

WITHDRAWAL SHEET (PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES)

FORM OF DOCUMENT	CORRESPONDENTS OR TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
CH. 12, Sec. A	Background to the Johnson Years Secret <i>Open 10-6-88 NLS 88-175</i> 6 p		A
CH. 12, Sec. B	Presidential Initiatives Secret <i>Open 10-6-88 NLS 88-175</i> 20 pp		A
CH. 12, Sec. C	Other Initiatives and Programs Secret <i>Open 10-6-88 NLS 88-175</i> 21 pp		A
CH. 12, Sec. D	Cultural Presentations and Sports Secret <i>Open 1-31-91 NLS 90-247</i> 8 pp		A
CH. 12, Sec. E	Effect of International Crisis on Exchange Secret <i>Open 1-31-91 NLS 90-247</i> 11 p		A
CH. 12, Sec. F	Program Re-Evaluation After Budget Reduction Secret <i>Open 1-31-91 NLS 90-247</i> 3 pp		A
CH. 12, Sec. G	The Exchange Programs in the Geographic Areas Secret 38 pp <i>Sanitized 1-31-91 NLS 90-247</i> <i>Open 4-15-97 NLS 96-333</i>		A

FILE LOCATION

Administrative History of the Dept. of State, Vol. I
Chapter 12

RESTRICTION CODES

- (A) Closed by Executive Order 12356 governing access to national security information.
- (B) Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- (C) Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in the donor's deed of gift.

~~SECRET~~

XII. EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

A. BACKGROUND TO THE JOHNSON YEARS

The Department's educational and cultural exchange program, administered by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, is now after two decades as a world-wide program an important and continuing aspect of US foreign relations. In its exchange of outstanding men and women in academic, professional and public life, as well as students and teachers; in its presentation abroad of distinguished US performing artists; in its leadership in coordinating all government exchange activities; and in its work with international governmental organizations which conduct educational, cultural and scientific programs, the Bureau has effectively served "one of the nation's most basic foreign policy objectives -- of helping strong free societies to work together, in mutual trust

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4
NIJ 88-175
By 6-27-88 NARA. Date 9-27-88

~~SECRET~~

SERVICE SET

and understanding, on the grave issues of our time."^{1/}

In November 1963 the program was already entering its peak years. The number of foreign and US exchange professors, students, teachers and foreign leaders and specialists traveling on new grants had risen to 8,175 for the fiscal year ending in June 1964. These exchanges were carried out with over 130 countries and territories, as compared to only 84 new grantees exchanged with 22 countries in the first operational year of the world-wide program in 1947-48.

Several major events of the immediately preceding period had given the program a new unity and strength. In early 1961, an Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs had been appointed for the first time to head the program and provide a central focus for international educational and cultural affairs in the US Government. The following September the many pieces of legislation affecting educational exchange adopted since the War were brought together in a single comprehensive bill, the so-called

^{1/} Beacon of Hope, April 1963. Report to the US Congress of the US Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Fulbright-Hays Act (P.L. 87-256), under which all educational exchange programs of the Department of State today are conducted. The new Act greatly strengthened the program, gave it new scope and flexibility and for the first time gave authorization under a single piece of legislation for the use of dollars as well as foreign currencies. It also extended the authority of the Board of Foreign Scholarships to include supervision of all academic exchange conducted by the State Department with all countries.

^{2/}
In June 1962 an executive order on the administration of the new Act, had "in order to assure appropriate coordination of programs", given to the Secretary of State the task of exercising "primary responsibility for government-wide leadership and policy guidance with regard to international educational and cultural affairs." This authority was delegated to the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs ^{3/} in August 1962.

In late 1962, moreover, the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs ("CU") had been reorganized on geographic lines, chiefly to develop more effective working relationships between the Bureau and participating countries with the various geographic offices in the Department. Further, a basic review

^{2/} Executive Order No. 10034, June 25, 1962.

^{3/} Delegation of Authority No. 105, August 14, 1962.

of the sometimes controversial cultural presentations program had been made, and in early 1963 a new and more viable method of selecting individuals and groups in the performing arts had been organized to assure the choice of programs and performers not only of the highest artistic quality but of the best possible suitability for varying geographic areas and types of audiences overseas.

Finally, the first really extensive survey of the effectiveness of the Department's international exchange program for foreign grantees, prepared by the US Advisory Commission, and published as the Beacon of Hope in April 1963, had conclusively shown that the exchange program was an effective and valuable instrument not only for international education but for US foreign policy.

Notably, the Commission's survey found impressive testimony that the exchange program increases international understanding; that it has succeeded in helping dispel among foreign visitors many misconceptions and ugly stereotypes about the American people; that it is outstandingly successful in providing a valuable educational and professional experience for foreign grantees; and that it has effectively established channels of communication between the people of other countries and the United States. Other studies over the two decades had confirmed that these conclusions apply as well to the experience of American

grantees.

This is not to say there were no problems nor areas for improvement. One of the most serious was the need for improving recruitment and selection of US professors and lecturers so as to maintain a high caliber of grantees. This need had been pointed out by the US Advisory Commission as well as other interested groups in and out of the Bureau. Part of the problem was the great demand for American lecturers abroad and hence their short supply for all foreign assignments. The difficulty was most acutely felt in the developing countries to which American lecturers and scholars were less readily and traditionally drawn than to Europe.

Another problem, then becoming more acute, was the need for some coordination of the many programs and forms of exchange conducted by US agencies not only in Washington but in our Embassies abroad. While much had been done following the delegation in 1962 to the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs of responsibility for this type of coordination, the April 1963 report had pointed out that there was "still a real want of the kind of inter-agency coordination.... universally desired....Complaints of lack of coordination are most concrete at the overseas posts, but confusion in the

field usually stems from failure of coordination in Washington."^{4/}

On January 20, 1964, an Interagency Council of International Educational and Cultural Affairs (CIECA) was formed, as discussed in the following section.

With all of these developments, the Bureau by early 1964 was set to take more effective action on the educational and cultural initiatives of the President.

^{4/} Beacon of Hope, op cit.

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4

NLJ 88-175

By ug, NARA, Date 9-29-88

B. PRESIDENTIAL INITIATIVES

1. The President's Smithsonian Address, 1965

The bicentennial of the Smithsonian Institution in September 1965, to which distinguished scholars and scientists from all over the world had been invited, gave President Johnson an outstanding platform from which to announce his new initiatives in international education. His major points were:

Together we must embark on a new and a noble adventure:

First, to assist the education effort of the developing nations and the developing regions.

Second, to help our schools and universities increase their knowledge of the world and the people who inhabit it.

Third, to advance the exchange of students and teachers who travel and work outside their native lands.

Fourth, to increase the free flow of books and ideas and art, of works of science and imagination.

And, fifth, to assemble meetings of men and women from every discipline and every culture to ponder the common problems of mankind.

In all these endeavors, I pledge that the United States will play its full role.

By January, I intend to present such a program to the Congress.

In the same address the President announced the appointment of a special task force on international education "to recommend a

~~SECRET~~

SERVICE SET

broad and long-range plan of world-wide educational endeavor", specifically to implement the five basic objectives named in his speech. The Secretary of State was named chairman of the task force, whose membership consisted of the heads of those major agencies of government conducting international educational and cultural programs and of distinguished private citizens in related fields. The Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs acted on behalf of the Secretary of State to chair the regular meetings of the task force and supervise completion of the report; the Bureau provided the necessary secretariat.

5/
The report, submitted by the Secretary to the President in December, formed the underpinning of many of the basic recommendations and proposals made on February 2, 1966, in the President's message to Congress on international education, and of the International Education Act, proposed in that message and later enacted by Congress.

The recommendations in the February message for which responsibility for action rested in whole or in part either with the Bureau or with the other agencies represented in the Interagency Council chaired by the Assistant Secretary were: to increase the flow of books and other educational materials;

5/ Report of the President's Task Force on International Education, November 1965. Privileged Information.

to assist the teaching of English abroad; to stimulate conferences (and seminars) of leaders and experts; to establish binational educational foundations to improve the quality of US schools and colleges abroad; to create special programs for future leaders studying in the United States (i.e., to put greater emphasis on activities for foreign students in the US who are not sponsored by the US Government); to establish an Exchange Peace Corps ("Volunteers to America").

2. Coordination of Government Educational and Cultural Activities

The carrying out of these initiatives, as well as of other educational and cultural programs calling for interagency cooperation, was greatly facilitated by the existence of the Interagency Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs (CIECA) mentioned above.

The Council was to "focus on strengthening the coordination of educational and cultural policies for government programs which are essentially international in purpose and impact," with "priority attention.... to better communication among the agencies with programs of this kind and to more effective use of resources through the elimination of any existing overlaps or gaps." Members of the Council have included all government agencies with significant international educational and cultural exchange programs -- Agency for International Development, the Peace Corps, Department of Defense,

~~SECRET~~

Department of Health Education and Welfare, United States Information Agency, in addition to State. Representatives of other agencies act as observers to the Council -- the Bureau of the Budget, which has been particularly interested in interagency coordination, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Department of Labor, the Office of Science and Technology in the White House, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Department's Office of International Scientific and Technological Affairs.

I. Since the formation of the Council, two other steps have helped coordinate government-wide educational and cultural exchange programs and implement the President's initiatives: (1) the appointment in 1964 of a special assistant to the President with educational and cultural activities as a responsibility; and (2) the appointment within the Bureau (autumn 1966) of a Deputy Assistant Secretary for Coordination. Throughout 1963-68, the coordination of educational and cultural programs, through agreement on general guidelines and policies for exchange, and through the meshing of activities of other agencies to assure neither gaps nor overlaps, became a primary activity of the Bureau and was one of the distinctive

~~SECRET~~

SERVICE SET

features of the period. In this the Assistant Secretary, his Deputy for Coordination and the Interagency Council played a continuing part. Together they made it possible for the Bureau to take more effective action on Presidential educational and cultural initiatives.

3. Increasing the Flow of Books and Educational Materials

The need for books, especially textbooks was by this time felt in nearly all developing countries. Part of the mechanism to carry out the President's initiative on books was already in being: in October 1962 a Government Advisory Committee on International Book Programs had been established by the Secretary of State under the authority of the Fulbright-Hays Act, to review all major book programs conducted by US Government agencies overseas. This Advisory Committee is now composed of 9 private publishers, an educator and two leading librarians.

The Advisory Committee's greatest value was in the improvement of coordination, not only between the Government and the book industry and library profession, but also between the Government and multilateral organizations, notably UNESCO and the OAS, and among the various Government agencies. In July 1966 the Bureau responded to the Committee's recommendations for greater coordination

in Government programs by creating an Interagency Book Committee under the Interagency Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. This Committee, chaired by the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, with representatives from AID, HEW, the Library of Congress, the Peace Corps, the Smithsonian Institution, and USIA, provides a central place to coordinate action upon the Advisory Committee's advice.

The immediate task of the Interagency Book Committee in line with the President's initiatives was to develop a national policy statement on US international book and library activities. This, with an implementing directive, was approved by President Johnson January 4, 1967. It was designed to provide for the first time a strong base not only for US Government action, but for cooperation with private interests in the field.

The policy statement declared that the US Government "is prepared, as a major policy, to give: (1) full and vigorous support to a coordinated effort of public and private organizations to make American book and library resources more available to the developing countries; (2) encouragement and support to the establishment of viable book publishings and distributing facilities in the developing countries; and (3) active promotion of the free flow of books and other forms of recorded knowledge." It instructed all agencies

concerned with international book and library programs to assign to these a high priority. It also instructed them to coordinate their efforts with those of other pertinent Government agencies and private institutions and, under the direction of the Department of State, to cooperate with foreign governments on a bilateral or multilateral basis in the achievement of the policy's objectives. It was accompanied by a directive to all pertinent Government agencies to develop specific courses of action to carry out the three major goals, above. Responsibility for coordinating US Government book and library programs overseas was assigned to the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Subsequent action took several forms. Embassies abroad were immediately asked to review their book and library activities and report what ought to be undertaken additionally. These reports were reviewed during 1967 on a geographic basis by government and private specialists from each area, and four area task forces (Latin America, East Asia, Near East-South Asia and Africa) were appointed by the Interagency Book Committee to consider what we ought to be doing in these areas. No task force was appointed for Europe, in view of the very different prevailing conditions there compared with underdeveloped areas.

In response to the President's international education message

of February 1966, Congress in October of that year passed two long-pending pieces of implementing legislation to facilitate the free flow of information and education materials abroad. Both of these UNESCO-sponsored agreements became effective in early 1967. One was the so-called "Florence Agreement", which would remove unnecessary barriers on the importation of educational, scientific and cultural materials by the United States and other countries. The second, the so-called "Beirut Agreement", provides, on a reciprocal basis, exemptions from import duties and licenses for international shipments for audio-visual materials.

The President's support and the US adherence to these agreements were a culmination of years of activity by the US Government and private groups as well as UNESCO; and of careful US consideration of the tariff implications. In signing them, the President reasserted his belief that "knowledge has no national boundaries and that the instruments of learning should be fully and freely accessible to all."

The United States in 1967 also ratified two UNESCO-sponsored conventions concerning the international exchange of publications. These provide for the duty-free exchange of a wide range of published material, official and unofficial, between US non-profit institutions and the rest of the world, between governments, and

between governmental bodies and private institutions.

4. Assisting the Teaching of English Abroad

Efforts to coordinate English teaching programs had begun in 1957. In 1959, the then Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs set up a working group of representatives of State, ICA, DOD and USIA to formulate a general policy for English teaching programs and to insure coordination of the planning and operation of these programs both in Washington and in the field. Its recommendations were sent to the field in 1961^{6/}.

Also in 1961, the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs reconstituted the working group as a permanent interagency committee to coordinate the English-teaching programs of the several agencies. Its membership was expanded to include the Office of Education, and eventually the Peace Corps. The Committee is now under the Interagency Council.

In May 1963 US and British Government representatives had met in Washington under the chairmanship of the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, to discuss ways of working together in this area. Both governments circulated the resultant proposals for collaboration abroad.^{7/}

^{6/} Department of State Instruction CA-5900, January 12, 1961 (OFFICIAL USE ONLY).

^{7/} Department of State Instruction CA-4861, November 1, 1963
~~(CONFIDENTIAL)~~.

From November 1963 to June 1965, when a significant national policy statement on English teaching abroad was approved by the President, the Interagency Committee was engaged not only in drafting and clearing the statement, but in such other activities as surveying the English teaching programs and needs of the several agencies, developing British-American cooperation in English teaching, and arbitrating agency disputes in regard to overlapping programs.

The National Policy Statement on English teaching abroad issued in June 1965 stated that the "US Government is prepared, as a major policy, to be of active and friendly assistance to countries that desire such help in the teaching and utilization of English" It pointed out that because of its "convenience as a lingua franca", demands for help in learning English were widespread, and it directed that "each agency providing assistance to the teaching of English abroad" assign a "high priority to activities in this area". It assigned the responsibility for coordinating government efforts in this field to the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.

The memorandum instructed the State Department to ensure that the actions of the US Government "take into account...the activities

of other countries that pursue policies of assisting the teaching and use of the English language in other countries". In effect its main purpose was to promote cooperation with British representatives, specifically the British Council, in the planning and operation of the US-British programs. At least one meeting is now held annually between the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs and the Director General of the British Council.

As a result of the President's policy statement and the other initiatives, the major US agencies involved have greatly increased their English teaching activities. AID more than doubled its funds obligated in this field; USIA stepped up training of English teachers abroad in USIS-sponsored seminars by 32 percent in 1967-1968; at Defense some 100,000 foreign military students now participate in various English training programs. The Peace Corps, in January 1968, had 2,974 volunteers teaching English abroad as their primary assignment; the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs has awarded 1,012 grants to Americans and foreigners in English language and linguistics in the fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

5. Stimulating Conferences of Leaders

Largely as a result of the President's September 1965 and February 1966 messages (above), the Bureau of Educational and

Cultural Affairs put new emphasis on encouraging "meetings to ponder the common problems of mankind", and, in general, improving communication between intellectual and cultural leaders here and abroad.

Of special assistance in stimulating conferences and seminars in the United States was the President's request, in his February address, to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General "to explore ways to remove unnecessary hindrances in granting visas to guests invited from abroad". Earlier efforts to stimulate foreign participation had encountered these hindrances. Immediately following the President's message, the Departments of State and Justice jointly developed improved procedures to expedite the granting of visas for such conference guests. The chief issue was the hitherto automatic exclusion of nearly all persons invited here to conferences who at any time had been associated with the Communist Party.

The new procedures were announced in May 1966 in a joint statement released by the Departments of State and Justice ^{8/}. The new procedures went far to remove rigidities which on occasion had prevented the easy entry of distinguished international visitors to US conferences.

^{8/} Press release No. 104, May 3, 1966, Department of State

The Bureau prepared a policy guideline paper on international conferences and seminars and distributed it to members of the Inter-agency Council. It stressed that the government agencies should serve not merely as a "catalyst" but as "impresario" to such conferences; that, primarily, participants should be intellectuals and meet as equals among equals (i.e., not in a teaching seminar); and that the conferences should be "non-official" and preferably small.

In the following years through 1968 a particular effort was made to stimulate the holding of international conferences in the United States. President Johnson called for a world conference on education, and such a meeting "The International Conference on the World Crisis in Education", was held in Williamsburg, Virginia, October 5-9, 1967. Jointly sponsored by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and ten U.S. foundations, and with John W. Gardner, Secretary of HEW, and James A. Perkins, President of Cornell University as co-hosts, it was attended by 170 educational leaders from 52 countries.

The use of exchange grants helped such efforts. To one of the most important meetings, the distinguished International Congress of Orientalists, first held in the United States in

August 1967, the Bureau's exchange program brought 16 scholars from the Near and Far East. Other examples of such use of CU grants have been the sending of a group of distinguished American Negroes in the arts to the First World Festival of Negro Arts in Dakar, Senegal; sending a group of young Bolivian leaders to a Princeton seminar on "Educational Reform and Community Involvement;" sending of US urban specialists to the symposium in Kyoto on "Man and the City"; and sending of ten American and 10 foreign experts to participate in a conference in Beirut in November 1967 on "Sciences and Technology in the Developing Countries." Such conferences have been in addition to the large number of local and regional seminars arranged in many countries by the exchange program, local binational commissions, Cultural Affairs Officers and USIS, on science teaching, university administration, economic development, international law, and American Studies, etc.

In early 1967 the Interagency Council (CIECA), at the Department's initiative, stimulated interagency financing of the World List of Future International Meetings. Hitherto compiled and published by the Library of Congress, this list had long been a valuable guide to advance scheduling of important international

conferences. Shortage of funds had threatened the Library's ability to keep the list up.

6. Establishing Binational Foundations

The President in his message of February 1966 had proposed that the significant amounts of excess foreign currencies at our disposal in a number of developing nations be used "where conditions are favorable... to support Binational Educational Foundations, governed by leading citizens from the two nations" which would offer "opportunities within each country much like those afforded by major foundations in the U.S."

The first country with which this idea was seriously discussed was India. Ambassador Chester Bowles in March 1964 had made such a proposal to the Department of State as a means of using our large official rupee balances for educational, cultural, agricultural and other development activities in India.^{9/}

On March 28, during Prime Minister Gandhi's visit, President Johnson formally proposed an Indo-American foundation to be established in India "as an independent institution", and endowed with \$300 million in US-owned Indian currency.

^{9/} From New Delhi, Airgram 864, March 11, 1964 (Unclassified).

Unhappily, hostile elements in India attacked the proposal as US "cultural imperialism", and in the following acrimonious debate the project was quietly shelved, though not abandoned, "until it can be discussed on its merits".^{10/}

7. Improving US Schools Abroad

In proposing the 1966 International Education Act, President Johnson stated that US elementary and secondary schools and colleges overseas, assisted by the State Department and AID, should be showcases and should provide close contact with students and teachers of the host countries. During his Administration the State Department and AID consolidated their assistance to our overseas elementary and secondary schools; a single program was set up in the Department, in the office of the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration.

8. Creating Special Programs for Future Leaders.

Since 1963 CU has had special programs for the so-called "non-sponsored" foreign students studying in the United States - students who come with private or other sources of support rather than on US government programs. This kind of activity

^{10/} From New Delhi, Telegram 5882, October 20, 1966 (SECRET)

was first funded in FY 1963, as a direct result of new provisions in the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961 which authorized counseling and orientation services.

As of November 1963, and through FY 1966, the Bureau had a yearly budget of \$395,000 for such activities. About a fourth of this sum was used for improving overseas college counseling and guidance at points, notably Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Southeast Asia and Latin America, from which rather large numbers of foreign students were seeking entrance to US colleges and universities on their own. Also supported were improvement of orientation courses for foreign students on their arrival here, and of admissions practices, and the strengthening of campus counseling and community hospitality programs.

In FY 1967, since CU's overall budget had been cut, and since there was expectation that the new International Education Act would permit the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to take over a large part of this responsibility, the Bureau cut funds for this program nearly in half. When the Act received no appropriations from Congress, much of the cut was restored and the programs maintained.

In FY 1969 the Bureau's allocation for the non-sponsored student program was raised to \$400,000, an increase of \$40,000

over FY 1968 and the highest figure since 1963. This increase is tied in with projects heavily emphasizing the expansion and strengthening of community services for foreign students throughout the United States -- providing, for example, more home hospitality, better host family programs (with special attention to the needs of students attending junior colleges lacking dormitory space and other facilities), and a wider introduction to American social and political life.

9. Establishing an Exchange Peace Corps

President Johnson in his February 1966 message likewise proposed an "exchange peace corps":

These Volunteers to America will teach their own language and culture in our schools and colleges. They will serve in community programs alongside VISTA Volunteers. As our Peace Corps Volunteers learn while they serve, those coming to the United States will be helped to gain training to prepare them for further service when they return home.

The Peace Corps asked for authority to bring these volunteers to America. As Congress indicated that the authority already existed in the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961, responsibility for the new program was assigned in August 1966 to CU in the Department.

There was agreement that the program should start modestly, as a pilot program. Discussions with interested countries

resulted in selection in the spring of 1967 of 64 volunteers by binational panels in 12 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. They arrived here in July. Four-week training periods, arranged at Boston, Brattleboro, and Los Angeles, were designed to precede one or two years' work in American schools and community social service agencies.

The program is financed from three main sources: the foreign governments, which pay international transportation for their volunteers; the Department of State exchange program, which provides the training, domestic travel and professional support; and local US schools and agencies, which pay the volunteers' living costs in return for their services.

The "Group I" volunteers, after their training and orientation, went into areas in every part of the US. They did such work as starting a credit union on a Cherokee reservation, developing community participation in clean-up and sanitation programs in East Harlem, acting as "resource" persons on area studies in local schools, serving as recreation leaders and organizing day care centers in impoverished rural and urban areas.

Budget reductions for the Bureau as a whole prevented expansion of the program in 1968-69, and for a time there was

doubt that it would continue. However, it was agreed in June 1968 to continue at a modest level; 26 of the "Group I" volunteers were given extensions of stay and 41 new volunteers were brought here as "Group II".

While there were trials and errors in the first pilot year of the program, an evaluation prepared in June 1968 concluded that "the results of the program were generally outstanding, particularly in consideration of the relatively small expenditure of Federal funds". The project "was successful in meeting its objectives: 1) of providing needed skills, experience, and viewpoints to America, 2) of providing participants with enriching experience which they can take home to their own countries, and 3) in contributing to the understanding of peoples, cultures and nations." 11/

10. The June 1968 Conference on Educational and Cultural Affairs.

In the spring of 1968 at the initiative of the White House a conference was called of some 50 leaders in education, communications, the private foundations and the arts, for review and consultation on the government's educational and cultural programs.

11/ An Evaluation of the Volunteers to America Program, 1967-1968
A Report Prepared for the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, U.S. Department of State, June 1968 by the School of Education Center for International Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

~~SECRET~~

The Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs was chairman of the one-day meeting, held June 25. Its purpose was to explore how, particularly in view of the Bureau's recent severe budget cut, the US Government could maximize its resources through its overseas educational, cultural and book programs, and what role the private sector could play. With a clear affirmation of faith in the value of the programs, the conference emphasized the dependence of educational and cultural activities - both for stability and for growth - on a broader base of public understanding and support. There was a recurring recommendation from private sector participants that the private sector needed to become much more directly involved in finding the solutions.

Two important long-range proposals were made for securing more adequate and continuing Congressional support for educational and cultural programs (see below).

C. OTHER INITIATIVES and PROGRAMS

1. The 1966 Symposium

President Johnson's February 1966 address helped stimulate actions to improve and strengthen the exchange program and to add to the State Department's coordinating activities through CU.

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4
NIJ 88-175
By , NARA, Date 9-27-88

SERVICE SET

Focusing particular attention on the future character of exchange was the September 1966 Symposium on "Diversity and Interdependence Through International Education", which commemorated the 20th anniversary of the world-wide educational exchange program. The Symposium, held at Columbia University, was sponsored by the Board of Foreign Scholarships.

The distinguished US and foreign scholars present made clear their view that the setting in which the educational exchange program began in 1946 had greatly changed, and that the program itself should have new directions and emphases in addition to its long-honored goal of increasing mutual understanding.

Appropriately for the opening year of a third decade of such exchange, 1967 saw the introduction of some of these new directions for the program. Three were specifically singled out: first, to point more exchange toward "interlacing" of educational systems, that is, toward establishing long-term relationships between academic leaders and institutions here and abroad; second, to stimulate and facilitate broader and more systematic communications between intellectuals and scholars; third, to cooperate with other countries, especially those in the process of development, in

strengthening their educational systems and institutions concurrently with promotion of international education in the United States.

2. Long-Range Planning Teams

To help establish long-term academic relationships abroad, the Bureau began the experimental introduction in late 1966 of long-range planning of educational exchange with selected countries. Beginning in November, separate teams of distinguished American scholars and educators joined with counterparts in 8 countries: Brazil, Peru, Finland, Yugoslavia, Thailand, Korea, Colombia and the Philippines. Similar teams were designated for Greece and India, but the political climate in these countries in mid-1967 led to their indefinite postponement.

The teams have been an experiment in an overall effort to bring the American and foreign academic communities more fully into the planning of exchange and to take a fresh look at the educational exchange program after its 20 years and more of world-wide operation. The interest was to achieve a closer identification of common educational interests, and to build long-term associations with US and foreign scholars and scholarly institutions.

Many of the recommendations made by the teams have had a valuable effect in pointing to some new priorities. Recommendations

of special interest are: the need to stress the building up of educational institutions abroad, especially in key departments; the need to upgrade the quality of foreign research and engage in more joint binational research; the need for more short-term US lecturers who can concentrate on meetings and seminars with foreign colleagues and on research rather than full-time classroom teaching.

3. Coping with the "Brain Drain"

The Bureau, and especially the Interagency Council, became increasingly involved with the issue raised by the migration of foreign talent and skills to America, the so-called "brain drain". The issue of earliest interest to the Congress, to the public, the US Government, and to many European countries as well as developing nations, was the possibility that educational exchange programs might be used, or misused, as a channel for such migration.

The Bureau, therefore, in collaboration with the Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, made a study of the problem as it related to official exchange visitors (holders of "J" visas), and found that the proportion of all such visitors, whether sponsored by government or private sources, who failed to return home - that is, who received waivers permitting them to

remain in the United States, was very low. However, a directive, approved by the Interagency Council, and sent to US posts abroad in early 1965, recommended that more stringent controls be established to guard against any possible future use of exchange-visitor programs as channels for immigration.^{12/}

Public and official awareness of debate about the brain drain increased sharply by 1967 and it became a leading subject of discussion and activity of the Interagency Council.

Since there was then very little precise information here or abroad on the migration of skilled people to the United States, an urgent task was that of collecting and analyzing all available data. The Council, prepared in February 1967 a roundup^{13/} of this information which constituted the first government-wide study of its kind ever made here. Although the facts were still incomplete, among the significant findings were:

- that the flow of skilled and talented people to the United States appeared to be a delimited problem;
- less than 10 percent of fiscal 1966 immigrants to the United States were professional or skilled people;

^{12/} Foreign Affairs Manual Circular No. 292, March 24, 1965

^{13/} "Some Facts and Figures on the Migration of Talent and Skills," published in March 1967 by the Interagency Council.

~~SECRET~~

— that government exchange programs were not responsible for a "brain drain"; less than 1 percent of all government-sponsored "exchange visitors" adjusted their status so as to remain in the United States; less than 3 percent of all such visitors sponsored by either government or private sources remained here. Although "non-sponsored students - that is, students who came to the United States on their own - were more likely to stay, less than 9 percent adjusted their visa status to that of permanent resident.

— that the most serious part of the "drain" involved the recruitment of trained mature adults - scientists and other professionals - by American industry, universities, hospitals and research organizations.

— that the majority (about 70 percent) of skilled and talented immigrants came from the developed, not the developing nations.

In the light of these findings, members of the Council recommended that the United States should not place statutory limitations on the freedom of entry of people from other countries, although non-legislative steps should be taken. An appropriate role for the US Government, it was agreed, would be to assist those

~~SECRET~~

SERVICE SET

~~SECRET~~

foreign countries, particularly any developing countries affected, by such means as: helping them to recruit their skilled people in the United States for special job opportunities back at home; helping them develop more careful manpower and surveys which would show up job needs and shortages; enlisting the cooperation of US business firms abroad to recruit nationals trained in the United States; and helping educational and research institutions abroad develop sufficiently to make more local research and job opportunities available for talented and skilled nationals. Many Government and private agencies have already begun to move in these directions.

These findings and views were reported before Congressional committees by the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, and other officials.

The Interagency Council, in a further effort to get precise information, also worked with the US Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) to develop plans for annual reporting on the migration to the United States of the skilled and talented, so that for the first time a regular indicator of such movement can be available. The first issue of the indicator was published by INS,

~~SECRET~~

SERVICE SET

with supplementary funds provided by the Bureau, in early autumn 1968.

The heavy migration of doctors and other medical personnel to the United States has been a matter of particular study. In late June 1967 the Council asked the US Public Health Service and private medical organizations to help develop criteria and standards for the desirable duration of effective training of foreign medical personnel in the United States. A workshop on this problem was held in mid-October 1968 under the auspices of the American Medical Association, with private and public medical and hospital agencies.

A non-governmental international conference of economists from both advanced and developing nations to assess "brain drain" problems was held in Lausanne in August 1967 on the initiative of the US Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. The University of Connecticut, with a grant from the State Department (CU), cooperated in facilitating the conference. One of its main conclusions was that "in a positive sense, the brain drain (from a nation) can be a primary catalyst to stimulate (that) nation to initiate change and self-regeneration, and an incentive to modernize".^{14/}

^{14/} The Brain Drain, edited by Walter Adams, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1968.

3. Exchange and the Civil Rights Struggle

With the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Council (CEICA) established a policy that "no foreign student sponsored financially, in whole or in part, by the US Government, shall be placed in an institution which is not complying with Title IV of the Act".^{15/} This policy has served as a guideline not only for government agencies but also for a large number of private organizations that sponsor foreign students.

4. Improving Grantee Quality

Fresh attacks were made during the mid-1960s on the problem of assuring participation of scholars of the highest possible caliber in the exchange program. This was particularly important in the case of American lecturers for the developing countries. In 1963 the Board of Foreign Scholarships took some new measures to improve the quality of lecturers - it authorized the award of short term grants to attract distinguished senior scholars who are generally not available for a full academic year. In 1965 the Board provided for year-round recruitment of US professors rather than complete reliance on open competition, since too few top-quality professors had been applying, especially for posts outside of Europe.

^{15/} Foreign Affairs Manual Circular No. 360, September 24, 1965.

The Conference Board of Associated Research Councils was also requested to conduct studies on improving selection, recruitment and quality. As a result, in 1967 the quality of applicants for lecturer grants showed improvement for the first time in several years, and the upturn continued. A record number of applications was reported for 1967-68, an essential factor in assuring a final choice of quality grantees.

Also in an effort to improve quality of grantees, in December 1963 the administrative structure of the American Specialists program was modified to provide for selection of all candidates by an inter-agency committee. In 1965 a program of special recruitment of American Specialists was instituted, with a senior officer assigned to interview prominent professional people and encourage them to serve.

American Specialists chosen during 1963-1968 included outstanding men and women in various fields, such as Supreme Court justices, deans and professors at leading universities, choreographers and drama directors of national renown, conductors of important symphony orchestras, Olympic champions, and Pulitzer prizewinners in journalism and literature.

5. Development of the Planning, Programming and Budgeting System

In 1967 the Bureau was directed to establish the Planning, Programming and Budgeting System (the so-called "PPBS") - currently being set

up on a government-wide basis to provide a bridge between planning, programming and budget procedures and an instrument for more effective control and coordination of world-wide programs. The Bureau has been the first within the Department of State to implement the directive. In 1968 it analyzed and projected some twelve country programs experimentally, using the PPB approach. In addition, an effort was made to present a world-wide project budget.

As a result of Bureau of the Budget guidance, a new approach was taken with respect to PPBS for the FY-1970 program. The first step was for the African area of the Bureau to develop an in-depth PPBS model systematically relating its program proposals to US foreign policy objectives. This effort was closely coordinated with the Department's Bureau of African Affairs. The Bureau of the Budget carefully reviewed the African model and decided that the approach should be expanded to all regions. Regional program memoranda were then prepared for the other areas and presented to the Bureau as the basis for the FY 1970 budget justification. It was anticipated that the system thus developed would serve as the basis for future budget presentations.

6. Guidelines for US Scientific Exchanges

In late 1967, the Bureau took the leadership in developing, in cooperation with the Department's Office of International Scientific

and Technological Affairs and other US agencies, guidelines for international scientific exchange programs. The final paper was issued to all US posts abroad on September 1968. Asserting that it is US policy to encourage international scientific and technological exchange programs, the paper stresses the long-range objectives, i. e., that all such exchange should emphasize development of long-term cooperative relationships between scientists, and the strengthening of scientific training and competence in countries abroad. Mindful of the issue of "brain-drain", the guidelines also asked that "US agency management of exchange programs should be designed to avoid the permanent movement of scientific and technical personnel to the US when such movement would constitute significant loss for the developing nations."^{16/}

7. Working With International Organizations

While most of CU's work involves bilateral educational and cultural activities, the Bureau maintains for the Department a continuing liaison with UNESCO and other intergovernmental agencies that have multilateral educational or cultural programs, gives the Department policy-guidance on US participation in them, and

^{16/} Department of State CA-10929, joint message from State/AID/USIA to all diplomatic posts, September 17, 1968 (UNCLASSIFIED).

helps shape and guide the preparation of their programs.

One of UNESCO's major problems during the 1963-68 period has been striking a balance between its traditional function of intellectual cooperation and its newer involvement in economic and social development programs. This problem has been accentuated as new and (usually) under-developed countries have joined UNESCO.

In 1967, for example, the Bureau helped UNESCO develop its new program in the field of family planning and population, and assisted in the selection of a leading American in the field, Dr. Bernard Berelson, Vice President of the Population Council, to consult with UNESCO. It also helped UNESCO shape its new program for the promotion and wider understanding of public international law.

The Bureau has also helped UNESCO to put increasing emphasis on the social and physical sciences, on communications and education. Through its representatives to UNESCO it has stressed the need for long-range planning, particularly in the field of education, and urged continuing evaluation of UNESCO projects.

The Bureau helped get other special advisors and consultants for UNESCO programs and cooperated with other State Department officers in recruiting able Americans for regular professional service in UNESCO. As of June 30, 1968 there were 137 American

professionals working in UNESCO and in its programs, as compared with 117 in June 30, 1966.

The Bureau was also instrumental in helping UNESCO develop a realistic policy on illiteracy, urging a carefully planned series of experimental projects to create methods, techniques and materials for full-scale literacy programs. This experimental type of program was adopted in September 1965 at a world congress on literacy convened in Iran under UNESCO auspices at the initiative of the Shah.

Also under CU guidance the United States took a major part in UNESCO's international campaign for the preservation of the Nubian monuments threatened by the construction of the Aswan Dam.

In 1966 the United States played a leading role in two very important meetings from which emerged a historic Recommendation on the Status of Teachers. The first of these meetings was the joint ILO-UNESCO Meeting of Experts on the Status of Teachers, held in Geneva, January 17-28, 1966. The US Representative served as chairman of a drafting committee which prepared a draft recommendation on the status of teachers. At an Intergovernmental Conference held in Paris September 21-October 5, 1966, the recommendation was unanimously adopted and now stands as a model set of guidelines for raising

the economic and social status of teachers to the level of other professionals, thus benefiting education as a whole.

In addition to UNESCO-centered activities, the Bureau has supported educational and cultural programs of other inter-governmental organizations. For example, with CU's guidance, the US Government in 1967 lent its support, through SEATO and in consultation with the South-East Asian Ministers of Education Secretariat, to the founding of the Asian Institute of Technology in Bangkok.

As the US Government over the past 2 years has worked with other member countries of the Organization of American States (OAS) toward the strengthening of the Inter-American system, the Bureau has worked closely with the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs on strengthening the Inter-American Cultural Council (IACC) in the OAS. The Bureau also participated actively in two inter-American committees in drafting proposals for programs to follow up on initiatives in education, science and technology and culture taken at the Punta del Este meeting in April 1967 by the American Chiefs of State. Agreement to establish such programs was made in early 1968 at a meeting of the IACC in Venezuela. In June 1968, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs (for Program Operations) was elected the US member of the IACC's new

executive committee which is to promote and guide the new programs.

At the Bureau's request, the State Department in 1967 initiated an overall review of US policy toward UNESCO to take account of the great changes which have occurred in the 20 years since its founding. This confidential report, the first to be prepared by the Department's Policy Planning Council on the US position vis-a-vis an inter-governmental agency, deals frankly with UNESCO programming and organizational problems and emphasizes means for more effective US participation.^{17/}

The US National Commission for UNESCO, for which the Bureau provides the Secretariat, acts as a link between UNESCO and the American people. It is composed, as Congress specified in establishing the Commission in 1946, of representatives of 60 national non-governmental organizations, plus public appointees to make up a commission of 100 members. The Commission played a specific and important role over the past three years in promoting UNESCO's greater emphasis on the social sciences, especially in its programs for the developing countries. During the period 1963-68 it has prepared 10 publications for general distribution and held 4 national conferences and 10 seminars and symposia on the programs, potential and achievements of UNESCO. In 1965 it began a self-study,

Department of State
17/ National Policy Paper on UNESCO, July 17, 1968 (~~CONFIDENTIAL~~)

~~SECRET~~

completed in 1967, whose main recommendations were a fuller involvement of US private sector and non-governmental organizations in the Commission's work, and establishment of closer and more ^{18/} timely advisory liaison with US officials on UNESCO programs.

8. The East-West Center

"To promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training and research", Congress in May 1960 authorized the establishment in Hawaii of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, more familiarly known as the East-West Center.

The only US graduate institution which receives its major support from the State Department, the Center was formally dedicated on May 9, 1961 by (then) Vice President Johnson, one of the "fathers" of the Center. As majority leader, he had introduced the necessary legislation to the Senate and played a vigorous role in its adoption by Congress.

In his dedicatory address, the Vice President had said: "To this Center we shall bring the wise men of the West and invite the wise men of the East... (so) that many generations of young scholars will learn the wisdom of the two worlds united here and to use that

^{18/} Getting America Behind UNESCO, the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, June 1968. Unclassified.

~~SECRET~~

wisdom for the purposes and ends of mankind's highest aspirations for peace, justice and freedom".

Three institutes were set up to administer the Center's program:

1) the Institute for Student Interchange, to provide grants to US and Asian graduate students for field study and study at the University of Hawaii; 2) the Institute for Technical Interchange, to concentrate on short term technical training for adults from the Pacific Islands, the US Trust Territory and Asian nations bordering the Pacific; and 3) the Institute of Advanced Projects, to provide grants to senior scholars, many of whom are government officials of their countries, for research and publication at the doctoral and post-doctoral level. By mid-1963 more than 1,600 students, technicians and scholars had already participated in and benefited from the Center's grant programs.

An East-West Center Press, established in 1962 as part of the Center to stimulate the flow of ideas between East and West through the interchange of books, had already published its first two books. An Asian Studies program, an English Language Institute and an American Studies program were being offered by the University of Hawaii for the Center's grantees.

The need for clarification of the Center's responsibilities to the University, to Hawaii, and to the Federal Government in terms of its national mission had, however, emerged by the fall of 1963.

In view of Congressional concern over the Department's active interest in and financial support of the Center, the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs had requested the US Advisory Commission to conduct a survey.

The study, issued January 9, 1964, prefaced its recommendations with praise. It concluded that "wise men have indeed come to the Center and contributed importantly to the prestige of the entire program... Barely three years old, the East-West Center has made a remarkable record of developing cultural, technical and educational interchange in the countries it serves....The distinctive living and working atmosphere...constitutes cultural interchange between East and West at its very best".

The study's major recommendations were 1) continued close ties with the University of Hawaii; 2) Federal commitment of indefinite long-term basic budgetary support; and 3) appointment of a National Review Board as an advisory group to represent the national interest and review the programs and operation of the Center.

The Board was created February 24, 1965. Its first report, in February 1967, recommended increased cooperation between the Center which administers the grants, and the University which provides the education for the students and grants degrees, and the construction of a much needed library. The report also asked for improvement of

recruitment and selection processes of grantees, greater involvement of foreign governments through cost-sharing as partial financial support, and reorganization of the East-West Center Press.

By the end of fiscal year 1968 more than 9,000 students, technicians and scholars from 33 countries had participated in the Center's programs. It had come to be recognized as an important center for field training for Asian conditions. The Center's training program had developed a corps of skilled technicians in the Pacific Islands, able to deal with new methods of tropical agriculture and public health in solving the problems in that area. Because of the Center's experience with problem-oriented research and its unique location and character, AID now contracts with the Center to train both American and Asians for Asian development programs. In July 1968 AID announced a Federal grant of \$1 million for a special research and training program on the population problems of Asia and the Pacific.

The East-West Center Press is serving an increasingly important function. Its three major activities are the import of Asian books and translations revised and reprinted for marketing in the West; the export of American scholarly paperback reprints for Asia; and the publishing of original works, most of them written at the Center. During fiscal year 1968 the Press issued 11 publications, of which 7

~~SECRET~~

were originals and 4 were imports. Since the establishment of the Center the Press has issued a total of 70 publications.

In short, the East-West Center is now recognized as a symbolic meeting place, an ideal crossroads, for international visitors as well as conferences and symposia. President Johnson recognized this symbolism when he delivered there the first address of his East-Asian and Pacific tour in the fall of 1966 and made the first official proposal for a World Conference on Education to be held in the United States the following year.

Financial support is provided through annual Congressional appropriations to the Department of State, administered through the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. Over the past five years, the Center has received an annual appropriation of between \$5 and \$6 million.

D. CULTURAL PRESENTATIONS AND SPORTS

1. Cultural Presentations

In the fall of 1963, the Bureau's cultural presentations program, which sends performing artists abroad, had begun again after a suspension of nearly a year. The suspension had been ordered by the Assistant Secretary to provide time for a serious review, by a special committee designated by the US Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, of the whole approach

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4

NJ 88-175

By isj NARA. Date 9-26-88~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4

NJ 90-247By isj NARA. Date 1-16-91

SERVICE SET

~~SECRET~~

and operation of the program. The study group was headed by Roy E. Larsen, Chairman of the Executive Committee of Time, Inc., then Vice-Chairman of the Commission.

The review group had faced some problems frankly. While in the 8 years since the program had started it had done a "remarkably effective job (in)... reveal(ing) the breadth and depth and vitality of American cultural achievement", some "critical questions had been raised about the specifics of the program and its policies and implementation". Pressures had mounted "from a number of sources, including posts, for attractions with primarily entertainment rather than cultural values. There were many requests, for instance, for variety shows to offset similar Soviet presentations".

Known as the Larsen-Wolfe report, the study was approved by the (then) Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Lucius D. Battle, who later commented:

The report marked a decisive turning point in the program. First, it recognized, and sanctioned, the gradual emergence of the program from its original competitive character: when it was launched as the "President's Special Program" in 1954, it was in effect a response to the Soviet cultural offensive. After 8 years, it had matured enough to merit a higher and more difficult challenge. Messrs. Larsen and Wolfe suggested a new - and, I think, admirably expressed - statement of purpose..."to reflect abroad the state of the performing arts in America, both in terms of creative natural vitality and the desire and capacity of a free people to ^{19/} support the development of a flourishing national culture".

^{19/} Exporting the Performing Arts, by Lucius D. Battle, Foreign Service Journal, February, 1964.

~~SECRET~~

By the end of the fiscal year 1963, the major recommendations of the report had been acted upon. First, the Department assumed full responsibility for direct management of all phases of the program in contrast with the former arrangement, whereby a major part of the management was handled outside the Government under contract. Second, expert artistic counsel was provided directly to the Department by a revitalized and expanded Advisory Committee on the Arts and by its panels, whose responsibility was to nominate performing groups and individuals for the program. Finally, a formal policy of long-range planning enabled programs to be projected as much as three years ahead. These new arrangements gave the program "a stability and sense of direction that had not been previously reached...improved management and a consistently high standard of excellence." Artistic excellence was designated as the "preeminent criterion for selecting performing artists to represent the United States overseas and responsibility for artistic judgment rests completely with panels of experts".^{20/}

In the first full year of operations after the reorganization some 620 artists officially performed abroad for us in 363 cities in 77 countries. These included large ballet and dance companies, symphony orchestras and choral singing groups.

In October 1965, the Assistant Secretary developed some new

^{20/} Cultural Presentations Program of the U.S. Department of State, July 1, 1963-June 30, 1964. Annual Report to the Congress and the Public Advisory Committee on the Arts, February 1965.

guidelines for the program. In a letter to the Advisory Committee on the Arts he proposed a new emphasis on small performing groups of four to five persons rather than large ensembles - the symphony orchestras and dance companies - which formed so much of the program in the past. The letter also recommended that the programs be chosen to make a stronger appeal to young audiences abroad.

In part the decision to use smaller groups was due to the high cost of sending large orchestral and dance groups abroad. But of equal importance was the conviction, resulting from earlier experience overseas, that smaller groups could be more usefully and flexibly programmed, especially in the developing countries. Small groups also make it possible to put more emphasis on informal educational and personal contacts at universities and elsewhere, to go outside the big metropolitan centers, to provincial cities rarely in touch with US cultural life, and to adapt to the interests and cultural levels of many diverse countries and areas and to young people. In 1966 special subcommittees on folk music and jazz were formed, to recommend groups of this kind so as to appeal to youth abroad.

The varied bill of fare of cultural presentations from 1963 through 1968 has included chamber music, folk singers, choral and jazz groups, and student music and drama troupes, as well as

individual artists.

A severe reduction in budget for cultural presentations in FY 1967, down over 40 percent from the preceding fiscal year, reinforced this shift to smaller groups. The program was supplemented by "picking up" performing groups and individual artists already touring abroad under commercial or private auspices, and, by providing some financing, having them appear for the Department under special circumstances. By these means the Bureau was able to present nearly as many (if not as large) performing groups as in the previous year and even to have presentations appear in a few more countries.

For FY 1969, the cultural presentation program budget was further reduced by 25 percent to \$1.2 million, or less than half of what it had been in FY 1964. By even greater emphasis on sending smaller groups, on shorter tours and again on "picking up" groups touring under other auspices, the number of groups sent overseas is however being maintained at about the general level of FY 1968.

A special effort however was made throughout all of 1968 to provide outstanding US cultural presentations to the Cultural Olympiad held in conjunction with the Olympic Games in Mexico City. With some supplementary private support, the Bureau was able to assure participation of two leading modern dance ensembles, a

New Orleans jazz group, and three groups of folk singers, one of these an academic folk song and dance company of young people, and a distinguished string quartet.

2. Sports

The Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961 authorized tours abroad by performing athletes as well as artists. Under this program individual athletes and sports groups have been sent abroad for exhibition games and matches, as well as coaching activities.

In 1963, the Department appointed a special assistant for athletic programs to serve as advisor to the Assistant Secretary. That August, this advisor became chairman of the Interagency Committee on International Athletics by executive order, and acted as staff director of the Advisory Panel on International Athletics set up under the Act. In mid-1968, athletic presentations became part of the Bureau's cultural presentations program.

From 1963 through 1967, the budget for sending sports teams and leading athletes abroad ran at about \$250,000 a year. This amount supported visits abroad of about 10 groups a year to 25-30 countries. In FY 1968 the budget for sports was greatly reduced - by 42 percent - to \$160,000, and for FY 1969, further to \$120,000. There was also a sharp reduction made for FY 1969 in the number of American specialists in sports (chiefly coaches)

being sent abroad, in part due to Congressional doubt as to their usefulness.^{21/} These cuts required reorientation of governmental programs of athletic presentations abroad, so that the government now has a supplementary rather than a principal role in this activity.

Partly because of reduced budget and partly as a means of increasing the international scope of sports exchanges, efforts were made throughout 1968 to interest major business firms and private foundations and associations in financing US athletic presentations abroad. In the Olympic Games of 1968 in Mexico City, private business, municipalities and private foundations joined to underwrite all major costs of American young people's attendance at the Olympic Camp for World Youth, held concurrently with the Games. Private industry also gave support in 1968 to inter-country sports activities and visits of American athletes to Central America.

Two events in recent years accented the important place of the Department in international sports programs. In December 1967 the athletic advisor was elected a member of the US Olympic Committee Board of Directors. In March 1968, the Secretary of State was made a member of the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports

^{21/} Hearings, Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives. Part 2. March 1968.

in recognition of the potential role of sports in foreign affairs.

E. EFFECT OF INTERNATIONAL
CRISES ON EXCHANGE

The major political crises of the 1963-68 period inevitably had their repercussions on the exchange program.

1. The India-Pakistan War

On September 6, 1965 hostilities broke out between India and Pakistan. While the exchange program in India was not affected, on September 13 the American Ambassador in Pakistan suggested that all academic grantees leave Pakistan immediately.

Ten such grantees assigned to Pakistan had already arrived in Karachi. The Department immediately began contacting embassies and commissions in other NEA countries in an attempt to find placements for these. By the end of September all of the nine grantees who chose to be reassigned had placements; the tenth, who was a renewal grantee already in Pakistan, chose to remain in Lahore.

2. The Arab-Israeli War

In June 1967, when as a result of the Arab-Israeli six-day war the UAR, Syria, Iraq, and Yemen broke diplomatic relations with the United States, all Americans, including grantees, were evacuated and exchange programs suspended. New American grantees were offered the choice of reassignment or of cancellation of their grants. It was agreed in the Department that Arab grantees in the United States

SECRET

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4

NJ 90-247

By mg NARA. Date 1-16-91

SERVICE SET

would be permitted to remain to complete their study program, but ^{22/} no new grants for these countries could be provided. The program with Israel was barely disturbed; most US grantees in Israel remained there. Some Israeli grantees in the United States rushed home for military service.

By late summer 1967, CU programs with Jordan and Lebanon were resumed. In late 1967 and early 1968 middle-ranking UAR officials and educators began to state informally that CU programs should be considered distinct from politics and resumed. It was reported that the UAR officials concerned had "never considered UAR-US cultural relations to be severed but only that certain programs had been ^{23/} suspended". The subject was reviewed within the Department, but by late summer 1968 the program was still in suspension despite revival of several other, US governmental and private, cultural activities in the UAR. Cultural relations with Iraq, Syria and Yemen, however, have not been resumed.

Among the African nations affected by the Middle East crisis, Algeria, Mauritania and the Sudan broke relations with the United States; but in Algeria and Sudan "cultural" relations were explicitly reserved and American Cultural Affairs Officers remained at their posts. Students and trainees from these countries who were then

^{22/} Memorandum, D.N. Batson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, to Assistant Secretaries Lucius D. Battle and Joseph Palmer, 2nd, June 13, 1967 (CONFIDENTIAL).

^{23/} Airgram to the Department of State from the American Interests Section, Spanish Embassy, Cairo, January 16, 1968 (UNCLASSIFIED)

studying in the United States were, under the same agreement cited above, enabled to continue their programs and, in cases of special merit, received renewals of grants.

3. The Viet-Nam War

The war in Viet-Nam has had two kinds of repercussions on the exchange program.

One was to raise questions as to the feasibility of continued academic exchanges in view of the disturbed conditions in the area.

In 1967, the Viet-Nam fellowship program for US graduate students was terminated, primarily because our Embassy in Saigon saw little value in it under prevailing conditions. In the spring of 1968 the Board of Foreign Scholarships informed the Secretary of State that the Board's concern "runs both to whether these individuals (recruited American lecturers and teachers) can perform a useful scholarly function and whether the risk to personal safety is such that the Board should not ask private citizens to consider such assignments at this time".^{24/}

The Secretary replied by letter on June 3 that "our Embassy in Saigon strongly reaffirms the need and feasibility of carrying on an academic program during 1968-69. The feasibility of such a program is underlined by the current presence in Viet-Nam of

^{24/} Letter from John Hope Franklin, Chairman, Board of Foreign Scholarships, to the Secretary of State, April 12, 1968.

350 French elementary, secondary and university teachers". The Secretary's letter also stated that the Embassy placed "highest priority" on the teaching of English at the University of Saigon. At the Board's regular meeting in early June it voted to continue academic programs and await specific program proposals from Embassy Saigon.

Other forms of exchange with Viet-Nam, such as the US visit of some 25 Vietnamese legislators in the summer of 1968, continued during the war period.

The other issue raised by the Viet-Nam War was that of the propriety of anti-war protest by exchange grantees. While only five specific instances of such protest ever actually arose (four with US student grantees abroad, and one with a US professor), the issue of the academic freedom of grantees, i.e., their freedom to disagree with the policies of their government, had been a subject of discussion from 1965 onward. A significant exchange of correspondence on the subject between the Board and various members of the academic community was published in the fall of 1966, in an article in the quarterly journal Exchange by Oscar Handlin, then Chairman of the Board.

In 1967-68 the issue centered on the degree to which Americans while abroad on US Government grants could publicly disagree with US Vietnamese policy without invoking the Board's long-standing

policy on grantee conduct, and specifically the termination clause. This clause cited, among other grounds for revocation of a grant, "engaging in acts likely to give offense to the host country (and) ^{25/}engaging in political... activities."

In late 1967 the Board adopted a statement on the rights and obligations of grantees, which, with some modifications, was subsequently incorporated in the regular guidance paper provided to all grantees: "Terms and Conditions of Award for American Grantees". These terms and conditions stress that, while grantees as private citizens retain "the rights of such citizens to the personal and intellectual freedom generally accepted under the US constitutional system and by the educational community...individual grantees are responsible for protecting the non-political character of the program during their grants". Grantees who "make political statements abroad or who engage in activities with political connotations... should be aware that such activities are incompatible with the ^{26/}objectives of the program".

4. The Reactions of Congress

The total funds made available by Congress for the exchange program as a whole, not only for direct exchanges but also for

^{25/} Board of Foreign Scholarships Policy Statement, Section 638, revised August 15, 1967.

^{26/} CA-10282, August 19, 1968. Unclassified.

cultural presentations, aid to American-sponsored schools abroad and other programs, reached their high point in FY 1964. In that year total funds available came to \$56.9 million. They continued at roughly this level through FY 1966, i.e., during the period of the President's call for major initiatives in international educational and cultural affairs. In FY 1966, indeed, the Congressional appropriation alone reached its highest point in the program's 20-years existence - \$53 million.

In FY 1967, however, an 11 percent cut (\$6 million) was sustained in direct appropriations. As a result of this reduced budget, the Bureau sharply cut the amounts allowed for the presentation of performing arts and artists abroad and for such special educational and cultural projects as the support to overseas institutions for American and foreign studies. All categories of exchange grants experienced some reduction. The direct appropriation for FY 1968 was further cut, about 7 percent.

The FY 1967 and FY 1968 appropriation cuts reflected the growing concern of Congress for budgetary reductions. In its report on the FY 1969 appropriation bill, the House Appropriations Committee stated that "the majority of the Committee felt that this educational and cultural exchange was an area in which substantial reductions could be made in view of the present financial situation and also in view of the efforts to discourage private citizens from

traveling abroad at their own expense". In addition, there was criticism of some of the Americans chosen to participate in the American Specialist program.^{27/} As a result, the House Appropriations Committee executed a major slash in the exchange program's FY 1969 appropriation. They authorized \$30 million - 31 percent below the figure for FY 1968. This cut was later characterized as "entirely too drastic" by the House Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman himself, who said that he did "not agree with the majority of the committee" on this matter.^{28/} While the Senate agreed to restore some of the funds, the final budget authorized for the FY 1969 educational and cultural exchange program was \$31 million, or 29% below that of the preceding year. This meant that the total budget had been cut nearly in half since its high point in 1964.

Since the House cut for FY 1969 was in part related to Congressional concern to reduce foreign travel by Americans in the light of the adverse balance of payments situation, the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, in appealing before the Senate for a modest restoration of funds, indicated that the Bureau would reduce funds programmed for

^{27/} Report No. 1468, May 24, 1968, House of Representatives, p. 8

^{28/} Congressional Record H4330, May 28, 1968.

American grantees going abroad by approximately 67 percent, and for foreign grantees coming to the United States by 22 percent or more, and all other activity by 19 percent.^{29/} In preparing its program for FY 1969, this general pattern has been followed, with the decision made to sustain all programs, even at a reduced level, rather than to discontinue any one of them.

The steady decline in funds available for the educational and cultural exchange programs of the US Government after 1966 has been protested by both the Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs and the Board of Foreign Scholarships, as well as by private educational and cultural organizations and individuals.

The Advisory Commission in its annual report to Congress in February 1968 deplored the fact that the "success of these programs did not breed commensurate success in the levels of financial support for them" and cited the "urgent need ... to move against the tide of retrenchment in this area where the advantages are so plainly evident at such relatively low costs". Vice-Chairman James R. Roach of the Board of Foreign Scholarships, in a letter of June 10, 1968, to Assistant Secretary Re, asserted "a strong objection to plans to let the American grantee portion of the Fulbright program absorb such a large part of the budget cut."

The June 25 White House-sponsored conference to review and discuss

^{29/} Hearings, Senate Committee on Appropriations, June 4, 1968.

the government's international educational and cultural affairs put considerable emphasis on the problems of declining Congressional support of the program and the role that the private sector could play in providing supplementary support. While it was conceded that there is much the private sector could do, and some valuable suggestions were made, two significant conclusions were drawn by featured speakers at the Conference. The first was from the Special Assistant to the President, S. Douglass Cater, Jr., one of whose major concerns was international educational and cultural programs:

We do exist today in a siege mentality with the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the State Department. It has received a major slash in the House Appropriations Committee...(Other international education programs are) also under fire (or) were not funded.

The first lesson I think that needs to be drawn from this is that Presidential initiative is not enough... If programs are to be funded over a period of time, a constituency has to be built that supports them, independent of the President. A second lesson is that Congress combines a mixture of apathy and in some cases real hostility toward these programs, particularly in the Appropriation Subcommittees... a kind of cynicism that goes very deep. So we are fighting an uphill battle in Congressional attitudes.

... It seems to me more important than it ever was that each title of each act has to have a political sub-structure, a sub-government, if you will, of people in the Executive and Congress and in the interest groups who become sophisticated in the uses of power ... The central problem that those of us in government and outside need

to face is how do we build this sub-government or sub-structure for international education. We don't have it now.^{30/}

The second proposal came from McGeorge Bundy, president of The Ford Foundation, who put the problem in this perspective, as he gave the concluding dinner address of the conference:

I don't believe that this case can be won by a series of separate and marginal kinds of appropriations and activities. My own guess is that in the long run there will have to be an explicit and overt assertion of a quite special kind. It will have to express the depth and strength of the national interest in a highly autonomous Federally-funded cultural activity... I don't think we will get it quickly...it will be very hard indeed to get this kind of strong autonomous agency with a high degree of participation and a high degree of visible role for the artists and the academic leaders and the professional representatives who are concerned with education and culture...I think it will take many years to develop the framework in which the taxpayers' money can be used - and understood to be used - not in a simple Cold War context, and not simply in the amiable exercise of international cooperation on borrowed money or on soft currencies that wouldn't get used otherwise...

In summary, we are right to be concerned about immediate problems of shortfall; we are right to be concerned about the problem of sustaining the good friends we now have in the House and in the Senate. We are right to put pressure on private sources - business, labor and even foundations. We are wrong to suppose that the end of Viet-Nam, which must surely come, will solve this problem. We must begin to think in terms of a larger, stronger and more sustained connection.

^{30/} Speech by S. Douglass Cater, Jr., Special Assistant to the President, to Conference on Educational and Cultural Affairs, June 25, 1968.

And in the meantime, we can take comfort in the fact that as a whole society we are doing many of these things even now.^{31/}

F. PROGRAM RE-EVALUATION AFTER BUDGET REDUCTION

In August 1968, after the Bureau's FY 1969 budget had been drastically reduced by Congress, the Bureau of the Budget wrote to the Under Secretary^{32/} to suggest that the Department "undertake an in-house study to evaluate and revamp the exchange program." Budget pointed out that "the appropriation history over the past few years and particularly the House and Senate action this year highlight a basic need to reexamine the way we plan and conduct our educational and cultural exchange programs and the relevance of these programs to national objectives". Requesting that this reexamination be done before the FY 1970 programs were planned, Budget suggested that the regional Assistant Secretaries and senior USIA officials as well as the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs participate in this review, and that the review be completed in 6 weeks.

This analysis and review, completed in mid-September, stated that "the effect of the FY 1969 budget reductions has been to

^{31/} Speech by McGeorge Bundy, President of the Ford Foundation, to the Conference on Educational and Cultural Affairs, June 25, 1968.

^{32/} Letter from Charles J. Zwick, Director, Bureau of the Budget, to Under Secretary Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, August 6, 1968.

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4

NJ 40-247

By mg NARA. Date 1-16-91

SERVICE SET

retain a skeleton program with little flesh on the bones."^{33/}
Reductions in academic grants indicated there was danger of losing adequate support from the American educational community and learned societies, vital to the exchange programs. This question was basic to the issue of allocations for FY 1970 as between academic and non-academic programs. Programs were developed country-by-country with the Department's geographic bureaus and revealed strong support, for foreign policy reasons, of a level of academic exchange at almost the same proportion of academic to non-academic grants as in previous years. However, a slight proportionate increase for international visitor grants was also advocated, to take advantage of the rapid pace of social and political exchange. Increases were proposed also for aid to non-sponsored foreign students, to help in orientation and counselling; and for "seed money" to induce private organizations to contribute to mutually advantageous exchange projects.

Most important, an increase to a level of \$36.8 million - the level allowed by the Department for presentation to the Bureau of the Budget - was needed, if the exchange programs were to achieve their goals of advancing US national and foreign policy objectives,

^{33/} Review of International Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs and their Relevance to U.S. Foreign Policy Objectives: FY 1970 Budget.

which were very carefully spelled out in a series of program memoranda, keying specific activities to specific policy goals.

G. THE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS IN THE GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

While major directions and policies originate in Washington, implementation occurs largely in the field. The major exchange developments here were as follows:

1. Latin America

The Department's oldest official exchange program, begun in 1939, is with Latin America. Its contributions to Latin American progress are exemplified by the many former grantees in positions of influence in Latin America today.

As of November 1963, the educational and cultural exchange programs in Latin America followed in plan and emphasis the broad goals of the Alliance for Progress. Highlights of the program were cooperative faculty and student exchanges in higher educational and university development, and special seminars and workshops for school teachers and administrators. In cultural exchanges, the goal was to strengthen intellectual communication with Latin Americans at all levels of national leadership, with emphasis on young leaders. Approximately 1,900 persons (arrivals) traveled on new grants to and from the US and the countries of Latin America during FY 1964.

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED

Authority 96-333
By isg NARA Date 3-1-97

The most significant new emphasis, perhaps, was on exchanges responding to the rising Latin American interest in educational development, especially at the university level. This interest led the Board of Foreign Scholarships in 1964 to urge the Binational Commissions in Latin America to ensure that their programs "continue to be responsive to the rapid social and cultural changes taking place in the area, especially in view of the important role of universities and schools in national development in this area." One result is that the annual seminar on "Higher Education in the Americas", sponsored by the Department since 1960 for Latin American university administrators, from 1964 onward has focused on the theme: "The Role of the University in National Development." The continuing interest of university rectors and deans who had participated in these seminars, which have been held in recent years at the University of Kansas, resulted in a special seminar in Peru in 1966, under the co-sponsorship of the University of Kansas and three Peruvian universities, in which 25 university administrators from 11 Latin American countries participated.

Another result was the 1964 participation of the Bureau with other Government agencies, private foundations and universities in furthering the major self-development program of the Autonomous University of Guadalajara in Mexico. The past few years saw a

rising interest on the part of US universities in developing other cooperative relationships with Latin American institutions. Thirteen US universities now have such relationships under the Bureau's exchange program. The most recent example is the agreement concluded in 1967 between the Columbia University School of Social Work, the National Council of Social Work in Colombia and the Binational Commission in Colombia, in which the three institutions agreed to commit considerable resources for a well-coordinated long-range cooperative relationship in the field of social work. The long-range planning teams for educational cooperation that went to Peru, Brazil and Colombia in 1967-68 reinforced the efforts to develop such inter-university relationships.

Special emphasis was also placed on teacher-development, with stress on short-term group visits built around a seminar at a US university, for Latin American teachers and school administrators. There have also been an extensive series of local seminars for social studies teachers in Central America and elsewhere in the area.

In 1966-67 guidelines were prepared in the Department's Bureau of Inter-American Affairs by ARA/IRG, through a series of inter-agency meetings chaired by ARA, to ensure better inter-agency coordination of overall area and country program objectives, goals, and projects. Each post in Latin America prepared Country Analysis and Strategy Papers projecting their major annual country programs

through 1970 on the basis of agreed US Government agency goals. The policy of emphasis on improving and modernizing education in Latin America was strongly set forth by the Latin American Policy ^{34/} Committee of the Department early in 1966.

Greater emphasis and attention also were given to selecting Latin American graduate students in fields closely related to their countries' educational development needs, and to reaching "have-not" students or those from the rising lower middle classes and from growing provincial centers. Of special interest is the effort to assure that the exchange program include "leftists" (and rightists) or those who were or thought they were "anti-American". In April 1962, the Department had apprised US posts in Latin America in a confidential cable ^{35/} that, in view of the Department's desire to make a determined effort to counter Communist youth activities there, a leftist record or affiliation (except actual Communist membership) should not deter a post from selecting such a candidate, if otherwise qualified for an exchange grant. The US Advisory Commission for International Educational and Cultural Affairs stressed the need for such exchanges in all areas in its report to Congress the following year,

^{34/} LAPC Policy and Action Paper: Education and Youth in Latin America, February 2, 1966, Confidential.

^{35/} Department of State Circular Instruction CW-8065, April 10, 1962 (CONFIDENTIAL).

and the recommendation was relayed to the field.

While an admonitory Department cable ^{36/} in 1964 cautioned against choosing "hard-core" Communists or those with "closed minds" who could not learn from their experience, a later communication in 1966 stressed that posts are "not only permitted but encouraged" to propose for travel and study in the US "Latin American leftists as well as rightists who are critical of the US and its policies or even sympathetic to the totalitarian left or right, always providing it is felt that (their) present or probable future importance justifies their inclusion... All posts should feel free to propose... (persons) of every political persuasion...In some instances...the Department will even be willing to consider a member of a Latin American Communist Party or Communist Youth Organization for inclusion in a travel program."^{37/} This special effort continues and is in addition to a regular policy of bringing promising Latin American younger people to the US on individual "leader" grants, and in educational travel groups.

A direct result of the White House initiatives has been an emphasis on seminars and conferences, beginning in 1966 with a

^{36/} Department of State Circular Airgram CA-3447, September 28, 1964 (CONFIDENTIAL).

^{37/} Department of State Circular Airgram CA-882, August 1, 1966 (CONFIDENTIAL).

conference in Princeton for Bolivian leaders on "educational reform and community involvement." One for Venezuelan leaders was held in 1967 on the role of private enterprise in economic development, and another in 1968 for West Indian leaders on tradition and change in the English-speaking Caribbean. The most recent symposium is one on "poverty and urbanization" given at the University of Pennsylvania in November 1968.

Perhaps the most important cultural development in the Western Hemisphere in which CU actively cooperated in 1967 and 1968 was the Cultural Olympiad in Mexico, held at the time of the Olympic Games. US participation in 16 of the Olympic cultural events during the Olympic year included: exhibitions on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and space exploration; various noted groups and individuals representing the performing arts; two important art exhibits; an exhibit of traditional and contemporary American Indian crafts; two leading modern dance companies; at least one company of folk singers; sculptures; popular art; and two excellent jazz orchestras. The Bureau facilitated some of these US contributions and financed others. The United States was probably better represented at the Cultural Olympics than any other country.

Our exchange goals were reflected in the Punta del Este "Declaration of the Presidents" (1967) which reaffirmed the goals

~~SECRET~~

of the Alliance, and set forth a cooperative course of action in science, education and culture for the hemisphere which would give fresh impetus to the accomplishment of these goals. In 1968, as a result of the meeting between President Johnson and President Diaz Ordaz in April 1966, steps were underway for a US-Mexico Cultural Agreement.

For FY 1968, a total of 1,618 persons (arrivals), US and Latin American, traveled on new exchange grants to and from the United States.

2. Western Europe

The largest and very nearly the oldest program of academic exchange is carried on with Western Europe. These countries were among the first to enter into binational agreements for educational exchange with us under the original "Fulbright" amendment of 1946. In 1963, eleven of the binational Commissions were 11 years old or more. The number of academic exchangees going to and from Europe has considerably exceeded those of all other areas combined during the 20-year period since 1946. For the 1964 fiscal year new grants went to some 3,128 persons (arrivals) in Europe and the United States.

Largely because of its long-established character, during the 1963-68 period the exchange program with Western Europe experienced few new developments.

In late 1963 one of the major thrusts was to continue to

~~SECRET~~

SERVICE SET

encourage and develop American studies. This effort had been made possible by the authorization contained in the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961 (P.L. 87-256) to "foster and support" American Studies, and the decision of Congress in 1958 to permit use of local currencies generated under P.L. 480 for financing development of American Studies abroad. The Walter Johnson report in mid-1963 urged even more support for development of such studies, not only at the university but at the secondary school level. The Bureau had already begun to promote American Studies through grants-in-aid in support of chairs of American Studies at various European universities and to such institutions as the Bologna Center of the School of Advanced International Studies of Johns Hopkins University (which includes a European Center of American Studies) and the celebrated Salzburg Seminar in American Studies.

These activities have continued, with outstanding American scholars and lecturers going to lecture in European classrooms, and symposia being arranged and/or supported to help encourage the rising interest in American history, literature and social studies. In 1964 the Bureau made a grant to the State University of New York to enable it to assume sponsorship of the American Studies Institute in Paris, and made grants to 8 British institutions for similar studies.

While not all countries have a proportional number, one

indication of the spread of American Studies is that, according to a tally made in late 1967, there are now 25 chairs in American Studies in Germany at 21 universities, 16 of them in American literature. No university in Germany (as few elsewhere in Europe) offered American Studies before World War II. Italy, which similarly had no regular courses in American Studies before World War II, had in 1957 8 chairs in American Studies and 27 courses in 22 universities. The formation of regional and national associations of American Studies has been another result of the active European interest fostered by the exchange program. The European Association of American Studies was founded in 1954 and a British Association of American Studies in 1955. These were followed by a German Association in 1956, a Nordic Association in 1961 and a French Association in October of 1967.

Another thrust of the exchange program between 1963 and 1968 was the emphasis on developing cost-sharing arrangements with West European countries to meet partial costs of the exchange program.

A cost-sharing agreement had first been worked out with Germany in 1962, and with Austria and Sweden in June 1963. In 1964 Norway and Iceland signed similar agreements; and France, the United Kingdom and Denmark signed in 1965. The Netherlands began contributing in FY 1965, after an exchange of notes. Formal cost-sharing agreements are now under discussion with Belgium, Italy and Spain. Although

final agreements were not yet completed, Italy contributed some funds in FY 1967 and 1968, and Spain expected to contribute to the program in 1969. Annual contributions to exchange programs by Western European countries ranged in FY 1968 from token payments to 80 percent of costs in the case of Germany.

The size and age of the program in Europe means that one of its chief characteristics today is its wealth of "alumni", who are now at a high level in political, educational and cultural affairs. For example, a count made in late 1967 showed that in Great Britain four out of the six men who now head new universities, and in Finland a third of all university rectors, have been on earlier exchange visits to the United States. In Germany 15 out of 20 members of the cabinet installed in 1966 were former grantees. In Italy five ministers, in Great Britain three, and in Finland 40% of the cabinet had been grantees.

The President's initiatives resulted directly in a new emphasis on English language teaching. Seven US lecturers are being placed at Spanish universities in 1968-69 to help improve English teaching programs.

Only one long-range planning team to help establish closer education relationships between US and foreign academic communities and institutions through the exchange programs was sent to Western Europe. This one went to Finland in late 1966. It was agreed that

with the older and long-established binational commissions existing in Western Europe, other means than such planning teams might more effectively be used to secure the same result. ^{38/}

The budget restriction beginning in 1967 was reflected especially in cutbacks in American student exchanges and in American Specialists, and in the elimination of teacher-development programs in all but 5 countries. These cuts permitted the leader grant program to continue at a reasonable level, during the period when Western European leaders were deeply concerned about the US role in the Viet-Nam War.

For fiscal 1968 there was a total of 2644 persons (arrivals) traveling on new exchange grants to and from Western Europe.

3. Eastern Europe

In keeping with President Johnson's East-West "bridge-building" policy, the period 1963-1968 was a time of building bridges of intellectual and scholarly communication between the US and Eastern Europe. The United States had already since 1958 had an agreement with the Soviets, renewed every 2 years, for a wide range of exchanges, including students, research scholars and cultural presentations. An American Studies program had started in Poland, with 3 US professors lecturing in Polish universities and some American professionals lecturing at English-

^{38/} Internal Memorandum to Dr. Charles Frankel, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, from Guy E. Coriden, Director of the Office of European Programs (CU/EUR), August 11, 1967 and memorandum of Mr. Coriden to Dr. John Hope Franklin, Chairman of the Board of Foreign Scholarships, September 20, 1967. Both memoranda unclassified.

teaching seminars. There had been a substantial increase in the number of Polish grantees coming to the US - 60 in FY 1964 compared with only 29 the year before. Some direct student exchange with Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia was taking place and the University of Kansas student drama group presented selections from US plays in Poland and Yugoslavia. Both Poland and Yugoslavia permitted some of their educational and cultural leaders to come to the US on international visitor grants. Only Bulgaria and Hungary were not engaged in some minimum form of exchange program.

In all, in FY 1964, 207 students, teachers and research scholars traveled on new grants, in addition to 140 grantees exchanged with the Soviet Union alone, under arrangements made by the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants (IUCTG) acting under contract to the State Department, which pays a share of the program costs.

Cultural relations with Yugoslavia were particularly promising: A new constitution and decentralization had helped create an improved atmosphere for exchange. Several US lecturers were cordially received in Yugoslav universities for lectures and seminars on American literature and linguistics, theatre and the arts, law and sociology. Prominent Yugoslavas in many of the same fields were coming to the US to study, lecture or make observation tours.

In November 1964 Yugoslavia became the first country of Eastern Europe to sign a binational exchange agreement with the US, setting up a binational commission and an agreed program for exchange students, professors, teachers and research scholars.

In December 1964 diplomatic notes were exchanged between the United States and Romania for the continuation of various educational and cultural exchange programs during the years 1965 and 1966. An American lecturer-grantee in linguistics was assigned in 1965 to Cluj University, the second lectureship established in Romania under the program. There was an increase in student and research scholar exchanges with Romania in FY 1965.

Bulgaria began at this time to show interest in American participation in English-language teaching. Two Bulgarian English-language teachers were accepted for the Teacher Development Program, and the Bulgarians also agreed to an American professor of English to lecture at the University of Sofia for 4 months and participate in teacher training seminars. This exchange first took place in the fall of 1965.

Officially sponsored exchanges with Czechoslovakia increased to sixteen in 1965 from 4 in 1964. In 1966 for the first time the Czechoslovaks sent a teacher of American literature to the US for study, and for the first time participated in the Salzburg Seminar

for American Studies. Moreover, prospects for ever-widening exchanges continued to improve as Czechoslovak leaders began to participate in officially backed multinational programs (i.e., the Harvard International Seminar, the Bureau's Teacher Development Program). IUCTG concluded a reciprocal student and research scholar exchange agreement with the Ministry of Education in 1966.

The reaction of the Eastern European countries to United States policy in Viet-Nam was reflected in 1966-67 in some slowdown and postponement of projects and, in the case of Poland, cancellations. The summer visit of Polish university students of English to the United States was cancelled, as was a tour in Poland of an American all-star basketball team and a seminar organized by New York University and Warsaw University for students of government and law.

In spite of these cancellations, however, the Polish program showed a sizable net increase in exchanges with special emphasis in American studies and English teaching. In April 1967 a new agreement was signed with Poland under which the United States would use US-owned excess currencies held in Poland to carry out a 10-year program of English language teaching that would involve training and retraining of English language teachers and development of teaching materials. An important feature of the proposed program was a series of centers for teaching English as a second

~~SECRET~~

language, to be established by a consortium of US universities, in conjunction with Polish universities. It was estimated that this eventually would enable some 2 million Poles to develop fair English-speaking capacity in 10 years' time. Characterized by Congressman John J. Rooney as a "grandiose scheme", the project was not started in 1968 because Congress did not authorize the use of the required \$9.5 million in US-owned Polish currencies. ^{39/}

Poland also showed increasing interest in American studies. During 1968 a fourth visiting US professor was added to the program - a lecturer in linguistics, and for the first time Poland nominated five advanced research scholars for study in the United States on American literature and linguistics. These scholars received grants for the 1967-68 academic year.

In February 1967, Romania and the United States announced the fourth renewal of the exchange arrangement initiated in 1960. The new arrangement permitted a significant expansion of educational and cultural exchange not only of individuals but of publications and other cultural materials. While small compared to those of Western Europe, the program in 1967 included four delegations to the United States of important economists and industrial planners - the first visits of this kind. An increasing interest in the teaching of English led to the first exchange of an American specialist in this field, and for the first time also, Romanian scholars were able to accept offers from American universities to

^{39/} Hearings, Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives: Part 2, March 1968.

~~SECRET~~

teach and carry out research.

For Yugoslavia, 1967 was the first year of full-scale operations of the new binational program set up earlier. In that year the binational Commission also took over the American Studies program which had up to that time been carried out through Indiana University. A long-range planning team for the binational exchange program had gone to Yugoslavia in November 1966, and made proposals for long-term relationships between US and Yugoslav academic institutions and individuals. Moreover, the Bureau, in collaboration with individual American universities, conducted from 1967 through 1968 various joint American/Yugoslav research and study projects in many fields, such as urban studies, law, public administration, drama and music and comparative linguistics.

Contacts with Hungary continued to be difficult throughout the 1964-1968 period, although a few American Specialists visited the country to give lectures in such fields as American Literature, drama and economics. More important contacts were developed, with Embassy encouragement, between the Hungarians and the Ford Foundation for bringing Hungarian leaders to the US. Similarly, the IUCTG concluded an agreement with the Ministry of Education in 1966 for reciprocal Hungarian/American exchanges of students and research scholars. The latter program was abruptly cancelled by

~~SECRET~~

the Hungarians in early 1968 for no stated reason. In light of the Czechoslovak crisis and Hungary's role in the invasion, it was not likely that conditions for educational and cultural exchanges would improve over the next few years.

The liberalization process in Czechoslovakia, commencing from January 1968, gave the opportunity for normalizing American/Czechoslovak relations, and seven leading political, economic and cultural figures accepted invitations to visit the United States under the 'leader' program. In addition, Charles University and Komensky University each accepted an American for the 1968/1969 academic year as guest lecturers in American Literature, financed jointly through the Department and the Czechoslovak Ministry of Education. This significant breakthrough could mean the inauguration of wider American Studies program, provided the subsequent Soviet invasion and ensuing occupation do not forcibly prevent the Czechoslovaks from maintaining contacts with the West.

The invasion of Czechoslovakia, however, put in jeopardy several cultural educational exchange projects in East European countries. While the two American professors as earlier agreed, still planned to lecture in Czechoslovakia, the US shortly after the invasion cancelled the planned visit to Russia of the University of Minnesota concert band, and of an American dance ensemble and the University

~~SECRET~~

of Illinois jazz band to Poland. The cultural program planned for Romania was not affected.

For the fiscal year 1968, there were a total of 197 persons on new exchange grants, traveling between the US and Eastern Europe in addition to 148 more grantees exchanged under State Department sponsorship through the IUCTG.

An outstanding aspect of cultural and educational relations with Eastern Europe throughout this entire period has been the program of presentations of distinguished US dance and music companies and ensembles. In the Soviet Union these presentations are provided for under the continuing two-year US-USSR cultural agreements and normally visit other East European countries on their way there. CU has, with guidance from its appropriate advisory bodies, responsibility for selection and programming of these cultural attractions. During the 1963-1968 period, outstanding individual Americans in the field of arts and letters and sciences have visited in Eastern Europe as American Specialists, also selected by the Bureau. All of these contacts have been of value in presenting a view of America's cultural achievements and stimulating a genuine dialogue between US and East European cultural and intellectual elements.

4. Africa

The "winds of change" affecting all of Africa during 1963-1968

were reflected in the African exchange program.

In 1963 the program was largely devoted to student exchange - principally the bringing of African undergraduates to the US for university-level training, and the bringing of African leaders or potential leaders, both men and women, to introduce them (many for the first time) to the American people and their institutions. In FY 1964 new grants in the African program totalled 517, of whom 457 were to Africans, chiefly students (174) and leaders (108).

The exchange program had made consistent efforts since 1961, as had AID and private foundations, to help develop Africa's own universities to increase their training facilities. By 1963 three US universities were involved with a direct CU-sponsored institution-to-institution agreement to develop Departments of Political Science (UCLA-Khartoum and Chicago-Makerere), and a school of engineering (Northwestern-Khartoum). CU had begun cooperating in 1963 on a graduate fellowship program under contract with the African-American Institute, to develop professors; and a small trickle (about 20 a year since FY 1964) of US teachers and professors was being sent to strengthen teaching methods and curricula in African institutions. In March 1964 the first formal meeting of African Ministers of Education at Abidjan stressed the importance of

stepping up the number and strength of local universities.

American professor grantees went for the first time to universities in the Ivory Coast in 1965, Rwanda in 1966, Cameroon in 1967 and Somalia in 1968. In cooperation with the SAILER (Staffing of African Institutions of Legal Education and Research) program, begun in 1962 with Ford Foundation sponsorship, the Bureau's exchange program also provided a law professor in Ethiopia and one in Tanzania, and helped bring outstanding young law graduates to the United States for further study.

An important emphasis of the exchange program in Africa, in terms of numbers of grantees, has been on bringing outstanding leaders and young potential leaders to the United States. A 1967 tally of the distinguished Africans whom the exchange program had brought over here in recent years as "leader" grantees included two prime ministers, two presidents, one vice president, 87 ministers, and five secretaries of state. During recent years special emphasis was placed on women leaders, young people, parliamentarians and journalists. In 1967 some 20 parliamentarians came to the United States from the Somali Republic, Niger and Tanzania. During the fall of 1968, under a project similar to that during the 1964 Presidential election, some 30 African journalists were enabled to visit the US for one month to observe the American elections, while American specialists visited Africa to explain these

and the issues involved.

Under the President's initiatives of 1965-66, special new efforts were taken to stimulate seminars and conferences and assure participation of first-rate American representatives.

The most dramatic of these occasions was the colloquium on "Negritude" held at the First World Festival of Negro Arts in Dakar in April 1966. State Department grants enabled outstanding American Negro leaders and artists to take part in this symposium. In December 1967 the Bureau also helped send seven distinguished Americans to the Second International Congress of Africanists, also in Dakar. The first of a series of African-American dialogues scheduled for November 18-22, 1968, in Nairobi, was partly prompted by CU, although its reduced budget has made it unable to provide financial support for the final conference.

In FY 1967 the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs was spending about 54 percent of its African budget for African students. More vigorous coordination of the CU and AID African student programs had been urged by Congress the preceding year. To comply, and to get further assistance for such exchange, CU worked out an arrangement under which AID would provide grants for students taking so-called "development" studies such as medicine, engineering and agriculture, while the CU exchange program would support students in the social

sciences and humanities. ^{40/} On July 1, 1967, under this arrangement, AID took over the support of 113 African students out of the 934 sponsored by the Bureau during the 1967 fiscal year, on new grants and renewals.

In nine of the ten African countries that became independent after 1963, some form of educational and cultural exchange began to take place. The exception was Southern Rhodesia. Southern Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence in 1965, which was not acknowledged by the US, effectively terminated exchange activities. All educational and cultural exchange with the Congo (Brazzaville) was suspended when that country broke relations with us in August 1965. The effect of the Middle-East crisis of June 1967 on exchange with states sympathetic to the Arab cause has been reported above.

Cultural agreements were signed between the US and Liberia in May 1964, with Morocco on February 10, 1967, and with Somalia, August 1, 1968.

a. Refugee African Students

Somewhat more than half of all African students brought as exchange grantees to the United States during the 1963-68 period came under what was called the Southern African Student Program

^{40/} AID Circular XA 1267, December 1, 1966 (LIMITED OFFICIAL USE)

(SASP). This program was initiated by the Bureau in 1961, at the request of President Kennedy, to provide training opportunities for refugee students who had leadership potential but who, because of racial policies in areas (principally Portuguese areas) of southern Africa, had limited access to higher education in their own countries. Lincoln University in Pennsylvania and the University of Rochester receive these students on arrival and prepare them, with remedial and language work as necessary, for entrance to other US colleges and universities. The program was extended and strengthened by the Secretary of State ^{41/} in late 1963. One reason for keen US interest in this project was that the Soviet bloc countries had greatly increased their African student programs. During the period 1962-1964 the number of African students and trainees going to Communist countries and receiving Communist training elsewhere was 6 times the number given scholarships in the Free World.

The refugee program, initially designed for 40 students, was increased, with the Secretary's approval, to 120, and the number kept on rising. In July 1967 the Board of Foreign Scholarships wrote the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs that it had become concerned at the sizable portion of the African

41/ Memorandum, W.Averell Harriman to the Secretary of State, November 4, 1963 (SECRET)

budget being used for this program, saying that it had now mushroomed to 460 scholarships at a current expenditure of nearly \$2 million annually. (This was about 50 percent of the total budget available for educational and cultural exchange with Africa at that time.) The Board said it believed that the refugee program "is not representative of educational exchange between the US, and we seriously question the proportion of CU funds devoted to it in the light of the limited resources available for academic programs in Africa". It also asked for a "reexamination and redress of the balance in academic exchanges with Africa" since "more than nine-tenths of the grants are awarded for university study alone (and)... the flow is almost entirely Africa to America."^{42/}

In August 1967 an interagency working group was established to review and make recommendations on the refugee student program. Their^{43/} report in March 1968 stressed that, in addition to its cost, there were "severe difficulties in repatriating the small initial

^{42/} Letter to Dr. Charles Frankel, from John Hope Franklin, Chairman of Board of Foreign Scholarships, July 24, 1967

^{43/} Study of the Working Group on Education for Southern African Refugees, March 1968 (CONFIDENTIAL)

group of refugee graduates" which "brought into question the current validity of the premises on which SASP had been founded". Their recommendations, however, were that the refugee student program be continued but with a progressive shift in emphasis toward providing training in Africa in preparation for employment in Africa, and that refugee students receiving training and education in the US be limited to those who could clearly benefit from graduate professional or special instruction in an American milieu.

For FY 1968, there were a total of 477 persons (arrivals) traveling on new exchange grants between the US and Africa; 39 of these were Americans.

5. Near East-South Asia

In November 1963, the Bureau had ongoing programs of educational exchange with all NEA countries except Kuwait and maintained binational educational commissions in all countries except Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen. Almost 75 percent of available funds were spent on academic exchanges. For FY 1964 new grantees traveling to or from the NEA area totalled 1,294, of whom 374 were Americans. In addition, the Bureau was carrying out a number of special educational projects.

The political situation throughout the area at this time

was wholly favorable to educational and cultural exchange programs with one exception - Cyprus. The Greek-Turkish antagonisms which had been developing since Cyprus became a sovereign state erupted in December 1963, and until very recently the Department has found it increasingly difficult to carry out educational and cultural exchanges with that country.

Between 1963 and 1965, the Bureau, in addition to its regular exchanges, placed a new and major emphasis on the development of indigenous institutions of higher education in a number of countries in the area.

In Turkey these included the Middle East Technical University, where the Department carried out an exchange of architectural students in cooperation with Pratt Institute in Brooklyn; the prestigious University of Istanbul where, with the help of the University of Iowa, the Department was building up a Department of political Science; and the American Research Institute established in 1963 with support from the Department and 15 leading American universities, to provide a focus and base for American and Turkish research in the area.

The Bureau helped support two similar institutes, the American Institute of Indian Studies, founded in 1962 in India, and the American Research Center in Egypt located in Cairo, founded in 1963.

Grants to American professors and librarians were awarded to complement activities of the University of Pennsylvania designed to build up Pahlavi University in Iran under an AID contract. The Bureau was also helping support archeological excavations of ancient Greek sites carried out by Harvard and New York Universities, out of P.L. 480 funds.

From 1963 onward the most important single project in India was the establishment of the American Studies Research Center at Hyderabad, inaugurated in April 1964. Its purpose was to promote in Indian universities and colleges the study of American history, literature, and similar subjects. More than a score of Indian institutions of higher learning are now corporate members, and individual memberships total more than 700.

In 1964 the United States and Greece negotiated a settlement of the 1929 and 1932 debts based on loans which the United States had provided to Greece for resettlement of refugees from Asia Minor. Under the terms of the settlement which was approved by Congress in 1966, the US Government undertook to use the annual repayment (approximately \$329,000) for the exchange program.

In 1964 the Bureau entered an agreement with AID to divide and regularize between the Bureau and AID the responsibility for financial support to American-sponsored and American community or American

dependents' schools abroad in the NEA area. Under this agreement the Bureau no longer was responsible for financial grant-in-aid contributions to such institutions in Greece as Pierce College, Athens College, Anatolia College and the American Farm School, or in Turkey to Robert College. These and others like them became solely an AID responsibility. The Bureau instead accepted responsibility for helping to fund such American community schools as that at Athens, as well as various other schools attended by American dependents at posts abroad throughout the area.

The Bureau also continued during 1963-1965 its substantial support (\$64 - \$75,000 a year) to a program, conducted by Brown, Cornell and Texas Universities in cooperation with the UAR Ministry of Education, to train Egyptian linguists and help prepare English language teaching texts for the UAR national school system. US-owned excess currencies were being used for this purpose, as was the case with the institutes in India and the American Research Center in Turkey. This program continued in operation up until the Arab-Israeli crisis of June 1967.

In 1965 a decision was made to offer no new grants to Iranian students. Not only did a large number come on their own or with other private financing but in the US their disaffection with their home country regime had caused continuing

political demonstrations and unrest - especially on the occasion of visits here of prominent Iranians. ^{44/}

Also in 1965 the Bureau agreed to support, and in 1966 actually began the formal support of, a CENTO fellowship program under which the Bureau finances a specially selected graduate student from each of the three CENTO countries for a year of study plus extensive travel in the United States. The United Kingdom is providing similar scholarships. Reciprocal scholarships offered by the ^{45/} CENTO countries have proved unattractive to American students.

In 1966, the Bureau declared in a policy statement that although it would provide grants for research and study to individual archeologists, it would no longer finance archeological excavation projects, since the special foreign currency appropriations which had been used to finance such projects, as that in Turkey (above), ^{46/} were exhausted.

During the 1963-1968 period new agreements or amendments of

^{44/} Department of State, Operations Memorandum to Embassy Tehran, June 15, 1964 (CONFIDENTIAL).

^{45/} Department of State Circular Instruction CA-4511, December 16, 1966 (LIMITED OFFICIAL USE).

^{46/} CU Policy Statement No. 11, November 15, 1966.

existing educational exchange agreements were successfully negotiated with Greece, Israel, the UAR, and Ceylon. These new agreements or amendments were designed to allow for the broadened scope of operations authorized by the Fulbright-Hays Act and to lay the legal foundations for cost-sharing.

There was no interruption of the exchange program with Greece following the take-over by the Greek military junta in April 1967. The very considerable impact, however, of the Arab-Israeli War of June 1967 on exchanges with the Middle-East has been described above.

The revelation in the spring of 1967 of CIA involvement in a number of projects concerned with education brought about, particularly in India, some serious questioning of private programs of exchange in the area. The retiring Chief Cultural Affairs Officer on his return from India in July 1968 stated that this was the most significant "negative event" of his entire five-year tour, 1963-1968.

The story for a time did not receive much attention because of the Indian national elections then taking place. But later the situation offered an ideal weapon for Indian detractors of the United States in attacking American influence and institutions in India. Not only were the institutions that reportedly had received CIA support affected - such as the Asia Foundation, which eventually

ARCHIVES PROCESSING NOTE

On August 14, 1998, it was discovered that Page 96 of Chapter 12 is missing from this file.

REGINA GREENWELL
Senior Archivist

In July 1968 the US Government and Saudi Arabia signed a cultural agreement (not yet ratified by the Saudi Arabian Government) which formally endorsed the two Governments' support of educational and cultural exchange.

During FY 68, there were 723 new exchange grantees (arrivals) between the US and countries of the NEA area.

6. East Asia and the Pacific

As of November 1963, exchange programs in EA put emphasis on developing area studies programs and youth programs and on bringing Asian professors to smaller American universities and colleges which sought them for teaching courses in Asian civilization. The level of exchanges in East Asia and the Pacific had risen slightly over the preceding year, to 1,119 persons (arrivals, on new grants) in FY 1964.

Particular political situations that affected the exchange program at the start of this period included the war and political instability in Viet-Nam, the increasingly anti-American posture of the Sukarno regime in Indonesia, and a rapidly developing nationalism in the Philippines. FY 1963 through FY 1965 witnessed a decline in exchanges with Burma, Cambodia, and Indonesia, respectively, due chiefly to neutral or pro-Sino-Soviet bloc attitudes adopted by these countries. US Congressional refusal in 1964 to create

an educational foundation in Japan with GARIOA (Government and Relief in Occupied Areas) funds ^{47/} caused considerable disappointment in Japan.

Over the five-year period, one of the most important Bureau-supported activities in East Asia was the US-Japan Conferences on Cultural and Educational Interchange - a series of biennial discussions that were initially brought into being by an agreement in 1961 between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Ikeda.

The second US-Japan Conference ("Culcon II") was held in Washington in October 1963, and, as a follow-up, educational TV exchange with Japan began in that year, with Bureau support. Culcon III in Tokyo in February 1966, and Culcon IV in Washington in April 1968, saw an advancement in cooperation. Both were coordinated by the Bureau. Culcon III called for joint social science research, which became a reality in 1968. Culcon IV provided for a Joint Permanent Committee of Nationals of the two nations to review cooperative programs and to advise on future directions.

The Bureau also has created the American Committee on United States-Japan Educational and Cultural Cooperation, as well as stimulated the creation of a sister Japanese committee.

47/ Department of State Telegram 02037 to Tokyo, May 5, 1964
(UNCLASSIFIED).

It assisted and participated in the Conference on Cooperative Social Science Research between the United States and Japan at Honolulu in 1968, and then took the lead in creating the American panel of a permanent Joint Committee on United States-Japan Educational and Cultural Exchange, decided upon at the 48/ Culcon IV conference.

Initiated in October 1963, and carried on throughout the period, have been the tours of Asian journalists jointly sponsored by State, Defense, USIA and the White House. Seven such study tours, of 30 days each, averaging 20 journalists per trip, have taken place through the fall of 1968, the most recent group having attended the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in August 1968. Desirable effects on journalists who previously were not invariably friendly to the United States, have been seen in numerous articles, radio and TV broadcasts and speeches on their return home.

Also begun during this period was the so-called China (Formosa) "Package Program", which exemplified long-range planning for academic programs. In cooperation with participating universities, special projects calling for the strengthening of Chinese faculty in priority disciplines have been planned.

48/ Final communique, Fourth US-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Exchange, April 8, 1968

These projects require a well-coordinated two-way exchange of scholars. Projects already implemented are: The assignment of an American professor to a Chinese university; the university's assignment of assistants to work with the American; and simultaneously, the training in the United States of junior faculty members and/or research scholars, thereby preparing them to take over the teaching previously done by the American professors. "The basic purpose is to establish a nucleus of trained personnel in courses important to the country's educational development and economic progress"^{49/}

Another important program has been cooperation with the Chinese University in Hong Kong which began in 1965, through a grant-in-aid agreement with the University of California at Berkeley. The Chinese University's purpose is to provide children of refugees with an alternative to going to mainland China for their higher education. The University was formed by consolidation of three post-secondary schools; its present Vice-Chancellor is a former Berkeley professor.

The exchange program has been continually active over the 1963-1968 period in its support of American Studies, particularly in Japan, the Philippines and Australia, where such studies have

^{49/} From Taipei, Airgram A-2-542, to the Department, January 15, 1965 (UNCLASSIFIED).

~~SECRET~~

become a basic part of university curricula. In the Philippines the fourth annual American Studies Seminar, arranged by the bi-national commission, was for the first time co-sponsored by the University of the Philippines and met jointly with the Philippine Association for American Studies in June 1967. The interest in American Studies continues to spread to other countries of the area.

To help establish other long-term associations between US and Asian academic institutions and scholars, long-range planning teams, comprising area and discipline experts, were sent by the Bureau to Thailand, Korea and the Philippines in 1967 and 1968, charged with making substantive recommendations to improve exchange programs.

Student counseling and guidance on US universities was much expanded during the 1963-1968 period. Beginning in FY 1963, the Bureau for several years provided \$25,000 annual grants to the American-Korean Foundation to help it provide counseling services for Korean students enroute to the United States and in finding jobs for returning students. In 1963 the Institute of International Education, with Bureau support, established a counseling office in Bangkok, and in 1964 a similar service in Hong Kong for students intending to come to US colleges and universities on their own.

~~SECRET~~

SERVICE SET

There was also a continuing effort to develop cost-sharing agreements with East Asian countries. The first such agreement in the area was reached with Australia in 1964 for the binational educational exchange programs, in which Australia provides 50 percent of the foreign currency costs. The upper limit of the program was set at \$405,000 per annum. Over the past two years discussions on cost-sharing have been underway with Japan and New Zealand.

Probably the most important single event for the program in the Far East in recent years was the resumption of exchange with Indonesia in November 1966 after a break of nearly two years. Although the initial exchanges were at first limited - an exchange of a few distinguished Americans and Indonesians in cultural and educational fields - both the US and Indonesian Governments welcomed the renewal. The FY 1968 exchanges with Indonesia approached normalcy, although the number of grantees was lower than in former years because of the Bureau's budget restrictions.

The Viet-Nam War produced uncertainty in planning CU programs for that country. It has offered a challenge to individual American professors, some of whom have been unable to adjust to the situation while others have found the milieu so stimulating they have requested second or even third annual

renewals of their grants. In 1967 the Bureau terminated the Viet-Nam Fellowship program for US graduate students, primarily because Embassy Saigon saw little value in it.

The binational program in Burma remained dormant, and the Cambodian program was confined to renewal of student grants. For FY 1969 the Bureau provided \$400,000 in support of programs of the Asia Foundation.

In FY 1968, there were 1071 persons (arrivals) traveling on new exchange grants between the United States and of East Asia. The level of exchange in late 1968 dropped very sharply below that of FY 1968 due to the severe cut in the Bureau's appropriations.