DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 568 SO 008 374

AUTHOR Hayden, Rose L.
TITLE Language and International Studies: The Rhetoric of Friction.
PUB DATE [75]
NOTE 24p.; For a related document, see SO 008 373

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS College Language Programs; Conversational Language Courses; Educational Improvement; *Educational Needs; *Foreign Culture; Global Approach; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; International Education; Language Enrollment; Language Proficiency; Language Teachers; *Second Language Learning; Social Sciences; *World Problems
IDENTIFIERS *International Studies

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines the ways in which natural, functional areas in international studies overlap with foreign language proficiencies. An overview of international studies and language developments is given along with contrasts between needs and realities, showing that educational practice in this area is out-of-phase. Today, the situation is packaged learning, monothink, jargon, and methodological sophistry, creating irrelevant and inapplicable knowledge. Given a desire for reform and restructuring of education, language training efforts could reinforce and be more closely aligned with international studies. Reasons for promoting this are: (1) survival in an increasingly interdependent world, (2) humanitarian compassion and responsibility of the "haves" for the "have-nots," (3) need for shared brain-power for the intractable problems of mankind, and (4) educating children to appreciate a diversity of cultural expression. An assessment of the nature of the world and the United States' place in the family of nations illustrates the necessity of linking international studies and language training. Points of international studies where language proficiency are essential include area programs, teacher education, technical assistance projects, study abroad, foreign students, problem studies, disciplinary specialities, professional schools, and non-traditional programs. (Author/ND)

LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES: THE RHETORIC OF FRICTION

by

Dr. Rose L. Hayden

International Education Project

LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES:
The Rhetoric of Friction

by

Dr. Rose L. Hayden

International Education Project

Introduction

Like love and marriage, language training and international studies supposedly go together like a horse and carriage. To quote the popular song: "You can't have one without the other." Yet in all truth, the rhetoric is not convincing. Some marriages are better than others, some end in divorce, others are never consummated at all. There is simply no guarantee, as experience has amply shown, that language and international programs will automatically mesh on a campus. Linking language courses to area studies, teacher preparation, technical assistance projects, vocational and professional programs and to the disciplinary mainstream of the humanities and the social sciences is no mean feat. Campus gaps, like the Snake River Canyon, require daredevils equipped and brave enough to make the jump. Without professional and financial parachutes, there are few volunteers.

While integrating language options with the world of work and with other international dimensions is difficult, it can and is being done. More energy is being devoted to meeting the

needs of special groups of students, although much of this activity smacks of entrepreneurialism in a credit-hour-hungry world. However, when such innovations reveal authentic educational missions, they are healthy developments. No one has ever demonstrated conclusively that providing effective language services erodes rather than enriches the profession.

This paper represents one attempt to outline where natural, functional areas in international education overlap. It has a beginning, a middle, and an end. An overview of international education and language developments is followed by a discussion of points of mutual reinforcement in the language and area domain, all of which leads to a set of specific conclusions and recommendations.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: THE ROAD TAKEN

More is spent on international programs in the United States than most countries have in entire education budgets. Even so, it is not enough. Yet despite gaps and deficiencies in functional areas which make up the field of international education, the fact remains that much been accomplished to date:

- Whereas thirty years ago most American scholars expert on world areas could have assembled in a small conference room, the scale of the academic enterprise by the 1970's was impressive: 3,803 language and area specialists in 203 organized graduate-level programs teaching 8,890 courses to 65,243 graduate students of whom 3,014 were training to be specialists, and to 227,541 undergraduates.

- Language courses for these programs enrolled 91,029.

- These 203 programs granted 3,990 M.A. and 830 Ph.D. degrees in the period 1964-1969. The number of all language and area degrees had risen from 1,466 in 1958-1959 to 5,185 in 1965-1966 to 9,362 in 1970-1971.

- The total number of programs had risen from 14 in 1946 to 312 by 1970.
- Technical assistance projects, involving hundreds of faculty members around the world, listed close to 300 separate projects by the 1970's.
- Topical and comparative studies by 1970 included over 350 programs.
- As many as 700 programs sent American students to study and work overseas, while 200 two-way exchange programs came into being.
- Today over 150,000 foreign students are currently enrolled in U.S. institutions of post-secondary education.
- Support facilities, such as library services, built their collections so that present levels are impressive: 5.4 million volumes on East Asia; 500,000 volumes in Arabic, Turkish and Persian, to name but two areas.
- Under Phase II of NDEA Title VI, activities aimed at diffusing international education efforts more widely have stimulated scores of projects focused on teacher training, materials development, and curriculum building. Institutions previously excluded now compete for innovative grants to infuse their academic programs with an international dimension.
- Over 130 consortia presently exist to serve program needs in international education.

The wealth and spread of international education across the educational map has done much to mitigate parochialism in American higher education. Few scholars today would echo young Santayana's description of the non-Western world as being made up of "interminable ocean spaces, coconut islands, blameless Malays, and immense continents swarming with Chinamen, polished and industrious, obscene and philosophical." About the citizenry at large, one cannot be so sure.

While there is reason to be encouraged at the range and vigor of activities which cluster under the descriptive umbrella, "international education," the truth is that accomplishment has secured neither a steady nor adequate level of support. Just as the beach is strewn with shells and debris after a storm, so does the educational seascape reveal the hulks of program vessels caught on the reefs of public indifference and professional fadism. Somehow, the timeliness and utility of international education has washed ashore in recent years.

International studies, like foreign aid, has few defenders anymore among the populace, businessmen, educators and other professionals, to say nothing of the media, legislators, bureaucrats or foundation officials. When World War II pushed America into a world leadership role, and Sputnik shocked us to our very bones, a combination of forces led to a broad push to develop and sustain a cadre of experts. These professionals, knowledgeable about other peoples and cultures, were trained, in theory at least, to apply their analytical skills to international events. The hope was that their insights would help avoid any intolerable surprises which would threaten our national security and, by extension, that of the so-called developed world of the Western bloc.

Major legislation, NDEA Title VI, Fulbright-Hays, and the International Education Act was passed. Some was funded. Foundations moved aggressively to center stage and supported scholarly research, exchange, academic and development initiatives. As long as generous external funding was the prevailing perception, if not overall reality, the imbalance in international programs, the ambiguous relationship of international, multi-disciplinary

studies with established disciplines and academic modes, the near-sighted focus on present-day, strategic studies, and the neglect of public, professional and adult education never surfaced. Given external funding and tacit dependence on the Cold War rationale, internationalists engaged in hitherto unimagined intellectual pursuits and created competencies where none had previously existed before.

But the world, as it is wont to do, changed. Failure to fund the International Education Act of 1966 blunted the edge of a movement many educators accepted as worthy of their deepest professional support. The foundations hastened the erosion of financing by shifting attention from foreign to domestic concerns. Pressures of inflation and declining enrollments led to cutbacks of so-called "non-essential programs." Today, hard money is scarce and soft money must be mined through different shafts. Never before in the history of the field has so little been expected to accomplish so much, has global reality demanded so much of so few.

Rising domestic tensions, failures in Viet Nam, disenchantment with the United Nations, disillusion with foreign aid (a mere 0.2% of our GNP), neoisolationisms and just plain apathy, along with dwindling economic resources, characterize the present scene. With public support and external funding on the wane, little wonder the internationalist feels that he has bitten a bullet and a half. While it is conceivable that just as Sputnik stimulated an era of growth in international education, the Arab boycott will create new support for world problem studies, there is little hard evidence to date that this hypothesis will be operationally proven.

International Education: Needs and Realities Contrasted

Two hundred years is a relatively short time in the history of nations and of cultures. Apparently it is far too short a lifespan for Americans to acknowledge, let alone accept their fate within the world's economic and social order, or to value their own linguistic, ethnic and cultural diversity. It is political dynamite, and is fraught with severe educational implications.

With near theological zeal, U.S. educators have relentlessly viewed their pedagogical mission as one of "Americanizing" a foreign, immigrant population. Like monotheism, monoculturalism and monolingualism remain the sacred tenets of the faith. This implicit as well as explicit philosophy has contributed much to the erosion of our linguistic resources. As late as 1919, the Supreme Court had to overturn a state court ruling which had declared it illegal to teach a course in a foreign language.

And the melting pot continues to bubble away, boiling out, where possible, all discernible evidence of foreign languages, customs and mores. Surely the United States has to be one of the few countries in the modern world where to speak a second language is a mark of inferior social status. Indeed, the United States has no official agency, professional group, or any other organ which regularly surveys and reports on language policy and practice. If anything, hostility and apathy have impeded any serious consideration of the role of language in American society. And to date, language departments have shown an admirable lack of interest in such non-literary, non-prestige research.

Despite newly-emerging bilingual and multicultural education programs, the prevailing emphasis is on linguistic and cultural sameness. This implicit if not now explicit national language policy has done much to discourage the study of foreign languages and to inhibit the preservation of language skills learned in the home. It has often prohibited such phenomena in the schools.

The truth of the situation reveals just how far out of phase much educational practice is today:

Fact: A sizeable number of Americans, 33,575,232 of a total 1970 population of 203,270,158 is foreign born or of foreign parentage.

Fact: In 1972, America's public schools enrolled 44.6 million pupils, of which 6.7 million were Black-Americans; 2.3 million Spanish-speaking Americans; 333,000 Asian-Americans; and 322,000 Native-Americans. Of the 35.5 million remaining Americans, there is every strain of ethnic, religious and cultural heritage. There are few unhyphenated Americans.

Fact: One of every five new Americans in 1975 is an immigrant.

Fact: Few people can, want to, or will be "melted down."

Fact: Educational thinking and practice must shift its emphasis from "Americanization" to "globalization."

There are compelling reasons for nurturing a capacity to learn about and experience other cultures. The first reason we Americans must globalize education is elemental -- survival. In an increasingly interdependent world, where Kuwait is closer to the neighborhood grocery than the corner drug store, we must sustain informed connections in order to survive, if not to prosper.

A second reason is humanitarian. If the "haves" of the world do not care and share, we will have little claim to self-decency in a desperate and starving world. Experts already predict 150 million famine deaths a year by 1980. It would be as if three of every four Americans today would die before Guy Lumbardo's orchestra ushered in 1976.

Frankly, it is virtually impossible to grasp the true dimensions of these bleak global realities. To imagine those billions of wretched people boggles the mind. Perhaps this illustration adapted from Daniel Shaughnessy's War on Hunger helps:

> Picture yourself living in a small town or village of 1,000 people. Of the 1,000 villagers, 700 are non-white. In fact, only 90 are North American, 60 American, and 190 European. This means that the bulk of the population is made up of Africans (100), Latin Americans (50) and Asians (570).
>
> Half the village, 500 people, go to bed hungry. In truth, at least half of this number, or 250 is starving.
>
> The U.S. citizens (60) receive about half of the total income of the community each year and use 30% of all its resources.
>
> The rest of the village does not fare well at all. About 800 of your neighbors live in shacks and huts unfit to house your family pet.
>
> By the way, the size of the village is expected to double by the year 2010 A.D. Of course, many will die.
>
> Remember: You live in this village and there is no place to run, no ocean to cross, no forest to clear, no new continents to plunder and inhabit. There is no easy way out and no escape.
>
> Like it or not, we are one world and it is the only world we've got. We are all in this together.

The third reason for attempting, through education, to relate to all peoples and cultures is the need for shared brain-power. Historically, America is the product of brains imported from abroad, of persons escaping from tyrannies, pogroms and famines. We need the best-of-all possible minds if we hope to mitigate the seemingly intractable problems of mankind: energy, population, pollution, urban sprawl, disease, discrimination and injustice, hunger, and war. The list is long and lead-time is all too short.

Even if security, compassion and human survival were not at issue, other - culture learning would be prescribed as the insulin to counteract what one observor termed "the excess sugar of a diabetic culture." While Americans may be physically overfed and overweight, we are aesthetically starved. Thrills and violence, not beauty and reflection, abound, making us all fretful and anxious.

One way to avert a national nervous breakdown is to educate children to be aware of the dazzling diversity of cultural expression around the world and within our own national borders. Full appreciation of such facets of existence as music, drama, dance, costume, sports, cooking, gardening, religious rites and literature is unattainable without an education which opens the mind and cultivates taste.

Some Further, Disquieting Realities

Many Americans are not enrolled in school. They must be reached in non-traditional ways if citizen or adult education for international understanding is to be effective at all. Again, the facts are clear:

- In 1972, only two of every five adults had completed a high school education in the United States. This means that of the 111 million persons aged 25 or over, 46 million had not completed secondary school.
- In 1973, a survey conducted by the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education revealed that barely 5% of the teachers being trained had any exposure at all to international content or perspectives in their course preparation for teacher certification.

- The current average newspaper coverage of international events which is read by the general public equals no more than one-half of one column of newsprint. Virtually none of the newspapers in the United States has foreign affairs reporters on their staffs. Less than twenty-four have any staff specialists in the area of foreign affairs.

College students do not receive a degree of exposure to international education commensurate with the need to educate our citizenry for the exigencies of the next century. Here are the facts:

- Only 3% of all undergraduate students, less than 1% of the college-aged group in the United States, have enrolled in any courses focused on international events or on foreign peoples and cultures.

Notable imbalances characterize the nature of expertise among international specialists. Here are some unhappy for-instances:

- Over 100 million persons speak each of these major world languages: Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, French, German, Hindi, Indonesian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Swahili and Urdu. Instruction in the less-commonly-taught languages lags far behind in key strategic areas.

  - With its 117 million Arabic speakers, to say nothing about its critical commodity, the Middle East as reflected in U.S. language enrollments draws relatively few students, about 1,300.

  - Despite our costly and debilitating war in Viet Nam, the Vietnamese language enrollments in 1970 for U.S. colleges and universities were appallingly low - eighteen in all.

  - For all Southeast Asian Languages, only 214 students were enrolled in 1970. The South Asian language total, a mere 528. Placing these enrollments against the fact that there are 116 million speakers of Bengali, 200 million of Hindi is a sobering exercise. More than 628 million people speak Mandarin Chinese, roughly 6,200 Americans pursued such study in 1970.

Enrollments tell us nothing about fluency levels nor do they reveal anything about the quality of instruction in the area of foreign language teaching.

- International specialists and scholars in some world areas are disturbingly absent in certain fields. Of approximately 5,600 area experts in 1970, only 2.8% were in the field of education, 7.7% in applied professional fields; and 5.6% [illegible] various fields which make up the humaniti[illegible]. More disturbing, perhaps, is the rather startling fact that less than one-third of this national cadre of experts is functionally fluent in any foreign language, while 20% possess no language skills whatsoever. Only 2.5% of this group was born in the world area of specialization, and less than 17% have ever lived or worked there.

- Multinational business enterprises do one-half trillion dollars of business and account for fully one-seventh of the world's GNP. Growing at a present rate of 10%, by the year 2,000, one-half of the gross world product will pass through the hands of the multinationals. This monumental involvement has involved relatively little in the way of language and area graduates. Only 3% of those with training in international education specialties are employed by business.

- Other major sectors of U.S. international activity do not hire proportionately from the pool of graduates who have international specialization. Only 0.9% of those trained in international education programs are currently employed by the media; 2.1% by foundations; 6.4% by government; 0.5% by church-related groups; and 5.6% by international organizations. Perhaps as many as 10% of these international education graduates are presently unemployed. A sizable number is under-employed in that these graduates are not utilizing their hard-earned skills in their current jobs.

- External support is slim and has always been too meager to build a proper structure for international education programs. In 1970, the NDEA funding component in international education was estimated at 9.7%; the Ford Foundation share, 4.9%; and all other support, 3.7%.

Language and International Education: The Road Ahead

Language training programs, like most others on a campus, are roundly, firmly and fully packed into tightly structured departments where the emphasis is generally not placed on language training at all. An overriding concern with literary scholarship has distorted the educational process, with often bizarre results, not the least of which is the graduation of student language majors who may know about the language, but who are far from fluent in its actual use. Many are cultural illiterates if by culture one implies immersion in more than fifteenth century dialects and eighteenth century writings. The student is not to blame since almost all "culture" is segmented chronologically and mononationally, and bears little resemblance to the original. Knowledge like fresh fruit, has fallen prey to the packaging mania of an industrial society.

Lest the internationalists get off easy, suffice it to say that the disciplines involved in this field are no less guilty of tracking students through a maze of requirements and sequences which defy intellectual logic. Monothink is the norm, methodological sophistry the objective of much current research in the field. Often fewer than ten scholars can fully appreciate, let alone utilize the outcomes of this prodigious effort. And if the experts in the particular field are mystified, think of the policy-makers in the State Department, in the Office of Management and Budget, in the U.S. Office of Education attempting to decode the jargon and make it relevant to the pressing domestic and international problems which daily assault them.

Things as they are, however, need not determine things as they might be. Given a sound desire for reform and restructuring, as opposed to a tendency for tinkering and dabbling, the language training effort could be more closely aligned with and reinforce international studies. Points of access in international education where language components are key include these:

Area Programs: These curricular emphases on other peoples and cultures are generally flexible, tied to language competencies in varying degrees, and multidisciplinary in their operation.

Teacher Education: Social science as well as prospective language teachers for the K-12 system require much-improved programs. Again only 5% of all current prospective teachers receive any training about foreign peoples, cultures and events. This must and will change if we are to educate for the exigencies of the coming global decades.

Technical Assistance Projects: Many institutions are heavily involved in providing both long- and short-term technical assistance around the world. Some projects have definite linguistic needs and may be able to finance these out of contract funds.

Study Abroad: Classically, these programs have featured language instruction as a primary goal. Today, many students prefer and can be extended credits for individual as well as group experiences overseas.

Foreign Students: Well over 150,000 foreign students are currently enrolled in U.S. institutions at the postsecondary level. They represent a much underutilized campus resource of particular relevance to modern foreign language instructional programs.

Problem Studies: Problem, topical and comparative studies are on the rise and often include cultural and language cognates as program requirements.

Disciplinary Specialties: Traditional social science and humanities sequences, which have by and large dropped language requirements, can still be served, especially in areas such as international relations and specialties such as foreign area history and culture cognates.

Professional Schools: From tourism to international law, from business to veterinary medicine, from home economics to journalism, there are area and linguistic skills which are open to new curricular packages for internationally - oriented students.

Non-Traditional Programs: In the world of adult and continuing education as well as in the public schools and communities themselves, there are internationally-minded clients who require cultural and linguistic course offerings suited uniquely to their own educational goals, occupational needs, and ethnic interests.

Obviously, the same exact language option and the same exact level of language skills would hardly be appropriate for each and every functional area within international education, let alone for each individual student or faculty member.

For area programs, there has always been an emphasis on language for specialist training. Therefore the need is not so much to insert a dimension, but rather to improve it. For those faculty members whose study and research requires absolute fluency, there should be in-country mechanisms for them to acquire it as well as regionally-designated centers where they can upgrade skills without having to resort to international travel. This implies truly intensive, probably summer if not year-long sequences for these experts. For those scholars not focused on any particular region or nation but working on transnational problems or in comparative studies, reasonable verbal and highly - sophisticated reading abilities would appear to be prime necessities. Overall, reading courses could be designed which would provide self-instructional modules for faculty whose intake of primary materials and insights depends upon an ability to fully comprehend other languages, in print if not aurally.

Teacher training is a classic area where the hybrid approach to education fragments rather than reinforces skills. There are two sides to this issue. On the one hand, students in colleges of education require more in the way of understanding the role of language in society. On the other, those prospective teachers who will actually teach languages require a high degree of fluency. Most emerging teachers rarely have this and it is unlikely that they will attain it until French 101 and 201 is followed by French 301 and 401, not by literature sequences whose emphasis on the acquisition of language skills is secondary. A prospective surgeon dissects cadavers and observes actual operations, as well as reads about them. One shudders to think how a corresponding emphasis on the literature to the detriment of training would affect medical education. One last word: doctors must pass state board exams, lawyers must pass bar exams. Teachers of language should also be required to meet high standards and pass professional certification exams before they are turned loose in the schools.

Technical assistance projects have and continue to be important components of a larger campus' international dimension. Even those institutions not themselves heavily involved in such activities have faculty who travel and consult in many fields. Needless to say, for sustained and on-going projects in a given country, some language skills are essential, at least for project coordinators. Language departments should be aware of their campus' overseas activities and should, where possible, press for inclusion.

Thus, for example, if campus X has a ten-year project in Brazil, written into the contract should be funding to support language and area training for faculty and monies to maintain a campus back-up of such services. Where possible, language liaison types could be assigned to travel, interpret, and work with technical personnel.

Study abroad programs are as numerous and prolific as rabbits. Like rabbits, their lifespan is often perilously short. Their instability is due, in part at least, to the fact that they are often not part of the mainstream of language training. Also, the rigidity built into many of these programs inhibits their utility to the student. At worst, students are sequestered in little American ghettos, at best they are expected to fit their overseas experiences into course structures replicating those back on the home campus. Departments are loathe to give blank credits towards a major, especially when those credit-hours are not neatly transferrable and clearly awarded to the department itself. No tickee, no laundry. Thus, a wider range of alternatives are implied if language options for study abroad programs are to become more popular. Finally, cost-cutting, consortial programs as well as scholarship and loan funds would enable talented, less-affluent language and area students to participate.

Foreign students have been utilized in language instruction for some time now, but again the emphasis is on the graduate assistant who is a Ph.D. aspirant in literature. In the more "esoteric" languages such as Urdu or Twi, this may not be the case. The fact remains, however, that humane and extended contact with foreign students is not always the case.

If language departments were more serious about producing bilingual students, the number of class contact hours would have to increase dramatically. One resource to meet this demand would be the foreign student, provided they would be adequately trained to teach their native languages to American students.

For problem and disciplinary specialties, there is not all that much hope for any real turnaround in educational practice until language requirements are firmly reinstated in certain pertinent and clearly related fields. This implies language offerings which are designed to meet specific curricular objectives set by other departments. It is a service function, pure and simple, and requires that a tough decision be made -- namely, that language may be a means to someone else's ends. It implies considerably more flexibility in scheduling and content as well as in the preparation of suitable teaching materials.

Basically everyone who has done some hard thinking has come up with some language program or other designed for airline stewardesses, health inspectors, restaurant employees and businessmen. That is not all bad, provided, of course, that the professional schools loosen up and take this requirement seriously. Another unlikely event, at least in the short run. Few faculty in the professional schools will do much more than pay lip service to the desirability of language learning. After all, how many Christians actually go to church when you get right down to it?

The curriculum is very tightly structured in the professional schools, and overall the student has very few electives. Wholly new degree designations and real educational reform must occur before anything

approaching meaningful language training will become a natural part of a student's program. In the short run, highly-specific, client-centered courses are the best a language department can expect to develop and market to the professional schools.

Last but not least are language training programs geared to the needs of a community, to adults, to the elderly, etc. These programs may range from non-credit evening classes in basic reading to very intensive, consulting services for multinational business firms. Once again, language will be a means to an end largely defined by the client in question. One can only hope that the client will choose wisely and that the client will get what he or she has paid good money for. "Remember Berlitz" is the rallying cry.

The real challenge, as it emerges from the above, is to be able to design and implement special service language training programs without undercutting the basic educational programs and purposes of the department and of the place of language in intellectual endeavor. Somehow, the "means" activities must strengthen the "ends" activities. Client-centered programs must reinforce, not fragment the field as it is constituted and functions in its own right.

It is important that operational implications be teased out of the above discussion. Thus, for example, in the field of language and area courses, team teaching may be desirable; in teacher certification, professional standards reinforced by national and state-level examinations may be a workable option; in technical assistance, language and area consultancies may

enhance program effectiveness, etc. Workshops on learning processes related to language skills could be undertaken with the assistance of colleagues drawn from the fields of educational psychology and testing. Pedagogical workshops aimed at producing more qualified teachers could be considered, as well as a sincere restructuring of incentives so that the teaching as well as research function would be adequately awarded and monitored.

Finally, some serious attention to assessing campus resources is long overdue. How many foreign students and faculty are on the campus and what are their linguistic talents? How many American students use other languages at home or have lived and studied in another country? How many use languages in their fields, with their spouses, in social and community functions? Such a student survey could be undertaken as part of the registration procedure itself, with conveniently designed computer cards. The results of such information gathering, whether focused on students or on the curriculum or both, would be illuminating. Education, like charity, begins at home, on the campus. Before a language department can sensibly plan where it is going, it must know where it stands in relation to the myriad of human and physical resources which make up its own institutional environment.

Concluding Comments

Ultimately, as a source of motivation, if not inspiration in the face of the tremendous effort that is tied to any one, let alone all of these program possibilities, one must ask a simple, basic question: Why international education and why, for heaven's sake, language training?

The answer is based on an assessment of the nature of the world today and of the place of this country in the family of nations.

Certainly, in this not-the-best-of-all-possible worlds, a creature from outer space would marvel at man's preference for tribal and small-town allegiances in the face of global interdependencies and the proliferation of nuclear powers. Brute fact has yet to modify the last century's doctrine of absolute national sovereignty with its veneration of the omnipotent and isolated nation-state.

New nations emerge, converts to a crumbling faith. More established, wealthier states suddenly and painfully learn that traditional international strategies are no longer operative; that Palestinian guerillas destroy European airports; that military satellites violate national borders with impunity; that Kuwait is closer to the neighborhood gas station than the corner grocery; that acupuncture cures the ailing; that the price of beef in the generally rain-rich United States reflects population pressures of a drought-stricken Africa; that distant wars impoverish and polarize; and that there is no escape from an anxious and fretful world out there and a disgruntled citizenry right here.

There is no easy way out of this, no miracle cure, no panacea. International education and foreign language competencies are no Messiah which will lead us out of the desert and into the promised land of transnational cooperation and security. To claim such overarching powers for language, for international education, or for any piece of the curriculum is in itself a very discrediting exercise. Yet, now is a particularly promising and indeed critical time to reaffirm the value of our endeavors, to reconfirm

commitments and to re-energize the field. The continued existence of language and international programs in education is linked to our ability to contend with the present and to meet the future in a way which promises to fulfill and deepen our sense of national purpose, to strengthen our bonds with all men, and to enhance our prospects for a genuine reign of peace and human dignity.

Some Bibliographic References

The text of this paper is drawn, in part, from several previous articles of the author's own doing. In addition, these items were very useful:

Andersson, Theodore. "The faces of Language: Tool - Communication - Culture - Style." The Graduate Journal, Volume VI, Number 2, Fall 1964.

Bono, J. D. "Languages, Humanities and the Teaching of Values." Modern Language Journal, Volume 54, May 1970.

Brickman, W. W. "Modern Foreign Languages, International Understanding, and Peace." Intellect, Volume 101, March 1973.

Brod, Richard I. and Lucille J. Honig. "Foreign Languages and Careers." New York, Modern Language Association.

Diekhoff, John S. NDEA and Modern Foreign Language. New York, Modern Language Association, 1965.

Edgerton, Mills F., Jr. "Training the Language Teacher - Rethinking and Reform." Foreign Language Annals, Volume 5, Number 2, December 1971.

Foulkes, Peter A. "Some Speculations on the Future of German Departments in the United States."

Graves, Mortimer. "Languages, Languages, Languages." ADFL, Volume 5, Number 3, March 1974.

Lambert, Richard D. Language and Area Studies Review. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political Science, 1973.

A National Foreign Language Program for the 1970's. Modern Language Association, 1974.

Parker, William Riley. The National Interest and Foreign Languages: A Discussion Guide. Washington, Department of State, 1961.

Report of Interagency Roundtables Study Group: Area Training and Language, February 25, 1972.

Thompson, Richard T. "The Right to Read in Any Language?" Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1973: Languages and International Studies.