major languages. To this end, it should:

- Set an objective that international education become an integral component of U.S. undergraduate education, with every college graduate achieving proficiency in a foreign language and attaining a basic understanding of at least one world area by 2015. New technologies should be employed creatively to help achieve this objective.
- Promote cultural and foreign language study in primary and secondary education so that entering college students will have increased proficiency in these areas.
- Through graduate and professional training and research, enhance the nation's capacity to produce the international, regional, international business, and foreign-language expertise necessary for U.S. global leadership and security.
- Encourage international institutional partnerships that will facilitate internationalized curricula, collaborative research, and faculty and student mobility.

International Student Recruitment

Such a policy should recognize that international students are a resource for the United States: They contribute significantly to national, state, and local economies; bring vital resources to U.S. educational institutions; enrich the academic experi-

ence of U.S. students; and spread U.S. values and influence in the world. To this end, the policy should:

- Set an objective to arrest the decline in the proportion of internationally mobile students who select the United States for study at the post-secondary level and to recapture 40 percent of this market for the United States.
- Promote the study of English by international students in the United States, and promote the United States as the best global provider of English training services and materials.
- Streamline visa, taxation, and employment policies and regulations to facilitate entry into the United States for bona fide short-term and degree students and to enable these students to maximize their exposure to American society and culture through internships and employment.

STUDY ABROAD

Such a policy should recognize that providing Americans with opportunities to acquire the skills, attitudes, and perceptions that allow them to be globally and cross-culturally competent is central to U.S. security and economic interests in the twenty-first century and, accordingly, should promote the experiencing of the world firsthand by American students. To this end, it should:

- Set an objective that 20 percent of American students receiving college degrees will have studied abroad for credit by 2010, and 50 percent by 2040.
- Promote ethnic, socioeconomic, and gender diversity in study abroad.
- Promote the diversification of the study abroad experience, including: increased study in nontraditional locations outside the United Kingdom and Western Europe; increased study of major world languages—such as Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, and Russian—that are less commonly learned by Americans; and increased study of under-represented subjects such as mathematical and physical sciences and business.
- Promote the integration of study abroad into the higher-education curriculum, and increase opportunities for international internships and service learning.

Exchanges of Citizens and Scholars

Such a policy should recognize that U.S. interests are significantly furthered by the vast network of exchange activity that occurs at all levels of American society. Accordingly, it should:

- Invigorate federal programs and reform regulations governing private efforts in order to promote citizen, professional, and other exchanges that bring future leaders from around the world to the United States for substantive exposure to our society, and that give future American leaders opportunities for similar experiences overseas.
- Promote the international exchange of scholars in order to enhance the global literacy of U.S. scholars, ensure that the United States builds relationships with the best scholarly talent from abroad, and strengthen the international content of American curricula.

MOBILIZING THE RESOURCES

Such a policy should recognize the crucial role of the federal government in mobilizing a national effort. Accordingly, it should:

- Clearly articulate the national interest in international education and set a strong policy direction to which citizens can relate their own efforts.
- Dedicate federal resources that are appropriate for the national interests served.
- Stimulate involvement by, and leverage funding from, the states and the higher education, business, and charitable communities.

HOW TO PROCEED

The President should:

- Announce the international education policy in a major address, decision memorandum, or message to Congress, and propose appropriate funding.
- Appoint a senior White House official who will be in charge of the policy and responsible for meeting its targets.

- Convene a White House summit of college and university presidents, other academic leaders, international education professionals, and NGO and business leaders to map out the specifics of the policy.
- Assign specific roles to appropriate federal agencies.
- Create an interagency working group of these agencies, chaired by the senior White House official, to ensure that policies and regulations affecting international education are consistent and coherent.
- Create an advisory commission consisting of business leaders, state-level officials, and international education professionals from institutions of higher education, exchange programs, foundations, and appropriate professional associations to offer advice and guidance on program implementation.

A COOPERATIVE EFFORT

The federal government cannot do it all. Colleges, universities, and community colleges must further internationalize their curricula and campuses, and must provide enhanced global opportunities for students and faculty. Higher education institutions, state governments, private foundations, nongovernmental organizations, and the business community (which will be the primary beneficiary of a globally literate workforce) all need to accept their responsibilities, increase their support for international education, and forge creative partnerships to achieve these important national goals.

But the federal role is crucial in setting a policy direction, creating a conceptual understanding within which members of the public can define their roles, and using federal resources to leverage action at other levels. If Americans are called upon from the “bully pulpit” to respond to the challenge of globalism, they will respond as they have to other international challenges. What is needed above all, as noted in a 1998 report by the U.S. Information Agency and the Educational Testing Service, is “a clearly articulated foreign policy strategy which recognizes international education as a fundamentally important endeavor at policy levels.”

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary (Oklahoma City, Oklahoma)

For Immediate Release—April 19, 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

SUBJECT: International Education Policy

To continue to compete successfully in the global economy and to maintain our role as a world leader, the United States needs to ensure that its citizens develop a broad understanding of the world, proficiency in other languages, and knowledge of other cultures. America’s leadership also depends on building ties with those who will guide the political, cultural, and economic development of their countries in the future. A coherent and coordinated international education strategy will help us meet the twin challenges of preparing our citizens for a global environment while continuing to attract and educate future leaders from abroad.

Since World War II, the Federal Government, in partnership with institutions of higher education and other educational organizations, has sponsored programs to help Americans gain the international experience and skills they will need to meet the challenges of an increasingly interdependent world. During this same period, our colleges and universities have developed an educational system whose reputation attracts students from all over the world. But our work is not done. Today, the defense of U.S. interests, the effective management of global issues, and even an understanding of our Nation’s diversity require ever-greater contact with, and understanding of, people and cultures beyond our borders.

We are fortunate to count among our staunchest friends abroad those who have experienced our country and our values through in-depth exposure as students and scholars. The nearly 500,000 international students now studying in the United States at the postsecondary level not only contribute some \$9 billion annually to our economy, but also enrich our communities with their cultures, while developing a lifelong appreciation for ours. The goodwill these students bear for our country will in the future constitute one of our greatest foreign policy assets.

It is the policy of the Federal Government to support international education. We are committed to:

- encouraging students from other countries to study in the United States;

- promoting study abroad by U.S. students;
- supporting the exchange of teachers, scholars, and citizens at all levels of society;
- enhancing programs at U.S. institutions that build international partnerships and expertise;
- expanding high-quality foreign language learning and in-depth knowledge of other cultures by Americans;
- preparing and supporting teachers in their efforts to interpret other countries and cultures for their students; and
- advancing new technologies that aid the spread of knowledge throughout the world.

The Federal Government cannot accomplish these goals alone. Educational institutions, State and local governments, non-governmental organizations, and the business community all must contribute to this effort. Together, we must increase and broaden our commitment. Therefore, I direct the heads of executive departments and agencies, working in partnership with the private sector, to take the following actions:

(1) The Secretaries of State and Education shall support the efforts of schools and colleges to improve access to high-quality international educational experiences by increasing the number and diversity of students who study and intern abroad, encouraging students and institutions to choose nontraditional study-abroad locations, and helping under-represented U.S. institutions offer and promote study-abroad opportunities for their students.

(2) The Secretaries of State and Education, in partnership with other governmental and nongovernmental organizations, shall identify steps to attract qualified post-secondary students from overseas to the United States, including improving the availability of accurate information overseas about U.S. educational opportunities.

(3) The heads of agencies, including the Secretaries of State and Education, and others as appropriate, shall review the effect of U.S. Government actions on the international flow of students and scholars as well as on citizen and professional exchanges, and take steps to address unnecessary obstacles, including those involving visa and tax regulations, procedures, and policies.

(4) The Secretaries of State and Education shall support the efforts of State and local governments and educational institutions to promote international awareness and skills in the classroom and on campuses. Such efforts include strengthening foreign language learning at all levels, including efforts to achieve bi-literacy, helping teachers acquire the skills needed to understand and interpret other countries and cultures for their students, increasing opportunities for the exchange of faculty, administrators, and students, and assisting educational institutions in other countries to strengthen their teaching of English.

(5) The Secretaries of State and Education and the heads of other agencies shall take steps to ensure that international educational exchange programs, including the Fulbright program, are coordinated through the Interagency Working Group on United States Government-Sponsored International Exchange and Training, to maximize existing resources in a nonduplicative way, and to ensure that the exchange programs receive the support they need to fulfill their mission of increased mutual understanding.

(6) The Secretary of Education, in cooperation with other agencies, shall continue to support efforts to improve U.S. education by developing comparative information, including benchmarks, on educational performance and practices. The Secretary of Education shall also share U.S. educational expertise with other countries.

(7) The Secretaries of State and Education shall strengthen and expand models of international exchange that build lasting cross-national partnerships among educational institutions with common interests and complementary objectives.

(8) The Secretary of Education and the heads of other agencies, in partnership with State governments, academic institutions, and the business community, shall strengthen programs that build international expertise in U.S. institutions, with the goal of making international education an integral component of U.S. undergraduate education and, through graduate and professional training and research, enhancing the Nation's capacity to produce the international and foreign-language expertise necessary for U.S. global leadership and security.

(9) The Secretaries of State and Education, in cooperation with other agencies, the academic community, and the private sector, shall promote wise use of technology internationally, examining the implications of borderless education. The heads of agencies shall take steps to ensure that the opportunities for using technology to expand international education do not result in a widening of the digital divide.

(10) The Secretaries of State and Education, in conjunction with other agencies, shall ensure that actions taken in response to this memorandum are fully integrated into the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) framework by means of specific goals, milestones, and measurable results, which shall be included in all GPRA reporting activities, including strategic plans, performance plans, and program performance reports.

Items 1-10 of this memorandum shall be conducted subject to the availability of appropriations, consistent with the agencies' priorities and my budget, and to the extent permitted by law.

The Vice President shall coordinate the U.S. Government's international education strategy. Further, I direct that the heads of agencies report to the Vice President and to me on their progress in carrying out the terms of this memorandum.

This memorandum is a statement of general policy and does not confer a private right of action on any individual or group.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

106th CONGRESS—2d SESSION

H. CON. RES. 342

Expressing the sense of Congress that there should be an international education policy for the United States.

In the House of Representatives

May 25, 2000

Mr. KOLBE (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mrs. MORELLA) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce

Concurrent Resolution

Expressing the sense of Congress that there should be an international education policy for the United States.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(a) International education entails the imparting of effective global literacy to students and other citizens as an integral part of their education;

(b) International education is important to meet future challenges facing the United States including national security and the management of global conflict and competitiveness in a global economy;

(c) Nearly 500,000 international students and their dependents contributed an estimated \$11.7 billion to the U.S. economy in the academic year 1998-99;

(d) Other countries, especially the United Kingdom, are mounting vigorous recruitment campaigns to compete for international students;

(e) U.S. competitiveness in the international student market is declining, the U.S. share of internationally mobile students having declined from 40 percent to 30 percent since 1982;

(f) Educating international students is an important way to spread U.S. values and influence and to create goodwill for America throughout the world;

(g) Less than 10 percent of U.S. students graduating from college have studied abroad;

(h) Research indicates that the United States is failing to graduate enough students with foreign language expertise to fill the demands of business, government, and universities; and

(i) Exchange programs, which in the past have done much to extend U.S. influence in the world by educating the world's leaders, are suffering from declining priority:

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that an international education policy should incorporate the following goals—

(a) To ensure that all college graduates will have knowledge of a second language and will have knowledge of a foreign area.

(b) To enhance the educational infrastructure through which the Nation produces international expertise.

(c) To recapture 40 percent of the international student market for the United States.

(d) To streamline visa, taxation, and employment regulations applicable to international students.

(e) To significantly increase participation in study abroad by U.S. students.

(f) To promote greater diversity of locations, languages, and subjects involved in study abroad in order to ensure that the Nation maintains an adequate international knowledge base.

(g) To invigorate citizen and professional exchange programs and to promote the international exchange of scholars.

106th CONGRESS—2d SESSION

H. R. 4528

To establish an undergraduate grant program of the Department of State to assist students of limited financial means from the United States to pursue studies at foreign institutions of higher education.

In the House of Representatives

May 24, 2000

Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. HINCHEY) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

A Bill

To establish an undergraduate grant program of the Department of State to assist students of limited financial means from the United States to pursue studies at foreign institutions of higher education.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “International Academic Opportunity Act of 2000”.

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this Act to establish an undergraduate grant program for students of limited financial means from the United States to enable such students to study at institutions of higher education in foreign countries. Such foreign study is intended to broaden the outlook and better prepare such students of demonstrated financial need to assume significant roles in the increasingly global economy.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF GRANT PROGRAM FOR FOREIGN STUDY BY AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS OF LIMITED FINANCIAL MEANS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Subject to the availability of appropriations and under the authorities of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, the Secretary of State shall establish and carry out a program in each fiscal year to award grants of up to \$5,000, to individuals who meet the requirements of subsection (b), toward the cost of 1 academic year of undergraduate study at an institution of higher education in a foreign country.

(b) **ELIGIBILITY.**—An individual referred to in subsection (a) is an individual who—

(1) is a student in good standing at an institution of higher education in the United States (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965);

(2) has been accepted for an academic year of study at an institution of higher education outside the United States (as defined by section 102(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965);

(3) is receiving any need-based student assistance under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

(4) is a citizen or national of the United States.

(c) **APPLICATION AND SELECTION.**—

(1) Grant application and selection shall be carried out through accredited institutions of higher education in the United States or combination of such institutions under such procedures as are established by the Secretary of State.

(2) In considering applications for grants under this section, priority consideration shall be given to applicants who are receiving Federal Pell Grants under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

SEC. 4. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

The Secretary of State shall report annually to the Congress concerning the grant program established under this Act. Each such report shall include the following information for the preceding year:

- (1) The number of participants.
- (2) The institutions of higher education in the United States that participants attended.
- (3) The institutions of higher education outside the United States participants attended during their year of study abroad.
- (4) The areas of study of participants.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated \$1,500,000 for each fiscal year to carry out this Act.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect October 1, 2000.

THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, September 13, 2000.

Ms. MARLENE JOHNSON,
Executive Director,
NASFAA—Association of International Educators,
1307 New York Avenue, NW, 8th Floor,
Washington, DC 20005

DEAR MS. JOHNSON:

I am writing to encourage your involvement in an effort to broaden our students' understanding of the world in which we live. The week of November 13-17, 2000, has been designated International Education Week in the United States by the Department of Education and the Department of State. This weeklong observation will provide a wonderful opportunity for students in our nation's schools, colleges and universities to learn more about the cultures, languages and governments of other nations and about the possibilities of studying abroad. I have invited foreign ambassadors to the United States to consider visiting educational institutions in this country, and I am encouraging representatives of the higher education community to visit schools in their communities. Your assistance will underscore the education community's commitment to international education and cooperation.

On June 21, at the U.S. Department of State, I met with representatives from the embassy community and the nongovernmental sector to exchange ideas regarding the Memorandum on International Education Policy, which President Clinton signed on April 19. Designed to make international experience integral to U.S. education, the policy memorandum directs the heads of U.S. government agencies to work together in consultation with all other sectors of society to strengthen America's commitment to international education.

During my remarks at the June 21 briefing, I invited ambassadors to the United States to visit at least one American school, college, or university during International Education Week in order to stress the importance of international education and cooperation. It is my hope that, in taking a firsthand look at our educational institutions, the ambassadors will have a better understanding of our young people and will be inspired to foster classroom-to-classroom connections among our schools, colleges, and universities and those in their home countries. I believe that the visits will not only help our students develop a wider view of the world and its different governments and cultures, but will also generate greater interest in studying foreign languages and visiting and studying in other countries.

Additionally, I will be inviting college and university presidents, provosts, and chancellors as well as heads of study abroad and international programs to visit middle schools and high schools during the week of November 13 to tell students about the opportunities and benefits of study abroad. I believe students in this age group will be a receptive audience for any information about foreign study and travel.

Your help and active participation will contribute greatly to the success of International Education Week. If you have any questions about International Education Week, please feel free to contact Regan Burke of my staff. We will keep you informed about this activity.

I appreciate your kind attention to this request and look forward to receiving any comments you may have. I hope you will be able to participate.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD W. RILEY.

U.S. LEADERSHIP IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: THE LOST EDGE?

WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 24, 1998

Conference Report and Action Agenda

I. INTRODUCTION

The presence of international students on U.S. campuses has created significant political, social, and economic benefits for our nation as a whole, but disturbing trends throughout the 1990s show that the United States may be losing its competitive edge in international education.

Officials from U.S. higher education and related organizations are seeing large numbers of students from Japan, China, Korea, India—countries that traditionally provide a large proportion of our foreign student enrollment—choosing to study in other countries. In the 1980s, 40 percent of the 1.3 million students studying abroad did so in the United States. Today we enroll just 32 percent.

In addition to this declining trend in the percentage of international students studying in the United States, officials are also noticing aggressive competition from other English-speaking countries.

To address these concerns, Dr. Joseph Duffey, Director of the United States Information Agency, and Dr. Nancy Cole, President of Educational Testing Service, convened a summit at the State Department on September 24, 1998. Participants in the summit on U.S. Leadership in International Education included representatives from institutions of higher education, U.S. corporations, non-profit organizations, and government entities.

The conference participants sought to identify barriers to international educational exchange between the U.S. and other countries and to formulate an action plan to maintain U.S. leadership. A volunteer task force will be formed to take action on the conference recommendations; and USIA will coordinate U.S. government involvement on this front.

(This document reviews the conference deliberations and sets forth recommendations and a suggested plan of action. The Appendices include abstracts of major addresses made during the conference, the conference agenda, a White Paper by Dr. Ted Sanders, President of Southern Illinois University, and a list of conference participants.)

II. SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE DELIBERATIONS

At the end of the conference, it was clear that intensified competition from other countries was only part of the reason for the erosion of America's dominant position in the world of international study. Other more troubling signs emerged—ones showing that key players in the United States' international education effort have contributed to this decline through benign neglect. In his White Paper written for the conference, Dr. Ted Sanders, President of Southern Illinois University, identified complacent attitudes on the part of U.S. institutions of higher education toward promoting themselves to foreign students; state and Federal governments failing to promote an aggressive spirit of entrepreneurship in international education; and diminishing Federal funds to support overseas educational advising centers affiliated with the United States Information Agency as factors that have contributed to this neglect.

Dr. Sanders summed up his position by noting, "If we are to regain our position of dominance in this very important area, we must now begin to emulate the enlightened policies of other advanced nations who have seen the future and are aggressively pursuing it. Nationally, we must enhance our tangible support for international efforts within a framework of a broad-based, clearly defined strategy . . ."

Following a series of major addresses, participants joined one of three groups to discuss the issues in-depth. They identified many of the barriers to U.S. leadership in international education.

(For purposes of clarity, we have grouped issues identified by conference participants into four categories: those that need to be addressed by higher education; by Federal, state, and local governments; by businesses and corporations; and global systemic issues.)

Institutions of Higher Education

For many decades, the flow of international students to the United States seemed to be never ending. Yet, participants agreed that this abundance has contributed to complacency by some institutions, evidenced by inattention to the marketplace. A long complicated application process for U.S. study and the perceived high cost of a U.S. education hamper international exchange, as does limited collaboration between U.S. and foreign institutions. For many younger U.S. faculty, a year abroad is career-deflating rather than enhancing. The difficulties that faculty sometimes experience in taking advantage of opportunities to research or teach abroad diminish the overall impact of international exchange and hamper Fulbright and other sponsored programs. Participants acknowledged that other institutions, however, are actively engaged in entrepreneurial approaches to international education, with extensive collaboration with institutions abroad and active overseas recruitment efforts.

Participants also discussed the inadequate integration of foreign students on American campuses. It was felt that officials at many institutions viewed these students primarily as revenue sources and offered limited mechanisms for incorporating them into or using their experiences to enrich campus life, including limited use of Fulbright students and scholars on U.S. campuses. There was also little effort given to encouraging foreign students to learn about American life. In addition, participants also identified a lack of information provided to international students on opportunities offered by community colleges as entry points to U.S. study. In the area of recruitment, experts at the conference also noted a failure by U.S. campus administrators to utilize and support the USIA-affiliated advising center network and the need to make better use of overseas alumni for recruiting purposes.

Conference participants focussed primarily on issues related to foreign students in the U.S. However, campus internationalization and study abroad issues also received some attention. Participants noted that U.S. students could benefit more broadly from the presence of foreign students on campus, but that interactions between the two groups are often limited. Rigid curriculum requirements, graduate faculty expectations, and restrictions on using financial aid for study abroad often constrain overseas study opportunities for U.S. students.

Federal, State and Local Governments

It was generally agreed that government officials at all levels had ignored or contributed to these disturbing trends. As Dr. Sanders noted, "In years past, the United States relied heavily on its overseas educational advisement centers, supported by the United States Information Agency, to communicate the strengths of the 'American model' of higher education. Yet Federal funds to support these centers have steadily diminished, forcing some of them to close and services to others to be cut." Cuts in Federal funding have also affected Fulbright and other scholarship programs and exchanges. Congressman Payne pointed out the need to build interest, concern and knowledge of international issues and programs in the Congress.

Most important, participants noted the absence of a clearly articulated foreign policy strategy which recognizes international educational exchange as a fundamentally important endeavor at policy levels. Such a strategy should be accompanied by compatible regulations and procedures that encourage, rather than discourage, foreign students to study in the United States. There is also insufficient recognition in the Federal government of education as a trade issue.

Another issue of concern to conference participants was the lack of coordination at the Federal level between the State Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), as evidenced by burdensome visa regulations, and consular officers with overly heavy caseloads, resulting in visa interviews that shortchange applicants.

At the state level, there is a need for alliances between state university boards, state governments and commerce officials to support international education. Participants stated that state legislatures have sometimes opposed educating international students at state expense.

Corporations and Businesses

Conference attendees agreed that there was a definite need for the business community to pick up where Federal support for scientific and technological research has declined. They also called for greater links between businesses and universities to ensure premier scientific research capacity and the ability to attract the best minds.

Because of the need for global workforce development, the private sector is well positioned to raise awareness and political support. One supporter of increased investment and attention to international study and exchange by corporations was Peter C. Thorp, Vice President of Corporate University Relations and Educational Programs at Citibank. In remarks that could apply to all businesses he said, "Citicorp receives benefits by supporting education from the employment angle—that is, to recruit bright, well-educated employees, and to better position their businesses worldwide. Creating partnerships, creating ties, can make things happen for businesses. Investments in education can be very long term investments in the economies and leadership of foreign countries."

It was generally agreed that U.S. companies especially need to be involved in international education because of their need to recruit employees overseas who are U.S.-trained. Yet only a small percentage of corporate foundation money is devoted to international activities, compared with the amount of corporate income that originates in overseas markets.

In the invitation to conference attendees, Nancy Cole noted, "Businesses need workers who can function in foreign marketplaces and who are sensitive to cultural and societal issues. America is preeminent in educating leaders for the global economy, and we must ensure that the best and brightest international students continue to choose the United States for their post-secondary schooling."

Global Systemic Issues

While the United States remains the country of choice for most foreign students, our relative share of foreign students has fallen because absolute numbers have plateaued. The reasons, conference attendees learned, are also the result of systemic issues that cut across international borders, and some that are beyond the control of government, education or business. Conference participants raised the following points:

- In 1997-98, the nearly 500,000 foreign students in the U.S. contributed \$8.27 billion to the U.S. economy.
- Foreign students in Australia contributed more than \$1 billion to the Australian economy and foreign students in the United Kingdom contributed approximately \$1.8 billion to the economy of the U.K.
- Distance learning technology is creating new outlets for the marketing of education around the world. In some cases, students can receive a degree from a foreign university without ever leaving home.
- Many educational systems around the world are strengthening their capacity and increasing enrollments in order to keep their "best and brightest" at home for their higher education.
- The relative strength, or weakness, of economies of other countries relative to that of the U.S. impacts the ability of students from those countries to afford the costs of U.S. study. This balance is constantly changing and can affect the marketing of U.S. higher education dramatically, as evidenced by the recent financial crisis in Asian countries.
- The ability of foreign students to study in the U.S. is inhibited by a complex regulatory environment unlike that of the countries which compete with the U.S. for these students.

One conference speaker, the Honorable Ray Mabus, former governor of Mississippi and former U.S. ambassador to Saudi Arabia, noted, "International students are important to our national and local economies, to the strength of our system of education; they add diversity to our campuses. It is becoming more difficult to attract and keep international students. Competition from developing local institutions around the world and from other countries trying to attract students could lessen the numbers of foreign students coming to the United States. The United States is going to have to do a better job. We've got competition; we're not a monopoly anymore. We can't beat other countries in the price of higher education, but we can be better in quality. We are the best. We need to do a better job of letting everyone know about what we have here in the United States."

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following list of recommendations for action is the combined work of conference attendees and distinguished speakers who are leaders in the world of education, government and business. They are offered by people who daily face the challenges of maintaining America's preeminent position as the destination of choice for international students seeking the best in higher education. The conference

attendees felt these recommendations could serve as the basis for a vitally important effort of bringing international education needed recognition.

1. Develop a Clear Federal Policy on International Education

It is critical that the Federal government continue to play a significant role in international educational exchange. We recommend that the U.S. government develop a clear Federal policy statement placing international education on the national agenda. The policy would define the goals of the Federal government in the field of international education and inform and direct programming and regulations, including visa regulations, tax policies and funding for grants, and strengthening of the overseas educational advising network.

2. Create an Alliance in Support of International Education

The corporate community needs to be engaged with U.S. universities and governments at all levels. We must build up communications networks among the various stakeholders, including government, the academic community, and the corporate sector, and develop a consensus on the issues and messages that need to be conveyed. Possible models for partnerships with the business community include NAFSA's ASPIRE project, alliances with the tourism and airlines industries, and state government/business alliances using public funds to match private sector funds as was successfully done in Minnesota to promote tourism and in Massachusetts to increase foreign student flows.

3. Conduct a Public Awareness Campaign About International Education

We recognize the critical need for a coherent case on international education to be made to the professional community and the public at large. The public needs to be educated about the positive impact of international student flows and about the serious nature of the issues surrounding U.S. leadership. This message also needs to be addressed to policy makers, corporations, local, state, and national legislators, and administrators and educators at all levels.

4. Strategically Market U.S. Education Abroad

We recommend that the full spectrum of U.S. higher education be marketed and represented abroad in a coordinated manner. Ideas to be examined include devising a group-representation mechanism similar to that used by Australian and British universities; convincing state trade missions to include representatives from universities and community colleges (perhaps subsidized by corporate presidents); reestablishing contact with foreign alumni of U.S. universities; and developing different marketing approaches for varying audiences. Alliances should be developed between community colleges and four-year institutions to market themselves jointly overseas as a cost-effective alternative to other countries' publicity about the high cost of U.S. tuition.

5. Publicize Best Practices at U.S. Universities

We recognize the need to develop models that showcase the integration and utilization of foreign students and scholars on campus, and the need to encourage educational institutions to train faculty, staff and administrators on the kinds of systemic change required to make institutions more hospitable and make curricula more global.

IV. ACTION PLAN

1. Convene a task force to disseminate data on marketing international educational exchange, conduct a public advocacy campaign to put international education on the national agenda, and craft a coherent message that demonstrates the political and financial case and engages policy makers.

The task force should be composed of individuals from universities, corporations, nongovernmental organizations, and various levels of government, each of whom would be assigned a specific issue/barrier and who would then identify others with whom to work on dismantling the barrier. A number of conference participants volunteered to work on the task force and will be contacted in the near future by ETS and USIA.

2. Convene the concerned Federal government bodies to discuss coordinating policies and procedures. These would most likely include the Department of State, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Department of Education, the Department of Commerce, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. USIA representatives agreed to spearhead the quest to coordinate government action.

V. CONCLUSION

Dr. Ted Sanders, President of Southern Illinois University, summed up the challenges ahead saying, "The United States has an unparalleled opportunity to market our advanced and very cost-effective delivery system in higher education. If we don't seize this opportunity, if we continue the gradual erosion of international students in our colleges and universities, we will lose far more than tuition dollars, important as these may be to local and state communities."

"As a nation, we will begin to find it more difficult to make friends around the world, to cement ties economically, culturally, and politically. Our influence as a positive international force depends on people in other countries understanding and appreciating American culture. To sustain that powerful instrument of foreign policy, a coordinated and assertive national policy for international education must be placed near the top of the agenda for Congress and the President."

APPENDIX I: ABSTRACTS OF MAJOR ADDRESSES

Dr. Joseph Duffey, Director, U.S. Information Agency, Welcoming Remarks

We want to develop a strategic plan to maintain and maybe increase U.S. competitiveness in international education. This competitiveness has implications for educators, business leaders, and the foreign affairs community. Educators are forced to review the quality of U.S. education; business leaders, to ensure dynamism and resources for growth; and the foreign affairs community, to adjust to a world in which it is increasingly necessary to work together with other countries and ensure a more accurate understanding of the U.S. in the post-Cold War era. There is no substitute for international education since neither tourism nor the popular culture currently being exported gives a complete or accurate view of the U.S. I don't think the edge has been lost, but I don't think we can take it for granted.

Dr. Sharon Robinson, Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, Educational Testing Service

Today is an important step in articulating our conference mission of maintaining the edge in international education and also in developing a strategy to increase the number of global students coming to the United States to work and study. At ETS we sincerely believe that a critical aspect of education is maintaining a global environment where students of every age, learn about and from people of diverse backgrounds. Being exposed to people of different languages, religions and cultures creates an understanding that is critical to maintaining and expanding our own appreciation of diversity and our own sense of well-being. Education makes it all possible.

The Honorable William Perry, Former Secretary of Defense, "American National Security Interests: The Importance of U.S.-Educated International Students"

International education programs create goodwill toward America all over the world. Foreign students are motivated to come to the U.S. because of our leadership, especially in science and technology, which has contributed to our national economic well-being. The most obvious example of American leadership today is in information technology, and our universities have achieved a unique connection with our technical companies. Foreign students come to the U.S. for education in science and technology because they want the best in education and because they want to learn to relate to industry like our universities do.

But the interest of other countries in having their future leaders educated in American universities depends on the U.S. maintaining its world leadership in science. It also depends on America's universities maintaining their standards of excellence in science and technology education and research, which many Americans take for granted. But this leadership cannot be taken for granted in the future.

Education is of critical importance to a country trying to maintain technological leadership. Technological training at U.S. universities has been relevant and cutting edge because of close ties between education and industry. Our leadership in technology today depends on our leadership in technical education and in maintaining the unique bonding between our universities and our technical companies.

The "magnet effect" of U.S. universities is decreasing. We need an increase in Federal funds for technology-based programs or alternatively, funding from research consortia composed of industries to invest in technology-based programs at our universities.

Attracting foreign students to study in the U.S. is a win-win-win situation: it's a win for our economy; it's a win for our foreign policy; and it's a win for our educational programs. Foreign students spend money while they are in the U.S., and when they return home, they often become business leaders who deal with U.S. col-

leagues. In addition, foreign students work hard in graduate courses, which raises the bar for U.S. students, forcing them to work harder.

The Honorable Ray Mabus, Former Governor of Mississippi and Former U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, "Building a Global Community, State by State"

I've always thought that if you did one thing right, education was it, and that you could shut down the rest of government if you did that right. We need to give our children the chance to succeed. Globalization and global interdependence affect us every day, in economics and in higher education. More international students come to the U.S. than U.S. students go abroad, which testifies to the excellence of U.S. higher education. At the University of Mississippi, 58 flags fly in the student union, representing the countries of all Ole Miss students, including 2,100 foreign students. These international students are important to our national and local economies, to the strength of our system of education; they add diversity to our campuses. It is becoming more difficult to attract and keep international students. Competition from developing local institutions around the world and from other countries trying to attract students could lessen the numbers of foreign students coming to the U.S. The U.S. is going to have to do a better job. We've got more competition; we're not a monopoly anymore. We can't beat other countries in price of higher education, but we can be better in quality. We are the best. We need to do a better job of letting everyone know about what we have here in the U.S.

On trade visits abroad, state governors should take education representatives, university presidents with them. We need to "think internationally" and be more aggressive in reaching the worldwide audience. International students bring new ideas and cultural richness to our universities and our communities. Also, they experience America. This creates some common ground in international relations. Excellence and hard work are needed and will work for higher education. American higher education will prevail.

Dr. Allan Goodman, President and CEO, Institute of International Education, "Open Doors and Opening Minds: Why Both are Needed for the 21st Century"

Three key questions we must answer are: Why is it important for the U.S. to have the leading edge in international education? What is making it so difficult to keep that edge? What do we have to do?

The single most important success factor for our times is having people whose minds are open to the world. This can only happen through international education. English is the international language, the dollar is the world currency, and the Internet is the means of communication. The costs of retaliation and security following the terrorist bombings in Africa were many times the budget request for international education. This disparity is striking.

While the U.S. government will maintain its leadership role in supporting flagship initiatives such as Fulbright, Humphrey and the National Security Education Program, future programs will require enlarging the circle of private sector stakeholders. Sources of corporate philanthropy have contributed only one out of every nine dollars in grant aid to international programs, while corporations earn six out of every ten dollars from their international activities. The best and brightest foreign students are now being aggressively recruited by other countries. We cannot continue to take for granted the flow of foreign students to U.S. campuses, or underestimate the intellectual, strategic, and financial resource they represent.

While foreign governments are developing sophisticated and well-funded strategies to increase the international mobility of their students and faculty members, there is no parallel strategy or resource pool to encourage and facilitate international academic mobility by Americans. Few American corporate leaders have ever articulated the importance of worldwide learning; yet no major business today can expect to survive without managers who are knowledgeable about and able to work across nations as well as cultures.

The numbers of foreign students coming here have been flat for several years, and visas are harder to get. Only about 1 percent of American college students study abroad, many of those in English-speaking countries. The problem is larger than just Federal funding cuts. Some suspect that "internationalize" may be just a buzzword rather than a reality. Faculties do not appear convinced about the value of overseas experience and scholarship.

State governments have virtually ignored the foreign investment brought to them in the millions of dollars by international students. Only a handful of states have developed a coordinated academic recruitment strategy. We cannot take for granted those flows of students to our shores.

There is, in sum, work for all of us here to do.

Why is it so difficult? We are cutting budgets. International educational exchanges are being affected. The private sector must step up to the plate to make international study possible. Companies are generating sales from abroad but not giving enough philanthropy or grants back. The private sector must speak out about the need to promote international education activities. Many nations have an international education policy to easily recruit international students. But our prices are high, and we do not have such a policy. We need to.

The U.S. curriculum makes it difficult to do study abroad. Senior scholars often discourage younger faculty from applying for Fulbright or other fellowships. We need to value the overseas experience more. We should also provide more scholarships. Deans and provosts need to change in this direction.

We need to lead a charge together. The U.S. government, state government, academic leaders, and corporate leaders all have roles. Academic leaders must clearly articulate the value of international students on campus and the value of study abroad for U.S. students. CEOs of major companies must speak out on the importance of international education.

Together we have to make the case that international education is one of the surest ways left to make the world a less dangerous place.

Ms. Marlene Johnson, Executive Director, NAFSA: Association of International Educators, "A Model to Improve Strategies for Supporting Study in the United States"

The U.S. needs more data about the potential pool of international students who may be interested in U.S. study. As a nation we don't know nearly as much about where foreign students come from as we should, given their importance to our colleges and universities, to U.S.-based employers, and to local economies. We have an excellent census that tells us more or less everything we need to know about international student enrollments, but we don't know much about what happens upstream. Knowing that two million students come through USIA's network of 450 advising centers worldwide, and that 50-90 percent of the international students who do study in the U.S. have come through those centers, is not enough information. The U.S. should have a keener business sense of this "raw material." What is the potential of U.S. educational advising as a business?

All of us with a stake in international education have something to learn from McDonald's and its strict but flexible strategy of franchising—demanding standardization, yet allowing a high degree of local ownership and customization, simultaneously protecting and extending its brand. Other top U.S. service export sectors—banking, accounting services, and so on—are much more consolidated and benefit from representation by trade groups. In higher education, the bigger names may not need this trade group representation. But the U.S. education system may benefit from cooperative marketing. Such tactics are most needed and most useful in sectors not dominated by one or more highly visible brands. Competitive pressures from Australia, Canada, and the UK, the rising costs of U.S. education, and increasing educational opportunities in students' home countries are issues which should compel the U.S. to think about the benefits of cooperative marketing.

The place to start with these efforts is the network of U.S. overseas advising centers. U.S. higher education needs to recognize this system and make it an integral part of its own system. Data is needed on how much this network costs to operate and how to more precisely assess its effects.

Then we can begin to think of the changes that consolidation can bring. Currently, each university advertises itself to the international market in a variety of means—booths in international events and education fairs, branch campuses, local advertising, and so forth. It is extremely difficult to market "U.S. education" abroad when the system of U.S. education itself is larger, more complicated, and more decentralized than any other nation's. An apt analogy for marketing U.S. education abroad might be piloting a supertanker with hundreds of presumptive captains at the helm.

However, the efforts could be worth it. NAFSA believes that the interests of students and universities and colleges alike would benefit by the creation of a more coordinated, disciplined, and focused marketing of U.S. higher education abroad. Exporters, importers and brokers all would gain from the creation of an independent, self-sustaining entity which would provide products and services such as marketing, management, and training after the franchising model. This entity would be funded by its member institutions, Federal and state governments, and businesses.

We must not allow the present system of overseas advising centers to languish and deteriorate. In a changing geopolitical and technological environment, everyone in the room has something to contribute to the health of this vital network and should not pass on the opportunity or the responsibility to promote U.S. higher edu-

cation to the world. We must think creatively, we must demonstrate our agility and our willingness to consider new strategies, and we must be entrepreneurial. Our contributions will go farther if we make them together.

Summaries of Panel Discussion on "Forging Alliances to Support International Education" Moderator: Dr. Ted Sanders, President, Southern Illinois University

Panelist 1: Congressman Donald M. Payne (D-NJ):

International exchanges are crucial to the U.S. at the edge of the next millennium, especially with our interdependent world. There exists a most unfortunate lack of interest, concern, and even knowledge of international relations in the U.S. and the U.S. House of Representatives. Funding for USIA programs has been cut. This trend should not continue. The numbers of students from Asia, which had been highest in numbers in the world, are declining due to a variety of factors. We need to recruit international students in new markets, in countries where the economies are growing (for example, in South Africa). Payne also advocated recruiting international students to study in diverse areas of the U.S., to those states that host relatively small numbers of international students.

Panelist 2: Mr. Peter C. Thorp, Vice President, Corporate University Relations and Educational Programs, Citibank:

I am a strong supporter of international education. Citicorp is about globalism. The corporation must support the franchise; it is not interested in old-fashioned philanthropy. Citicorp receives benefits by supporting education from the employment angle—that is, to recruit bright, well-educated employees, and to better position their businesses worldwide. Creating partnerships, creating ties, can make things happen for business. The company puts nearly \$6 million annually into higher education programs. Citibank has a worldwide interest in education and economic development. The demand for MBA programs remains steady. Those MBA graduates are appearing all over the world. Investments in education can be very long term investments in the economies and leadership of foreign countries.

Panelist 3: Dr. Jacquelyn Beicher, President, DeKalb College:

There continues to be a tremendous lack of understanding about community colleges among the U.S. public and even within the higher education community. Meanwhile, the number of international students coming to community colleges has grown by 9 percent compared with a 2 percent decrease in the number of international students attending four-year institutions. Community colleges can be a solution to the problem of decreasing numbers of international students coming to the U.S. The growing interest of community colleges in international education can be attributed to the involvement of the U.S. in international business; the increase in cultural diversity in the general population and subsequently on college campuses; and the substantial presence of international students, immigrants, and refugees in community colleges.

Is the U.S. higher education commitment to international education still strong or have we stopped pushing the limits of expanding connections? Certainly community colleges do not feel that they have lost the edge. There is expanding involvement by community colleges in international partnerships: approximately 48 percent of community colleges are involved in exchanges and/or study abroad, and 79 percent of these institutions have internationalized the curriculum in some way.

Community colleges can realize numerous benefits from having international students on our campuses. Continuing to attract international students to the U.S. requires commitment, tenacity and caring. It is important to advocate on campuses about the importance of these students, especially to the president because it is the president of each institution who will decide about committing the necessary funding for international programs.

Mr. Steven Trachtenberg, President, George Washington University, "The Lost Edge? An Action Plan for Recapturing U.S. Leadership"

At one time, American students seldom studied abroad unless supported by scholarships, while controversies between traditionalists and non-traditionalists over college and university curricula played a part in attracting large numbers of foreign students to U.S. institutions. Foreign leaders and countries studied the American educational system because it was such a pervasive system so profoundly tied to American economic development. This "mega-university" is administered in a totally decentralized manner, operating in a mostly voluntary fashion. It keeps its parts synchronized and interchangeable so that a community college graduate in Illinois can get a B.A. in Los Angeles, an MBA in Texas, and a first job in Virginia. Meanwhile, faculty in research-oriented universities not only teach but serve as the cease-

less analysts of the entire U.S. national system. The rest of the world looks to the United States for assistance in catching up with the American-style higher education system (most of which is controlled by the 50 states) and with a national economy the likes of which the world has never seen. Meanwhile, foreigners' high regard is viewed with bewilderment by the American people. The history of modern American higher education is a story that is dying to be told.

APPENDIX II: AGENDA

"U.S. LEADERSHIP IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: THE LOST EDGE?"

Date: September 24, 1998

Loy Henderson Conference Room, Department of State

Morning Session

- Moderator:* Keith Geiger, Director, Office of Academic Programs, U.S. Information Agency
- 8:00–8:45 a.m. Registration and Continental Breakfast
- 9:00–9:10 a.m. Welcoming Remarks and Introduction by Dr. Joseph Duffey, Director, U.S. Information Agency
- 9:10–9:30 a.m. "American National Security Interests: The Importance of U.S.-Educated International Students" *Speaker: The Honorable William Perry, Former Secretary of Defense*
- 9:30–9:40 a.m. Welcoming Remarks and Introduction by Dr. Sharon Robinson, Chief Operating Officer, ETS
- 9:40–10:00 a.m. "Building a Global Community: State by State" *Speaker: The Honorable Ray Mabus, Former Governor of Mississippi and Former U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia*
- 10:00–10:30 a.m. "Open Doors and Opening Minds: Why Both Are Needed for the 21st Century" *Speaker: Dr. Allan Goodman, President and CEO, Institute of International Education*
- 10:30–10:35 a.m. Charge to Working Sessions—*Mr. Keith Geiger, U.S. Information Agency*
- 10:35–10:50 a.m. Break
- 10:50–11:50 a.m. Working Session: Quantifying the Current State of Affairs
- Noon–1:30 p.m. Lunch—Benjamin Franklin State Dining Room

Afternoon Session

- Moderator:* Linda Pfister, Vice President, Educational Testing Service
- 1:30–1:45 p.m. "Current Structures Supporting Study in the U.S. and Abroad" *Speaker: Ms. Marlene Johnson, Executive Director, NAFSA: Association of International Educators*
- 1:45–2:30 p.m. "Forging Alliances to Support International Education" Panel Discussion
Moderator: Dr. Ted Sanders, President, Southern Illinois University
Participants: Mr. Peter C. Thorp, Vice President, Corporate University Relations & Educational Programs, Citibank
Congressman Donald M. Payne (D), Newark, New Jersey
Dr. Jacquelyn Belcher, President, DeKalb College, Georgia
- 2:30–3:00 p.m. Interactive Discussion
- 3:00–3:15 p.m. "The Lost Edge? An Action Plan for Recapturing U.S. Leadership" *Speaker: Mr. Stephen J. Trachtenberg, President, George Washington University*
- 3:15–3:30 p.m. Break
- 3:30–4:45 p.m. Working Sessions: Development of Recommendations for Action Plan
- 4:45–5:30 p.m. Reports on the Afternoon Working Sessions and Closing Comments—*Dr. Sharon Robinson, ETS*

The Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange and the Embassy of Spain will host a reception for conference participants on September 24 from 5:30–7:30 p.m. at the Spanish Embassy. The embassy is located at 2375 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, approximately six blocks from the State Department.

APPENDIX III: WHITE PAPER

LEADERSHIP IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: THE LOST EDGE?

(By Dr. Ted Sanders, President, Southern Illinois University)

WARNING SIGNS

For many years higher education in the United States has enjoyed a preeminent position in the world of international education, attracting students in large numbers from other countries to its colleges and universities. Foreign enrollment in the U.S. rose steadily from a relatively modest 34,232 in 1954, to a record setting 457,984 students in 1996-97. Peak growth occurred from 1975 to 1980, when enrollment in the U.S. almost doubled. Troubling, however, is the dramatically slowed rate of increase, from 4.5% in 1992-93 to a virtual standstill (0.3%) in 1995-96. Of particular concern is the fact that in 1996-97 there was only a slight rise in the number of foreign students coming to the United States from Japan, South Korea, and Malaysia, countries which provide a large proportion of our foreign enrollment.

Approximately 1.3 million students pursued education outside their home countries during the 1980s. The United States attracted roughly 40% of them, but now enrolls only 32%.¹ From 1994 to 1996, Taiwan sent 10.2% fewer students to the U.S., India 5.3% fewer, Hong Kong 7.1% fewer, and Mexico 3.5% fewer.² There is no doubt that the United States has lost its competitive edge as a world leader in international education.

THE CAUSE AND THE COST

There appear to be many reasons for the decline. Among them are complacency, rising relative costs to attend our colleges and universities, unwillingness of state and federal governments to spend more money to attract foreign students, changes in political and economic conditions in a number of countries, and stepped up efforts by others to obtain an increasing share of the lucrative international student market.

It appears that past successes have contributed to a complacent attitude on the part of many institutions in the U.S. The seemingly never-ending growth in the number of students coming into the country, along with a lack of serious competition, has caused us to miss the need to pay close attention to competing developments around the world.

The U.S. government may pay a high cost for its failure to foster a spirit of strong and vital entrepreneurship in international education. Students from around the world broaden and enrich the intellectual and social climate of our institutions, providing young Americans with invaluable understanding and appreciation of other peoples and cultures. It is also true that in a period when public support of U.S. higher education is diminishing and the costs of maintaining and improving quality are rising, new revenue streams are essential. Foreign students in the United States inject about \$7.8 billion annually in tuition, fees and living expenses into our local economies. And their presence creates an additional 100,000 jobs in the U.S.³

Probably even more important, a strong international student and alumni network helps to build the kinds of long-term relationships and trust essential for the U.S. to be an effective global citizen and global competitor. When enrollment declines, we lose far more than tuition dollars. We begin to lose the opportunity to make important friends around the world. Our positive international influence in the world depends on others understanding and appreciating American culture. International education is a key element in achieving that goal, so sustained support for this powerful instrument of foreign policy should be near the top of the agenda for Congress and the President. Unfortunately, that does not seem to be the case.

CREATIVE AND COMMITTED COMPETITION

The United States has traditionally relied heavily on its overseas educational advising centers, supported by the United States Information Agency, to provide information about U.S. higher education to prospective foreign students. Yet, federal funds to support these centers have steadily diminished, forcing some of them to close and services to be cut in others.⁴ While the United States government is decreasing its support for recruiting foreign students, other nations, particularly Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom, are actively promoting their colleges and universities around the world. Enrollment of foreign students in higher education has become big business and is now an integral part of strategic planning by governments in many countries. Australia, for instance, actively promotes its attractive

lifestyle, its wide range of high quality curricula, and the value received for a dollar spent to potential foreign students. The Australian International Education Foundation, established in 1994, also markets Australian education by linking it with trade, investment, and diplomacy. Australia is one of the first countries to develop an international alumni-networking system, and it is the first to host a convention including foreign alumni from all its universities. Australia's alumni in Singapore number about 50,000; in Indonesia, between 40,000 and 50,000; while in Malaysia, Australian alumni exceed 120,000.⁵ Australia's share of international student enrollment has increased steadily from 1.6% in 1985 to 3.3% in 1994.⁶

Britain is also becoming a serious competitor in international education. It offers comparatively low educational costs and is a big spender in recruiting foreign students. Its Educational Counseling Service actively promotes British education, particularly in Southeast Asia. And these strategies appear to be working. During 1996-97, Asian enrollment in British universities was up 27% from the year before, and has increased an average of 20% annually since 1992-93.⁷

GROWING DEMAND AND GREATER OPPORTUNITY: A NEW CHANCE AT LEADERSHIP

The recent economic crisis in Asia has been an important factor for many international students in selecting Australia, Canada, and Britain as alternatives to the U.S. for their studies. Even though this trend had begun before the crisis, the affordability of study in these countries has made them more attractive. During 1996-97, Asian students comprised 57.6% of foreign student enrollment in the U.S. Asian countries providing the most students were Japan (46,292), China (42,503), Korea (37,130), India (30,641), and Taiwan (30,487).

The potential for significant growth over the next several years remains great. Projections for 1995-2010 are that Asia will need an additional 800,000 international university places, and another 1.5 million places will be needed in the following 15 years.⁸ Of the 200 million people in Indonesia, 26 million are between the ages of 15 and 25.⁹ Indonesia's colleges and universities cannot hope to meet that demand for higher education in their country. Other projections indicate that the world population of college-age students will grow by 100 million over the next 10 years. These burgeoning youth populations, particularly in countries which appreciate the importance of a well-educated citizenry to their development plans, will provide new opportunities for America to regain its preeminence in international education. But nations facing many competing needs for limited resources will be careful shoppers in the world education market. They will look for the most cost-effective way to provide needed education services, and they will be reluctant to put scarce capital into providing their own classrooms, labs, and dormitories. Alternatives which provide high quality services at low cost and at the same time diminish or even eliminate the need for expensive local infrastructure will define the market.

A precondition for any serious effort on our part to retain a leading role in international education is for the federal government to recognize, both in policy and action, that it is in the national interest to do so. It must restore and enhance its tangible support for international efforts and provide such support within the framework of a clearly defined strategy. Opportunities for technologically advanced, cost-effective higher education delivery systems that have expensive infrastructures already in place may be unparalleled in history. The challenge for America will be to offer the most affordable higher education, and technological superiority may provide the avenue for us to do that. If we are to maintain our position of leadership in this important area and make the contribution to world society expected of us, we must begin to emulate the enlightened policies of other advanced nations who have seen the future of international education and are actively pursuing it.

¹*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Dec. 6, 1996.

²*Open Doors, 1995-96*.

³*Open Doors, 1996-97*.

⁴*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 29, 1998.

⁵*The Straits Times*, April 27, 1998.

⁶*Open Doors, 1995-96*.

⁷*Asian Wall Street Journal*, October 20, 1997.

⁸*Open Doors, 1995-96*, p. 12.

⁹*Meeting Notes, IIE Tenth Biennial Educational Associates Seminar on International Education, 1998*.

APPENDIX IV: CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

U.S. LEADERSHIP IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: THE LOST EDGE?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE—SEPTEMBER 24, 1998

List of Attendees

Name	Title	Institution
Ms. Pamela Alden	Vice President, Planning and Development	Educational Testing Service
Mr. Frank Alejandro	Program Officer	U.S. Agency for International Development
Mr. Gary Althen	Director, Office of International Students and Scholars	University of Iowa
Ms. Mary Ashley	Chief, Advising, Teaching and Specialized Programs	U.S. Information Agency
Ms. Mariam Assefa	Executive Director	World Education Services, Inc.
Ms. Ellen Babby	Senior Director for Planning and Development	NAFSA: Association of International Educators
Mr. Roger Batchelor		Bowling Green State University
Ms. Valerie A. Becker	National Education Program Administrator	Chrysler Corporation
Mr. Peter Becskehazy	Chief, Advising and Student Services	U.S. Information Agency
Dr. Jacquelyn Belcher	President	DeKaIb College
Ms. Becca Bell	Deputy Division Director, NIS Exchanges	IREX
Mr. Victor Betancourt	Coordinator, International Services	University of Maryland University College
Dr. Peggy Blumenthal	Vice President for Educational Studies	Institute of International Education
Mr. Michael Bonner	Director, Center for Middle Eastern and North African Studies	University of Michigan
Ms. Jennifer Bremer	Director	Kennan Institute
Dr. Barbara Burn	Associate Provost for International Programs	University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Ms. Achamma Chandrasekaran	Office of Service Industries	U.S. Department of Commerce
Ms. Audree Chase	Coordinator of International Services	American Association of Community Colleges
Mr. E. Thomas Coleman	Vice President	BASF Corporation
Ms. Marthena Cowart	Director, Office of Public Liaison	U.S. Information Agency
Mr. James Cramer	Interim President and CEO World Learning	World Learning
Ms. Marianne Craven	Deputy Director, Office of Academic Programs	U.S. Information Agency
Dr. William Cressey	Vice President	Council on International Educational Exchange
Dr. Lois Cronholm	Interim President	CUNY Bernard M. Baruch College
Mr. William Dant	Director, Humphrey Fellowship Program	Institute of International Education
Dr. Dan E. Davidson	President	American Councils for International Education
Mr. Paul Desruisseaux	International Affairs Editor	The Chronicle of Higher Education
Mr. John Deupree	Director, International Education	The College Board
Mr. Michael Ditchkofsky	Vice President	Peterson's
Dr. Joseph Duffey	Director	U.S. information Agency

Name	Title	Institution
Ms. Jeanne-Marie Duval	Associate Executive Director	NAFSA: Association of International Educators
Mr. Stephen Eck	Director of Graduate Admissions	New Jersey Institute of Technology
Dr. Eileen M. Evans	International Education Program	George Washington University
Mr. Thomas Farrell	Vice President, Exchange Programs	Institute of International Education
Ms. Marina Fernando	Director, International Studies Programs	City College of New York
Ms. Patricia Fesci	Consultant, Academic Leadership and Change	American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Ms. Jeannette File-Lamb	Executive Director	Educational Testing Service
Ms. Lenore Yaffee Garcia	Director, International Affairs	U.S. Department of Education
Mr. Keith Geiger	Director, Office of Academic Programs	U.S. Information Agency
Dr. Allan E. Goodman	President	Institute of International Education
Mr. Dale E. Gough	Director, Office of International Education Services	American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
Ms. Madeleine F. Green	Vice President	American Council on Education
Ms. Virginia Hammell	Assistant Director, Federal Relations	National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC)
Ms. Linda Harbaugh		U.S. Department of Commerce
Mr. Fred Hecklinger	Dean of Student Development	Northern Virginia Community College, Alexandria Campus
Mr. Stephen Heyneman	Vice President	International Management and Development Group, Ltd.
Mr. Ralph Hines	Director, International Education and Graduate Programs	U.S. Department of Education
Ms. Gail Hochhauser	Senior Director, Special Programs Division	NAFSA: Association of International Educators
Mr. John K. Hudzik	Professor and Dean of International Studies and Programs	Michigan State University
Mr. James P. Hurley	Director of International Education	Pikes Peak Community College
Ms. Arlene Jackson	Director, Center for International Programs	Virginia Commonwealth University
Ms. Marlene M. Johnson	Executive Director and CEO	NAFSA: Association of International Educators
Mr. Victor C. Johnson	Senior Director of Public Affairs	NAFSA: Association of International Educators
Dr. Larry H. Jones	Associate Dean	University of the South
Ms. Mary C. King	Executive Director	Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs
Dr. Benjamin Ladner	President	The American University
Dr. Richard Lariviere	Associate Vice President	University of Texas-Austin

Name	Title	Institution
Dr. Marjorie Peace Lenn	Executive Director	Center for Quality Assurance in International Education
Mr. Charles Lenth	Director of Policy Studies, Higher Education	Education Commission of the States
Ms. Beverly Lindsey	Director, J. William Fulbright Scholarship Board	U.S. Information Agency
Ms. Martha Loerke	Director, Network Scholarship Program	Open Society Institute
Dr. John P. Loiello	Associate Director for Educational and Cultural Affairs	U.S. Information Agency
Mr. David Longanecker	Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education	U.S. Department of Education
Mr. James F. Lynch, Jr.	Director, International Students and Scholars	Pennsylvania State University
Hon. Raymond E. Mabus	Former Governor of Mississippi	
Mr. C. Peter Magrath	President	National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges
Ms. Ann Marinoni	Director of International Studies	Lake Superior State University
Ms. Mary Beth Marklein		USA Today
Mr. Michael McCarry	Executive Director	Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange
Mr. Robert McCarthy	Director, Office of East European and NIS Affairs	U.S. Information Agency
Ms. Mada McGill	Assistant to the Deputy Director	Council for the International Exchange of Scholars
Mr. David McNierney	Office of Service Industries	U.S. Department of Commerce
Dr. Shah M. Mehrabi	Professor of Economics	Montgomery College
Ms. Cindy Barnes Ochoa	Past President	American Association of Intensive English Programs
Ms. Jody Olsen	Senior Vice President	Academy for Educational Development
Hon. Donald M. Payne	Member of Congress	
Hon. William Perry	Former Secretary of Defense	
Mr. Norman Peterson	Director, International Programs	Montana State University
Ms. Linda A. Pfister	Vice President	Educational Testing Service
Ms. Rachell Punctatz	Executive Director, Marketing	Educational Testing Service
Mr. Hoyt Purvis	Chairman, J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board	University of Arkansas
Ms. Margaret Pusch	Associate Director	Intercultural Communication Institute
Dr. Hazel Reed	Dean, School of Graduate Studies	Delaware State University
Dr. Sharon Robinson	Chief Operating Officer	Educational Testing Service

Name	Title	Institution
Mr. William Rugh	Ambassador	America-Mideast Educational and Training Services, Inc. (AMIDEAST)
Mr. McKinney H. Russell	Senior Coordinator of Academic and Training Programs	International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX)
Dr. Ted Sanders	President	Southern Illinois University
Ms. Linda Scatton	Director, International Activities	Educational Testing Service
Dr. Robert A. Scott	President	Ramapo College
Ms. Catherine Sevcenko	Senior Program Officer	Academy for Educational Development
Ms. Alonia C. Sharps	Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs and Affirmative Action Programs	Prince George's Community College
Dr. Judith Siegel	Deputy Associate Director for Educational and Cultural Affairs	U.S. Information Agency
Mr. Robert O. Slater	Director	National Security Education Program (NSEP)
Mr. Andrew F. Smith	President	The American Forum for Global Education
Mr. Michael John Stopford	Senior Assistant to the President for International Affairs	The American University
Mr. Ned D. Strong	Executive Director	LASPAU (Harvard)
Dr. Shirley Strum-Kenny	President	SUNY Stony Brook
Mr. Jerry Sullivan	Executive Director	AACRAO
Ms. Mary Ann Swain	Provost	SUNY Binghamton
Mr. Peter D. Syverson	Vice President	Council of Graduate Schools
Dr. Julia Taiber	Assistant Director	Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange
Ms. Marie Taris		Ohio State University
Dr. Orlando Taylor	Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences	Howard University
Mr. Peter C. Thorp	Vice President	Citibank
Mr. Stephen J. Trachtenberg	President	George Washington University
Dr. Barbara Turlington	Director, Office of International Education	American Council on Education
Mr. Jay Van Den Berg	Vice President, Administration	Whirlpool Corporation
Mr. David L. Warren	President	National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
Ms. Norma Williamson	Team Leader	U.S. Information Agency
Dr. Craig Dean Willis	President	Lock Haven University
Dr. H. J. Zoffer	Senior Counsel, University Center for International Studies	University of Pittsburgh

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. SHERRY MUELLER

Senator Grams, thank you for the opportunity to testify on the domestic impact of the State Department's International Visitor Program. My name is Sherry Mueller. I have the privilege of serving as the Executive Director of the National

Council for International Visitors (NCIV)—the nonprofit, professional association for the private sector partners of the State Department who implement the International Visitor Program. Each year more than 80,000 volunteers—citizen diplomats—are involved in the activities of our 97 community-based member organizations throughout the United States. Our members organize professional programs, cultural activities and home visits for the distinguished foreign leaders who participate in the International Visitor Program. A list of our members by state is appended. You each have a membership directory and copy of NCIV's latest publication *A Salute to Citizen Diplomacy*.

When assessing the impressive results of the International Visitor Program, we usually focus on the Visitors themselves—the positions of prominence that alumni attain and their accomplishments. For example, we note former Prime Minister Kaifu of Japan learned about the Peace Corps during his IV trip and years later helped found the Japanese equivalent. The current Minister of Justice of Poland credits her deeper understanding of democratic institutions and a market economy to her experience as an International Visitor.

We also focus on how the Program enables U.S. Embassy personnel to be more effective. Last January, all U.S. ambassadors were asked to rank public diplomacy products and programs. In 2000 as in 1993, the last year the survey had been conducted, the International Visitor Program was the most highly rated.

However, when discussing the national interest it is also imperative to focus on the domestic impact of exchange programs. I have conducted research and currently spend approximately 20% of my time “on the road” meeting with these dedicated citizen diplomats. Why do Americans volunteer for the International Visitor Program—and for other exchange programs as well?

- The most important reason can best be illustrated by an adaptation of the original ad for a Pony Express rider.

Wanted: Young wirey, skinny fellows under the age of 18. Must be expert riders willing to risk death daily. Wages \$25 per week Orphans preferred.

If I were to rewrite this ad for NCIV members, it would read:

Wanted: Young at heart of all ages. Must be well-organized, eager to learn, and willing to risk breaking stereotypes daily. Wages—won't be discussed. Idealists preferred.

Our volunteers come from all walks of life and represent the diversity of their communities—but they are all idealists. They care about promoting human rights and civic participation. Whether in Tennessee, Texas, California or Wisconsin, whether farmers, bankers, doctors, or teachers, these volunteers relish the opportunity to make a difference, as one of our member's phrases it, “one handshake at a time.”

- Their second major motivation is the education of their children. Through extensive school programs and home hospitality, the children of these citizen diplomats enjoy a valuable supplement to their education. As a volunteer from Freeport, Illinois asserted: “My daughter can discuss intelligently places her classmates can't find on a map.”
- Many volunteers are involved with the International Visitor Program and other exchanges to counter the ugly American image. The Arkansas Council for International Visitors was established in the early 1960s to counter the negative publicity surrounding the integration of Central High School. Founder Fred Darragh observed that hosting newly independent African visitors helped advance integration in many U.S. communities.
- Still others are involved because they are responsible for economic development in their communities and the International Visitor Program and other exchanges provide valuable connections and cross-cultural experiences, particularly for small and medium sized businesses.
- The International Visitor Program reaches a broad spectrum of the community. It involves a cross-section of institutions and individuals who might never have the opportunity to study or travel abroad. “Travel by proxy” is the way one volunteer described her involvement.

After receiving the invitation to testify, I sent out a broadcast fax to our members inviting statements. They sent wonderful articles and quotations (some are attached) that illustrate the remarkable outreach of the International Visitor Program.

Despite the tremendous constituent involvement in exchanges, the overall direct exchanges appropriation fell 31% adjusted for inflation since FY1993. Funding for

the International Visitor Program is 34% below FY1993. (See attached chart.) Fewer participants and shorter trips mean that for NCIV community member organizations, the program has diminished by approximately 40%. During a recent visit to Grand Island and Lincoln, Nebraska, our volunteers spoke of declining numbers and their concern that fewer foreign leaders get to smaller and more rural communities where they can have such a great impact. These concerns are all too common.

NCIV is a member of The Alliance. We enthusiastically echo Ms. Johnson's request for a congressional caucus and a national policy on international education. Citizen diplomats leverage an enormous amount of resources for exchanges locally but they need your leadership at the national level.

NCIV members across the United States strongly support increased funding for all State Department exchanges. We urge that the International Visitor Program, not only be restored to its FY1993 levels, but that it be expanded to cover inflation and needed new initiatives. Specifically, we request that you identify additional new money in FY2002 to fund the GREAT Program (GrassRoots Exchange And Training Program) that would—under the auspices of the International Visitor Program—enable an additional 400 participants to come to the United States each year. These new participants would be local officials, representatives of Chambers of Commerce, and other community leaders who would spend the last 5-7 days of their 21 days in the States in their current (or in a potential) Sister City to develop plans of action and strengthen Sister City relationships. This addition to the International Visitor Program would serve as a model generating synergy among exchange programs and expand U.S. efforts to build stronger commercial and cultural ties between U.S. leaders and their counterparts abroad. A statement of support for the GREAT Program from Sister Cities International is appended. Senator Grams, we appreciate your interest in this new initiative.

If the world consisted of 100 people, only five would live in the United States. We must learn to communicate—to work well with the other 95. The International Visitor Program and other exchanges help us do just that.

Thank you for underscoring that fact by holding this hearing.

International Visitor Program Statistics

Fiscal Year	Grant Visitors	Nominal Dollars ¹	Constant Dollars ²
1993	2,983	52.3	52.3
1994	3,109	51.2	48.0
1995	3,083	49.4	39.0
1996	2,393	41.1	36.1
1997	2,595	39.1	35.1
1998	2,505	39.2	36.1
1999	2,581	41.1	36.1
2000 (estimate)	2,499	41.7	35.0

¹ Nominal Dollars in millions.

² Constant Dollars adjusted for inflation.

In real terms, the overall direct Exchanges appropriation fell 31 percent adjusted for inflation since FY1993. IVP funding is now 34 percent below FY1993—the peak year for inflation-adjusted exchanges budget authority since FY1966.

[Attachments.]

Community Organization Members of the National Council for International Visitors

Community Organizations	City	State
International Services Council of Huntsville-Madison County	Huntsville	AL
Arkansas Council for International Visitors	Little Rock	AR
World Affairs Council of Arizona	Scottsdale	AZ
Tucson Council for International Visitors	Tucson	AZ
University of California, Davis—International Agricultural Visitors Program	Davis	CA
International Visitors Council of Los Angeles	Los Angeles	CA
UCLA International Visitors Bureau	Los Angeles	CA
International Relations Council of Riverside	Riverside	CA
Sacramento Council for International Visitors	Sacramento	CA
International Visitors Council of San Diego	San Diego	CA
International Diplomacy Council	San Francisco	CA
Silicon Valley Forum International Visitor Program	San Jose	CA

Community Organization Members of the National Council for International Visitors—Continued

Community Organizations	City	State
International Visitors and Protocol Foundation of Orange County	Santa Ana	CA
Stanford University, Office for International Visitors	Stanford	CA
Boulder Council for International Visitors	Boulder	CO
Colorado Springs Committee for International Visitors	Colorado Springs	CO
Institute of International Education—Rocky Mountain Regional Center	Denver	CO
International Center of New Haven	New Haven	CT
World Affairs Council, Hartford, CT	West Hartford	CT
International Hospitality Committee of Fairfield County, CT	Westport	CT
Delaware Council for International Visitors (DELCIV)	Greenville	DE
International Resource Center of Jacksonville	Jacksonville	FL
International Council of Central Florida, Inc.	Longwood	FL
Florida Space Coast Council for International Visitors	Melbourne	FL
Miami Council for International Visitors	Miami	FL
Georgia Council for International Visitors	Atlanta	GA
Pacific & Asian Affairs Council	Honolulu	HI
Iowa Council for International Understanding	Des Moines	IA
Council for International Visitors to Iowa Cities (CIVIC)	Iowa City	IA
International Visitors Center of Chicago	Chicago	IL
Freeport Area International Visitors Council	Freeport	IL
Geneseo International Thanksgiving Fellowship Program	Geneseo	IL
Paris International Thanksgiving Fellowship	Paris	IL
Springfield Commission on International Visitors	Springfield	IL
Rock River Valley International Fellowship	Sterling	IL
International Center of Indianapolis	Indianapolis	IN
Louisville International Cultural Center (LICC)	Louisville	KY
Council for International Visitors of Greater New Orleans	New Orleans	LA
WorldBoston	Boston	MA
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Cambridge	MA
Harvard University Marshal's Office	Cambridge	MA
World Affairs Council of Western Massachusetts, Inc.	Springfield	MA
International Center of Worcester	Worcester	MA
World Trade Center Institute	Baltimore	MD
World Council of Maine	Portland	ME
University of Michigan International Center	Ann Arbor	MI
International Visitors Council of Metropolitan Detroit	Detroit	MI
International Visitor Committee of Mid-Michigan	East Lansing	MI
Minnesota International Center	Minneapolis	MN
International Visitors Council of Greater Kansas City	Kansas City	MO
The World Affairs Council of St. Louis	St. Louis	MO
The International Visitors Center of Jackson	Jackson	MS
Montana Center for International Visitors	Bozeman	MT
Charlotte's Council for International Visitors	Charlotte	NC
Piedmont Triad Council for International Visitors	Greensboro	NC
Research Triangle International Visitors Council	Research Triangle Pk	NC
Minot Area Council for International Visitors	Minot	ND
Grand Island Council for International Visitors	Grand Island	NE
Mayor's Committee for International Friendship	Lincoln	NE
Kiwanis Club of Omaha, Inc.	Omaha	NE
New Hampshire Council on World Affairs	Durham	NH
Albuquerque Council for International Visitors	Albuquerque	NM
Santa Fe Council on International Relations	Santa Fe	NM
International Visitors Council of Northern Nevada	Reno	NV
International Center of the Capital Region	Albany	NY
Buffalo-Niagara Region Council for International Visitors, Inc.	Buffalo	NY
Rochester International Friendship Council	Rochester	NY
International Center of Syracuse	Syracuse	NY
Akron International Friendship	Akron	OH
International Visitors Council of Greater Cincinnati	Cincinnati	OH
Cleveland Council on World Affairs	Cleveland	OH
International Visitors Council, Inc.	Columbus	OH
International Institute of Toledo	Toledo	OH
Oklahoma City International Visitors Council	Oklahoma City	OK
Tulsa Global Alliance	Tulsa	OK
World Affairs Council of Oregon	Portland	OR

Community Organization Members of the National Council for International Visitors—Continued

Community Organizations	City	State
International Visitors Council of Philadelphia	Philadelphia	PA
Pittsburgh Council for International Visitors	Pittsburgh	PA
World Affairs Council of Rhode Island	Providence	RI
South Carolina World Trade Center—Charleston	Charleston	SC
Columbia Council for International Visitors	Columbia	SC
Dacotah Territory International Visitor Program	Rapid City	SD
Memphis Council for International Visitors	Memphis	TN
Nashville Council for International Visitors	Nashville	TN
International Hospitality Council of Austin	Austin	TX
Dallas Committee for Foreign Visitors	Dallas	TX
El Paso Council for International Visitors	El Paso	TX
World Affairs Council of Greater Fort Worth	Fort Worth	TX
Institute of International Education—Southern Region	Houston	TX
San Antonio Council for International Visitors	San Antonio	TX
International Visitors Utah Council	Salt Lake City	UT
Center for International Programs, Virginia Commonwealth University	Richmond	VA
The Vermont Council on World Affairs, Inc.	Burlington	VT
World Affairs Council of Seattle/Tacoma	Seattle	WA
Spokane International Exchange Council	Spokane	WA
Yakima Valley Council for International Visitors	Wapato	WA
International Institute of Wisconsin	Milwaukee	WI

THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE INTERNATIONAL VISITOR PROGRAM—A 60TH
ANNIVERSARY INITIATIVE

GrassRoots Exchange And Training Program (GREAT) for Community Leaders
Concept Paper—September 14, 2000

GOAL

The overarching goal of the GrassRoots Exchange And Training Program is to provide opportunities for U.S. elected officials and other community leaders to build enduring personal and institutional relationships—both commercial and cultural—with their counterparts abroad. Participants should have some responsibility for economic development and providing a governance climate conducive to the growth of medium and small businesses.

DESCRIPTION

Each year as part of the State Department's International Visitor Program, U.S. Embassy Committees, with advice from Sister Cities representatives, will select 400 local officials, representatives of Chambers of Commerce, and officers of Sister Cities organizations to participate in a 21 day International Visitor Program. Delegations of 5-8 officials will travel to Washington, DC, two other appropriate communities, and their Sister City, to meet, share best practices and make plans with their U.S. counterparts.

ASSUMPTIONS

1. Local (municipal and county) and other community leaders are the pool from which national leaders will emerge.

2. Privatization on the scale now occurring around the world will only succeed if (a) there are healthy, viable government structures to tax, regulate, and provide a sound legal context for the private sector actors and (b) creative partnerships between the public and private sectors are encouraged.

3. To avoid duplication and take advantage of the synergy of two flagship exchange programs, this initiative would make possible unprecedented collaboration between two national networks of citizen diplomats—the National Council for International Visitors and Sister Cities, International.

4. There is an avalanche of information about globalization and economic development available, but not enough firsthand human experience to enable government officials to analyze, evaluate, and derive maximum benefit from it for their commu-

ities. This short-term professional exchange program will provide this needed first-hand international experience.

5. The United States has a vested interest in democracy—building and increasing civic participation at home as well as around the globe.

Selection of Participants: Participants in the GREAT program will visit the United States under the auspices of the U.S. Department of State's International Visitor Program. They will be selected by U.S. Embassy Committees, with advice from appropriate Sister Cities representatives. Each program will be built around a specific theme or themes such as preserving water resources, promoting economic development and trade, or building NGO management.

Each participant must be willing to make presentations to school classes and to other audiences while in the United States. Ability to speak English will be considered when selecting candidates for this program. However, interpreters will be provided in cases where the participants do not speak English.

Program Management: The U.S. Department of State's Office of International Visitors will manage the program. The Office of International Visitors will also be in consultation with Sister Cities International and the National Council of International Visitors. The partnership between NCIV and SCI combines the strengths of two internationally recognized networks of citizen diplomats.

SISTER CITIES INTERNATIONAL,
1424 K STREET, NW, SUITE 600,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2000.

Dr. SHERRY MUELLER,
Executive Director,
National Council of International Visitors.

DEAR DR. MUELLER:

Sister Cities International (SCI) would like to express its enthusiastic support for the GrassRoots Exchange and Training Program (GREAT), which you will be presenting to the Senate International Operations Subcommittee on September 14th. We believe that this proposal combines the unique strengths of both our organizations, and will foster an innovative, focused and sustainable approach to the International Visitor Program.

Sister Cities International is committed to fostering citizen diplomacy through its incredible network of 3500 communities linked together around the world in 137 different countries. Our local chapters bring together municipal officials and community leaders to foster international exchange programs. These efforts are volunteer based, and bring out the very best in international collaboration. We recognize the importance of partnerships in achieving our goals, and we welcome this opportunity to work together with your organization to put forward this new initiative to the Senate International Operations Subcommittee.

Increasingly, local governments through their sister city programs, are seeking new ways in which to foster international engagement at the community level. As globalization sweeps our planet, our cities and towns are committed to building "globally competitive communities." This is being done through partnerships with civic and educational institutions, with business and technology centers, and through citizens and their nonprofit organizations.

Building "globally competitive communities" requires our communities to adapt and change within our rapidly globalizing planet. It is about:

- Enabling our communities and their citizens to be globally competitive, not just economically but in every aspect of life. While economics are critically important, communities must also be competitive in terms of education, the environment, health and other quality of life issues, which form the very fabric of our communities.
- Providing a platform for our citizens to be engaged as "global citizens" in an effort to build international bridges of friendship, mutual respect, and support.
- Establishing partnerships, linkages and coalitions and unleashing the incredible interests, passions, and talents or citizens have for making a difference by "thinking globally and acting locally."

The *GrassRoots Exchange and Training Program (GREAT)* is a very important new initiative. Sister Cities International stands with the National Council of Inter-

national Visitors on presenting this proposal to Senator Grams and the International Operations Subcommittee, which he chairs.

Sincerely yours,

CHUCK STOKKE, *President,*
Sister Cities International,
Former Mayor, Menomonie, Wisconsin.

TIM HONEY, *Executive Director,*
Sister Cities International.

PIEDMONT TRIAD COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL VISITORS, INC.,
815 WEST MARKET STREET,
Greensboro, NC, September 11, 2000.

TRIAD RESOURCES SPEAK OUT FOR PTCIV

“ . . . I have had the opportunity of meeting (PTCIV) visitors from around the world including Morocco, Korea, and all parts of Europe. These meetings have benefited the Center and assisted us in planning some of our programs . . . including an upcoming sojourn to Morocco for our Bryan School MBA students.”

Riad Ajami, Director
Center for Global Business Education and Research
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

“At the time, Sara Lee happened in be having difficulty resolving a trademark issue in Korea. Leon Porter, who was then Chief Counsel of Sara Lee Personal Products, and I were able to have very productive meetings with these two gentlemen (distinguished Korean lawyers).”

Arthur J. DeBaugh, Chief Counsel
International Property Law Department
Sara Lee Corporation
Winston-Salem, NC

“ . . . a visit from citizens of Uzbekistan . . . was a mutually joyous event—particularly in the eleventh grade Honors English class made up of Asian, African-American, Palestinian and Caucasian students.”

Dr. Ann Pember, Special Populations Coordinator
Ben L. Smith High School
Greensboro, NC

“At one of the meetings, I met . . . an enterprising young fellow from Lithuania. I subsequently engaged him to handle our affairs in the Baltic States . . . which resulted in us being able to widen our sources of imported plywood . . . I consider my dues and time to PTCIV a worthwhile endeavor and feel both myself and my company get an excellent return on our investment.”

William F. Doran, Vice President
Hardwood Plywood Sales
Columbia Forest Products
Greensboro, NC

“I was pleased to receive Mr. Mallia and Mr. Azzopardi and you, yourself. I agree that each opportunity we use to share information reduces the wall of ignorance which separates and cripples us.”

Maya Angelou
Reynolds Professor
Wake Forest University
Winston-Salem, NC

“I have found occasions arranged by PTCIV to be far more productive than those occurring under other circumstances . . . Local government is of particular interest to many visitors since it is the critical link between individuals, neighborhoods, and requisite services. It is a ‘missing link’ in many nations accustomed to totalitarian systems and the absence of authority at the local level.”

Carolyn S. Allen, Former Mayor
City of Greensboro, NC

“It is impossible to put a monetary value on the goodwill and contacts that have been generated by the dozens of visitors I have met over the years I now have busi-

ness contacts all over the world which I believe are of great value to me. I thank you and the PTCIV for the outstanding job you do in promoting global contacts.”

Joe Carroll, Publisher
Furniture/Today
High Point, NC

“(PTCIV) offers a viable, established vehicle for volunteers to participate in International goodwill efforts . . . as evidenced by the long roster of visitors to our region. The many volunteers and small staff of PTCIV operate very effectively as a highly specialized mentoring organization with clearly substantiated and documented instances of ‘satisfied customers’”

Thomas L. Stapleton, CED/FM
Manager, Business Assistance and Development
City of Greensboro, NC

“. . . I have observed . . . international visitors . . . have gained a clearer appreciation of the culture and business opportunities afforded by our area . . . These Visitors (who already hold responsible positions in their communities) often attain positions of leadership and . . . will . . . encourage commerce and communication with our area and the State of North Carolina.”

Jonathan V. Maxwell, County Attorney
Guilford County, NC

“Not only have you promoted better awareness of this area within our own citizenry, but you have also educated many folks from overseas about the Triad, its industry, culture, and people . . . At the University of North Carolina at Greensboro . . . we have developed strong programs of cooperation with Romania and Moldova, largely built upon contacts provided though PTCIV auspices.”

Charles H. Lyons
Associate Provost for International Programs
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Excerpts from letters on file at the office of The Piedmont Triad Council for International Visitors, Inc. Document updated: July 27, 2000.

INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMACY COUNCIL,
San Francisco Bay Area, September 12, 2000.

To: Sherry L. Mueller
Subject: Senate Hearing

On behalf of the 1,200 member International Diplomacy Council of the San Francisco Bay Area, I am writing to respectfully urge you to expand support of the International Visitor Program. IDC was founded 48 years ago and is one of the largest international visitor programs in the country. We schedule over 14,000 professional and cultural appointments for approximately 1,500 visitors each year.

Our two and one-half year old Education Enrichment Program brings the international visitor into the classroom with in depth discussion on human rights, rule of law, economics, HIV/AIDS, international relations, the list goes on. In its short life, over 4,400 Bay Area students and teachers have been impacted by this highly acclaimed program. In fact, we cannot keep up with the student and teacher demand! And the 400 plus international visitors who have participated in this program find it one of the most rewarding parts of their U.S. visit.

The International Visitor Program advances the U.S. national interest by putting a human face on American foreign policy, sharing American values and democratic institutions, and by fostering economic ties with rapid developing overseas markets. Large and small businesses in the nine Bay Area counties, including Silicon Valley, have benefited significantly from the professional appointments with the visitors. Business development opportunities have occurred through many of these meetings—Hewlett-Packard, Cisco Systems, Oracle, AirTouch and some of the small and upcoming e-commerce companies to name just a few.

We count on your committee's support for international education and cultural exchange.

SHARON DEZORDO,
Executive Director.

NORTH ARKANSAS COLLEGE,
Harrison, AR, September 8, 2000.

To: Sherry Mueller
Subject: Exchange Programs and the National Interest

Since June of 1988, North Arkansas College in Harrison, Arkansas has served as the host of the Harrison Council for International Visitors (HCIV), an associate council of the Arkansas Council for International Visitors (ACIV), one of the members of the National Council for International Visitors (NCIV) network. Our location in a small, rural community in the Ozark Mountains has enabled Northark and HCIV's local volunteers to offer special experiences to our guests from other countries. These international visitors have been unanimous in their praise for the personal attention they've received and the quality of their experiences in Harrison. In return, our local "citizen diplomats" have had an opportunity to meet emerging leaders from more than 60 different countries. These international visitors have made numerous presentations to area college and high school classes, civic clubs, and other groups.

The benefits of having a CIV in a community of our size are innumerable. The program has literally offered our area citizens and Northark's students a window on the world, exposing them to people, ideas, and cultures that they otherwise would never have had an opportunity to experience.

This program is a shining example of the positive outcomes that can result when local volunteers, guided by experienced professionals, are given an opportunity to assist their country in its quest to be a positive influence in the global community.

If better understanding of other cultures and people is vital to United States security interests, certainly the Visitors Program is critically important in that effort.

JORDAN, DUNLAP, PRATHER & HARRIS, L.L.P.,
BANK ONE PRESTON, SUITE 400, 8111 PRESTON RD.,
Dallas, TX, September 12, 2000.

To: Sherry Mueller

The Dallas Committee for Foreign Visitors, acting under the auspices of the Dallas Council for World Affairs, was formed more than 40 years ago by Mrs. Clyde Emery, deceased. This organization has as its purposes:

"A. To receive foreign visitors sent to Dallas by the various governmental agencies, and to provide them personalized local itineraries, including professional appointments and hospitality, satisfying the requirements suggested by U.S. embassies, through the national programming agencies.

"B. To involve as many local citizens as possible in each visitor's program, without exploiting the visitor.

"C. To continue serving as an all-volunteer organization."

We strongly believe that these three elements are like a three legged stool. All must be present for the best results.

Others may address the impact of the citizen to citizen approach on the lives and careers of the many thousands of foreign visitors who have come to Dallas and received the benefit of our collective services. For our part, the participation of our volunteers has had immense impact upon their own lives. Friendships have been formed extending throughout the world. We have learned much of the world and have come to a better understanding that we are all part of the human race with more similarities than differences. Reciprocal visits have been made. Home hospitality has affected the families of our volunteers. This perhaps is best illustrated by the following story:

Jill was a senior in highschool. Her mother and father and her grandmother had all been active in the work of our organization since shortly after its inception. Jill grew up with meeting guests from all over the world. In her grandmother's guest book there were people from over 60 countries who had been at her house. Jill was selected as TACT finalist. This is the Teen Age Citizenship Tribute sponsored by the Dallas Morning News. In the final selection process, Jill was asked the question, "What person do you admire the most that you know and why?" She promptly replied, "It would be a teacher from Afghanistan I met at our home; who if he was lucky would eventually own a bicycle. He had such a love of his country and was so committed to serving his students and his country that I greatly respected and admired this man."

This is but an example of the effect of the International Visitor Program upon our several hundred volunteers who over the years have labored and enjoyed the work and opportunity to meet with interesting people from throughout the world. We believe that they have made a contribution to international understanding whereby they become a personification of the U.S. for the visitor and similarly the visitor has become a personification of his or her country to our volunteers.

This program should be increased. At our end, we act as an all volunteer organization donating our time and money in the interests of better international understanding and because we enjoy it.

Respectfully,

JERRY N. JORDAN,
*Chair Elect, Steering Committee,
Dallas Committee for Foreign Visitors.*

TULSA GLOBAL ALLIANCE,
2819 EAST 10TH STREET,
Tulsa OK, September 12, 2000.

To: Sherry L. Mueller
Subject: NCIV Testimony

Dear Sherry:

Below is some additional information about Tulsa Global Alliance and our experience with the International Visitor Program.

Tulsa Global Alliance annually hosts between 100 and 125 visitors from over 30 countries through the U.S. Department of State International Visitor Program. These visitors interacted with over 700 Oklahomans during their professional meetings and home hospitality experiences and have had a substantial and positive impact on our community, economically and culturally. International visitors have served as guest speakers in local classrooms, assisted local businesses in making contacts abroad, and offered hospitality to Oklahomans who visit their countries.

I hope this helps.

BOB LIESER,
Program Director.

MEXICAN VISITOR—MARCH, 1999

Tulsa Global Alliance (TGA) hosted Dr. Zidane Zeraoui, and International Visitor from Mexico, from March 23-26, 1999. Dr. Zeraoui is Director of the International Relations Department at the Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey (Monterrey Tec) in Monterrey, Mexico. In keeping with Dr. Zeraoui's interest in U.S.-Mexican relations, TGA arranged professional meetings with media, government agencies, NGOs and civic groups that represent the Hispanic community of Tulsa.

During his visit to Tulsa, Dr. Zeraoui enjoyed home hospitality with Mr. Rodger Randle, Professor of International Relations at the University of Oklahoma Tulsa campus. He has also served as President of Sister Cities International and is a former Mayor of Tulsa. Since March 1999, Dr. Zeraoui has returned to Tulsa as a guest of Prof. Randle and the University of Oklahoma. The two of them are organizing a joint conference between the University of Oklahoma and Monterrey Tec that will take place both in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and Monterrey, Mexico.

The conference, scheduled for Spring of 2001, will focus on U.S.-Mexican relations and on each country's perceptions of the other. "Dr. Zeraoui's visit shows how the International Visitor Program can bring about long-term relationships between institutions in the United States and other countries. This conference is a direct result of his visit to Tulsa and could contribute to improved U.S.-Mexican understanding."

KAZAKH VISITORS—JUNE, 2000

From June 7-10, 2000, TGA hosted a group of International Visitors from Kazakhstan through the U.S. Department of State Office of International Visitors. This program was coordinated nationally by Meridian International Center. The three Kazakhs, reporters from the city of Atyrau, report on the oil and gas industry and its impact on the environment. Atyrau is located about fifty miles north of a vast petroleum reserve in the northern Caspian Sea that may well be the largest oil discovery anywhere in the world in the past 20 years.

During their visit to Tulsa, they met with representatives of the Tulsa World and KJRH Channel 2 to find out how reporters research stories in the United States, and with staff of the Oklahoma Energy Resources Board (OERB) to learn about OERB's efforts at cleaning up abandoned oil sites. The highlights of their stay in Oklahoma were visits to Parker Drilling and Phillips Petroleum, two companies currently doing business in Kazakhstan. The meetings focused on the two companies' operations in Kazakhstan and the steps taken by both companies to address environmental concerns. At Parker Drilling, the company's chairman, Mr. Robert Parker, Sr., and the Vice President for Corporate Business Development, Mr. John Gass, hosted the visitors.

At Phillips Petroleum, the visitors met Mr. Edd Grigsby Vice President for Investor and Public Relations, and Mr. Bill Berry, Vice President for the Eurasia Division of Phillips Petroleum Corporation. Mr. Grigsby said that the visit was "a good example of how the International Visitor program can introduce American businesses to potentially useful contacts abroad."

[From the Sapulpa Daily Herald, September 13, 1999]

PERUVIAN POLITICAL AND LEGAL ADVISOR VISITS CREEK COUNTY

He was here by invitation. Arriving fresh from a whirlwind tour of New York City and Washington D.C., the Peruvian visitor who arrived at the Creek County Courthouse in Sapulpa Friday afternoon came with the express purpose to meet local officials in mid-America to learn how the electoral machine here works, by examining specifically how it works in Creek County. In all actuality, it would be his first real look at how democracy in the United States operates.

Guillermo Gonzalez, a chief political and legal advisor to three members of the Peruvian Congress—and a potential Congressional candidate in his own right—entered the office of the Creek County Election Board, accompanied by interpreter Dylan G. Westfeldt, and was greeted at the door by Creek County Election Board Secretary Joy Naifeh and state Sen. Ted Fisher. The visit was arranged by the Tulsa Global Alliance under the auspices of the U.S. Information Agency's International Visitor Program. The Tulsa Global Alliance is a non-profit organization dedicated to promoting international awareness and understanding throughout Northeastern Oklahoma.

"It's wonderful having you here," Naifeh said, extending a hand. Naifeh manages the electoral process for the 39 voting polls throughout Creek County. Gonzalez, speaking through Westfeldt, said he was pleased to be here, and after a moment of introduction, began immediately to ask about Creek County's political engine. "Well, over there is one of our voting machines," Naifeh said, pointing to the computerized instrument that reads bar-coded data from the various polling sites. The small crowd hovered over the device for a moment, looking at the printed materials similar to what is used during an actual election. After a moment, Naifeh invited them into her office for a more detailed interview and discussion.

Once inside, Westfeldt, speaking for Gonzalez, gave a little more explanation for Gonzalez's visit. He said Gonzalez, who holds a law degree and has worked as a journalist in both print and electronic media, wanted to see how the administration of elections happen in mid-America, more because he didn't want to focus on the large metropolitan areas. "He wanted to see how elections in small cities worked," Naifeh said later. "Having learned about Oklahoma from the Oklahoma City bombing and the recent tornadoes and his knowledge of the Five Civilized Tribes, that's why he wanted to come here," she said. Besides, Westfeldt said, Gonzalez has a wide range of experience in political, legal and academic positions and he wanted to learn how election integrity is maintained. "He's also interested in the role of legislative staffs at the state level as well as the federal level and political campaigning," Westfeldt said.

In Peru, the political engine has less regulation than it does in the U.S., said Fisher, who was present not merely to greet the visitors and offer his insights on the Oklahoma political machine, but because he also chairs the Economic Development Committee and he's a member of the Tulsa Global Alliance. "It's good to know your neighbors," Fisher said. "When you know them, understanding creates a bond, and a bond trust. And from that trust, peoples of the world can learn to live and work in harmony."

To: Sherry L. Mueller
 From: Patricia Gehri <ICCF.FL@worldnet.att.net>
 Subject: re congress

The International Visitors Program benefits not only the International Visitors by learning about our nation first hand, but it benefits our own citizens through cultural exchanges. One example, would be Belarus, here to follow the primary elections in the Central Florida Area. These 10 visitors are the opposition party to a very dictatorial government. A panel was initiated which consisted of local government elected officials: this consisted of Mayors, Vice Mayors, Commissioners and news media. They had many questions to ask on our form of government and how our elected official ran a campaign.

One Commissioner stated to the press that this was a humbling experience. Here Belarus was fighting to vote and have a free election and we had to answer that perhaps 19% to 22% would come out and vote for a local election. The exchanges that occur among our visitors, whether in schools, or a waste dump always brings about a positive understanding on both sides. The Intern programs and college credit program has enable this Council to open up the world to our student Interns. The more that our students and the community learn about our international visitors brings a strengthening respect for each other. There is no way to equate what one and one conversations means to our country, but we do feel by these International Visitors having the opportunity to ask questions and have our citizens answer them honestly brings about a mutual respect on both sides. Planting seeds of friendship and understanding is a lot cheaper than a peace keeping mission.

Thanks, Patricia.

To: Sherry Mueller
 From: Karen Turner <KTurner@IVCCinti.Org>
 Subject: September 14th Hearing

Sherry,
 Listed below are some quotes from a tri-fold publication we use that may be helpful:

Dr. George Vredevel, University of Cincinnati Center for Economic Education: "IVC plays an important role in enhancing global understanding. Visitors learn from local hosts and these hosts learn from visitors. Importantly, our community learns more about itself through the opportunity that the IVC makes available to us."

David B. Lee, Marketing Director, F&W Publications, Inc.: "What a wonderful program for Cincinnati. In today's increasingly global world and economy, we need to understand and relate to other cultures. . ."

10th Grade Student, Lakota High School: "Dear International Visitors Council, Thank you for sending our class newspapers. Since we are learning about diversity, it was fun to read about it in a newspaper for a change. I normally don't get a chance to read the paper. From getting to read these papers, I feel more in touch with the world."

Joe Mass, president of JTM Food Group: "I am grateful the International Visitors Council gives me the opportunity to exchange viewpoints with other cultures. I am glad to have the opportunity to help, in some small way, to get Russia on its feet. The stability of our global economy impacts my business directly. IVC does a great job helping our foreign visitors gain useful knowledge in growing their businesses."

From an International Visitor: "This IVC Program taught me that Americans are anxious to share their knowledge and experience. . . and that they're willing to learn from us to."

To: Sherry L. Mueller
 From: Diane Elton <delton@ucr.ac1.ucr.edu>
 Subject: Comments for Hearing

My Personal Gratitude for a Lifetime Civic Gift.

Having studied abroad for the academic year 1969-70, I was thrilled to realize a dream of finally visiting Washington, D.C. after having seen the capitals of so many other nations. The IYP and Riverside's local affiliate, The International Relations Council, permitted this onetime 26-year old to visit her nation's capital as a citizen diplomat. With that 1975 COSERV/NCIV conference, I felt the palpable difference

of freedom and access available to me as a U.S. citizen from what I had felt as a young visitor, for example to the former Soviet Union. Indeed over these decades, I relish my exchanges with colleagues who also express their gratitude to the IVP for permitting them to “feel” the connectedness between what we offer in service to international understanding and foreign policy in our home towns and the national perspective in Washington, D.C. I truly do not know of a more effective means of linking the legislative and executive profiles of this country in the minds and hearts of individual citizens than the International Visitor Program.

IMPACT SPOTS

(1) Volunteers worry how a former delegate of a GrassRoots Democracy (Phelps Stokes) group is doing with his NGO promoting community justice . . . in Colombia. Volunteers reassured a couple of years later during a local visit by the U.S. Ambassador to Colombia that all is well.

The Department of State needs to be able to continue to provide this full domestic array of expression of our foreign policy. The nature of world affairs requires multiple and reinforcing experiences for an informed citizenry who will better engage the International Visitor.

(2) A stunning model of healthful living, the Executive Director of New Zealand Nutrition Foundation extols a class of attenuates at one of the most ethnically diverse high schools to pay attention to their nutrition. According to the coach, the athletes really did exhibit, at least for a month, different eating patterns. Beyond the improved performance in sport the visitor promised, the students commented that was the first personal interaction they had had with someone from New Zealand and inquired how she got all the way to Riverside, California.

So developed the opportunity to educate some emerging voters of America on the impact and value of volunteering and how the government develops foreign policy. Besides, we all like to think that the team won that day’s tough Homecoming game with the extra IVP boost.

(3) Quick! A What do you know about Djibouti? message raced through the volunteer ranks as Riversiders prepared to receive the first visitor from this new country. Nothing in print from ordinary sources, save the masterful briefing prepared by the Post.

This IVP provided the extremely important message about the fast-changing, contemporary political world. Our volunteers felt compelled to campaign for more foreign news in local press and an expansion of resources in the local library.

(4) Unexpected Memorable Spirituality. Completing a visit on governance with the Tribal Council of the San Manual Band of Mission Indians, the Mayor of Santiago del Estero, Argentina, asked for the closing moment. With eloquence equal to the native tongue of the Band, the Mayor (not a native speaker) recited in the language of the indigenous tribe of his city a beautiful “poem” which turned out to be the Lord’s prayer. Silence and emotion crossed cultures.

Many aspects of the IVP can not be measured. Testimonials must be given equal or higher value than mere quantitative reports.

To: Sherry L. Mueller
 From: Albuquerque C. International-Visitors
 Subject: ACIV Inputs for Sept. 14 Hearing

Dear Sherry, thank you for requesting our input for your hearing. Here are our ideas:

ACIV is an all volunteer organization which hosts approximately 300 visitors annually. We believe that peace in the world happens when people know and trust one another.

Our volunteers meet and escort visitors throughout Albuquerque and New Mexico, and home hospitality often provides international visitors their first exposure to an American home.

Our “citizen diplomats” are very motivated by the very positive interactions and feedback we receive from our visitors.

For example: A recent visitor from Hong Kong stated: “The opportunity to go to ordinary people’s home gave me a better understanding of the American Society.”

A visitor from Vietnam said: “A visit to Isleta Pueblo completely changed my understanding of the Native American.”

Sherry, best of luck. Could you please send us a copy of your final testimony?

BILL YARNALL.

To: Sherry L. Mueller
 From: Maria Wrigley, Director, UCLA International Visitors Bureau
 Subject: Importance of the International Visitors Program

Dear Sherry: In response to your request in support of the International Visitor Program, I would like to submit following statement.

The UCLA International Visitors Bureau has actively supported the International Visitor Program since 1967 and has served as a liaison between UCLA administrators/faculty and international academic and professional leaders. The staff and volunteer "citizen diplomats" have provided appropriate contacts between hundreds of international visitors and the UCLA community which have developed into, mutually beneficially, intellectual exchanges and strategic alliances.

The UCLA curriculum, research, and cultural programs encompass a broad spectrum of instruction and inquiry with respect to the nations, peoples and languages of the world. The University is a magnet to visiting scholars who wish to engage in the exchange of knowledge around the globe.

It is of vital importance to foster these international exchange programs which play a major role in enhancing international understanding among citizens of the world.

We urge the support of this people-to-people International Visitor Program.

We wish you a very successful presentation to a cause, which we, at the UCLA International Visitors Bureau, strongly support—to foster international understanding.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES,
 INTERNATIONAL VISITORS CENTER,
 Los Angeles, CA, *September 9, 2000.*

SHERRY MUELLER, Ph.D.,
*National Council for International Visitors,
 1420 K Street, NW, Suite 800,
 Washington, DC.*

DEAR SHERRY:

I have been a volunteer in the UCLA International Visitors Bureau for several years. Meeting many international visitors sponsored by the State Department has been a most rewarding and enriching experience. As a volunteer "citizen diplomat" I provide support to the staff members of the UCLA International Visitors Bureau and have established personal friendships with visitors from around the globe.

I strongly recommend the support of the international exchange programs in our national interest.

Sincerely,

ANNETTE LEHMANN.

SPRINGFIELD COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL VISITORS,
 109 NORTH SEVENTH,
 Springfield, IL, *September 13, 2000.*

Re: Statement of support for the International Visitors Program

The City of Springfield created the Springfield Commission on International Visitors in 1962. For 38 years volunteers have enthusiastically contributed their time, local and state leaders have been actively involved in the programming, and thousands of internationals have benefited from their visits to Springfield. The fact that this city has sustained this program with financial support and staffing for almost 40 years says more than anything else does about its importance and value to our community.

KAREN HASARA, *Mayor.*

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

 PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAMS (AAIEP)

Mr. Chairman:

We deeply appreciate this opportunity to encourage our government to support the President's April 19, 2000 Memorandum on International Education Policy, in which he stated "We are committed to . . . encouraging students from other countries to study in the United States." The biggest single discouragement to such student mobility is the existence of outdated regulations which lead to inappropriate and expensive visa-processing at U.S. consular posts, and an unnecessary enforcement burden on the already overburdened U.S. immigration system.

Our organization represents the intensive English program sector of higher education. Over 300,000 international visitors come to the United States every year to learn English and to experience American life. These visitors represent a significant part of the U.S. export economy, spending over \$2 billion annually. Their visits to the U.S. and enrollments in intensive English programs (hereafter IEP) are fully financed from their own or other funds from abroad. These nonimmigrant visitors should not be confused with non English-speaking residents of the U.S. or immigrants whose English instruction is publicly funded. These visitors bring far more financial benefit to the communities in which they stay than merely paying tuition to intensive English programs. They stay with families or in extended-stay lodging, they rent or buy cars, they visit local tourist attractions.

Other English-speaking countries (principally Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom) compete aggressively for this IEP market. They already enjoy a significant advantage in this competition over the U.S. in having very active government support for their industry along with less stringent entry requirements for this low-risk group.

In addition to the enormous financial benefits these 300,000 international visitors bring to the communities in which they stay, they represent a very significant foreign policy asset when they return home. They are exceptionally well placed by educational and family background (as well as by their English training) to achieve positions in the leadership elite of their countries. They remember their time in our country with affection and respect. This translates into a web of invaluable connections for the U.S. around the world.

This is a young industry: most U.S. intensive English programs were established in the 1970's and 1980's. It has grown as mass tourism, globalization, open markets, and the pervasive influence of the United States have grown. Knowledge of the English language is now recognized as prerequisite to success in the global economy.

The United States is alone among English-speaking countries in treating short-term English-language program participants as equivalent to long-term students, requiring student visas, rather than as tourists. This requirement unnecessarily and very significantly increases costs at overseas U.S. consular posts, and leads to large numbers of potential visitors choosing Australia, Canada, or the United Kingdom for their short study-visit, rather than the United States. This increase in government-costs, and decrease in export-income, comes with no improvement in the integrity of the U.S. immigration system.

We urge your attention to the removal of outdated and unnecessary obstacles to international student mobility.

 PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE FULBRIGHT ASSOCIATION

The Fulbright Association is a private, nonprofit membership association of more than 6,000 Fulbright alumni. The Fulbright Association supports and promotes the Fulbright Program and works to strengthen the national and global networks of Fulbright alumni. The Association facilitates relationships among, and the public service of, former Fulbright grantees. The Association's 37 chapters across the country provide hospitality and enrichment activities for foreign Fulbright students, scholars, and teachers during their stay in the United States.

International educational and cultural exchange initiatives like the Fulbright Program bring considerable and tangible benefits to the U.S. national interest. These people-to-people exchanges benefit the economy, strengthen the educational system, and enrich not only the lives of the exchange participants, but the communities and institutions in which they reside and work.

Since its establishment by Congress in 1946, the Fulbright Program has provided grants to over 200,000 individuals. These Fulbright exchanges between U.S. students, teachers, and scholars and their counterparts in approximately 140 other countries result in significant benefits to U.S. communities. The Fulbright Program helps to strengthen relationships among individuals and institutions across borders, promoting a more stable and peaceful world. Fulbright exchanges develop critical foreign language, cross-cultural and area studies skills needed among U.S. citizens to meet the challenges of a new century. Through its merit-based, open, selection processes and its bilateral decision-making, the Fulbright Program provides extraordinary opportunities for sharing knowledge and for promoting democratic values.

Core funding from the U.S. government supports the global Fulbright Program and helps to leverage cost-sharing from a significant number of foreign governments and from private sources. In order to secure the foundation of Fulbright exchanges worldwide and to maximize opportunities to leverage other resources, restoration of adequate U.S. funding is essential. Cuts in funding since 1996 have diminished U.S. capacity to identify and develop U.S. leaders with critical international perspectives and foreign leaders with informed perceptions of U.S. goals. The Fulbright Program—whose acceptance here and abroad is a national asset—further long-term U.S. interests in an increasingly complex international geopolitical world and must be funded accordingly.

The Fulbright Association advocates increased support for the Fulbright Program and other international educational and cultural exchanges. A renewed commitment to international exchanges would indicate recognition of the broad and vital role exchanges play in strengthening the U.S. national interest both at home and abroad.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. ALLAN E. GOODMAN, PRESIDENT AND CHIEF
EXECUTIVE OFFICER, INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee.

Thank you for affording me this opportunity to submit this statement for the record on a topic that is so important to America's future. Increasing international educational exchange is the best investment we can make to assure a more peaceful world and one in which America has friends. By focusing attention on this issue, the Subcommittee is helping to promote a national, bipartisan consensus on an issue of critical import for the 21st Century.

For the past two years, I have been the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Institute of International Education (IIE). Prior to that I spent nearly 20 years as a dean at the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service and director of graduate programs there. I have also served in government. In both worlds, my focus has been on preparing people to live and work in the ever more interconnected global economy in which we now live.

The Institute of International Education is the world leader in the exchange of people and ideas. The Institute was founded at the end of World War I by two winners of the Nobel Peace Prize, Elihu Root and Nicholas Murray Butler, and a renowned professor of diplomatic history, Stephen P. Duggan. They founded the Institute on the premise that educational exchange would foster an understanding of other peoples and cultures and, in the long run, make the world a less dangerous place.

We at IIE design and administer a range of programs which foster international educational exchange. We do this for governmental agencies, corporations and foundations. IIE has administered the Fulbright Educational Exchange Program on behalf of the U.S. Department of State since its inception. IIE proposed and then lobbied for the creation of the non-immigrant student visa in 1921, and is today the leading source of information on student mobility and study abroad opportunities for students, scholars and college foreign student advisors. In November, during International Education Week, we will be issuing the results of the 51st annual census of international educational exchange trends, known in the trade as *Open Doors*.

For half a century, the United States has been the destination of choice for those studying abroad. We are still the world leader, but the percentage of those studying here has declined from over 40% to 30% in the past ten years. The implications of a continued erosion of this market share are ominous. It will adversely affect our economic security, our colleges and our future.

Nearly 500,000 foreign students study in the United States each year. The Department of Commerce considers this an export of services valued at \$13 billion dollars annually. Other countries have for years been seeking to encroach on the United States' market share for foreign study. For purely economic reasons, the U.S.

should protect this. For policy reasons, we should seek to have the largest possible number of students from abroad experience life in our country and come to understand our democratic institutions and our economic system.

Foreign students coming to the United States are important to America's future. Studying here gives them an opportunity to observe and to live in an open democratic system of government, experiencing all the freedoms we take for granted. They perfect their English language skills and learn about the economic potential of our country as a trading partner. Upon their return to their country of origin, they take with them an appreciation of democracy that is sure to influence their relationship with their own government. Their perspectives are informed by their personal experience of American values and the American way of life. As they mature professionally, they will be more inclined to turn to the States as a supplier of products with which they have some familiarity. Those who enter the diplomatic corps or other government service will view the U.S. with an understanding and appreciation that can only come from having lived here.

On June 18 of last year, British Prime Minister Tony Blair launched a campaign to increase the number of international students in the U.K. by 75,000. His stated goal is "to have 25 percent of the global market share of higher education students" studying in the U.K. In pursuing that, his government has funded a \$7.78 million marketing campaign to develop the U.K. educational brand. In launching the campaign, Blair noted the long term mutual benefits:

People who are educated here have a lasting tie to our country. They promote Britain around the world, helping our trade and our diplomacy. It is easier for our executives and our diplomats to do business with people familiar with Britain.

Similar initiatives have been announced in recent months by the governments of France, Germany and Australia. These countries recognize the dividends that accrue from opening educational doors. Their academic leaders truly believe in the importance of intercultural learning.

Our colleges and universities need the intellectual stimulation that foreign students provide, especially at the undergraduate level. About four percent of students enrolled in American higher education are non-U.S. citizens. As a former professor, I know that having foreign students in class changes not only how one teaches, but also what students learn. With so few Americans studying abroad, increasing the number of foreign students here offers an opportunity for U.S. students to learn from, and work together with, someone from another culture.

For students from the U.S., an opportunity to study abroad, to learn other languages and other cultures, is essential preparation for senior management positions in global corporations. Today only about 115,000, less than one percent of American college students study abroad, however, and very few speak a second language fluently. We can and should do better. Indeed we must, if our corporations are to retain their competitive strength in this world economy.

With the advent of a new century and an unprecedented period of globalization, the United States needs a policy to actively promote international educational exchange.

We have very few tools and not enough resources to assure America's prominence in the international educational field. President Clinton took an initial step in this direction with the issuance of a memorandum to the Secretaries of State and of Education, directing them to work toward that end. Secretary of Education Richard Riley has addressed the elements of such a policy. Recently, the President declared the week of November 13 to 17 to be International Education Week. Congressman Ben Gilman, Chairman of the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives introduced legislation (The International Academic Opportunity Act of 2000, H.R. 4528) which, if enacted, would provide scholarship assistance to students with demonstrable financial need to assure them the opportunity to benefit from an international educational exchange opportunity. The Gilman Scholarships would be limited to U.S. citizen students receiving Pell Grant assistance. These are all welcome steps.

The Administration's proposed budget for the next fiscal year, includes \$225 million for international educational exchanges such as the Fulbright Program. Public opinion polling in many developing countries tells us that the United States is perceived by many as the greatest threat to world peace today. The amount requested for educational exchange is woefully inadequate to support the single best means we have to rebut that sentiment.

The budget also provides \$3.1 million for overseas advising centers serving as the gateways for foreign students seeking to study in the United States. This compares to the investment of more than twice that by the U.K. to entice international stu-

dents to study there, and more by the other countries seeking a share of that market.

We need champions in Congress to support educational exchange and to defend the government's strategic role in encouraging it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for taking the leadership to highlight a topic of significance for our country as we enter the 21st Century, a century where not only what people learn, but where they learn it could make the difference between war and peace.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT B. KAPLAN, EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS (FORMERLY, DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA)

Please accept the following contribution to the hearing record on the benefits of International Education Programs.

Knowledge depends critically on the free flow of information, and the free flow of information, in turn, depends on the ability of persons to move internationally for educational purposes.

Over the past forty years, I have engaged actively in international education and therefore I take the liberty of speaking from the perspective of a private citizen and an expert. International educational activity has taken me to more than 30 countries, has enabled me to "profess" at academic institutions in all those countries, and has further provided the opportunity to meet professional colleagues not only from the more than 30 countries indicated but from a much broader base. On the other hand, I have had the opportunity to teach literally thousands of international students studying in the United States.

It is shocking that the United States has carelessly wasted the resources of the huge multilingualism of its own population and has failed to recognize the enormous foreign policy assets represented by International Education Programs. At the almost trivial level, international students represent a significant "export" income. Quite aside from that, International Education not only brings talented individuals to the United States to study, but it permits U.S. citizens to travel to, and study in, other countries, in other cultures, among other ethnicities, and thus to learn other languages. The monolingualism of a significant part of the U.S. population is equally shocking. But the NAFSA statement on International Education is no doubt already a part of the hearing record, and there should be no need to rehearse its contents here.

It is critical that the federal government take cognizance of the assets it has frittered away. The Congress, on the contrary, has enacted legislation the effect of which is to impose greater and greater barriers to the free movement of scholars and the free flow of information. The enactment of such legislation is based, at least in part, on a fear of the infiltration of "terrorists" into the U.S. society, but the number of terrorists among international students (a trivial figure) is far exceeded by the number of terrorists who are U.S. citizens. The Congress and the federal agencies have imposed fees that guarantee the arrival in the United States of only some minor segment of the elite rather than the rank and file of the best and brightest.

This letter is a heartfelt plea for rationality on the part of the Congress. There is, now more than ever before, a need for a national policy on International Education—a policy that will allocate resources to the uninhibited movement of intellectual talent into and out of this country, a policy that will facilitate the movement of intellectual talent rather than inhibit it, a policy that will not only remove political obstacles but that will take a rational approach to the financial support of reasonable costs to support such movement rather than putting the full burden on the backs of those least able to pay (it is a readily observable fact that the denser the bureaucracy the greater the cost of supporting it), a policy that will recognize the huge asset represented by multilingualism in the U.S. population and will simultaneously support an increase in multilingualism by encouraging the learning of languages other than English, a policy that will, once and for all, put an end to the illogicality of declaring English the official language of the United States, which, if enacted, will cost far more than the support of language learning and international exchange and which will constitute an absurdity akin to designating crab grass an endangered species.

It is surely not too much to expect farsightedness and intelligence on the part of the country's leadership. It is not too much to expect the Congress to act in the best interests of the nation rather than in the best interests of any political party, any

special pleading, any vestiges of isolationism drawing the nation into the past instead of moving it into the future.

In 1990, the Native American Languages Act was enacted. The Senate is now considering an amendment to that Act (S. 2688) to establish Native American language "survival" schools. This is a major step in the right direction. To preserve and augment the linguistic diversity of the United States, why can't the Congress consider similar legislation for all ethnic minority languages? And then it is only a small further step to act to insure language learning among English monolinguals. Such linguistic foresight will strengthen the nation, minimize intercultural misunderstanding, and assure that international educational exchanges will profit those who participate.

There is nothing to lose, and everything to gain. I respectfully urge the Congress to enact, in the present session, a National International Education Policy designed to remove obstacles and enhance opportunity for all citizens.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DANA BRESEE KEETH, DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARS OFFICE, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

We would like to contribute the following statement for the hearing record on the benefits of international education programs. This is in connection with the senate hearings on international education that were held on September 14.

Speaking for the International Scholars Office at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, we strongly support an international education policy for the United States. MIT is committed to the exchange of foreign students and scholars, and to sending U.S. students and faculty members abroad for educational experiences. Out of a total body of 9,845 students, 2,255 are from overseas studying toward undergraduate and graduate degrees. In the course of a given year, nearly 1,400 scholars from overseas are teaching in their fields of specialization and/or undertaking ground breaking research in many technological fields here on campus.

We are very encouraged by President Clinton's April 19 memorandum calling for an international education policy, and are most eager to see such a policy put into practice. An international education policy highlights the importance to the U.S. of foreign student and scholar exchanges. It acknowledges the interdependence of the world and the growing importance of international educational exchanges, cross-cultural understanding and collaborative research. Such a policy sends a positive message of welcome to overseas students and scholars contemplating study in the U.S., and to those providing funds for their support. It can simultaneously promote foreign language study in the United States and encourage U.S. students and scholars to seek more cultural and educational opportunities overseas. It can also provide incentive to U.S. colleges and universities to initiate, promote and expand international programs and activities.

Implementing an international education policy would go a long way toward resolving a national ambivalence about the value of foreign nationals. A united sense of purpose and an agreed upon set of goals would inform everything from educational programs and opportunities to immigration regulations. It would help to dispel the erroneous image created in recent years that foreign students are synonymous with terrorist acts. It would correct the longstanding misconception that the number of highly skilled and talented foreign scholars coming to share their knowledge and expertise in colleges and universities needs to be restricted each year due to labor market concerns. Immigration regulations, initiatives and procedures could be made to coincide with the national vision and fit into a more integrated whole.

We are grateful for the opportunity to contribute to this very important dialog.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WORLD LEARNING

When 23 young students embarked from New York harbor for France in June 1932, the "Experiment in International Living" was born. Founder Donald Watt believed that fostering deep connections between individuals by living and learning together would transcend borders and create understanding between cultures, and ultimately, peace. Nearly seven decades later in this age of globalization, his vision is more relevant than ever as individuals are increasingly important players in international relations.

World Learning, one of the nation's oldest and largest non-profit exchange organizations, based in Brattleboro, Vermont, continues to run Experiment programs. This summer over 900 high school students from 40 U.S. states were immersed in the

cultures of 24 countries around the world. In addition to the broader goals of mutual understanding and intercultural learning, such programs very personally change lives. Several current U.S. ambassadors and two members of the 106th Congress, for example, first gained an interest in foreign affairs as youth on Experiment programs.

World Learning and its accredited School for International Training (SIT) now administer a wide range of international exchange programs, including college study abroad and professional skills training. While the majority of World Learning's programs—and exchange opportunities in general—are privately funded, World Learning believes that federal public policy plays a critical role in the promotion of international exchange. The government articulates the national interest rationale for international exchange and federally-sponsored programs leverage significant private resources. *Therefore, World Learning is pleased to endorse President's Clinton April 2000 International Education Policy and calls on the Committee to support bipartisan legislation that would help to realize the goals set out in the policy.*

SIT Study Abroad offers 56 semester-length programs in 42 countries with a special emphasis on non-traditional locations; it is the largest sender of students to Africa and Asia. Programs have substantive themes such as community development and peace and conflict studies. SiT also has pioneered efforts to diversify the study abroad population, including providing scholarships to science students from Historically Black Colleges and Universities. *World Learning urges the Committee to offer a companion bill to Chairman Ben Gilman's legislation, H.R. 4528, to establish a grant program so that students of limited financial means gain the opportunity to study abroad.*

In this short statement, we would like to highlight two English Language Programs, small but important activities administered by World Learning's School for International Training for the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. The English Teaching Fellow Program sends some 40 teachers with Master's degrees in English as a Second Language around the world to increase the American presence, enhance American cultural training, and improve academic standards in the teaching of English. A participant in Cambodia recently wrote that "The presence of an English Teaching Fellow has significantly improved English language teaching at my host institution, the Royal University of Phnom Penh."

The EFL Fellow Program sends seasoned American language professionals to serve in the Independent States of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The primary objective of the program is to promote the teaching and learning of English as a vehicle to foster and develop democracy. A recent fellow increased understanding of legal English in Romania by working with judges in four regions of the country. World Learning has found that these programs have high impact with limited investment and have demonstrated measurable success in meeting their objectives. *World Learning appreciates the continued support of the Committee for the English Language Programs.*

Finally, World Learning would like to thank the Foreign Relations Committee for its continued oversight as the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs moves to open to fair and transparent competition the large exchange program grants—some for the first time in 50 years. Expanding the pool of partners will help ensure that federally-sponsored exchange programs are of the highest quality and conducted in the most costeffective manner possible.