GOVERNMENT
Storage

h Congress
t Session } COMMITTEE PRINT

DOCUMENTS
JUL 13 1977
FARRELL LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Y 4
. In 8/16
Ed 8/1 x

NOTES ON EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND COUNTRIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION 1083

A SPECIAL REPORT BY MEMBERS OF THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS ON A TRIP TO EGYPT, SAUDI ARABIA, KUWAIT, THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES, IRAN, AND TURKEY

A11600 695559

JUNE 2, 1977

Printed for the use of the Committee on International Relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
90-454 O WASHINGTON : 1977

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Michigan
ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania
DONALD M. FRASER, Minnesota
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York
LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana
LESTER L. WOLFF, New York
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York
GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania
MICHAEL HARRINGTON, Massachusetts
LEO J. RYAN, California
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
HELEN S. MEYNER, New Jersey
DON BONKER, Washington
GERRY E. STUDDS, Massachusetts
ANDY IRELAND, Florida
DONALD J. PEASE, Ohio
ANTHONY C. BEILENSON, California
WYCHE FOWLER, JR., Georgia
E (KIKA) DE LA GARZA, Texas
GEORGE E. DANIELSON, California
JOHN J. CAVANAUGH, Nebraska

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Michigan
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois
JOHN H. BUCHANAN, JR., Alabama
J. HERBERT BURKE, Florida
CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR., Ohio
LARRY WINN, JR., Kansas
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
TENNYSON GUYER, Ohio
ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO, California
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
SHIRLEY N. PETTIS, California

JOHN J. BRADY, JR., *Chief of Staff*

FOREWORD

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1977.

This report was submitted to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., on March 22, 1977, pursuant to section 107 of Public Law 87–256 (the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961), and was referred to the Committee on International Relations.

The report contains findings and conclusions relative to U.S. cultural and educational exchange programs with countries in the Middle East. The role of American-sponsored universities in the region is also examined.

It is published herewith as a committee print because of the committee's interest in all aspects of U.S. policy in the Middle East.

It is hoped that this document will be useful also to other Members of Congress, the executive branch, and the public who are interested in this matter.

The findings, conclusions, and recommendations contained in the report are those of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs and do not necessarily reflect the views of the members of the Committee on International Relations.

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, *Chairman.*

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1977.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 107 of Public Law 87–256 (The Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961) instructs the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs to submit to the Congress not only an annual report but "such other reports as they deem appropriate." Since no other independent agency advises on our governmental international educational and cultural programs, these reports are unique.

In accordance with that mandate I am submitting the attached report: *Notes on Educational and Cultural Exchange Between the United States and Countries in the Middle East.* It is based upon a month-long trip which William French Smith, a colleague on the Commission, Mr. W. E. Weld, Jr., our staff director, and I made in November 1976 to Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, Iran, and Turkey. It records our observations and recommendations on the problems and potential for educational and cultural exchange between these countries and the United States.

This special report is a sequel to one submitted to the Congress on December 29, 1975, on the effects of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe on the cultural relations of the United States and Eastern Europe. It is prompted by the tremendous importance the Middle East has assumed in U.S. foreign policy as a result of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the energy crisis precipitated by the oil-producing states, the Cyprus issue, and related developments.

The purpose of our trip was to ascertain how, or whether, educational and cultural exchange might contribute to the promotion of better relations between the United States and countries of the Middle East. The report specifically addresses aspects of this question and concludes that exchange programs, effectively planned and conducted, can contribute to this end. I have long been convinced that, in an increasingly interdependent world, cultural and educational exchange becomes an important factor in diplomacy by helping to establish enduring relationships between peoples. My visit to the Middle East confirmed this view.

It is also my view that although political and economic differences exist between the United States and many countries of the Middle East, the climate for educational exchange is most favorable at this time. Each country we visited is sending large numbers of its students to the United States and welcomes American teachers and professors

to its universities. This receptivity to American education and culture presents us with an opportunity to construct, through judicious use of exchange programs, mutual understanding between the United States and Middle East nations which will endure in spite of any temporary politico-economic crises.

The report does not recommend a large increase in U.S. Government spending in support of exchanges; instead it argues that the State Department and other concerned agencies can generally be most helpful by facilitating projects initiated by the Middle East States, and by stimulating more privately supported efforts. If the Department's appropriation request of $70.5 million for fiscal 1978 is approved, the Department plans augmented programs for the area which would adequately complement these other efforts.

The present U.S. Government-sponsored programs are, on the whole, well conceived and well executed; but they can be improved by:

(1) Refining the recruiting and selection process of American grantees to assure that all who are selected are fully qualified to serve overseas;

(2) Providing more adequate counseling for both American and foreign grantees;

(3) Cooperating with officials in Egypt and Turkey to reduce the "brain drain" of their specialists;

(4) More selective utilization in the Middle East of Cultural Presentations (i.e., U.S. performing arts companies);

(5) Increasing the emphasis on the teaching of English in the Middle East;

(6) Taking steps to redress the imbalance between Americans going to the Middle East (very few) and Middle Easterners coming to the United States (very many), thus improving the "mutuality" of the exchange effort; and

(7) Establishing a program whereby Middle Eastern professors who have studied in this country can return for "sabbatical years."

The report makes specific suggestions on how these improvements may be realized in each country visited.

Another object of our trip was to determine whether the American-sponsored universities in the region—the American University of Beirut, the American University in Cairo, and Robert College in Istanbul—continue to serve a useful purpose and merit continued U.S. Government support. It appears that none is likely to play in the future an important regional role in Middle Eastern education, but that each represents a valuable American presence within its own country.

Since this report deals with an aspect of U.S. relations with countries which are presently of great importance to the United States, I should be pleased to have it published as a House document and distributed to Members of the Congress, as has been the case with previous special reports of the Advisory Commission.

Mr. William French Smith concurs in these observations and joins in the report.

Sincerely,

LEONARD H. MARKS.

CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	III
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	V
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4
1. The climate for exchange	4
2. Funding of programs	4
3. Brain drain	5
4. Cultural presentations	5
5. Academic programs	6
6. Counselling	6
7. English teaching	7
8. American universities	8
9. Exchange—A 2-way street	9
10. Sabbaticals in the United States	9
III. EGYPT	10
General climate for exchange	10
Brain drain	12
Exchange programs	14
Counselling	16
English teaching	17
American studies	18
The USIS Cultural Center in Alexandria	18
Books and libraries	19
Performing arts	19
The Joint Commission	20
The American University in Cairo (AUC)	21
IV. SAUDI ARABIA	24
General climate for exchange	24
Exchange programs	26
Counselling	29
English teaching	31
American books and magazines	32
American universities	33
V. KUWAIT	34
General climate for exchange	34
Exchange programs	36
Counseling	38
English teaching	39
American universities	39
VI. THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	41
General climate for exchange	41
Exchange programs	43
Counseling	45
English teaching	46
American universities	46

	Page
VII. IRAN	48
General climate for exchange	49
The educational broker	51
Counselling	52
Exchange programs	53
American studies	57
English teaching	59
American universities	59
VIII. TURKEY	60
General climate for exchange	61
Robert College	64
Exchange programs	65
Counselling	69
English teaching	69

NOTES ON EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND COUNTRIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

I. INTRODUCTION

For the past several years members of the United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs have visited various areas of the world in order better to fulfill the Commission's mandate to advise the President and the Congress on the conduct of this country's international educational and cultural affairs.

In August 1975, the United States and 34 European countries signed in Helsinki the "Final Act" of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. One chapter of this document, entitled "Cooperation in Humanitarian and other Fields" (covering the so-called Basket III provisions of the Conference) dealt largely with the improvement of communications between nations and gave promise of significantly affecting the international cultural relations of this country. Consequently, on August 16 the undersigned members of the Commission, Chairman Leonard H. Marks and William French Smith, accompanied by the Commission's Staff Director, W.E. Weld, Jr., undertook a major trip to Eastern Europe to investigate the implications of the Basket III provisions of the Helsinki agreement for U.S. international educational and cultural exchanges. Our report on that trip was reprinted by the Congress as "Executive Communication 2276" and appears to have had some effect on the reactions of our authorities to the Helsinki accord.

One year later focus of public attention had shifted to the Middle East, as a series of developments in the Arab-Israeli conflict, and the energy crisis precipitated by actions of the oil-producing states brought home to this country the necessity for harmonious interdependence with the nations of the Middle East. While the political and economic aspects of the situation were not a direct concern of the Commission, they were accompanied by developments in the educational and cultural field which certainly were. For example, U.S.-Egyptian cultural relations were beginning to flourish again after a 7-year interruption; the Arab States and Iran, using their new-found oil wealth to educate their masses and train their specialized elites, were looking more and more to the United States for guidance and help; and in Turkey the once-predominantly U.S. influence on Turkish education appeared to be on the wane, the victim of a growing Turkish nationalism. The Commission felt that the situation called for first-hand investigation.

Accordingly on November 4, 1976, the same Commission team which had visited Eastern Europe in 1975 embarked on a month-long trip to the Middle East. Its purpose was to undertake on behalf of the Commission a survey of exchanges with represen-

90-454 O - 77 - 2

ative countries, with a view to making recommendations on how educational and cultural exchange might contribute more fully to the promotion of mutual understanding between the United States and the Middle East.

Our trip took us to thirteen cities in six countries: Cairo and Alexandria in Egypt; Jidda and Riyadh in Saudi Arabia; Kuwait; Abu Dhabi, Dubai, and Sharjah in the United Arab Emirates; Shiraz, Isfahan and Tehran in Iran; Istanbul and Ankara in Turkey. We met formally with approximately 75 foreign officials in a series of 44 official meetings which averaged over an hour each in length; and we talked informally with at least 150 more. We spoke with some 30 American teacher and professor-participants in exchange programs. And we had the benefit of the advice of 33 U.S. officials at nine diplomatic missions, including five Ambassadors, one Chargé d'affaires, nine Public Affairs Officers and seven Cultural Officers.

We acknowledge here with particular appreciation our indebtedness to these American officials. Without their assistance and understanding our mission could not have been possible, much less successful. In each post we visited, the programs arranged for us by the Embassy were unfailingly responsive to our needs; the caliber of local officials whom they arranged for us to meet was such that we were assured of authoritative comment; the representational activities in which we were included were pleasant and useful supplements to our official appointments; and the administrative arrangements for our visit were made with such efficiency that we were able to concentrate fully on our professional concerns. Above all, however, we are indebted to them for their personal guidance. We were impressed at each post by the thorough knowledge our representatives had of the customs, politics and language of the country in which they served, by the soundness and objectivity of their judgments, and by the rapport they had established with local leaders. As a result of these qualities, they were the most helpful of advisers. While it is impossible for us to identify here by name all of the U.S. officials who contributed so much to the success of our mission, we feel we would be remiss if we did not publicly acknowledge our indebtedness to the following, who were most directly responsible for our schedules:

In Egypt: Ambassador Herman F. Eilts; Public Affairs Officer William A. Rugh; Educational Programs Officer George E. Wishon.

In Saudi Arabia: Chargé d'affaires Hume A. Horan; Public Affairs Officer Isa K. Sabbagh; Deputy Public Affairs Officer Robert D. Jones; Cultural Affairs Officer Jonathan Owen; Branch Public Affairs Officer (Riyadh) Jon Stewart.

In Kuwait: Ambassador Frank E. Maestrone; Public Affairs Officer Edmund A. Bator.

In the United Arab Emirates: Ambassador Francois M.

Dickman; Public Affairs Officer George A. Naifeh.

In Iran: Ambassador Richard M. Helms, Counselor for Public Affairs Gordon Winkler; Cultural Affairs Officer William F. DeMyer.

In Turkey: Ambassador William B. Macomber, Jr.; Counselor for Public Affairs Gilbert F. Austin; Branch Public Affairs Officer (Istanbul) Patrick E. Neiburg.

We would also be remiss if we did not note here with appreciation the help which the Department of State and the United States Information Agency gave to our project. It was approved and supported by James Keogh, Director of USIA, and by Assistant Secretary John Richardson, Jr., Director of the Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU). Under the aegis of the former we were provided with valuable briefings and documentation by John W. Shirley, Assistant Director (Europe), and David Nalle, Assistant Secretary (North Africa, Near East and South Asia). Under the aegis of the latter we received similar assistance and encouragement from the Director of CU's office of Western European and Canadian Programs, Richard Straus, and especially from the Director of CU's Office of Near Eastern and South Asian Programs, Marshall Berg. The information they gave us on the countries we were to visit and the personalities we were to meet provided us with the necessary background for meaningful discussions.

We give in the pages which follow the principal observations and recommendations which stemmed from our talks with all these American and foreign authorities who gave us so generously of their time and advice. In the first chapter we summarize without much comment the findings which appear to us to have some applicability to all, or most, of the countries on our itinerary. These are elaborated in the succeeding chapters, which deal in some detail with conditions in, and make recommendations for, the individual countries of our survey.

It is our hope that the report as a whole will help the Congress and the Executive Branch to utilize our international educational and cultural exchange programs fully and effectively in the development of mutual understanding between the United States and an area which has recently assumed an unusual importance in world affairs.

William French Smith

Leonard H. Marks, Chairman

March 15, 1977

II. SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As noted in the "Introduction," our survey produced a number of observations and recommendations which apply rather generally to the countries visited. These are outlined immediately below.

1. The Climate for Exchange. In every country visited we found conditions most favorable for educational and cultural exchange. In spite of a 7-year lapse in our relations, Egyptian leaders are still eager to send their students to American universities and to receive American professors. The Gulf States of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates have made a conscious decision to rely heavily on this country for the education of their elites. Iran is sending more students to the United States than any other country in the world, and has embarked on an ambitious program to develop American studies in its universities. In Turkey American influence on the educational system is waning, but an influential segment of its academic leadership is working to retain the best aspects of the American system--and needs support.

Decisions on where and how advanced students from these countries should be trained are made by informed, dedicated and highly-motivated authorities, many of whom have themselves studied in American universities. They favor sending their students here because U.S. universities: a) demand more regular and systematic study; b) are more flexible and provide a wider range of electives; c) have better facilities; d) are preeminent in fields of primary interest to developing countries; e) are more progressive and ready to experiment; f) show no prejudice against the foreign students; g) have successfully graduated a high percentage of students sent to them. Most encouragingly of all, they have a genuine respect for our democratic institutions, and an antipathy to the Communist system.

The countries we visited had differing political attitudes toward the United States. Despite these differences, conditions at the present time offer us an unparalleled opportunity to develop through the exchange program a mutual understanding which will endure long after any temporary political or economic crisis has passed. It is an opportunity which should not be missed. Accordingly, we recommend that the responsible government agencies and private institutions working in the field encourage in every possible way exchanges with the countries in the Middle East.

2. Funding of Programs. Large increases in U.S. Government spending are not required to bring exchange programs with this area to the level and effectiveness we desire; and we do

not recommend such an increase. The Gulf States and Iran are prepared to pay for the projects which are of importance to them. Private institutions can assist significantly through such devices as university-to-university arrangements. However, we do believe our Government can, and should, increase its budgets to support exchanges with Egypt and Turkey, to bring more leaders to the United States under its International Visitor Program, and to send more short-term American lecturers overseas under its American Specialists Program. Increases for these purposes are foreseen in the Department's 1978 budget request.

We therefore recommend: a) that the Congress approve an appropriation of $70,500,000 which the Department has requested for fiscal 1978, thus enabling it to expand its Middle East programs in the ways we have suggested above; and b) that the Department continue to suggest and encourage private exchange efforts.

3. Brain Drain. Defection to the United States of highly-trained foreign scholars is a problem in the countries we visited only for Egypt and Turkey. The Gulf States and Iran have pretty well resolved it by assuring their returned grantees important or challenging jobs. Nevertheless, the alluring opportunities in the United States for lucrative employment, and/or advanced research with the most modern resources, constitute a stimulus to brain drain; and unless it is stopped the purposes of international exchange are circumvented. The situation poses potential dangers for the area as a whole.

While we recognize that retention of its highly-trained specialists is largely the responsibility of their country of origin, we recommend that U.S. authorities cooperate fully in the efforts these countries are making to do so. Some specific steps we believe this country can take are outlined in our chapter on Egypt.

4. Cultural Presentations. The State Department's despatch overseas of American performing arts groups, called its Cultural Presentations Program, is an activity which the Advisory Commission has strongly supported for many areas of the world. On this trip we discovered that the value of such exchanges is in rather direct proportion to the receiving country's proximity to "The West." Thus there was considerable interest in them in Turkey; some in Egypt and Iran; and almost none in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the Emirates. It is interesting, and perhaps instructive, to note in this connection that the Eastern European countries have been sending large numbers of their artists to Turkey, Egypt and Iran. We

recommend: a) that the Department not expend its limited resources for cultural presentations on sending American performers to the Gulf States; b) that it continue to send some to Turkey, Egypt and Iran on an experimental basis--i.e., until it has determined whether the results justify the expense; c) that it encourage private groups and artists to include these three countries in their overseas itineraries.

5. Academic Programs. The State Department's student, research, and professor exchanges, more commonly known as the "Fulbright Program," have been noticeably effective in the countries we visited where they have been in operation. In fact, an official in Ankara told us, "The Fulbright Program has changed the educational pattern of Turkey." Though modest in size, the programs have been effective because they concentrate their resources on specific projects which are not being implemented in other ways--for example on the promotion of American Studies; and they have used grants wisely to achieve a balance between grantees in humanistic fields and those in scientific fields. The countries where the program operates have shown their appreciation by contributing, in various amounts, to the financing of the program. We commend the bi-national commissions which direct the academic programs and have only one general recommendation for them: that efforts continue to persuade the foreign governments to make larger financial contributions to their support.

Our one criticism of the programs is, in a sense, a product of their success: because Fulbright grantees are so influential, we would like to be sure that all are exemplary. Yet in Egypt, Iran and Turkey we heard variations on this theme: "U.S. grantees have not always been the kind we can be proud of." Why not? There seem to be several interrelated reasons: the supply of qualified candidates is limited; stipends are inadequate; positions to be filled are inadequately publicized; candidates for grants are not properly briefed on living and working conditions in the country for which they are applying.

We recommend that each agency responsible for selecting American academic grantees review its process of recruiting, paying and orienting its grantees, with a view to assuring that only those qualified in every way receive awards.

6. Counselling. We have just touched upon one serious deficiency of our exchange programs which is endemic to the area. Grantees and prospective grantees, both American and foreign, are inadequately counselled on the countries which will receive them.

The problem for Americans, while real, is less serious than for foreigners, for the number of Americans going to the Middle East is relatively small.

The problem of advising students and scholars in the Middle East who seek admission to U.S. universities is, on the other hand, a significant matter, if only because of the large numbers involved. Each country we visited recognizes the problem, and each has attacked it--but without complete success. In Egypt and Iran counselling is done by the American Friends of the Middle East (AFME), on a grant from the State Department; but neither country has enough people to do the job thououghly. In Turkey inquirers are well briefed by the Fulbright Commission; but it operates almost exclusively in Ankara. The Gulf States lack even these facilities, so counselling is inadequately handled by USIS, local ministries, returned grantees, Washington Embassies--and the grapevine. The results of these variously inadequate procedures are predictable: students suffering a demoralizing "culture shock," disillusionment or despair; overconcentration of foreign students in a few areas or universities; scholars disappointed with their programs in one university when others could have supplied what was desired--all adding up to irritations and antipathy rather than understanding.

We recommend that American authorities work out a systematic program to provide adequate counselling on U.S. life and universities for each student or scholar considering study in the United States. We recommend specifically that additional funds be found to expand the counselling function of AFME in Egypt and Iran, and of the Fulbright Commission in Turkey, and to investigate the possibility of other non-governmental organizations being used throughout the area.

7. English Teaching. It is an axiom that communication between peoples leads to understanding, and that a common language facilitates communication. It follows that it is in our national interest to promote everywhere a knowledge of English. This axiom seems to us directly applicable to the Middle East. Officials of all six countries we visited recognize that English is becoming the lingua franca of the world; that a knowledge of it is important for the conduct of scholarship and business; that their students must know it to study in the United States. And yet these same officials admit that knowledge of the language, if not actually deteriorating, is patently not meeting the requirements of a growing population and a growing need. In every case the problem is one of inadequate or insufficient instruction in the school system. Corrective measures have been undertaken in several countries. Ain Shams University in Cairo, through a U.S. Government grant, has invited UCLA to train teachers. Saudi Arabia has requested the British Council to conduct a 1-year crash program of instruction for prospective teachers

of English. Turkish universities where courses have been taught in English are resisting government pressures to replace English by Turkish as the language of instruction. But these efforts are clearly not enough.

We make in the body of this report specific suggestions on what may be done in each country to improve an unfortunate situation. Our overall recommendation is that appropriate U.S. authorities collaborate with appropriate local authorities to plan and implement for each country a comprehensive, effective program for teaching English in the local school system.

8. American Universities. One of the main purposes of our trip was to ascertain whether the American-sponsored universities in the area--the American University in Beirut (AUB), the American University in Cairo (AUC), and Robert College (RC) in Istanbul--had served their day and no longer merited American Government support. Our conclusion is that none is likely to play an important regional role in the future, but that each represents an extremely important American presence in the country where it is located.

We did not visit Lebanon, but it was clear from our discussions with Arab officials that AUB had made a most significant contribution to education in the Arab world. Its importance as a regional university has, however, declined as a result of its disruption by the civil war in Lebanon, and Arabs from other countries now have the inclination--and the money--to pursue advanced studies in the United States. We nevertheless believe that, when conditions return to normal in Lebanon, AUB will continue to be influential in that country.

The American University in Cairo does not have the prestige of AUB in the Arab world; insignificant numbers of students from outside of Egypt have studied, or are likely to study, there; yet it is a visible and important American presence in the country and can, we believe, make an important contribution to mutual understanding through its education of many of Egypt's intellectual elite.

Robert College has had an incontestable effect on Turkish education and remains a bastion of the American system in a country where American influence in education is declining.

We recommend that the U.S. Government continue its financial support of AUC and Robert College and specifically that it endow the former from the large reservoir of surplus Egyptian pounds held by our Government.

9. Exchange--A 2-Way Street. For many obvious reasons, the flow of people from the Middle East to the United States is much greater than the reverse. Middle East officials are keenly aware of the imbalance and have done what they can to redress it; for example, by sending "cultural missions" to us. But unless more is done, the "mutuality" which is the object of all effective exchanges will be endangered in our relations with this part of the world.

We recommend in specific sections some concrete actions which might be taken to inform Americans more fully on the policies, customs and culture of the Middle East countries. In this summary we generalize by recommending that U.S. authorities study ways by which our exchange with the Middle East can become a genuine 2-way street.

10. Sabbaticals in the United States. One concrete proposal made to us for augmenting U.S. knowledge of Middle Eastern countries was so universally approved by the academicians we met that we include it among our general observations and recommendations. It is that foreign professors who have studied in American universities be returned to them periodically, under a "sabbatical year" system. The professor would be invited not only to carry on his scholarly research and update his knowledge in his specialty, but also to lecture to American students and serve as a kind of foreign scholar in residence.

The proposal strikes us as having a double value: it would enable the participant to renew his contacts with American people and American thinking; and it would enable an important segment of the American academic community to obtain first-hand information on recent developments in a Middle East country. We therefore recommend that the Committee on the International Exchange of Scholars (CIES), and/or a similar appropriate body immediately examine the possibilities for, and the modalities of, operating such a program.

90-454 O - 77 - 3

III. EGYPT

In Egypt we were thoroughly briefed by the following American officials, all experts in the Arab world: the Ambassador, the Public Affairs officer, the Cultural officer, the Educational Programs officer, the Consul General in Alexandria and his Branch Public Affairs officer; and we talked briefly but profitably at social functions with many other U.S. officials.

We also profitted from the observations of knowledgeable Americans in the private sector. We met with the President of the American University in Cairo, with an American Fulbright professor in Alexandria, and with the Director of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago and his associates; and we spent an evening with a Middle East expert formerly with the State Department's Policy Planning Staff.

The Embassy and the Consulate in Alexandria arranged for us meetings of at least an hour with the following Egyptians knowledgeable about U.S.-Egyptian educational and cultural relations: The President of Ain Shams University and several members of his staff; the Under Secretary for Foreign Relations of the Ministry of Education and members of his staff; the President and Vice President of Cairo University (the latter was named Minister of Health the day after our visit); the Egyptian Co-Chairman of the U.S.-Egypt Joint Working Group on Education and Culture; the Director of the Cairo office of the American Friends of the Middle East, and her associate; the Dean of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Alexandria, whose President and Dean of the Faculty of Medicine we met informally.

Thanks to the knowledge, experience and candor of these, and others, with whom we spoke, we came away from Egypt with sharp impressions on what we believe are important aspects of our educational and cultural exchanges with Egypt. The most significant of these, together with our recommendations which stem from them, are summarized immediately below.

General Climate for Exchange.

Eighteen months ago our colleague, Rita Hauser, visited Egypt. Diplomatic relations between the United States and Egypt had been restored for only a year after the rupture in 1967 over the Arab-Israeli war, and the Russian influence in Egypt had been predominant. There was therefore every reason to believe that Egyptians still looked upon the United States

with distrust, or at least apprehension. Yet Mrs. Hauser reported to the Commission on September 24, 1975: "The Egyptians want many more exchanges with the United States." Our experience confirmed this. Indeed, as the political climate has improved since Mrs. Hauser's visit, the Egyptians' desire for closer ties with the United States, and particularly in the educational/cultural area, has mushroomed. Whatever vestiges of discontent remain in Egypt over U.S. policy in the Arab-Israeli disputes have affected very little, if at all, Egyptian respect for American education.

The Embassy estimates that there are 5,000 to 6,000 Egyptian students in this country. The Egyptian Minister of Education informed us that in recent years 500 of these have been sent at the expense of his Government. (He is therefore aggrieved that the U.S. Government provided last year only two scholarships for Egyptian students, in contrast to 300 given by France and 200 by the Soviet Union.) Statistics on the counselling of Egyptian students seeking to study in the U.S. indicate that this flow is not likely to decrease. The Cairo office of the American Friends of the Middle East (AFME) advises an average of 1,000 students a month, and a local USIS employee in Alexandria spends 80 percent of her time counselling students who aspire to go to U.S. colleges and universities. The Ministry is also eager to have its professors teach or do advanced research in the U.S., sending more there than to any other country, including the United Kingdom. At the same time, it welcomes American professors to Egyptian universities. Egyptian universities are equally eager to establish direct contacts with their U.S. counterparts. The University of Cairo is involved in a joint research project with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and has other programs with the Universities of Iowa and Michigan. Ain Shams University in Cairo has entered into a State Department-sponsored agreement with the University of California at Los Angeles to improve the quality of its English teaching. And the University of Alexandria has an arrangement with the State University of New York to accept annually a group of its students for a special course in Middle East and Arabic studies.

This extraordinary receptivity of the Egyptians to American education obviously presents the United States with an opportunity which it should not miss. Although its oil-producing neighbors in the Middle East are much wealthier, Egypt clearly occupies a leading role in the Arab world by virtue of its history, its size, its political power, and above all its intellectual and cultural eminence. It is, therefore, per se, a country of great interest to the United States. But it is also of interest because of its importance in the region as a whole. As Mrs. Hauser noted after her visit in

1975, "Egypt's biggest export at the moment is brains." We discovered all through the Gulf area Egyptian teachers, doctors, technicians and administrators whose influence was clearly considerable.

Since the exchange program deals essentially with brains, and since Egyptians are so ready to cooperate with the United States in the intellectual/cultural area, we believe government and private educational and cultural exchanges between the U.S. and Egypt should be encouraged in every possible way. Furthermore, it seems to us that, given Egypt's economic plight, American institutions, especially U.S. Government agencies, should be prepared to bear a disproportionate amount of the costs of such programs.

We therefore note with satisfaction that CU's allocation for Egypt has risen from $457,858 in fiscal year 1975 to $675,326 in fiscal 1977. But even with this increase, CU's academic program will bring only six Egyptians to the United States and send only ten U.S. professors to Egypt (eight of whom are included in the Ain Shams-UCLA project). We believe this number is small in relation to the possibilities and recommend that CU's FY 1978 appropriation request be fulfilled, thus allowing it to realize its intention to bring eight Egyptian professors to American universities and to send 12 American professors to Egyptian universities. This seems to us, under the circumstances, a minimal program. We suggest further that the use of surplus Egyptian pounds which we hold be considered to implement exchange projects approved by the Egyptian and U.S. Governments.

Finally, a word about the relationship of AID to the educational exchange programs. We did not have time to study AID-supported exchange projects; but we are under the impression that, though directed towards Egypt's technical development, they have nonetheless contributed in a most salutary way to the achievement of CU's broad objectives. We are pleased that this is the case and would only recommend continuing close collaboration between AID and USIS, to assure the most effective use of limited U.S. Government funds in support of our educational exchanges with Egypt.

Brain Drain

Gratifying and potentially useful as it is, we must recognize that Egyptian enthusiasm for study in the United States is not an unmixed blessing. Of all the countries in the Middle East--in fact, quite possibly in the world--it is the one most infected by the disease for which the U.S. has long sought

a permanent cure: the brain drain.

The Undersecretary for Foreign Relations in the Ministry of Education told us that 12 percent of the Egyptian students who have gone to the United States have remained there, and that 1,000 advanced scholars are serving as professors in U.S. universities. The President of Cairo University claimed that 25 percent of its faculty had left the country. The President of the American University in Cairo advised that no Egyptians, not even Ph. D. candidates, should be sent to study in the United States because they would all try to stay there; in support of his thesis he averred that there are now 22,000 Egyptian Ph. D.'s in the United States and Canada. To make matters worse, those who remain in the U.S. are, for the most part, those with the talents most needed in their own country: doctors, engineers, scientists, specialists in economics and commerce.

The reason for this high rate of defection is easy to identify. Simplistically put, it is that Egypt, with its enormous ecomomic problems, is unable to provide all its trained citizens with facilities for research or opportunities for stimulating careers; they often find them in the United States.

The obvious remedies are also easy to identify--but impossible or counterproductive to apply: a) Don't send anyone abroad to study; b) improve conditions in Egypt so that its trained citizens will want to work there. (This latter has been done almost without conscious effort in the wealthy Gulf States.) Remedy one is clearly unacceptable in our interdependent world; and furthermore, Egypt needs for its development the skills which its scholars can often obtain only from study abroad. Remedy two, which Egyptian officials are striving more to apply, quite obviously will not become effective for many, many years. Our Ambassador implied the magnitude of the problem when he told us, "It will be difficult for the United States through its aid program to build up the university infra-structure which the country requires; so great are the needs, that we are faced with an almost bottomless pit."

Pending the moment when Egypt can develop the conditions which will make its young scientists, businessmen, doctors eager to practice their professions at home, interim measures must be taken to stem the brain drain while retaining the advantages of international exchange. Here are some suggestions by American and Egyptian authorities which we recommend.

1. Send to the United States only (or mostly) graduate students who have completed their M.A. requirements. Let

them work in the U.S. for a year or two on projects supervised jointly by an American and an Egyptian university, and then return to Egypt to complete the advanced degree requirements.

2. Develop close contacts between chairmen of university departments in Egypt and the U.S., thus encouraging joint research efforts and discouraging American universities from hiring Egyptian scholars who have worked with American professors.

3. Send Egyptian graduate students and research scholars to the U.S. on short, 4-month grants. (This is the system used by the National Science Foundation.)

4. Increase the number of high-level American professors assigned to Egyptian institutions, thus making it possible for the Egyptian student to get specialized training in his own country.

Exchange Programs

We have noted above the favorable climate for educational exchange with Egypt and have recommended that the CU program be enlarged. We have likewise noted one of its serious problems and suggested some resolutions to it. In these comments we have touched upon some aspects of our official programs, but we feel the subject deserves some elaboration.

We believe that the thrust of the State Department's small program is correct in its concentration on areas not reached by Egyptian grants, AID assistance, or private programs: for example, American studies.

A specific step in the right direction is the CU-supported arrangement between Ain Shams University and UCLA designed to help improve the quality of English instruction in Egypt. The program has been plagued by problems: adequate facilities were not provided by Ain Shams; the course was not adequately integrated into the university; the American teachers, though eager to begin working in September were not allowed to do so until December. Still, both sides agree that the program is potentially valuable and have made successful efforts to overcome the problems. We believe the experiment represents an imaginative, constructive use of CU's funds and recommend that it be continued. Even if it fails, it will have taught us valuable lessons about the relationship between U.S. and Egyptian universities. If it succeeds, as we believe it will, it will be an excellent example of how a limited program can make a wide impact.

It is of course a truism that an exchange program is only

as good as the people who participate in it, for even one poor grantee can do serious damage to the fragile structure of "mutual understanding." For example, wherever we turned in Egypt we were confronted by the case of an American professor who, insensitive to normal good manners and customs, demanded a private swimming pool, resented student questions in class, and once hid a microphone among the flowers on the table of an Egyptian host. This professor was not a Fulbright grantee, but we were told by people who know our Egyptian program well that "not always have the right people been sent here under the Fulbright program." Although this case is not typical, it serves as a reminder that a single egregious mistake in the selection process overshadows the many well-chosen grantees. In a program so small, careful selection of each grantee is obviously crucial. We recommend that the selection process of grantees to Egypt be reviewed to assure that only those be sent who are highly adaptable, have a deep interest in their field of study, and are prepared to make certain sacrifices in their standard of living.

A corollary to careful selection is adequate briefing. We were several times informed by Egyptian university officials that American Fulbrights left the country dissatisfied because they had arrived with unrealistic expectations. We therefore urge that the Department give continuing and particular attention to counselling its American grantees on the facts of the life they will live in Egypt. (We discuss below the larger question of the counselling of Egyptian participants in academic exchange programs.)

In this effort, the Egyptians also bear a responsibility. The dissatisfaction of some American grantees stems from the fact that they were not utilized as they expected to be, or were not adequately utilized in the positions to which they were assigned. We therefore supplement our recommendation on the counselling of American grantees by the recommendation that grantees be chosen only on the strength of firm and clear commitments by Egyptian authorities to place them in predetermined positions appropriate to their capabilities.

We believe that this latter difficulty, as well as others, can be alleviated by the establishment of a bi-national commission to supervise the Fulbright program. Not everyone we talked with, including our Ambassador, shares this opinion. But we found universal acceptance of it among the Egyptian officials with whom we spoke. This convinced us that such a concrete demonstration of our real committment to the principle of mutuality in exchanges would elicit from the Egyptians a similar response. Thus not only would the programs be devised and operated on a basis of genuine cooperation, but progress would be made toward the basic goal of international exchange: the development of a genuine mutual understanding.

Counselling

If an experience in the U.S. for an Egyptian student is to produce the hoped-for results, he must be placed in the university which best meets his needs, under conditions which he clearly understands. This will usually happen only if he is wisely counselled before his departure from home.

We have previously referred to the large number of Egyptian students seeking guidance on study in the United States, and on the number who actually matriculate in U.S. universities. We do not have an accurate count of how many of these need counselling, but we estimate that it approximates 2,000 persons a month. If each were counselled for an average of only 15 minutes, it would take 500 man-hours per month to meet the demand. The manpower available at present falls far short of that demand. Our Embassy in Cairo agrees; our Consulate in Alexandria agrees; and Egyptian officials agree. The Embassy's small cultural section is not adequately staffed to do the job, and does not attempt it. The USIS office in Alexandria has a local employee who spends 80 percent of her time on this activity, and the Branch PAO assists when he can, but they need more help. The Egyptian authorities lack money and personnel to do the job properly.

The State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, keenly aware of the problem, has done what it can to resolve it by providing the total financial support in fiscal '76 for the Cairo office of the American Friends of the Middle East (AFME) and delegating to it the counselling responsibility. The AFME office is staffed by two well-informed, conscientious women; but they cannot, with the best will in the world, meet the demands of the statistics cited above. To make their task even more onerous, we note that they cannot spend all their time counselling students. If they are to do it properly, they must read widely and make periodic visits to American campuses to keep abreast of changes in the American university scene.

As usual, it is easier to identify the problem than to solve it, but we believe that CU is on the right track in delegating primary responsibility for counselling to AFME. In Egypt the revelation of AFME's one-time association with the CIA has not seriously damaged its credibility as an objective and qualified authority on U.S. universities; and the organization has had long and valuable experience in the field. While a full-time American counsellor would of course be desirable, we do not believe one is essential; the present Egyptian employees have shown that they can do the job. We therefore recommend that a way be found to increase the AFME staff in Cairo. As a corollary, we recommend that a member of the enlarged staff devote some time to Alexandria, to help handle the load which is now borne by the USIS branch post.

A start in improving AFME's capability would be to encourage the organization's regional director to spend more time in Egypt. A second possibility is to have AFME supplement CU support with monies raised independently. A third possibility is for CU to increase its grant by enough to permit the hiring of additional Egyptian personnel. This channel should be given particular thought when the CU budget for FY 1978 is developed. We recommend that these possibilities be explored, in the order listed.

English Teaching

It is an axiom that communication between peoples leads to understanding, and that a common language facilitates communication. It follows that it is in our national interest to promote everywhere a knowledge of English, which is becoming the lingua franca of the world.

We expected to find in Egypt that almost everyone spoke English, and we did. In only one of our numerous conversations with Egyptian officials was an interpreter necessary.

But the obvious assumption which flowed from this fact, that English was and would continue to be spoken by nearly everyone and therefore its teaching needed no promotion, turned out to be incorrect. The President of Ain Shams University told us sadly that the teaching of English to his countrymen was insufficient to keep pace with the demands of the times; this was a principle reason for the establishment of the Ain Shams-UCLA project to train teachers of English. The Dean of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Alexandria confirmed his colleague's opinion and added that improvement of English teaching was a desirable objective of U.S. exchange programs in Egypt. The President of the American University in Cairo went so far as to state that the U.S. should give "a high priority" to the encouragement of English teaching among its activities in Egypt.

Such comments convinced us that we are facing in Egypt a deterioration in the level of a knowledge of English, and thus the deterioration of a valuable element in the building of mutual understanding. USIS does not have the facilities to get into the English-teaching business in a big way, and should not do so; and the efforts of the British are insufficient to meet the demand. While aware that our exchange programs can be only a drop in this huge bucket, we nevertheless recommend that they be used as effectively as possible to promote improved and increased teaching of English. The Ain Shams-UCLA arrangement is a good illustration of what can be done. We further recommend that CU, AID, HEW and USIS consider other ways in which they can contribute to the preservation of a wide knowledge of the

90-454 O - 77 - 4

language in Egypt. It would be unfortunate for us to lose in this vital country perhaps the best tool we have for the communication of American ideas, principles, knowledge.

American Studies

Related to the question of English teaching is that of American studies in Egypt. We have already recommended it as a possible area of concentration for the Fulbright program. We assume no justification is needed for the principle behind such a recommendation and therefore stress briefly here simply the fact that the moment seems propitious for us to move forward. As we have said, the climate is favorable; there is a sympathetic interest among Egyptians in the United States, but little has been done in the academic world to respond to it.

Neither Ain Shams nor the University of Cairo has courses in "American Studies": each merely touches on aspects of the United States in courses in its several faculties. The American University has no course either, but would start one if it had the money to do so. It has thus been left to the University of Alexandria to make the first tentative moves to fill the gap. It has begun planning for the first Center of American Studies in the Arab world. Though plans are still hazy, they call for a research center for graduate students, rather than a series of courses, and for establishment of a library as a first step. CU will provide a professor in the next academic year, and will assist the Center with funds with which to buy periodicals. We applaud CU's recognition of an opportunity to be seized and repeat here our earlier implied recommendation that the U.S. Government encourage in every possible way the development of American Studies in Egyptian universities.

The USIS Cultural Center in Alexandria

These observations on U.S. support of English teaching and American Studies leads us directly to the vexing subject of the USIS Cultural Center in Alexandria.

In a nutshell the situation is this. In 1967 USIS's magnificent and well-located cultural center in Alexandria was gutted and its books burned in a fire set by Egyptians protesting U.S. policy in the Arab-Israeli dispute. The following year the Egyptian Government indemnified the U.S. Government for the loss; yet to this day nothing has been done to rebuild the Center. Mr. Marks was particularly distressed at this because, as Director of USIA at the time of the burning, he had personally negotiated reimbursement from the Egyptian Government for the loss and had fully expected to find a restored and active U.S. Cultural Center. As things stand,

however, even if reconstruction were to begin tomorrow it would take two years to restore and re-equip the building. In the meantime the U.S. is wasting opportunities to: a) respond to a crying Egyptian demand for books; b) establish a library which can serve as a model for Egyptian libraries; c) capitalize on Egypt's growing interest in English teaching and American Studies; d) demonstrate our genuine concern for the intellectual/cultural life of a valued friend. We deplore these wasted opportunities and urge that the Foreign Buildings Operation take immediate steps to begin the rehabilitation of the Center.

Books and Libraries

There is, we were assured by our Egyptian friends, a potential market for American books in Egypt; certainly they are wanted and needed. The President of Cairo University put it bluntly: "American books have been missing in the Egyptian market. A reprint program of American books should be started." The Dean of the Faculty of Arts at Alexandria University told us that American books are in demand and regretted that the much appreciated USIS presentation of books to the University had been abandoned. The problem, of course, is that U.S. books are too expensive and hard currency is scarce. It therefore seems to us that Egypt is a likely participant in any currency convertibility program, similar to the former Informational Media Guaranty Program, which the U.S. might reinstitute to encourage the sale of American cultural materials abroad. The Advisory Commission has recommended the re-establishment of such a program in the context of the Helsinki agreement. Our observations in Egypt reinforce our recommendation that a re-instituted program be made applicable in Egypt and other developing countries which have trouble paying for U.S. products in dollars.

Egyptian libraries, as we suggested when talking above about the USIS Cultural Center in Alexandria, could profit from exposure to this country's highly developed library science. We were told, for example, that most university libraries have no orderly way to catalogue their collections. In fact, one we visited simply shelved its materials by date of acquisition. The inevitable result is that the university libraries are not the useful research centers they might be. We therefore recommend that, to the extent possible, our exchange programs and our technical assistance programs assist the Egyptian collections to fulfill their potential in the scholarly community of the world.

Performing Arts

One element of its exchange activity which the State Department specifically asked us to look into was its Cultural Presentations Program, which sends American performing arts

groups abroad. We found very little interest in them throughout the Gulf area; but Egypt was a possible exception to the general rule. Our Ambassador feels that such presentations have small impact, but some of our Egyptian contacts have a different view, pointing out that the Eastern bloc countries are making an impression on the public by flooding the country with their performers. The consensus among those favoring U.S. presentations was that American college or amateur groups would "appeal only to the American University crowd," and therefore only important, highly professional artists should be sent. A big U.S. orchestra, a professional theatrical company, a famous jazz combo were specifically mentioned as the kind of company which would be most appreciated.

We are aware of the relatively low priority which a limited budget forces the Department to place on its cultural presentations program--particularly outside of Eastern Europe; and we are certain that it could not meet the enormous expense of sending a symphony orchestra to Egypt. But we recommend--on an experimental basis--partial support for significant theatrical companies or orchestras which would enable them to include Cairo and/or Alexandria in tours to the Middle East, and full support for smaller, but highly professional jazz or dance companies. If our Embassy and the State Department conclude after a few efforts that the results do not justify the costs, we would recommend that no more such presentations be supported. In short, in view of the general climate of opinion in Egypt, and in view of the activities in the field of the Socialist countries, we believe we should give cultural presentations a fair try.

The Joint Commission

In 1974 Secretary Kissinger and President Sadat set up the Egyptian-U.S. Joint Commission for Cooperation. One of the four bodies established by the Commission was the Joint Working Group on Education and Culture, which has met four times since the founding of the Commission.

We believe the purpose behind the Commission is praiseworthy; we are pleased that educational and cultural relations between the U.S. and Egypt were deemed sufficiently important to merit the formation of a special, high-level committee to consider them. However, our talks with Egyptian and American officials indicated to us that the Joint Working Group has not lived up to expectations. Our Ambassador believes it is "going all right;" but authoritative Egyptians with whom we discussed it did not accord the Committee even this faint praise. Here are typical comments on it by people who should know.

--The President of Ain Shams University: "Lots of talk, not much action. The Joint Working Group can make a master plan, but actually the plan has delivered much less than projects put forward by individual universities."

--The Under Secretary for Foreign Relations in the Ministry of Education: "A bit slow in the field of education; nothing has come of its activities."

--The Co-Chairman of the Joint Working Group: "The Group has not been very successful. On the university side there have been some useful achievements; but on the side of general education nothing concrete has been achieved...I am not satisfied with the third, or cultural, side. We need to establish a public opinion center to tell us what the people think, so that we can draw up a cultural program. We also need a center for mass communication and a research-and-documentation center."

Such comments suggest to us that the Joint Working Group is faced with a problem not unknown to advisory bodies. It can plan and propose, but it must rely on others to carry out its plans and proposals. We are not certain about this, but we suspect that the only operating agencies attempting to carry out the Working Group's suggestions are USIS and CU's office of Near Eastern and South Asian Programs. The spending pattern of both shows a regular increase in amounts spent to implement Joint Working Group projects. While these projects may be quite worth doing, they may also not be projects the post would elect to fund if left to its own devices. We noted some sensitivity on this point.

Having recommended a bi-national Commission to operate the Fulbright program because it assured a greater degree of Egyptian-American cooperation, it would be inconsistent for us now to suggest abandonment of a venture specifically designed to promote such cooperation. We do not do so. We repeat that we are solidly behind the principle of the Joint Commission. What we do recommend is that the Department push the effort we understand has already begun to assure that the deliberations of the Joint Working Group on Education and Culture lead to concrete results. Implicit in this recommendation is our hope that funding of the Working Group's proposals can be managed in such a way that it does not utilize CU or USIS monies which the post believes could be better employed in other ways, and that the U.S. does not promise more than its budget can support.

The American University in Cairo (AUC)

One of the questions uppermost in our minds as we prepared for our trip to the Middle East was whether the once highly

influential, American-sponsored schools in the area had outlived their usefulness. Or, put more crassly in terms of the Commission's mandate to advise the President on the country's international exchange programs, whether the U.S. Government should continue to support them financially. Where AUC is concerned we came down strongly, after a great deal of discussion, on the side of U.S. Government support.

Understandably, Egyptian educational authorities were not enthusiastic about AUC--and their reservations were, we felt, significant. One university official said he could not say whether AUC had made any contribution to the educational life of Egypt. Another said that AUC was a useful model of one type of higher education, but that it cannot meet Egyptian needs. He placed it in the priority of U.S. financing lower than grants to send Egyptian professors to the U.S., or grants to U.S. professors to visit Egypt. A third, who had taught there for three semesters, maintained that 60 percent of the American professors are "useless," and therefore bad propaganda for the U.S.; that AUC is isolated from Egyptian life and cannot play a real role unless it works more closely with Egypt's national universities; that its students come from a special class and don't represent their country; that while its B.A. is better than that of Egyptian institutions, its M.A. is worse. The Ministry of Education spokesman probably summed up more accurately the general Egyptian view: the Ministry appreciates what AUC has done and regards it as an accredited American university with good standards. As long as it is there, let it alone. But if it were not, he would channel available resources into indigenous universities.

Although Egyptian educators expressed these views, it is significant to record that 1,250 Egyptian families have enrolled their children and pay a substantial tuition for their education. Presumably some, at least, preferred an AUC education to that of an Egyptian university.

American opinion was far more positive. Our Ambassador maintains that it is an institution which for 50 years has offered an American curriculum of good quality to carefully selected students and is therefore a factor in creating Egyptian leaders; furthermore, it is the only institution in Egypt to provide adult education. Our Cultural Officer, while recognizing that it can be improved, sees it as a good model of U.S. education catering principally to a social elite which supplies much of the leadership of the country: e.g. Nasser and Sadat sent their children to AUC. The retiring president of AUC justifies its existence by saying that it provides a type of education Egyptians want and can't get elsewhere; that it has a role as a regional institution serving large parts of the Arab world; that its flexibility and independence allow it

to meet current demands--as it did by running a journalism school when it was needed; that, in short, it is "a model school which shows what American higher education is all about."

We find these latter views more persuasive. We believe that AUC is intrinsically valuable to us in Egypt. We accept the view that it needs to be improved: e.g., by upgrading the quality of its staff, widening its student clientele, broadening its course offerings. But we also believe that it can make these improvements, fill a real need in Egyptian education, and become the kind of continuing American presence of which we can be proud--<u>if properly funded</u>.

We therefore recommend--in full knowledge of Congress's earlier 25-million-pound appropriation and the current audit of the use of these funds--that Congress make an additional appropriation of 60 million pounds for the university, thus allowing it to increase its enrollment to 3,000 students, expand its graduate training, and possibly open a new campus in Alexandria. This recommendation is based upon our understanding that the U.S. has a surplus of 150 million Egyptian pounds. We recall that we once held in India an abundance of local currency which, instead of being used to support projects of mutual advantage to India and the U.S., was ultimately returned to the Indian Government. We would not like to see us follow the same pattern in Egypt when there are ways in which surplus currency can be used in our continuing mutual interest.

One final word on AUC. It was several times suggested to us that it might become an institution of regional importance, perhaps replacing in influence the American University of Beirut (AUB) whose operations have been seriously affected by the strife in Lebanon. We therefore discussed thoroughly this possibility with academic leaders in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the Emirates, Iran and Turkey. We found among them a surprising disinclination to send their students to AUC. The prevailing view was that if they wished their students to be exposed to American education, they would, and could, send them to the United States. We therefore think it unlikely that AUC will be heavily patronized by the Arab States and recommend that it continue to concentrate on serving the Egyptian community as effectively as it can.

IV. SAUDI ARABIA

In Saudi Arabia, as in Egypt, appointments arranged for us by the Embassy were so productive, and the counsel of our own people so perceptive, that we came away with the feeling that we had a realistic grasp of the problems and potential of our exchange programs and plans.

Those to whom we are particularly indebted are, on the American side: the Ambassador, the PAO, the Deputy PAO, the CAO and the Branch PAO in Riyadh. On the Saudi side: the Deputy Minister for Economic and Cultural Affairs, the Executive Secretary of the King Faisal Foundation, the Secretary General of the Supreme Council of Universities, the Deputy Minister for Education and Administration, and the Director-General for External Relations and Missions Abroad of the Ministry of Education. Our principal observations and recommendations generated by discussions with these authorities are outlined immediately below.

General Climate for Exchange

Saudi Arabia has made a conscious decision to rely heavily on the United States for the higher education of its young people during this period of the country's fantastically paced development. The decision was clearly not arrived at haphazardly by dilettantes. It was made by well-informed and highly motivated leaders, fully aware of the risks involved in exposing a generation of its intellectual elite to customs and values quite different from their own. The Deputy Minister for Economic and Cultural Affairs put it to us this way: "By inculcating the American system into Saudi children, you will have a whole generation oriented toward the United States. I recognize the dangers in doing this, but it is the best alternative I have."

The Saudis prefer the U.S. system to that of the British and others because they believe American universities: a) demand more regular and systematic study throughout the year as a result of the course system, term papers and other periodic checks on a student's progress--and thus reduce the pressure of final exams; b) provide a wider range of electives for the student; c) have, in general, better facilities; and d) are more progressive and ready to experiment.

Having made their decision, the Saudis have vigorously followed it up. There are now approximately 5,000 Saudi Arabian students in American universities: approximately 2,000 graduate students and 3,000 undergraduates. According to the Secretary General of the Supreme Council of Universities, 80 percent of the students sent to the United States

VI. THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Our stay in the Emirates was limited to Abu Dhabi, Dubai and Sharjah, but we nevertheless feel we can speak with some confidence about U.S.-Emirate exchanges because of the high caliber of the Americans and Arabs with whom we talked.

Our Ambassador, though recently arrived in Abu Dhabi, has had a great deal of experience in the area. His advice was most valuable, and he supplemented his efforts on our behalf by inviting six Abu Dhabi specialists to meet with us at the Residence. Our Public Affairs Officer, who has established remarkable rapport with local officials, accompanied us wherever we went, contributing importantly to our understanding of the local scene.

We are further indebted to him for arranging for us appointments with the following Emirate officials, all splendidly qualified to speak to our interests: the Press Adviser to the Ruler, the Director of the Arab Office for Planning and Architecture, the Cultural Adviser to the Ruler, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Adviser in charge of the Ministry's lecture series, the Under Secretary of Education, the Director (Mayor) of Dubai Municipality, and a prominent businessman who is Special Secretary to the Government of Sharjah. We summarize immediately below the principal observations and recommendations generated by the counsel of these authorities.

General Climate for Exchange

Before the recent discoveries of oil brought sudden prosperity to the Emirates, their sons received their higher education in Cairo or Baghdad. Now all that has changed. Like their neighbors in the Gulf, they have made a conscious decision to rely heavily on the United States to train the leaders so necessary in their rapidly-developing country.

This decision is based, our conversations suggest, on: a) their genuine respect for our democratic institutions, coupled with an equally strong antipathy to the Communist system; b) the American experience of a federal system, whose universities they believe have helped to overcome the problems of federal, state and local authorities which they themselves are now confronting; c) U.S. pre-eminence in such fields as town-planning, and municipal government, which are of immediate importance to the Emirates; d) the flexibility of U.S. universities in comparison to those of Western Europe; e) the well-organized and supervised curricula of U.S. universities; f) the favorable reports of returnees on the friendliness, receptivity and lack of prejudice of Americans.

Many of these factors were summarized so eloquently for us by an Adviser to the Ruler that we cannot refrain from paraphrasing his comment. He said of his visit to the United States, "I realized that we had lost 20 years of our (national) life because we did not know and understand the United States well. In fields like mine (town planning) citizen participation is important; the planner must know the people's needs and wants. Citizen participation in the United States is admirable; therefore the U.S. system cannot fail. I have told our leaders that the United States can serve as a model for the establishment of a federal state; and I believe the American system of higher education should be followed in our new university."

His opinion has apparently been accepted by the Emirates' leaders. The university being planned for the country will be modeled on the U.S. system of courses and credits, and American assistance in the development of curriculum, teaching aids, and so forth is sought. The Emirates have about 800 students in the United States and are sending them--at their expense--at the rate of 400 a year. The Under Secretary of Education predicted that soon there would be as many as 1,200 Emirate students at one time in the United States, even though the number of undergraduates will fall off when the Emirate university is functioning. Emirate students have no trouble being placed in U.S. universities, except in the field of medicine--a bothersome concern for them. Most are trained in economics, management and other skills needed in a rapidly-developing land; and those who have returned are occupying important positions.

But the United States has been chosen, we were pleased to learn, not only for the excellence of its university facilities. The Under Secretary of Education confided to our Public Affairs Officer that he wants his students in the United States because "even if they fail, their exposure to the openness of American society will have been beneficial."

The Emirate-sponsored lecture program for its Government leaders supported this view. The majority of foreign specialists invited under it--with all expenses paid--were in the fields of politics, economics, international law. The eight Americans invited included: Senator Abourezk; Dr. William Quandt, Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania; Dr. David Walker, Associate Director, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Affairs; Fred J. Maroon, photographer and author of "These United States."

In sum, what we found in the Emirates was yet another country whose oil resources, so much in demand in the Western

World, give it an influence disproportionate to its size. It is a country which has not only eliminated the Communist influence at home but, along with its neighbors, was influential in persuading Egypt to expel the Russians who had dominated its economic life for five years. And it is a country which last year spent a billion dollars on education and which looks primarily to the United States for guidance in the development of its institutions and the training of its future leaders. In the face of these facts it seems superfluous for us to make any general recommendation on the desirability of our fostering an international relationship much in our national interest which has developed almost fortuitously. Exchanges, if properly handled, can and should be used to maintain it.

Exchange Programs

Here, as in the other Gulf States, we believe the U.S. Government is correct in using its money and efforts almost exclusively to initiate or facilitate visits by Emirate leaders who are structuring this 5-year-old federal union. Reports from the post delineate the effectiveness of these efforts in producing an understanding of our country; and we ourselves heard in Abu Dhabi and Dubai the most convincing statements we heard anywhere of their value to both the countries involved. For example:

--The official we quoted above as saying he had lost 20 years of his life by not knowing the United States well, described his participation in one of the Department's multi-regional, multi-national projects as "One of the great events of my life," principally because it "allowed me to see all aspects of U.S. life and policy," and because the group arrangement enabled him to hear "expressions of many points of view."

--The Press Adviser to the Ruler, a recent leader grantee of the Department, was impressed by the vastness of the United States, and by the ready access he had to Americans; but what impressed him even more was their willingness to listen to him and their appreciation of U.S. interest in the Emirates' problems.

--The Mayor of Dubai, another leader grantee, regretted that he had to cut short his visit after staying a month and a half. It was he who told us that he was curious to learn how, "as a colored man and an Arab," he would be treated by Americans. He was, he said, treated very well: "I felt at home wherever I went." He has sent his congenitally lame son to the United States for treatment.

The mayor's feelings about his U.S. experience lead us to comment briefly on an aspect of the leader program which we have not touched upon elsewhere in this report, home hospitality. Several of the former grantees told us how much they felt living briefly in American homes contributed to their understanding of the United States. As one put it, "It is important because we (Americans and Arabs) discover that we have many things in common as human beings."

The only fly in the ointment of the Department's International Visitors Program is the one we referred to in Saudi Arabia: first-class travel for our guests. Emirate officials are accustomed to it and expect it. We believe, in view of their tremendous contribution to exchanges with the United States, that they should be given it without cavil.

Emirate officials, like their counterparts in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, are mildly disturbed that U.S.-Emirate exchange is for the most part a one-way street, with traffic flowing from east to west. They suggested that the effects of this one-way flow could be somewhat mitigated by their sending to the United States officials and educators who could speak to Americans with authority about the Emirates. They therefore supported whole-heartedly the proposal of the Saudis of a sabbatical year in U.S. universities for their professors, who could lecture about the Emirates, as well as renew their acquaintance with the United States.

This desire to have their country better known in the United States, added to their need for American experience in many fields, explains why the Emirates so avidly seek American specialists. They would like, for example, to have visits from more U.S. journalists who can write about their country, and more U.S. Government officials who can appraise their policies. But principally they would like more educators who can assist them in developing curricula for the colleges of their university which are being established in order of need (beginning with a teachers' college), and in advising on teaching methods and materials. The seriousness of their intentions was brought home to us after our return to the United States. We learned that, encouraged by his talks with us, the American adviser to the Ruler of Sharjah has written to the University of California asking for help in developing an "extension" course for Sharjah.

The Department's plan to send an educational consultant to the Emirates next year is a sensible response to this expressed need; we commend it. But it is obvious that the Department does not have the resources to meet either the material or psychological demands of the situation. We therefore recommend that it increase, if possible, its efforts

already well begun to spur direct university-to-university exchanges and the recruitment of American specialists for the Emirates through private channels. We believe that AID can be especially helpful in finding the required specialists and encourage its cooperation with the Emirates. Finally, we recommend that the U.S. Government explore the possibility of establishing the kind of cooperative program which the Emirates now operate with Germany and Japan: an arrangement in which the U.S. Government, a private U.S. firm and the Emirates all share in the cost of recruiting and maintaining in the Emirates an American specialsit requested by the latter.

The importance of what we have been saying about developing a genuine 2-way exchange with the Emirates--and indeed with the whole Arab world--was brought home to us by the remark of an official who is a close adviser of the Ruler of Abu Dhabi. He said to us, "If there is to be mutual understanding between the United States and the Emirates, you must get over the impression that we are ignorant, avaricious peasants." We demurred at this evaluation of U.S. opinion of the Arabs; but deep down, we knew he was right.

Counselling

Inadequate counselling of students coming to the United States from the Emirates appears to be more a potential than an immediate problem. To date, the numbers going annually have been relatively small. Those going on government grants have been adequately advised by Emirate officials who have been to the United States or by the UAE Embassy in Washington, which is also responsible for placements. Counselling for non-government students is provided by a USIS local employee, a Palestinian with four years' experience. Still, we were assured by our Ambassador, by the Under Secretary of Education and by the Director of Dubai, that increased counselling by American authorities would be welcomed as the number of candidates for U.S. universities increases.

A related question which emerged in the Emirates, as it had in Kuwait, was the application to Emirate students of the U.S. law which forbids American universities to give a student's grades to anyone but the student. When the UAE Government foots the bill for a student at an American university, it believes its Embassy in Washington has a right to recieve an evaluation of the student's work, including regular reports on the grades he has made. To date we believe the matter has been handled by having the government-sponsored student waive his right to be the only recipient of his transcripts, so it has not become a major irritant nevertheless, it is all part of the larger problem of providing the students' sponsor with a regular, informed evaluation of a student's progress, which

the sponsor understandably wants. We recommend that Department officials consult with the Emirate Embassy in Washington and Ministry of Education to work out a system of counselling, placement and evaluation which is satisfactory alike to the UAE Government and to its grantees.

English Teaching

We have noted above that Emirate leaders were formerly trained in Arab-speaking countries, but that now they were being sent by preference to the United States, for English is recognized as the dominant language for international communication. Though many potential leaders do come here, more would if they knew English. The Press Adviser to the Ruler estimated that only 20 to 30 percent of those who would like to study here know English well enough to do so, and most students sent to the United States study exclusively English for a semester or more before they are placed in an American college. It would obviously save the student time and money if he could acquire a better command of the language at home, where at present there are only Arab teachers, supervised by Britons. The Ministry of Education is aware of this. It has signed a contract with the Oxford University Press to set up a new teaching system and supply language laboratories for all its schools. Still, we are under the distinct impression that there is room for American assistance in this field. We recommend that the Department or USIA make a study of the situation with a view to encouraging the use of American teachers, texts and techniques in the teaching of English in Emirate schools.

American Universities

We found in the Emirates much the same attitudes towards AUB and AUC that we found in Kuwait. AUB was acknowledged to have played an important role in educating Arabs. It was several times described to us as "formerly the best university in the area." The emphasis is significant: respect for it, and reliance on it have clearly waned as a result of recent political developments in Lebanon. Nevertheless informed Emirate educators agreed that is should be reactivated but, they uniformly added, "with a more Arabic characer." To several this meant specifically with an Arab president.

AUC was less well known, and less well regarded. One official suggested that undergraduates from the Emirates could go to AUC, as well as AUB, before going abroad for graduate studies; he was the exception. Others held the prevailing view that AUC was an institution designed primarily for an Egyptian elite. Students who wished an Arabic education would

do better to attend the indigenous Egyptian universities. Those who wanted an American education should--and could--go to the United States. In short, our conversations in the Emirates supported the conclusion we had tentatively reached in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait: that AUC was unlikely to play an important role in the developing Arab world.

VII. IRAN

There are more students from Iran in the United States than from any other country in the world, and some 50 American colleges or universities have links with Iranian institutions. Exchanges of this volume are bound to create problems as well as opportunities. One of the principal purposes of our trip was to inquire into both.

Shortly before our departure we were permitted to see a pre-release copy of a report prepared by the American Council on Education (ACE) under a grant from the Department. ("An Analysis of U.S.-Iranian Cooperation in Higher Education.") Its conclusion, that the widespread involvement of American universities in the ambitious development plans of oil-rich Iran can benefit both sides if "academic hustling" and an "atmosphere of salesmanship" can be kept to a minimum, strengthened our belief that the situation merited more than passing attention from our Commission.

Our brief report which follows does not pretend to be as authoritative as that of the American Council on Education. The latter was based on a survey of universities in this country and a 3-week visit to Iran last May by a 4-member team of experts. We hope, however, that our observations, based on long, informal talks with many knowledgeable American officials known to us personally, and with a representative sampling of high-ranking Iranian educators, will usefully supplement those of the ACE report.

Our stay in Iran included visits to Shiraz, Isfahan and Tehran. Throughout we were accompanied by the Cultural Affairs Officer of our Embassy, who has been working closely with Iranian universities for four years. In Shiraz we heard the views of three American professors assigned to Pahlavi University, and met with USIA's American Studies Adviser. In Isfahan we met with the American Director of the Iran-American Society Cultural Center. In Tehran we had a session with the Ambassador and his Cultural Officers, visited the Iran-American Society's impressive Center, and had several long talks with the Embassy's Counselor for Public Affairs, a 4-year veteran of the local scene.

The contacts arranged for us by the Embassy with Iranian officials represented the acknowledged leaders of Iranian higher education. In Shiraz we had long talks with the Chancellor of Pahlavi University, and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and held a round-table discussion with 20 of its professors. In Isfahan we talked with the Chancellor of the University (who was named Minister of Education shortly after our visit) and all his principal Deans; and we had a long session with the Dean of the Faculty of Foreign Languages. In Tehran we met with: the Executive Director of the Fulbright Commission; the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of the National University; and its professor of American Government; the Deputy Minister for Scientific Research in the Ministry of Science and

Higher Education, who is also Co-chairman of the Science, Technology and Education Committee of the U.S./Iran Joint Commission, and two of his principal assistants; the President of the State organization for student affairs; and the Minister of Higher Education and two of his high-ranking aides. In addition both the Counsellor for Public Affairs and the Cultural Attaché gave large dinners for us at which we were able to supplement the information given to us by these authorities. We summarize below our main observations and recommendations stemming from these high-level talks.

General Climate for Exchange

In Iran the statistics almost tell the story. As we noted above, there are approximately 25,000 Iranian students in the United States. The Iranian Government supports in one way or another almost 50 percent of these students, since even those who begin their U.S. studies without Iranian Government help receive government scholarships after they have achieved a "B" average for two years. Less than 5 percent of this scholarship group fails, and 98 percent return to Iran because they are assured of good jobs when they do; so there is no "brain drain" to speak of, except of highly-specialized doctors. The reasons why so many Iranians wish to study here, rather than in Germany or England or Russia, are much the same as those given by students in Egypt or Saudi Arabia or Kuwait: they find Americans less reserved, more open and friendly; American university administrators give generously of their time to assure proper courses of study and provide close supervision; American programs are more flexible; the United States is pre-eminent in fields of interest to a developing nation; the number and variety of American institutions allows them to absorb practically anyone who wishes to study abroad.

The ACE report to which we referred above noted that "nearly a third of the 74 separate links the team discovered involved American universities working for Iranian Government departments or organizations." In addition, there exist a great number of informal links between university departments and between individual faculty members in the two countries.

The Iranian Government has in a number of other concrete ways demonstrated that it welcomes an almost unlimited exchange of people and information with the United States. Here are some illustrations.

--It has established, using the income from a million dollar endowment from the Empress, a Center for American Studies at Pahlavi University in Shiraz. The grant has enabled the University to augment its offerings in American

literature and American politics, and to initiate a course in "American Values."

--It made a Bicentennial grant of $100,000 for the exchange of scholars.

--The National University has recently established an interdisciplinary Department of American Studies. It will provide instruction on a broad range of subjects--politics, economics, the land and the people--not just on standard subjects like literature and race relations.

--An Iranian professor has been despatched to the United States to write a book about it.

--The U.S.-Iranian Joint Commission has recommended an expansion of the Fulbright Program and has agreed to share equally in its financing. In fact, the Iranian Government is so pleased with the Fulbright Program concept that it has modeled on it an exchange agreement with the United Kingdom.

The prevailing attitude was summed up for us by a professor at Isfahan University; "I am a believer in mankind's interdependence, which implies the necessity for mutual understanding. If only for political reasons, Iranians should study American and British literature, and American studies should be taught in our universities. I therefore agree with Toynbee when he said, 'The United States has provided two great things for the world: the Marshall Plan and the Fulbright Program.'"

The situation regarding exchanges with Iran is, then, rather different from that in the Gulf Area. We do not need to encourage them, let alone augment them. What we need, rather, is to refine and improve them, for the sheer volume of U.S.-Iran exchanges presents, along with real opporutnities, some real problems. The ACE report dilates at some length on these problems; we simply list here those which were called to our attention as of particular concern.

--All of the Iranian students who attend U.S. universities are not of the best quality. Those who do so on government scholarships are, as we have noted, almost invariably successful; but the 10,000 or more who are here on their own include many who cannot get into Iranian schools, or who are political dissidents, or who are avoiding military service, or who are, in short, simply not serious students. They cause problems at home and abroad, and make no contribution to the objectives of international educational exchange. (We discuss this and related problems below, under "Educational Brokers" and "Counselling.")

--The best American professors do not always wish to teach or do research in Iran because they suspect that they will not have as satisfying an intellectual experience there as in London, Paris or Vienna.

--The numerous arrangements between U.S. and Iranian universities border on the chaotic, fostering what the ACE report calls "academic hustling," with all the evils which the term implies. The Iranian Minister of Education has begun to bring some order out of this chaos and proposes a supra-university Board of Trustees to coordinate the overseas linkages of all its institutions; but until this is accomplished, these university-to-university arrangements will fall short of fulfilling the real desiderata of exchanges.

In short, all that glitters in the Iran-U.S. exchange picture is not gold, though happily much of it is. The conditions are certainly propitious for the development of a singularly fruitful relationship between the United States and a valuable ally in the Middle East. All the evidence indicates that a program of exchanges can contribute importantly to the achievement of such a relationship if it is carefully planned and effectively administered. It is up to the U.S. and Iranian officials concerned to eliminate the program's weaknesses and exploit its strengths.

The Educational Broker

In discussing above the probability that there were too many unqualified Iranian students in American colleges, we had in mind an aberration which, apparently, is largely confined in the Middle East to Iran. This is the appearance on the international exchange scene of the educational broker: the man who--for a fee--guarantees to place an Iranian student in an American college--which pays him a bounty for each body he delivers. We had been alerted to this character before we left Washington and had expected to encounter him throughout our travels; fortunately, we did not. He had been heard of in Egypt, and had practiced a little in the Gulf States, but only in Iran were conditions such that he had flourished.

As some of our contacts pointed out to us, the educational broker is not necessarily evil. It is possible that a person of high and honest motives can serve as a useful bridge for the deserving-but-uninformed foreign student to the reputable-but-ailing U.S. college. However, it is our clear impression that most brokers are more concerned with earning a tainted dollar than with promoting the ends of international exchange; some even go so far as to supply their victim with a bogus I-20 form, the "certificate of eligibility for a student visa." What normally happens, we suspect,

is that the broker: a) places a serious student in an inferior U.S. college; or b) places a dilettante in a respectable but failing school; or c) places a dilettante in an inferior college. None of these alternatives is conducive to the kind of meaningful experience international exchange is designed to provide.

Iranian authorities share our opinion. They are sufficiently troubled by the activities of educational brokers to have taken steps to control them. They now propose to separate the sheep from the goats by issuing a license to practice the trade, of course licensing only those whose motives are noble and whose expertise is demonstrable. We recommend that U.S. officials and universities do whatever they can to support the Iranian initiative.

Counselling

One obvious way to curtail the business, and the influence, of the educational broker in Iran is to make certain that every student who wishes to study in this country can get competent advice on U.S. colleges and universities.

But the need for more and better counselling transcends the need to circumvent the machinations of the educational broker. In Iran the sheer weight of numbers suggests that it is a subject of the utmost importance. Assuming that one person can counsel 20 people a day, we estimate that it would take 20 people working full time to advise all the Iranian students who seek help. The American Friends of the Middle East (AFME), the principal counselling agency, has six professionals on the job; USIS officers and Iranian officials also assist. But even so the total number of qualified advisers falls far short of the required number. The result is that some Iranians may enroll in colleges which are inadequate for their needs, or that too many are concentrated in 100 to 150 universities which are thought by Iranians to be "good."

Americans and Iranians alike have admitted the problem. The Chancellor of Isfahan University listed improved student counselling as one of five things which the United States can do to improve our exchange programs. The Joint Commission has recommended a joint study of the need for counselling and English language training; and the Institute of International Education has been asked, in vain, to establish an office in Iran. Clearly those concerned want something more to be done.

A solution to the problem appears to us possible: increase the counselling capacity of AFME. No CIA taint attaches to the organization in Iran. By all accounts it has done a first-class job, placing 2,000 students since 1973,

and professionally advising literally thousands each month. The Department has shown its confidence by contributing financially to its operations in Iran. We therefore repeat here our recommendation on counselling in Egypt, that a way be found to increase the AFME staff in Iran. As a corollary, we recommend that the enlarged staff extend its operations to Shiraz and Isfahan, where the demand for counselling is great and the supply is very limited.

We found a less clear picture of the selection and briefing of American professors going to Iran. We were assured in Tehran that Fulbright professors were well briefed, and the three we met in Shiraz and Isfahan had adapted admirably to their new environment. But we suspect the operative word here is "adapted," and that the success of these grantees is attributable more to their own character than to the process of recruitment and orientation which they underwent; for each admitted that he was unprepared for the living and working conditions which faced him in Iran, and each said more counselling before he left home would have been helpful. They were particularly surprised that they had not been personally interviewed before they were selected. A spokesman for the three implied that improvements in the selection process could be effected when he said: "Recruitment of U.S. professors must be designed to get people who are sympathetic to, and interested in, working with students who, because English is not their first language, are 'slow learners' in courses taught in English. A very special kind of person is needed here: someone who is interested in something other than a pay check, who wants to open student minds..."

Judging from the grantees we met, we would have to conclude that something is right in the process which selected and prepared them for Iran: they seemed to us to fit their own description of the ideal grantee. And yet their accounts of their first months in Iran raised the suspicion that it was more luck than good management which in these cases produced the happy result. We return to this general subject below in discussing the implementation of American Studies programs in Iran, and make there a recommendation similar to the one which we make now: that all agencies recruiting and briefing U.S. professors for service in Iranian universities review the process to assure that properly motivated candidates are selected, and that they know precisely what to expect when they reach their posts of assignment. We specifically recommend that personal interviews with candidates be incorporated into the selection process.

Exchange Programs

The State Department allocated $264,000 in fiscal 1977 to promote exchanges with Iran. About $150,000 of this was spent on "academic programs" (i.e. the Fulbright Program);

about $32,000 to bring eight Iranian leaders to this country under the International Visitors Program; about $18,000 to send eight to ten American specialists to Iran (and other countries in the area); about $19,000 to finance projects recommended by the Joint Commission; and the remaining $45,000 to support various private efforts which complement the Department's programs.

While the Department could always effectively use more leader grants than it can afford with its present budget; while the projects recommended by the Joint Commission seem to be generally worthy of support; and while there are of course innumerable private initiatives which warrant government support--we nevertheless do not recommend a large increase in the Department's budget for exchanges with Iran. There are, after all, 50,000 Americans in Iran, so the American presence does not need to be increased; it needs to be refined. Here, as in the Gulf States, we believe major financial support for programs of mutual interest can be expected from Iranian sources, and that the U.S. Government can best deploy its resources of men and money to encourage and facilitate the activities of others. We therefore beleive that the sum of $320,000 which the Department has requested for fiscal 1978 is about what is needed, and we recommend that the Department's budget request as a whole be approved so that this amount can be allocated for exchanges with Iran.

This does not mean that we received in Iran no suggestions on how to improve existing programs, on possible changes of emphasis, or on new projects which are worth a try. We did. Those we believe deserving of consideration are outlined below.

We turn first to the Fulbright Program. It clearly has a good reputation in Iran. Last year Iranian universities contributed to it the equivalent of $124,000. Next year the Iranian Government will match the U.S. contribution of $150,000. A Fulbright grant still carries with it, in spite of many competing awards, considerable prestige. The value of the program lies in the fact that it is the only "planned program" in the country; thus it can develop certain disciplines like American Studies (see below), library science, or education which are inadequately catered to by other programs. We commend the Fulbright Commission on its approach and recommend that it continue to use its resources in this concentrated manner. Within this general pattern, however, we believe there are aspects of the program which need examination, to wit:

--Although, as we have noted, a Fulbright grant has prestige and is generally expected to attract the best applicants,

we were told by people who know the program well that "U.S. grantees have not always been the kind we can be proud of." The following factors were suggested to us as possibly contributing to this result: a) stipends are inadequate; one professor told us, "A person who accepts a Fulbright grant expects to lose money. Perhaps a sliding salary scale or a means test should be established to determine an adequate stipend." b) there are not enough candidates for each professorship; this may be because the job opportunities are not widely enough publicized, and requirements for the job not clearly enough defined. We recommend that the process of recruiting, paying and orienting Fulbright professors for Iran be reviewed to see whether there is justice to these allegations.

--A minor related point. Candidates for lecturing grants are frequently persons who have originally applied for other countries and been rejected. The applicaitons submitted to the Fulbright Commission in Iran indicate this. Thus, even though the candidate may be excellent, Iranian university officials may feel they are being offered an inferior product. It should be simple to revise the applications so that this impression not be created; we recommend that it be done.

--More follow-up of Fulbright grantees, both American and Iranian is needed. We recommend that the Department, the Fulbright Commission, the Board of Foreign Scholarships and our Embassy in Iran address the question.

--Most Iranians and Americans involved agree that a "long-term" lecturer gives more and gains more. Without clearly defining the terms, one American professor in Shiraz told us, "Of course, a lot depends on the discipline a professor teaches, but speaking generally, I believe a short term is too short." Iranian universities would like their American Fulbrighters to remain two years. What we saw in Iran leads us to believe that a 1-year tour is minimal and that a 2-year tour is desirable. Therefore, even though we are aware that the aim of Fulbright programs is to give at least some exposure to foreign cultures to many people, we recommend that its lecturers in Iran be encouraged to remain for two years.

--Housing in Iran was the most constant irritant we discovered among American grantees: it was either too uncomfortable or too expensive. Where, as in Isfahan, faculty housing was provided by the university, the grantee adjusted swiftly and happily to his work and to his new environment. The moral is clear. We recommend that the Commission do all it can to have acceptable housing available for American grantees when they arrive at their destinations.

--American professors usually teach undergraduates, and usually not very many--either because Iranian students lack facility in English or are not interested in what the professors teach. Their impact is thus less than it might be. Two possible solutions suggest themselves: a) recruit Americans for courses in which a respectable number of undergraduates are assured; b) use them in graduate courses, where numbers may be small but the "multiplier effect" can be expected to be greater. We recommend that the Fulbright Commission review the use of its American professors with a view to assuring that they make the greatest possible impact on their academic community.

Our discussions with Iranian and American officials were not, of course, confined to the Fulbright program. They ranged over the entire field of official and private exchanges. Here are some additional observations which may be of interest to the people responsible for them.

--In recommending that Fulbright lecturers remain a minimum of one year in Iran, we did not intend to suggest that American specialists sent on short-term grants were not valuable. We were assured by Americans and Iranians that top-flight Americans lecturing on specific topics of interest to Iranians can be put on lecture circuits around the country and are highly desirable. In fact, not enough have been sent. We are pleased to learn that the Department plans to send a dozen or more to Iran under its direct and regional programs. We recommend that these plans be fully implemented; and we recommend that they be supplemented through USIA's Volunteer Speakers Program.

--American professors are also sought to guide and direct research projects. The National Scientific Research Council plans to give grants to both Iranians and Americans to participate in joint research projects. It strikes us as a particularly sound way to build lasting relationships. We recommend that other agencies be alert to opportunities to develop such projects.

--We have referred earlier to the lack of coordination in the numerous direct university-to-university arrangements which exist, and have noted the Iranian Government's intention to do something about it. We now add that we strongly support the principle of such exchanges, particularly those involving department-to-department relationships. They respond to expressed, rather than hypothetical, needs; and they avoid the danger of our trying to impose an entire system on Iran, when only certian parts of it are applicable. The ACE report lists many of these successful linkages. We call attention to just one which we believe can serve as a model for others; it

involves students going both ways, instead of only professors from the United States. Under it, the University of Texas and the University of Isfahan exchange six students a year. Tuition is waived by each university; the sending institution pays other costs; the receiving institution provides a tailor-made study program. We recommend that such arrangements, involving professors and students, be encouraged--always in consultation with the Iranian Ministry of Education.

--The "sabbatical year" proposal we outlined in our discussion of the Gulf States was warmly embraced by Iranian professors who have studied in the United States. We recommend that they be considered for inclusion in it if it can be established.

--Provincial universities like Shiraz and Isfahan requested more information on audio-visual materials available in the United States, and back issues of American periodicals. We recommend that USIA help meet these requests.

--In Iran, as elsewhere in the Middle East, authorities are concerned about the training of doctors and nurses for their country. In Iran, however, the Minister of Education has done something about it. He is involved in the establishment in Tehran of an International Medical Center which will be sponsored by the Iranian Government. Its planning and governing board will include representatives of Columbia, Cornell and Harvard medical schools, with whom the Minister has been consulting. Instruction at the Center will be in English. We believe this major initiative of an important ally to solve a serious regional problem deserves U.S. support. We recommend that competent authorities in State, AID, the National Science Foundation, etc. consult with Iranian officials to see what help this country can appropriately give.

--There is a limited interest in Iran in American performing arts groups. Our officers there believe occasional visits by important American companies are desirable, as a demonstration to Iran that we consider it a country which can appreciate the best of our cultural manifestations. They also believe that individual American performers who can perform with local institutions can be useful in promoting U.S.-Iranian communication. We recommend that these suggestions be implemented through the Department's Cultural Presentations Program.

American Studies

We have earlier in this report touched upon the development of American Studies in Iran as an illustration of the favorable climate which exists for exchanges. We now expand briefly on the subject because of the significance we think

it has for the promotion of our exchange objectives.

Perhaps the first point we should make is that Iran is the only country we visited which has established American Studies, as such, in its universities. Its experience will therefore be illustrative. In this connection we trust that those involved in similar enterprises elsewhere will take to heart the valuable collaboration between the Embassy, the Fulbright Commission, and USIA. The Embassy's Cultural Attaché was relieved of many of his routine responsibilities so that he could, in effect, function as an adviser to Iranian universities on educational matters, with special emphasis on American Studies. The Fulbright Commission collaborated by using its grants to promote the discipline; and USIA made available as a consultant its expert adviser on American Studies. These actions must surely have stimulated any latent interest in American Studies which existed, so that when the Empress set up her endowment of a million dollars to facilitate the establishment of a Center of American Studies, a number of Iranian universities were eager to have it. And it is instructive that the National University and Isfahan University (and quite possibly others) went ahead with plans of their own even though it was decided that the Center itself would be sited at Pahlavi University in Shiraz.

In its first year the Center had six students. Now 50 are enrolled in its courses. The final form of its program is still to be determined, though it now appears likely that a Center for International Studies will be developed, with American Studies as the centerpiece. The advice of USIA's expert is, we were pleased to note, being sought by the University authorities responsible for the Center's evolution. It appears to us that the Center is well launched and that it will contribute to better understanding among Iranians of all significant aspects of American life. It therefore merits the close, continuing support of American authorities and specialists. We suggest two areas in which we believe U.S. help might be particularly valuable.

--The first is in preparing prospective students to follow lectures in English. We have already cited the experience of the American professor who found that the pace of his instruction had to be slowed because of his students' inadequate knowledge of English. To this evidence we now add the following: the National University has felt it necessary to offer the students in its American Studies course two years of language study before they plunge into "American Studies" proper. While this is not time "wasted," it is clearly time taken from an indepth study of a student's primary interest.

--The second, and more immediate, is in the recruitment

of American professors. The source of supply of fully qualified professors in the field of American Studies is limited, and the demand for them abroad is, happily, increasing. The urgency of the problem was dramatized last year, when the normal procedures failed to elicit completely acceptable candidates for Iran, as well as for several other countries. One weakness in the procedure, we understand, is that which we referred to in our discussion of the Fulbright Program: that available positions are not adequately delineated and publicized. The situation in Iran was saved by the personal efforts of those who felt a particular responsibility for the program, but the experience points up the need for the establishment of procedures which will guarantee the best available talent for important Centers, like that at Pahlavi University. We recommend that the Department and the Committee for the International Exchange of Scholars (CIES) undertake a review of present recruiting procedure, giving special attention to ways of improving the announcements about posts available to American Studies specialists.

English Teaching

We have twice in this report alluded to the inadequacy in Iran of instruction in English. This conclusion is based on the statements of Iranian officials as well as of American professors. For example, the Chancellor of the University of Isfahan told us flatly, "English teaching at the lower levels of our educational system is inadequate." An Iranian professor echoed this sentiment: "English training in Iranian high schools is not up to standard; it is quite inadequate to prepare students for study in the United States or for courses in English at Iranian universities. Yet no program has been undertaken to attack the problem at its base--in elementary and secondary schools." He added almost plaintively, "Why can't Americans help us in this?" We think Americans can--and should. We therefore reiterate here the recommendation on U.S. support of English teaching which we have made in the previous chapters of this report.

American Universities

Iranian students have never been sent to the American University in Cairo, and we saw no disposition whatever for them to attend it now, when they can afford to travel to the United States if they wish an American college education.

The American University in Beirut, on the contrary, has trained many Iranians, and they remain loyal to it. But now Iran is equipped to train many more of its own students, even at the graduate level, and is doing so. We think it highly unlikely that in the years ahead Iran will send an appreciable number of students there, or will support the institution financially.

VIII. TURKEY

The principal focus of our trip was on the potential for exchanges with Iran, Egypt, and the Gulf States; however, we included Turkey in our itinerary to learn whether there were significant points of difference or similarity between the possibilities for exchange with an old and established ally and with the rapidly-developing Arab world.

Our itinerary took us first to Istanbul, where we concentrated our attention on Robert College, the famous American institution, and on a spin-off from Robert College, Bogazici (or Bosphorous) University. We had the best possible sources of information: the Headmaster of Robert College, the Rector and Vice-Rector of Bogazici University, and the Public Affairs and Cultural Affairs Officers attached to our Consulate in Istanbul.

We then moved on to Ankara, where we had ample opportunity for discussions with our Ambassador and our Public Affairs Officer. Both have served for several years in Turkey and are extremely well-informed on U.S.-Turkish cultural relations. They had arranged for us meetings with: the Deputy Secretary-General for Cultural and Information Affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; the Director General of External Relations, Ministry of Education; the Rector of the Middle-East Technical University; the Dean of the Faculty of Social and Administrative Sciences of Haceteppe University; a professor at the Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey and the Executive Director of the Fulbright Commission. At a luncheon given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs we met, among others, the Chief of the Cultural Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Dean of the Faculty of Law at Ankara University, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at the Middle-East Technical University. At a dinner at the Ambassador's Residence we met, in addition, the Rector of Ankara University, the Rector of Haceteppe University, the Under Secretary of the Ministry of Cultural Affairs, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Turkish-American Association and other educational authorities.

Mr. Smith returned to Istanbul from Ankara for a second round of appointments which included: a meeting with the Director of the Turkish Educational Foundation; a luncheon with members of the Istanbul Language and Cultural Association; a luncheon with the Dean of the School of Administrative Sciences of Bogazici University (who had formerly served as a visiting professor at Columbia, Harvard and Princeton); a round table discussion with the Rector of Istanbul University and all his deans; a reception at the home of the Acting Principal Officer, at which he had an opportunity to talk with numerous Turkish

and American officials involved in educational exchanges with the United States.

The full, carefully-thought-out programs organized for us in both Istanbul and Ankara gave us excellent insights into U.S.-Turkish educational and cultural relations. We summarize in the paragraphs which follow our principal observations and recommendations.

General Climate for Exchange.

It is our impression that U.S. influence on Turkish education, so strong during the first half of this century, is on the wane. This fact will inevitably affect our educational and cultural exchanges with Turkey, but just how will depend to some extent on U.S. reaction to the new situation.

There are several inter-related reasons for this situation: growing nationalism; increasing illiteracy as a result of a rapid population growth; a reduction in U.S. technical assistance; a decline in Turkish knowledge of English in the face of positive efforts to make Turkish the language of instruction in universities; the lowered number and influence of U.S. institutions; and the concomitant growing influence of other countries.

It is difficult to sort out the chicken and the egg among these factors, so closely are they intertwined; but a point of departure must be the burgeoning of Turkish nationalism, stimulated by such political issues as the Cyprus conflict. As a result of it, American institutions, like the enormously influential Robert College, have either been taken over by Turkish authorities or had their "American" character significantly diluted. U.S. technical and financial support to these, as well as to specifically Turkish institutions which are attempting to keep alive American concepts of education, has been simultaneously reduced, thus endangering their very existence. Into the vacuum thus created flow other foreign influences, principally from the Communist bloc which borders on Turkey. In the meantime, the development of Turkish schools and teachers has not been able to keep pace with the growth in population. Only three of every 100 college-age students can be accommodated in Turkish universities. (Last year 300,000 students applied for 40,000 places.) Recognizing that this small number of college students will determine the future of the country, extremists of the Left and the Right flood the universities with their political partisans, who are anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist, anti-communist, anti-everything but their own political interests. The universities thus periodically become battlegrounds for political ideologies

and so disruptive that they are shut down for long periods of time. One obvious victim of these several factors is the teaching of English, which is perhaps the key to western, particularly American, influence in Turkish education.

We were exposed to many specific illustrations of the generalities we have just outlined. To cite only a few:

--While we were in Turkey, all its universities but one, Bogazici, were closed because of student unrest. Bogazici remained open, said one educator, "partially because many of its students are from Robert College, and are more moderate social democrats than students in other universities."

--As this report was being written in late February 1977, the Washington Star reported as follows on the mission undertaken by former Secretary of Defence, Clark Clifford, to Greece, Cyprus and Turkey: "While Clifford was meeting with Demirel, a band of students stoned the U.S. Information Center in Ankara..."

--In 1971 the trustees of Robert College, seeing the handwriting on the wall, merged its boys' lycée division with the American College for Girls to form a co-educational secondary school, and turned over to the Turkish Government its college division, which now carries on as the Bogazici University. Though the new Robert College is scrupulously a-political, and functions within the Turkish system, some believe that it will be nationalized within five years.

--AID no longer gives financial help to Robert College. The Rector of an important Turkish university attributes its dismemberment to lack of U.S. support.

--Three Turkish universities where instruction is in English fear that the Ministry of Education will shortly decree that all instruction in Turkish universities must be conducted in Turkish.

--There are presently no American professors at the University of Istanbul, Turkey's largest and most prestigious university (40,000 students, 950 professors, 1,500 instructors). The Dean of its Faculty of Economics told us his faculty had been under German influence until the 50's, when U.S. influence became predominant, and he thinks the German language and influence will soon regain precedence.

--A spokesman of the Ministry of Education requested U.S. assistance in preparing teachers of English in Turkish universities "because English-teaching is not very successful in our elementary and secondary schools."

--A spokesman for the Foreign Ministry told us: "The Socialist countries are doing much more than the United States in Turkey in the field of cultural relations. Because of Cyprus and other political developments, many Turks are spreading wrong impressions about the United States. You (the United States) must give encouragement to those Turks who are favorably-disposed toward you."

We recommend that this advice be followed, for there are many Turks who remain "favorably disposed" toward the United States and are working to stem the decline of American influence, particularly in its educational system. Here are illustrations.

--The Foreign Office spokesman we have just quoted added, "Turkey has some educational exchange with socialist countries, but I would like to put our emphasis on exchanges with the West, particularly with the United States.

--Although the University of Istanbul has no American professors this year, it has retained many contacts with the United States. For example, over 50 percent of its medical faculty has studied in our universities; and if a professor from Istanbul is awarded a Fulbright, or other, grant for study in the United States he is allowed a 3-year leave of absence from his university.

--The Turkish Government contributes $40,000 a year to support of American grantees to Turkey, and there is some evidence that it would be willing to increase this figure.

--The Rectors of three of Turkey's best-regarded universities--Bogazici, Haceteppe and Middle-East Technical--are convinced of the value of the "American system" which they have to a large extent adopted, and of the use of English as the language of instruction. They are prepared to oppose vigorously any moves to impose Turkish as the sole language of instruction in Turkish institutions of higher learning.

--The representative of the Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey assured us that his organization felt U.S. universities were pre-eminent in graduate research, and that Turkish students had no problems in adjusting to life in the United States "because Turks and Americans have an affinity for each other."

--The program of the Turkish Educational Foundation illustrated the continuing interest of Turkish students in

studying in the United States, and the value they place on it. The TEF was established in 1967 by 200 businessmen (with the assistance of AID and the Ford Foundation). Its purpose was to provide scholarships in business administration for needy students. Since its inception the Foundation has sent approximately 150 students to the United States. Almost all successfully completed their course of study and returned to good jobs in Turkey. The program has been so effective and so popular that the Foundation continues to send ten grantees a year to the United States. Last year it had 143 applications for its ten grants.

In short, though U.S. influence in Turkey's educational and cultural life is waning, there are many in Turkey who do not wish to see it disappear entirely. We are sympathetic to Turkey's desire to establish its own national identity, but we would be sorry to see its search for independence in political action lead to cultural isolation in an increasingly interdependent world. We would particularly regret it if this important NATO ally lost contact with those aspects of the American experience which cultivated the affinity between Turks and Americans which was referred to above. We believe a sensible use of exchanges can help prevent this eventuality and therefore recommend that the United States re-examine its public and private programs with Turkey (including specifically AID activities in support of Turkish education) to determine whether we are doing all that we can do to encourage those Turks who are attempting to retain a happy balance in their country between unbridled cultural nationalism and inhibiting cultural subservience. We shall make later in this report specific suggestions on how exchanges may contribute to this end.

Robert College

Robert College has had an enormous influence on Turkey. The Assistant Secretary-General for Cultural and Information Affairs of the Foreign Ministry told us: "Robert College has been a great influence on this country. Our best politicians have studied there or in the United States." The Rector of the Middle-East Technical University, himself a Robert College graduate, assured us that there would have been no Middle-East Technical University without Robert College, and regretted that it had not been allowed to continue as it was: i.e., as an American university. The Rector of Bogazici University attributed the fact that its students were not on strike to its liberal heritage from Robert College, with the better communication between administration and students which that implies. The justice of such sentiments is verified by the number of Robert College graduates who are now leaders in Turkish educational, political and social life; by universities like Bogazici, Haceteppe and Middle-East Technical, which have

continued many of the educational policies and practices introduced into Turkey by this American institution; and by the extraordinary record of its graduates in U.S. scholastic achievement tests.

While it is therefore regrettable that the College was not able to carry on in its original format, it continues to exercise considerable influence as, to quote our Public Affairs Officer in Istanbul, "the top secondary school in the country." Although the present school is under pressure to conform more closely to the standard Turkish curriculum, it still selects its own students, and so high is its reputation that it gets the cream of the crop. Thirty-seven percent of its teachers are American; 16 percent are third country nationals (mostly British) and many of the remaining 47 percent have U.S. degrees and/or have studied at Robert College. Thus the College retains an orientation toward the West while training a cadre of young people who seem destined to be in the forefront of Turkish life.

For the moment the Turks appear to recognize that the college helps protect Turkish interests by training well its future leadership; and indeed alumni support of it has increased. And yet, as we noted earlier, the future of the school is in doubt. Although it is scrupulously a-political and coordinates its programs with Turkish regulations, pressures to make it conform so closely to the Turkish pattern that it will lose entirely its individual character continue to mount. If this happens, the chances are good that the trustees may decide not to carry on. Financial problems resulting from withdrawal of AID and private U.S. support will undoubtedly encourage such a decision.

On the strength of what we learned in Turkey, we are inclined to agree with the American official who stated flatly, "the benefit to the United States of Robert College is almost incalculable," and that correspondingly, its demise would damage our national interest. U.S. Government support of it is then a sound investment. We recommend that the possibility of long-term AID financing of Robert College therefore be investigated.

Exchange Programs

We did not examine in detail the official U.S. exchange program with Turkey. This was done early last summer by a State Department inspection team whose recommendations are now being acted upon. Nevertheless our discussions did prompt opinions, suggestions and impressions, the most significant of which we mention here.

Opinions on the use of grants under the Fulbright program varied according to the interests of the person expressing the opinion. The spokesman of the Ministry of Education would like to see them geared more toward the industrialization of Turkey; the Scientific and Technical Research Council predictably wants more grantees in science and technology; the Dean of Haceteppee's Faculty of Social and Administrative Sciences just as predictably wants more in the social sciences and humanities. Some believe grants should be used largely for undergraduates; others, for graduates; still others, for young instructors or professors. Some believe too much support is given to the U.S.-oriented institutions; others, believe not enough.

In this welter of needs and desires we believe that the Fulbright Commission has struck a happy balance. We recommend: a) that it continue to make grants to a limited number of undergraduates whose advanced training will make them particularly valuable to Turkey; b) that it continue to send professors to Bogazici, Haceteppe and Middle-East Technical, for these institutions are growing in influence, are already U.S.-oriented, and deserve the encouragement of U.S. support; c) that it maintain a balance between grantees in science/technology and social sciences/humanities.

We have, of course, not answered the question of whether the official U.S. programs are large enough. In the light of what we have said above about the climate for exchange, we would have to believe that our programs are too small to do the required job. This belief is substantiated by the Assistant Secretary-General for Cultural and Information Affairs in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It was he who told us that we must encourage those Turks favorable to the United States because there were many who were giving the wrong impression of us. He added: "You should send professors, lecturers and performers in that order. Turks who have studied in the United States or at Robert College have an affinity for the United States, but there aren't enough of them. The Western presence is decreasing, and the Arab and Socialist countries are moving into the vacuum thus created. Russians, Romanians, Bulgarians are doing all they can to attract Turks, and those who have spent time in Eastern Europe are returning impressed by their reception..."

We recognize that the Department of State is probably doing all it can in Turkey with the funds available to it. Its total expenditure of over $530,000, of which some $350,000 goes into academic programs, is already large in comparison to other programs funded by the Department, and therefore probably cannot be increased. We therefore recommend that: a) Congress approve the Department's request of $70.5 million for exchanges

in fiscal 1978, thus permitting the Department to carry out the programs with Turkey which it has planned; b) the Embassy and the Department continue their efforts, so well begun, to have the Turkish Government increase its contribution to the Fulbright Program.

A word on AID's role in the development of a U.S.-oriented educational system in Turkey seems appropriate at this point. We were impressed by what it has accomplished in Turkey. The Turkish Educational Foundation, which AID initially supported, is an excellent illustration of how "seed money" sensibly used can help to develop a continuing program of value to our international relations. AID's support of Robert College was clearly important in keeping alive this bastion of American academic influence in Turkey. And its assistance to Bogazici University enabled that institution to hire American professors and retain the U.S. orientation it inherited from Robert College. AID no longer gives financial help to Robert College, whose financial future is threatened as a result; and we understand that it will cease its support of Bogazici in two years, which could cause a reduction in the university's complement of American professors. Given the "climate" we have described, the demise of Robert College as an American institution, and the diminution of the American presence in Bogazici would be unfortunate. We recommend that AID review the needs of these institutions, and its own priorities, to determine whether it can, and should, not continue to contribute to their financial support.

We turn now to other, miscellaneous observations and recommendations which we believe merit the attention of those in the public and/or private sector who are concerned with U.S.-Turkey exchanges.

1. Cultural Presentations. We have alluded above to the intense effort of the Socialist Bloc to penetrate Turkey through performing arts groups, and the willingness of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to see a counterbalancing effort by the United States. Since the need for, and the receptivity to, American programming in this area seems much greater than in Iran and the Arabic world, we recommend that the Department: a) review its Cultural Presentations program with a view to sending more U.S. artists to Turkey; b) encourage more privately-financed groups to include Turkey in their overseas itineraries.

2. American Books. The decline in the physical American presence in Turkey dictates that we find other ways to keep in touch with Turks. Our representatives in both Ankara and Istanbul suggested that one way we could do so was through books. They added that there might well be untapped possibilities for commercial sales, particularly of scientific materials.

We recommend that USIA and the State Department (acting through the Government Committee on International Book and Library Programs) explore ways to increase the distribution of U.S. books throughout Turkey.

3. Sabbatical Years in the United States for Turkish Professors. The proposal we have made earlier that a program be developed to enable foreign professors to renew their American contacts by spending sabbatical years in U.S. universities was embraced by Turkish educational authorities. We recommend that Turkish professors be included in any such program which is established.

4. American Faculty for New Turkish Universities. A spokesman for the Ministry of Education noted that it would welcome American faculty for new universities which Turkey is establishing in its eastern provinces. This exchange would appear to be a good way to extend the U.S. presence beyond Istanbul and Ankara. We recommend that the possibilities of such assignments through the Fulbright Program, AID, and direct university-to-university arrangements be explored.

5. Brain Drain. This appears to be somewhat of a problem for Turkey. Here, as in Egypt, the solution depends largely on the Turks themselves. The experience of the Turkish Educational Foundation indicates that conditions can be created which will encourage Turks to return to their homeland after study abroad. The Rector of Istanbul University is promoting a scheme whereby each Turkish university receives a quota of study-abroad grants equal to the number of scholars it will place in its faculties when they have earned Ph. D.'s abroad. So the Turks are facing up to their problem. We recommend that the U.S. Government cooperate with the Turks in these specific initiatives, and in every other effort designed to eliminate "brain drain."

6. University-to-University Exchanges. The limited experience which Turks have had with direct university-to-university exchanges has been productive. For example, the University of Istanbul's Economics Faculty operated with Iowa State from 1965 to 1973 an annual head-for-head exchange of professors. The Faculty of Law had a 5-year arrangement with Columbia, and another of indeterminate duration with the University of California (at Berkely). All three of these, incidentally, were organized by Fulbright grantees after they had spent a year in Istanbul--proof, if more is needed, of the valuable "multiplier effect" of the program. Everyone agreed that these private programs were beneficial; but all have lapsed. One explanation for their suspension can be found in this statement made to us by the Rector: "This kind of

exchange cannot be initiated by our university because we do not have enough money. The exchange must be largely financed by the U.S. university." If U.S. universities can be found to take the initiative, we feel sure there will be eager participants on the Turkish side, for all the university officials we saw stated unequivocally their eagerness to receive American professors. We recommend that the Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs and its cooperating private academic agencies stimulate direct university-to-university exchanges of professors, research scholars and students.

7. Medical Training. In Turkey, as elsewhere in the area, we found concern about the diminished possibilities for medical and nursing training in the United States for Turkish citizens. It was, however, less acute than in the Arab States, for medical schools exist in Turkey and the language of instruction is Turkish. The University of Istanbul even has a nursing school, founded by AID, but American teachers of nursing are in demand. We suspect this demand for in-country instruction by Americans may have been conditioned by an unfortunate brain drain: four of eight nurses sent to the United States for training under the AID program remained in the United States. We recommend that appropriate U.S. agencies keep in mind Turkey's needs for the medical training of its citizens when grantees in exchange programs are being selected.

Counselling

In spite of the reported affinity of Turkish students for America, the counselling of prospective grantees is a sore point, especially in Istanbul. In Ankara, students seeking advice on study in the United States are handled by the Fulbright Commission, which seems to perform well. In Istanbul the situation is less satisfactory. USIS is the only qualified adviser, but it is not adequately staffed to handle the load. According to the Public Affairs Officer, "We try to meet the need by giving inquirers a packet of materials and advising them to write to the Fulbright Commission," but he is the first to admit that more personal counselling is needed. The Turkish Educational Foundation concurs. We recommend that the State Department take steps to remedy this unfortunate situation. The simplest solution in the circumstances would appear to be this: provide the Fulbright Commission with additional resources so that it can broaden the scope of its counselling, specifically by assigning a counsellor in Ankara on a full or part-time basis.

English Teaching

We sensed in Turkey the same decline of a knowledge of English, in comparison to the need for it, which we found in

Egypt, Iran and the Gulf States. Here is some of the evidence which led us to this conclusion.

--Bogazici University, the descendant of American-sponsored Robert College, continues to give courses in English primarily, we were told, because Turkey's Supreme Court overrode the ruling of a lower court that all teaching in Turkish universities be done in Turkish.

--The Director General for External Relations in the Ministry of Education asked American faculty for Turkey's new universities "because English teaching is not very successful in our elementary and secondary schools." In point of fact, a Turkish student can't begin the study of English until he is 13, and has lessons only a few times a week until he is 18.

--The Director General also asked us, revealingly, "what can be done for the many excellent candidates for grants who don't know English?"

--The British Council, the Turkish-American Society and other organizations teach English to many Turks--but only in major urban centers. English instruction is thus not available to most Turks.

--The Assistant Secretary for Cultural Affairs in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs attributed the low level of knowledge of English to the fact that German and French were formerly better known. He added that interest in English is now increasing but "any encouragement we could give English teaching would be much appreciated."

--The Middle-East Technical University, whose determination to retain English as its language of instruction we have mentioned, has found it necessary to establish a "prep school for English" in order to assure that it can enroll the best Turkish students.

The Turks themselves are eager for assistance. For example, the students at the universities where instruction is in English have never objected, because they see knowledge of English as a great advantage to their studies and their careers.

USIS/Turkey is obviously not equipped to meet the need. The United States can and does provide some help through its exchange programs. But what is needed, we believe, is a coordinated Turkish-British-U.S. effort to determine the areas of need and the allocation of resources. We recommend that the Department and/or our Embassy in Ankara take the initiative in promoting a study which would lead to the desired coordinated effort.

○