



## **Dialogue, Not Monologue: International and Educational Exchange and Public Diplomacy**

*A Policy Forum held at the Heritage Foundation's Allison Auditorium with cosponsors The Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange, the Heritage Foundation, the Migration Policy Institute, and NAFSA: Association of International Educators.*

*November 16, 2005*

**James Carafano, Senior Research Fellow, Defense and Homeland Security, The**

**Heritage Foundation:** Good afternoon. My name is James Carafano, I'm the Senior Fellow for Defense and Homeland Security at the Heritage Foundation, and let me get the most important things out of the way first that is, if you have anything that beeps, buzzes, squeaks, squawks or does anything like that, if you'd please turn them off or put them on vibrator or silence, whatever, at this time. That would be helpful. On behalf of the Heritage Foundation and all the co-sponsors we join in welcoming you to this event here today. I know it seems a bit odd that the Homeland Security guy is up here chairing a panel on . . . or for . . . hosting a conference on public diplomacy. I think, you know, let's be frank, absent 9/11 we simply wouldn't be having this meeting, we wouldn't be having this discussion.

After 9/11, the United States became a lot more concerned about securing who comes in and out of its country and one of the consequences of that was a significant downturn in the number of friends and allies around the world who got to journey here and visit this great country and go back again. It is an important issue. Our approach at the Heritage Foundation has been very simple, it said, look this is going to be a long war and the strategy for a long war consists of three components and there has to be a security component, you have to protect yourself from the enemy but equally important, is economic growth, because what enables a country to compete

and win over the long term is the ability to sustain its growth and economy and equally important to that is to protecting the civil liberties and privacies of its citizens and its friends and allies, because at the end of the day, that's really the great strength of a nation, the will of its people to endure and persevere.

And if you don't do all three of those things, if you don't provide for your security, if you don't promote your economic growth, if you don't protect the civil liberties and privacies of your citizens, and if you don't, perhaps, do the most important thing, which is win the war in the minds of men and women, not just in your own country but around the world, then you simply don't win long wars.

And so you have to do these things equally well. You don't just trade one off for the other. And so, I think it is appropriate that there is a security dimension here, there's an economic, a political and a public policy that all come together and that need to be discussed and to do that we have a tremendous panel of experts today, and I'm going to turn this over to Marlene Johnson, who is the Executive Director of NAFSA, the Association of International Educators and Marlene is going to introduce our panelists and then they'll each speak and she will chair a question and answer session. And I'll get my last piece of administration out of the way right now. When we go to the question and answer session, if you have a question, if you'd please raise your hand and wait to be recognized and they'll bring a microphone to you and then once you get the microphone, if you would state your name and affiliation that would be great. Thank you again. Marlene.

**Marlene Johnson, Executive Director and CEO, NAFSA: Association of International Educators:** Thank you very much. I want to join in welcoming all of you to this very important forum on International Education Exchange and Diplomacy. On behalf of the

other co-sponsors I want to say a special thanks to the Heritage Foundation for hosting this event. The Heritage Foundation has played a key role in advancing the importance of public diplomacy as you've just heard and we are very pleased to be able to collaborate with them on this event.

Of course, we also appreciate being able to meet here in this wonderful facility and for all the opportunity to work with Jim Carafano and Laura Keith who have done most of the details in putting this program together today. I also want to say a special thanks to the Migration Policy Institute, and the Alliance for International Education and Cultural Exchange. Both are important allies of ours and in the struggle to keep our doors open, have been important co-sponsors of this event.

Most of you know NAFSA as the professional association of international educators. Our members are the people who make education exchange happen at colleges and universities around the country. In the public policy arena we and the Alliance are the nation's leading advocates in the non-profit community for educational exchange. Our members are united in the belief that education exchange is essential for furthering important interests of our country: national security interests, foreign policy interests, economic competitive interests and, of course, educational interests.

Six years ago, NAFSA and the Alliance released a statement entitled, "Toward An International Education Policy for The United States". I hope you picked a copy of that up on the table out in the foyer but if you didn't I encourage you to do it. In that paper we explain why international education is important in terms of the interests that I've identified and we set forth what the elements of such an international education policy would be. In other words, what it should consist of. And we called upon the President to articulate such a policy and to bring the stakeholders together to agree on what each of us will do.

Now, I can imagine that some of you were surprised to see this group of cosponsors sponsoring this event today. I believe that what our collaboration means and demonstrates more dramatically than anything else is that this issue resonates across the political spectrum and it is being understood and embraced as an important topic of conversation at this point. And I think that our panel today reflects that.

We are pleased to have . . . our whole panel is here now. Well! Welcome everybody. So, no problem. We're so happy to have all of you here and I will introduce all of them now in the order in which they will speak, then we'll let each of them make their remarks and then we'll have questions to the extent that we have time. We are committed to adjourning at 3:00pm. We'll lead off with Dr. Joseph Nye, who is a Distinguished Service Professor at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. Dr. Nye has had a distinguished academic and government career, having served as Assistant Secretary of Defense and Chair of the National Intelligence Council in the Clinton Administration. Dr. Nye coined the term "soft power" and has underscored the importance of educational exchange in the exercise of power. We asked him to serve on our panel because in our view public diplomacy is the exercise of "soft power" so his views are central to what we are talking about this afternoon.

We will follow with Ambassador Cresencio Arcos, the Director of International Affairs at the Department of Homeland Security. Ambassador Arcos is a retired Foreign Service Officer and former Ambassador to Honduras. Having served in important public diplomacy positions in the State Department, Ambassador Arcos has done public diplomacy in the trenches. He has a very sophisticated understanding of how and how not to use public diplomacy to project "soft power" and of how educational exchange fits in. From the perspective of his current position, at Homeland Security, Ambassador Arcos is uniquely positioned to help us understand how to

integrate public diplomacy, education exchange, and Homeland Security.

Then we will hear from Sanford Ungar, President of Goucher College in Baltimore. Mr. Ungar practiced public diplomacy for two years as Director of Voice of America, before which he was Dean of the School of Communication at American University here in Washington. You may know him as a journalist, including host of "All Things Considered" and other NPR programs. We asked him to join us today to talk about the other side of educational exchange and public diplomacy, not bringing international students here but sending American students to study abroad. Goucher College is one of the few, if not the only school in the country that requires study abroad of all of its students and pays for it.

And lastly, we will hear from Congressman Jim Kolbe of Arizona who will tie the threads of this discuss together by explaining how everything we're talking about here this afternoon is part of a international education policy. Congressman Kolbe is a key Congressional leader on foreign policy and international trade issues. He chairs the Appropriations Committee, Foreign Operations Sub-Committee which funds most of our foreign aid programs. We asked him to be part of our panel because he has twice introduced a congressional resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should establish an international education policy, including House Concurrent Resolution 100 which is pending in the current Congress. In 2004, NAFSA recognized Congressman Kolbe's leadership on international education with our Global Leader Award.

I'll ask each panelist to speak for about 10 minutes in the order in which I've introduced them and then I hope we'll have time for questions from you. Professor Nye.

**Dr. Joseph S. Nye, Jr. Distinguished Service Professor, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University:** Do I need to push this? No.

**Marlene M. Johnson:** No.

**Professor Nye:** I want to thank Jim and Marlene for organizing this panel on this extremely important subject. I can give proof that I walk or I talk on this because when I was Dean of the Kennedy School, I doubled the proportion of international students at the school. And every once in while you get an Alumnus or somebody else, particularly somebody whose child didn't get in who says how can you give away such an important, scarce resource to foreigners when there's not enough to go around to Americans?

I used to say, because it is one of the best investments the United States can make. And I think it's true that the presence of foreign students in American universities is a tremendous resource for American "soft power". Soft power is an easy concept to understand. If power is the ability to influence others to get the outcomes you want, you can do it with threats or coercion, which is sticks, you can do it with inducements or payments, which is carrots, or you can do it by attraction and bringing people to the United States, having them learn here, having them imbibe of American values, having them make friends is a tremendous source of attraction.

And if we think about the problems that we face of defeating a threat from terrorists from international terrorism, basically it's not something we're going to win unless we have soft power, unless we can attract. Hard power is necessary, don't misunderstand me, on that. But in an information age it's not only whose army wins, it's also whose story wins. And it's essential that we get our story out and the best way to get our story out in terms of winning hearts and minds, the best emissaries are really people who have been to American universities and return home. We can set up broadcasting as we do with Al-Hurra and Radio Sawa and so forth, but very often you'll look at polls and it will say that Al-Hurra is regarded as American propaganda, discounted. But when people come back to their countries, having experienced the United States with its

good parts and its bad parts, but with a balanced view, that's a tremendous source of our ability to influence moderates in other countries.

Now it's not true that every student goes back home happy. There are some cases that don't work out, and you don't see the results of this immediately. It often takes quite a long time to see the pay-off, but the pay-off can be quite dramatic when it comes.

Let me give you an example of this, from a case that was recently in the news. I don't know how many of you noticed the obituary a couple of weeks ago, Alexander Yakovlev. He was the Russian, previously Soviet leader, who was Mikail Gorbachev's right hand man in bringing about Perestroika and glasnost, which is essentially, in the end, what undid the Soviet Union. The interesting thing is that in the 1950s there was a great debate in the United States about, should we be having a lot of international students and what were the risks to our security. And the people who opposed it said, you know, if you get the Russians sending . . . or the Soviets sending students here, they're going to send a lot of KGB agents and they're going to steal us blind. They're going to steal our technology, and you know, this is not a good idea. President Eisenhower said, we're going to do it anyway. They negotiated an agreement and the first 50 Soviet students came in 1958. One of them was Yakovlev and another was a man named Oleg Kalugin who was, indeed, a KGB agent who stole us blind and went home and rose to a very high level in the KGB. But the intriguing thing is that Yakovlev went to Columbia University, studied with David Truman, and began to believe deeply in the theories of pluralism that Truman was promoting. So Yakovlev went back home, he didn't immediately become a dissident, he didn't immediately rise to the top in Brezhnev's Russia, but when Gorbachev and his generation came to power Yakovlev was at his right hand and tremendously influential in bringing about what is now known as the end of the Soviet Union.

Kalugin rose to the top or near to the top of the KGB and in the '90s he wrote his memoir after the collapse of the Soviet Union and he said, "Of all the Trojan Horses that undid us, international student exchanges were the worst." So, yes, they stole. There was a security risk, but in terms of that return on our investment of the education of Alexander Yakovlev that was a tremendous pay-off. It took more than two decades and at the time you wouldn't have known exactly how it was going to work out, but again, you don't need very many Yakovlevs before you have a tremendous return on your investment. So, when you look at figures such as we've seen of declines in American proportions of international students, even though we saw a slight reversal in last year, and you realize that there is a competitive market in which other countries are also competing for this, and I should mention there, that the rise of foreign students going to Chinese universities has been quite impressive in recent years, then you realize that when we face this trade off between security and essentially attraction or increasing our "soft power" we ought to be careful not to shoot ourselves in the foot by over-doing it on the security side.

Very few of the people who commit terrorist atrocities come in on student visas. There are other ways to get into the United States and if in the process of making it difficult to come to the United States we wind up depriving ourselves of that tremendous source of "soft power" we'll all be much the poorer for it.

So, I think that while we made some improvement in visa procedures, some improvement in understanding of the importance of this, I think we still have quite a long way to go and I hope that a panel like this one, this afternoon can help to dramatize that point. Thank you.

**Marlene M. Johnson:** Thank you.

**Ambassador Cresencio Arcos, Director of International Affairs, U.S. Department of Homeland Security:** Thank you. It's always tough to go after somebody like Dr. Nye.

Let me say as a practitioner, I'm reminded as I listen to the Soviet story and all that, I did serve as a Public Affairs Officer in the Soviet Union in the late '70s and I fully can sympathize with what you're saying in terms of many of the Soviets came to me and would tell me about exchanges and possibility of exchanges and how could they and get involved in an exchange with . . . in the United States. So, I . . . it took me back in a very nostalgic trip in listening to you Dr. Nye.

But, let me just say, I took over this job two and half years ago and I think even after . . . Congressman Kolbe may agree with this or disagree, when Congress passed the legislation for Homeland Security, international was not exactly at the top of the list, and then they realized that they needed an international office as an after-thought, fortunately, there was legislation implemented to create this office. And let me say, when . . . over two and half years ago, the very first day, after I met with Secretary Ridge, he asked me, he says, let's look at immigration and the movement of people because the biggest challenge we face here is how to balance our security concerns with the flow of goods, services and people into the United States and with our security concerns the way they are, we have to make sure that we don't disrupt what we have in the United States and have had for a long period of time in history, a free flow.

Well, no more than he had said that, within minutes I got a call from the Bangladeshi Ambassador who called me in to ask . . . if I would explain to him why Bangladeshi students were subject to NSEERS, the National Security Entry Exit Registration System, and that was my baptism of fire in this job two and half years ago so I feel very, very strongly about this issue in terms of how do we make sure that the free flow of people into the United States is not encumbered by the security measures. In fact, some . . . about a year ago, I was asked by Bill Rura, a former U.S.I.A. colleague of mine, if I would contribute to a book called Engaging the

Arab and Islamic World Through Public Diplomacy and I contributed one on this very subject of exchanges and how to manage it better, how do we do the . . . better than we have done it and improve it? And addressing it at that time we didn't have the figures yet, that there had been a slight increase in 2004 back when international students, but we were working on the supposition that the decline would continue. And clearly, one of the things that I have engaged, the component agencies, and particularly the Immigration, Customs and Enforcement Agency as well as our Citizenship and Immigration Service people is to manage this much better and I think that we have learned quite a bit in terms of listening, particularly to the countries and the students affected by this issue. The problem is that too often we get unfunded mandates. And, give an example, the NSEERS was a mandate even though it was basically . . . it came out of a policy decision, a series of policies to implement NSEERS and it was basically targeted at . . . in the end it turned out to be the Islamic and Arab world. Mostly with the exception of North Korea, being the one exception. How did we get to that is all history, but the fact of the matter is that it was perceived, it was targeted against the very people we were trying to reach out to after 9/11. At the same time we were being asked by the academic community to address this as quickly as possible. And it was not just student exchange reasons that were involved here.

My second trip, after I took this job, was to New York with the Business Council in International Understanding and the first thing I was faced with was the corporate world asking me why they couldn't get visas for their intra-company transfers for bringing scientists from the Arab world . . . engineers or customers from China to Boeing in Seattle. So it was not just students, I mean, it was whole issue of how do manage people across borders. The fact of the matter is, we have roughly 430 million entries into the United States a year. Not people, but entries and this takes place mostly at the land borders between Canada and United States and

Mexico and the United States and the airports and the seaports that we have, but it's 430 million, and how do we manage it? How do we get a system that does not allow us to fall into a situation we did in 9/11? And the scale of the challenge is the one that we face, and how to manage all this? But going back to the NSEERS, the issue of the NSEERS was that we were asking them to register as they came in but we have a very peculiar situation in the United States in terms of airports, primarily. There's no real international terminal, there's no exiting through Immigration, so it's incumbent on the student to go and find the kiosk or find the official or the correct officer, how to do it, and in most places, in most airports and they asked and nobody knew where the officer was or what they were talking about. So, we quickly . . . this . . . figured . . . we figured this, by the time we got USVISIT that USVISIT would address this and it has by and large but the fact of the matter is, we still have a problem, it's not the actual entry and exit that's just part of the problem. The other is, the challenge we face is how do we vet people when they apply for visas in different countries. I was with our Ambassador to Micronesia and he tells me that some of the islanders in Micronesia have to travel four and five thousand miles to get to a Consulate. How do we do that? How do we do this better? These are all challenges we face. And I remember as a Consular Officer in Portugal 30 something years ago, the only thing we were concerned about was, "Are you planning to stay in the United States and work?" and that was our basic concern and we would do a quick hand checking in the files that we had, we didn't even know what a computer was, at that time, 30 something years and of course the Portuguese country people would bring us a basket full of eggs and cheese and a goose, in a fine Portuguese tradition, but that was . . . the world has changed, it's no longer that way and now we have to look at how do we make sure that we have our security concerns addressed. And we have to have reasonable and proportional measures, but they have to be reasonable. The fact of the matter that

we have concern in this country and the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States has said, we need to address this, and how do we do it better is a real challenge. But it goes back to the challenge of balancing. Of balancing the trade . . . the movement of goods and services and people, primarily, with our security concerns. And with the technology we have, have improved and have vastly improved and one of the areas we're looking at as well as our USVISIT program, is the biometrics. The ideal world is to have everybody be identified with a digital photograph and a biometric, preferably a fingerprint to make it much easier and eventually we will not even need passports, maybe just a card, in theory, like a, what do you call these, e-passes, eventually. But then we're faced with another challenge, what goes into acquiring a document, is a birth certificate fraudulent or not? Does a person even have a birth certificate to get a passport? In many places in the world, when you look at India with over a billion people, how many hundreds of million people may not have any documentation or even in Latin America or in Africa? So, this presents us all with a challenge which can be exploited by people who would want to do us harm. So, the issue is, how do we engage ourselves in a much better way to do this and I think a panel like today which we hear the value of student exchanges and we cannot lose that tradition that we started many, many years ago. And perhaps, on the way over here, one of my assistants said, maybe we need to recapture the spirit of Ellis Island, the spirit of the Statute of Liberty and that's hard in this day and age, it really is hard. And believe you me, I mean, so many ambassadors have come through my office and I've gone to their offices around town and hear the story of visas, the story, and particularly of international exchange and student visitor visas. So, anyway, I just wanted to . . . and I'll let you ask me in the questions and answers, the more mechanical questions, but we do have a mandate within Homeland Security to address this on a daily basis and how to manage it much better and also we understand the cost of

this because much of it is not funded, directly by Congress, where it's fee derived, and so that becomes another problem for . . . in lesser developed countries where their resources are poor, such as I served in Honduras and I can tell you most of the Honduran students wouldn't be able to pay a \$100 fee and the subsequent fees that are involved in applying for a visa. So, that's another thing we have to address. So, it's not just the entry/exit, it's the getting there, educating people and basically reaching out and letting people understand that we are prepared to accept them and there are universities, in fact, I was visited by my alma mater's Dean of Liberal Arts last night from the University of Texas and the first thing out of his mouth was, what are we doing about student visas. And so, I told him I was going to come to the Heritage Foundation and address this and he said, "Bravo" and he promptly told the President of the University last night at a reception that I was doing this, so there is real concern out there. Thank you very much.

**Marlene M. Johnson:** Thank you.

**Sanford J. Ungar, President, Goucher College:** Thank you, Marlene Johnson, I particularly appreciate your having said at the outset that this is not a partisan issue, this is a matter of widespread concern and I'm going to accept your invitation to talk about our approach to this issue at Goucher College from a different perspective. We, of course, would like to have as many international students coming to study at Goucher as possible and we've had our share of the problems that every institution has had getting students qualified, getting them their visas and getting them back in, in some cases after they were already with us. But really, our focus these days is on the concept that it's not just important to have everybody come here, so we can show them what we are doing in the United States, but that it is equally important if not more important to demonstrate our interests in sending students overseas to see what other people are doing. To see what life is like in other parts of the world and I think this has become an urgent

matter of public policy, really, in the United States that we should be doing things. Congress and other branches of government should be doing things, agencies, to encourage study abroad, and try to encourage the fact, the idea that we have something to learn from sending students abroad, that that has a lot to do with public diplomacy and with our public image. In fact, sitting next to Congressman Kolbe reminds me of something that I think about often. My former colleagues in the media often poked fun at members of Congress who traveled abroad, in . . . the typical term was "junket" when Congressmen went abroad they were accused of going on junkets and perhaps in some cases they were. I'm sure Ambassador . . . the Ambassador was sometimes involved in having to host members of Congress who came abroad in their less than ideal circumstances. But I actually . . . I think one of the most alarming things is that there aren't more members of Congress going abroad. I've read studies indicating that only something between a third and a half of members of Congress actually even have passports. And I think an argument could be made that if you're elected to Congress, it ought to be a required part of your orientation to go abroad, to have one or two trips abroad and understand the world better because we are not, any longer, in a situation where all the world is waiting for the United States to tell them how best to do things, and waiting for them to follow us in line. So, what we've done at Goucher, and it's a new requirement that will go into effect next fall with the students who enter in the fall of 2006, we have said that every student, in order to graduate from Goucher must have a study abroad experience. And that can be a semester or a year abroad in the traditional sense, or one of our shorter sort of three week intensive programs abroad that we are now . . . they have just mushroomed extraordinarily and they're not all in London and in Paris, by any means, our most popular one is in West Africa in Ghana, Benin and Togo. We have one, starting up in Argentina, in Uruguay and another marine biology in Honduras, the art and technology of glass in Romania,

Central American history and literature in Prague, a new trip to China, one starting to India in January and on and on. There are 18 of them now and I think by this time next year there will be many more. And the idea is that everybody has to have some experience abroad in order to put his or her studies into an international context and it really doesn't matter what your major is, you can be pre-med, you can be in theatre, religion, history, in any field, we feel that students will benefit from some exposure overseas. We would like it if students would spend a semester, a year abroad, but we're very happy if they'll spend these three week intensive courses abroad. And we find that even . . . even in such a short period of time, while of course there's no pretense that people become an expert in another culture in any way in three weeks. They do get jarred off center, they do get a new perspective and some idea that not everything, everywhere is done exactly as we do it. The world is not waiting for us to tell them how, what the American way is. Only a tiny percentage of American students now study abroad. Well under 10% and obviously at a Liberal Arts college, with 1,350 undergraduates we're not going to make a big dent in the statistics immediately but we do hope that other colleges will join us in this effort. We hope that this will be something that others decide to do. It's logistically complicated, it's financially complicated. As Marlene Johnson pointed out, we are going to give every student a voucher initially for \$1,200 to help with travel expenses and to make it more possible. We will turn no one away from a study abroad program for financial reasons, and we have other funds to supplement that initial travel grant if we need to do so. And we think that in the long run, even with only 1,350 preps and the whopping number of 1,500 undergraduates that we will have an impact that everyone who graduates from Goucher will influence others in her or his life, members of the family, children to think differently, to think more broadly about the United States' role in the world, and to think more broadly about their own lives and the global aspects

of those lives. And so, we hope it will make a big difference. I would argue that if we are as preoccupied as we think we are and we say we are with the American image overseas, that rather than simply hammering away at people and trying to tell them, we're better than you think we are, what we ought to do is, demonstrate who we are and how we are able to be constructively self critical, to be introspective, to travel abroad and to see ourselves more clearly from afar and I think that will go a great deal further in improving the American image in the world than simply . . . while I think it's important to bring people here, I think we can't just bring people here, and we can't just keep telling everyone how great we are, we have to be demonstrating the whole American curiosity, the American willingness to take ideas from others and incorporate them into our own way of doing things. Thanks.

**Marlene M. Johnson:** Congressman Kolbe.

**The Honorable Jim Kolbe, United States House of Representatives (R-Ariz.):** Well, thank you very much Marlene for moderating this panel and my congratulations. Is this is on?

**Marlene M. Johnson:** Yes.

**Congressman Kolbe:** I think it is. Yes. And my congratulations to all the group. This is a very diverse group when you get NAFSA, and the Heritage Foundation, and Migration Policy Institute, the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange all together doing this, I think you realize that you really do have a broad-based coalition here. Ambassador Arcos said it was tough to follow Joe Nye but how about me, I get to follow Joe Nye, and Ambassador Arcos, and Sanford Ungar here, so I've got to finish this up here. I've been told that I'm supposed to weave this together. It's probably not going to look like a very well-woven cloth when it gets done here, but just a few thoughts to add to this discussion here today.

And by the way, I ought to say just in advance, in case you hear a beeper go off up here, that means I may end my remarks in mid-sentence and leave for votes which are expected in just a few minutes here. But you have heard something about, I think maybe Marlene did mention the fact that Jim Oberstar of Minnesota and I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 100 which does express the sense of Congress that the United States should establish in international education policy. I believe very strongly that we need to have an international education policy. I believe it's successful having been . . . spent so much of my career in Congress working in the area of foreign policy and in particular, the last six years, as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that funds all of our foreign assistance programs. I think I . . . I believe passionately that we need to have . . . that if you're going to have a successful foreign policy, you need to have people who understand the U.S. leadership role in the world. There are a lot of surveys that show that Americans know on some level or another that isolation is not an answer and I think since 9/11 that's particularly true. But there are still many who are woefully ignorant of our role in the world and the role of other countries that play in the world. And we need national leadership if we're going to change that, if we're going to help articulate the fact that isolationism is not an option.

For more of our citizens, if they're going to understand and they're going to support U.S. engagement abroad, they have to understand our relationship to the rest of the world. And I think in this context the profile that you see of international education in the United States is troubling. We do have, probably, more than most countries, we have little exposure to other cultures, to other peoples and languages. We're a big country, our language is the dominant language in the world. We're the dominant political and economic power. It's easy, frankly, for some of us it's easy to be lazy and not have to learn languages of other countries and learn as much about other

countries. As Sanford pointed out, that well under 10% of our college graduates have ever studied abroad as part of their college education. That's a very different figure than you would find in Europe or Japan or many of the other countries of the world, certainly of the developed countries. In any given year, only about 1% of all of those who are enrolled in either a two or a four-year college actually study abroad. I'm reminded of my own experience, and this goes back a ways, because I want to emphasize that things have changed.

When I was an undergraduate at Northwestern University, and I had an opportunity to study abroad. I learned about a program and it was exciting and I wanted to do something with it and it was a year long program and I went to the Dean to see about, if there would be some chance of getting some credit for it. I remember him flipping through the papers and all the documents of this thing, and the curriculum and so forth and he finally just shrugged and said to me, "I don't understand why you want to do this" he said, "Everything you need to learn can be learned here at Northwestern University" . . . (*audience laughter*). . . like I said, things have changed a bit since that, and now Northwestern has a very large component of its students that go abroad, in fact, they almost push you out the door to do it, and thank God they are doing that today. So, times have changed but we're still a long ways away.

The numbers I just cited really aren't going to be acceptable if we're going to retain our leadership it seems to me. In today's world we simply have to do better. We're not generating enough graduates with expertise in foreign languages and cultures and understanding of foreign business practices to fill the demands that business and government and universities have.

Equally distressing on the other side of this of course, is the number of international students that are enrolled in the colleges and universities here in the United States. It started to trend downward for the first time in a long time, though I think we're now beginning to see that

bottom out and perhaps even a little up tick in that.

I'm happy to hear that Ambassador Arcos says he's heard, he's listened to the problems that we have with visas and getting people into this country, either students or professors. I can tell you that more than 50% of the entire case work of my office is on immigration issues. And it's not because I'm on the border, they're not border immigration issues, these are issues dealing with students, with cultural exchanges, with the university, with professors, with IBM trying to get their people in here, it's all of those kinds of things. And the difficulties of getting those people in. Just the other day, I had a professor at the University of Arizona come to me lamenting the fact that a major international conference scheduled for the University had been canceled because they couldn't get the visas to get all the people that needed to come and the professors and the other professionals that needed to come to that conference. So, the conference was moved to, I think it was to . . . I think it was to Berlin or to Amsterdam, I forget which. And so, we lose as a result of that. We don't get that kind of intellectual exchange as a result of that.

Funding for educational and cultural exchange programs which have done a lot to help U.S. influence around the world has declined a lot over the last ten years. In fact, by about 37%. Now the Administration has, this year, in the 2006 budget proposed a significant increase in funding for exchange programs and Congress, I'm happy to say, not only met that but actually exceeded that amount so that even in the face of the very tough budgetary pressures that we have this year, we did that and so I congratulate the Administration, I congratulate the leadership in both the House and the Senate for doing that.

But putting that aside, you need the levels of funding for the other problems, and the House Resolution by the two Jims here, Jim Kolbe and Jim Oberstar, aims to respond to these sobering realities by stressing the need for a national strategy on international education policy.

The Resolution calls for an international education policy which ought to seek to accomplish about two or three key things.

First, a policy needs to articulate for the American people why international education and exchange are vital for enhancing our own security. Second, it needs to invigorate citizen and professional exchange programs to promote the international exchange of students and scholars, and third, it should ensure that visa and employment policies that we have here in this country and the Congress adopts and are implemented by the Administration promote access to the United States by international students, by scholars, by exchange visitors. All of course have to be consistent with our Homeland Security needs, but I don't think they are mutually exclusive by any means.

So, these are just a couple of the major things that are in the House Resolution. It already represents a pretty ambitious agenda. I think if the President were to articulate such a policy and call on Congress and all of you to help implement it, I think, there's no doubt that the people in this room and many others would rise to the occasion.

Specifically with regard to the discussion today, the nexus of international education and public diplomacy, I believe it's important for that education policy that we have to answer two fundamental questions.

The first is, as Joe and I were talking about, how do we effectively use educational exchange to promote "soft power", and the second, as Ambassador Arcos spoke about, is how do we effectively use educational exchange to advance our public diplomacy? An educational policy, a national strategy on international education and exchange needs to be able to answer those two questions and pull them together in a coherent national effort. It's important that we do that, that we have answers to those questions as a part of a broader policy framework.

We can't lead in a world that the American people don't understand . . . the world that is around them. We can't have a successful foreign policy without internationally educated and aware citizens who support that foreign policy and who understand, relate and interact with the people of all countries that we are engaged with. And the flip side of that is a successful foreign policy depends on our being able to educate future leaders from around the world about our way of life, our system of government, our culture, our political system. We're not talking about indoctrinating, we're not talking about propagandizing or proselytizing, we're talking about exposing people to the American values which we believe are important values and as we know have been . . . are still even, when we're unpopular in many countries they are still the values that many countries want to adhere to . . . or the peoples of many countries want to adhere to.

So, that's why I think this is extraordinarily important in my capacity both as Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee and as a member of Congress, intending to continue to work on this idea of trying to articulate a national strategy for international education. Thank you very much Marlene.

**Marlene M. Johnson:** Thank you very much. I had some closing remarks but I think Congressman Kolbe has given them. I think there's no question that he did a stellar job of weaving the issues of this panel together. I think the need, the urgency of a national policy is pretty clear. After hearing these four presentations, I hope that the Administration will heed the call and I think we have our work cut out for us, but it really is extraordinary to have the kind of leadership at this table to help guide us in our efforts. So, now we'll open it up to a few minutes of questions. There are microphones here, so if you would . . . let's see, I can't see where there's a question. Oh, okay.

\_\_\_\_\_: Hello. I'm Andrea . . .

**Marlene M. Johnson:** Short question.

\_\_\_\_\_ : Yes. I'm Andrea Leskes at the Association of American Colleges and Universities. We've heard a lot of the issues of education and international exchange as a part of a public good and clearly education and international exchange is also a private good. And I wonder how we can actually generate the kind of conversations that we need to bring both of these elements forward, not just at the national level, but also at the state level, since so much educational policy occurs at the state level and at the individual institutional level. Thank you.

**Marlene M. Johnson:** Who wants to respond?

**Sanford Ungar:** Andrea, I couldn't agree more. I mean, I think, that this is something that . . . these issue need to be . . . it's almost too late if you only start sending people abroad or bringing people in at the university or the college level. I believe this an issue that should affect the curriculum of schools right from the start. That we have to educate our young children to understand that they live in a much broader world, as Congressman Kolbe said, that isolation simply is not an option and even a seven or eight year old needs to be taught to understand about the bigger world, so I think this is something that the states need to think about and local communities as well.

**Marlene M. Johnson:** Thank you. Yes. Down here.

\_\_\_\_\_ : I'm David Epstein with *Inside Higher Ed*. We heard quite a bit about the visa problems and we know that after 9/11 that caused a significant downturn in the number of foreign students coming here, but also now with Australian universities becoming more aggressive in Asia and European universities forming coalitions to be aggressive in Asia, I think a lot of people would argue that even once the visa issues are worked out we'll still have major problems and I was wondering if that's a point of focus or, you know, how we might respond to

that coalition building that's going on in pursuing students primarily in Asia?

**Congressman Kolbe:** Do you want to elaborate when you say, we'll continue to have problems from . . . once we've worked out the . . . .

**Mr. Epstein:** May continue to have either stagnant or down turn in the number of foreign students coming to American universities from Asia.

**Congressman Kolbe:** Oh, they'll be going elsewhere even if they're able to get into the United States?

**Mr. Epstein:** Yes, even if they're able, I think arguably some people would say that's as big an effect now, especially with some of the coalition building and yes, Australian universities becoming very aggressive.

**Marlene Johnson:** Well, I can respond to that from our perspective. I think that you're absolutely right and I think that goes to the heart of why we need a national policy, because the issue is not only visas. Visas have been a huge problem since 9/11 but there was a trend down prior to 9/11 which we started talking about when Congressman Kolbe first introduced the resolution. There was a resolution already on his desk that had his signature on it prior to 9/11 because we were concerned about it already. Then the visa problem became the dominant issue for the last few years. But there is new competition out there, in Europe, in Asia, and the ones you cited as well. There's also an increase in capacity in China and Korea and Japan, so many things are happening and a policy would help us look at all of these things at the same time.

**Professor Nye:** I must just add some numbers that I saw recently. Over the last 10 years the number of foreign students going to Chinese universities has tripled, or nearly tripled from 36,000 to 120,000. And that's quite a change. It's getting more competitive.

**Congressman Kolbe:** Can I just add something because that was the beeper that said the

votes have just started. Here, I couldn't agree more. Other countries are becoming much more aggressive in their trying to attract students. They understand . . . it doesn't take a genius to figure out if you're in Europe, if you're in places like Japan where you have declining or aging populations and actual falling populations that you're going to have to do this. If you're going to get the brain power that you need you're going to have to attract them from somewhere else because you're not producing them in these countries. We, fortunately, are better off than most, because we still do have significant immigration to this country, but we are having a serious problem with attracting the kinds of people and the professional talent that we really need, so I couldn't agree more with you that I think that this is a major policy that we've got to adopt if we're going to compete with other countries doing the same. And on that I apologize for needing to depart . . . .

**Marlene M. Johnson:** Thank you very much, Congressman.

**Congressman Kolbe:** Thank you very much.

*(Applause)*

**Marlene M. Johnson:** We have time for another question. Back here. Would you introduce yourself.

\_\_\_\_\_ : Yes, I'm L.E. Roper with Amideast. My question is as regards to the mandatory study abroad program. First of all, I think it's a great idea but I was most curious, I know it's not going to be implemented until next fall, have you had any response from other universities e-mailing you or calling you and just kind of asking how it's being received that students are going to go over . . . what's been the general response from the overall university, college world?

**Sanford Ungar:** Well, first of all, let me say that the response from alumni and

perspective students and their families has been very positive. We'll see, you know, what the totals are when the time comes when all the applications are in and when we are actually getting deposits from people but we expect that overall it will have a positive effect on enrollments. We think we'll lose some applications and gain many more and that seems to be the evidence so far. As far as the reaction of other people in the higher education community some of them have suggested that we ought to have our head examined because there are a lot of administrative aspects to this that still need to be figured out. Clearly there will be some people who will need to have some exceptions to the policy for medical reasons or let's just say, disciplinary reasons, things like that. And we are going to design internationally-oriented programs that we offer in the United States to make up for that small number of students that we'll have to exempt. But we wandered in on this; we have a new strategic plan that called for it. The faculty passed a new genealogy (inaudible) curriculum that included it. And rather than wait for grants and for other details we just decided to go forward with it. I think the first couple of years we'll have to see how it goes. There's one other aspect to this that I didn't mention, very briefly, I'll just mention with Marlene's permission. We also launched something this year that we call the International Scholar's Program and thus far it's only 55 students, but this is a very intensive international program for students from all disciplines and it lasts over a period of two years and they take inter-disciplinary seminars together. They are expected to go abroad for either a full semester or two of these shorter three-week courses and they're expected to study some foreign language at an advanced level or start a second foreign language. Those students we're offering a larger voucher as incentive to go abroad and thus far that is working very well too. And we have, for example, pre-meds in the International Scholars Program, which we hadn't expected but we're very pleased to see. So, I think that there will be others who will join us in one way or another. I

hope it's a tide that can't be stopped.

**Marlene Johnson:** One more question. Ambassador?

\_\_\_\_\_ : I'm Bruce Langdon from the American Academy of Diplomacy. I suppose most Americans used to think that everybody ought to speak English, should speak English, wants to speak English, and now we hear everybody wants to go to China. Is English language capability an overriding advantage or isn't it any more in attracting students?

**Professor Nye:** Well, I'll take a first guess but I'd be interested to see what others say. English is still the Lingua Franca; it's still the operational business language. How long that will last out into the century is . . . some people debate, for example, there's an argument about . . . just given the absolute numbers that in 20 or 30 years Chinese may be the larger number of speakers, or larger language used on the Internet. But I still think that English has . . . it's a little bit like Latin, in the sense of medieval analogy, that English still does have a head start of being a Lingua Franca so, I think English still does give us an advantage. And if you look at Japan which . . . and Japanese universities—one of the problems the Japanese had in attracting students to Japanese universities is language prevention.

**Sanford Ungar:** But I think language is one of the lurking issues here that's going to be very, very important. We are experiencing a great demand for students to offer other languages beyond those we have traditionally. And there are high schools in this country . . . I heard about a high school in Houston, recently, that teaches 11 languages. And it's not just for immigrant children in the high school, it's a language magnet school, and they are turning people out that colleges and universities are going to have to be places where you can continue the study of those languages before long.

**Marlene Johnson:** Okay, I think we're at the time we have to thank our panelists and

thank all of you for joining us today and helping us advance this agenda. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]

*Transcribed by **HBR, INC.**, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 842-0869 or (202) 293-3222*