

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 378

HE 012 115

TITLE Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act and Related Measures, Part 10. Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Sixth Congress, First Session. Washington, D.C., on September 18, 1979).

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE Sep 79

NOTE 66p.: Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of original document

AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Educational Legislation: Educational Quality: Federal Aid: *Federal Legislation: Financial Support: Foreign Culture: Government Role: *Hearings: Higher Education: *International Education: *International Studies: *Language Instruction

IDENTIFIERS Congress (96th): *Higher Education Act Title VI

ABSTRACT

Transcripts of the hearing on the reauthorization of Title VI, Studies and Language Development, of the Higher Education Act of 1965 are presented. The history of federal legislation dealing with international education is reviewed including the provisions of Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and the International Education Act of 1966. Undergraduate as well as graduate programs are discussed. In general an inadequacy in foreign language and international studies programs is noted at all educational levels. Problems of financial support, adequate coverage of all languages and nations, program coordination, and program quality are discussed. Testimony is presented by representatives of the federal government, individual higher education institutions, and international education programs. (SF)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

HE

ED180378

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT AND RELATED MEASURES

Part 10

HEARING BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES NINETY-SIXTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON
SEPTEMBER 18, 1979

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 012 115

**REAUTHORIZATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT
AND RELATED MEASURES
Part 10**

**HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETY-SIXTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION**

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON
SEPTEMBER 18, 1979

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1979

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey

JOHN BRADEMÁS, Indiana

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan

PHILLIP BURTON, California

JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania

WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri

MARIO BIAGGI, New York

IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina

PAUL SIMON, Illinois

EDWARD P. BEARD, Rhode Island

GEORGE MILLER, California

MICHAEL O. MYERS, Pennsylvania

AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania

TED WEISS, New York

BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico

DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan

PETER A. PEYSER, New York

EDWARD J. STACK, Florida

PAT WILLIAMS, Montana

WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut

RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado

DON BAILEY, Pennsylvania

JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio

JOHN N. ERLBORN, Illinois

JOHN H. BUCHANAN, Jr., Alabama

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania

MICKEY EDWARDS, Oklahoma

E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri

KEN KRAMER, Colorado

ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota

THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa

DANIEL B. CRANE, Illinois

JON HINSON, Mississippi

THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

JOHN BRADEMÁS, Indiana

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey

MARIO BIAGGI, New York

PAUL SIMON, Illinois

PETER A. PEYSER, New York

JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania

AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania

TED WEISS, New York

WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Ex Officio*

JOHN H. BUCHANAN, Jr., Alabama

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont

MICKEY EDWARDS, Oklahoma

THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa

JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio, *Ex Officio*

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, D.C., on September 18, 1979.....	1
Statement of—	
Bullard, Betty, director of education, the Asia Society.....	45
Burn, Barbara, Executive Director, President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies.....	9
Lambert, Richard, director, South Asian studies program, University of Pennsylvania.....	36
Martin, Harold C., and Joseph A. Chalmers, Trustees, Franklin College, Lugano, Switzerland.....	51
Metz, Joseph, Center for Study of World Food Issues, Cornell University.....	42
Moye, Alfred, Deputy Commissioner for Higher and Continuing Education; accompanied by Richard T. Thompson, and Edward Meador, Division of International Education.....	2
Mullins, John M., trustee, American College in Paris.....	54
Nguyen, Dinh-Hoa, director, Center for Vietnamese Studies, Southern Illinois University.....	22
Rabinowitch, Alexander, director, Russian and East European Insti- tute, Indiana University.....	27
Ward, Robert, Center for Research in International Studies, Stanford University.....	11
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.—	
Bullard, Betty, director of education, the Asia Society, prepared statement of.....	45
Metz, Joseph F., Jr., director, Center for Analysis of World Food Problems, Cornell University, prepared statement of.....	42
Mullins, John M., Trustee, American College in Paris, prepared statement of.....	55
Rabinowitch, Alexander, director, Russian and East European Insti- tute, Indiana University, prepared testimony of.....	28

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT AND RELATED MEASURES

Part 10—Studies and Language Development

SEPTEMBER 18, 1979

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:40 a.m., in room 2257, Rayburn Office Building, Hon. Paul Simon (acting chairman) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Simon, Jeffords and Petri.

Staff present: Thomas R. Wolanin, staff director; William Clohan, minority assistant education counsel.

Mr. SIMON. Our hearing will come to order. Today, we will be discussing at a time that is very crucial for us right now, putting together title VI.

In connection with this, let me mention for the witnesses here from the administration and others the concerns that I have as I have observed this area, and I would appreciate if the witnesses can address these concerns and if they have any specific suggestions as to how we might address these concerns in legislation or through administrative action.

One is the problem of financial weakness. The second is a feeling that I have that the coverage tends to be too broad. While there may be one or two or three schools that can have African studies programs or Latin American studies programs, maybe someone ought to be concentrating on the Horn of Africa or Africa north of the Sahara or Nigeria, that kind of thing focused a little more.

The third is, do we have adequate coverage to meet the national need? In fact, are we developing places where we can go to find out what is going on in New Zealand, just to mention a nation, or Burma or Botswana. Do we have adequate coverage?

Fourth, are we coordinated? Through the Office of Education or the future Department of Education, how are we working with the State Department, the Department of Defense, the CIA, the Department of Commerce, and others to really meet what they perceive to be the national need?

Fifth, I am concerned about area studies programs. As the Lambert study pointed out some time ago, you can get a Ph. D. in an area study without getting a word of language. The lack of language orientation is a key question.

Sixth, we want to maintain a quality program, but I am also concerned that we are not reaching the community college in New Mexico or the State college in Vermont or the black college in Louisiana. How do we maintain this quality in-depth study after the Harvards and the Stanfords and, at the same time, see that we have a program that reaches to these areas and also reaches beyond these areas to the public?

Those are my concerns as we begin our testimony today.

Our first witnesses are from the administration. They are Dr. Moyer, Deputy Commissioner for Higher and Continuing Education; Richard Thompson in the Division of International Education; and Dr. Meador in Division of International Education.

I do not know how the three of you care to proceed. The floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF ALFRED MOYE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FOR HIGHER AND CONTINUING EDUCATION, ACCOMPANIED BY RICHARD T. THOMPSON, AND EDWARD MEADOR, DIVISION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Dr. MOYE. Thank you, Mr. Simon.

We are indeed pleased to appear before the subcommittee to discuss the programs authorized under title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to review the administration's reauthorization proposals, which would merge title VI of the National Defense Education Act and portions of the International Education Act of 1966 into a new title VI of the Higher Education Act.

Title VI of the National Defense Education Act established programs to strengthen our country's capacity for research in, and the teaching of, modern foreign language and area studies and international education.

Although originally enacted as an emergency measure with foreign language education related to national defense, the act quickly established its relevance to broader national interests.

The International Education Act of 1966 established that all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and cultures are important to the Nation's well-being.

Never funded, the International Education Act nevertheless greatly influenced the title VI programs. For example, title VI added programs paralleling some of the International Education Act authorized activities, and in 1976 a new section was added to promote locally designed cultural understanding programs for citizen education.

As an overview of the program, let us look at 1979 as a typical year. In fiscal 1979, the Office of Education funded 85 grants to colleges and universities and consortia for centers focusing on a world region or on a topic of worldwide concern. The centers covered 11 world areas at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.

Title VI also provided 30 2-year grants to establish college and university programs—(as distinct from centers)—of a global or multiarea nature.

In addition, title VI provided funding for foreign language and area studies fellowships for 765 graduate students in such fields as economics, geography, political science, and other professional studies.

We funded 25 research projects in areas directly related to foreign languages and international studies and, under section 603, we made

awards to 39 projects, most of which focused on precollegiate education.

A brief word about our reauthorization proposals. NDEA VI is a solid foundation upon which to build and strengthen international education programs. The job of educating the American public about today's world is far from done. For example, there is a greater need for international programs involving professional schools.

The proposed bill will strengthen the existing basic authority, and section 605 of the proposal will require geographic distribution as a selection criteria. This has been done to attract underrepresented populations and to improve access to these programs.

Combining the International Education Act and the National Defense Education Act title VI into a new title VI of the Higher Education Act will enable us to address today's critical needs in international education, just as the original NDEA did some 20 years ago.

The administration's bill omitted section 602, as you know, Mr. Simon, of title VI as part of the new authority created under title VI of the Higher Education Act. Section 602 is an integral and essential part of the international legislative authorities, and its elimination would represent a substantial loss to the national interest in providing understanding among the nations of the world.

Under current law, section 602 of NDEA title VI authorizes the funding of individual research projects as compared with research carried out under the international studies centers' program.

These individual research projects may be surveys and studies focusing on improved curriculum, teaching methods, and the identification of areas where improved methods are needed. We have asked you, Mr. Simon, to correct this omission for us.

I have submitted for the record a more detailed testimony. I have given you only a very brief summary. I would now ask that my colleagues address some of the questions you have raised in your opening remarks.

I will first turn to Dr. Meador, who is the Division Director for the International Education Division.

Mr. SIMON. Dr. Meador?

Dr. MEADOR. Mr. Simon, I think you have focused on a number of key issues and raised some important questions concerning the administration of these programs.

Let me speak first to the issue of maintaining quality while simultaneously expanding programs and reaching new clientele. This is something we are particularly concerned about, and it relates to several other issues, such as how broadly conceived a program we should or can have. You said the coverage may be too broad to reach new clientele, impacting a community college in Arizona or a black institution in Louisiana and, at the same time, addressing critical national needs for these competencies.

Coverage that is adequate for all citizens may indeed suggest a very broad-gaged program which, in the face of a static or a constant financial base, creates a problem of program balance or emphasis.

I see the questions you have raised as interconnected and very critical ones to our policy determinations in OE.

We have attempted to seek new clientele through a number of means. One that is well known and has attracted the most comment is the provision for outreach, wherein a foreign language and area

center as an entity receiving Federal funds under NDEA title VI devotes a portion of its funds to helping or assisting others who do not receive funds directly. They may do this by working with other schools, with the community at large, with businesses, and with others who have a stake in international affairs and global concerns.

The provision for outreach, when first discussed, did raise serious concern about weakening the quality of the program or diluting ongoing program capabilities.

I feel the outreach mechanism should be continued since we have centers and activities of quality that can be encouraged and stimulated to provide needed services in the community and provide a greater awareness and knowledge of international affairs.

Dr. MOYE. In addition, the undergraduate international studies programs also attempt to address the concerns that you raised. These programs do support the smaller institutions, the community colleges, the developing institutions, and attempt, through modest funding, to meet some of their needs.

Dr. Thompson may wish to comment further on that.

Dr. THOMPSON. Mr. Simon, with respect to the question of quality versus broader coverage, which is your question number six, following on both what Dr. Meador and Dr. Moyer said, I am recalling for a moment the recent hearings of the President's Commission, which I attended, and some of that discussion.

On the point of making possible recommendations for national versus regional centers, Pricilla Ching-Chung made the observation that these regional centers, were they in fact allocated in some sense by State, possibly could have a multiregional or interregional composition in terms of world area.

It would occur to me that, although officially we have not yet seen the final report of the President's Commission, this is one observation that certainly we would wish to consider carefully and to discuss for policy and pragmatic considerations.

It would seem to me that this kind of a proposal, were it to be multiregional, permitting an institution in a given State, without well developed coverage in international education, to proceed, not on the basis of the single world area focus which we currently require on the area studies side, to develop a multiregional program in accordance with locally designed needs, would be worth considering further.

Mr. SIMON. None of you have covered this question of coordination. How do you work right now with John Reinhardt's ICA and with the State Department and the Department of Commerce?

What are we doing?

Dr. MEADOR. We coordinate closely with ICA and with other Federal agencies which have a stake in international education affairs. With ICA particularly, we share a very keen interest, especially given their mandates. The focus of the former cultural unit of the State Department, as you know, was augmented by President Carter's directive for ICA to address the American public's needs to know about our foreign policy objectives and how these are developed. I would say that the extent of interagency coordination varies, depending upon the subject or program under consideration.

For example, I am informed there is a very effective interagency coordination on foreign language and materials development to insure that we do not fund projects that may be duplicated by the Defense

Language Institute or the Foreign Service Institute or some other agency, and to insure that the limited funds that we have do the very best job that can be done with the money.

On a question such as, do we have sufficient information or knowledge of events about Burma, for example, my own opinion is, we do not have nearly enough such coordination.

I have suggested to ICA and FSI that it would be useful for the International Division staff and policy people like Dr. Moye to meet with our counterparts in those agencies periodically to review what we are doing so we are better aware of what is going on. This is especially important, given the financial problems that we both must face and the constraints that education generally faces today.

I would say coordination is important in resolving such questions as how much is enough for any given world area.

Mr. SIMON. You mentioned specifically ICA. Do you work with anyone at the State Department or CIA or Department of Defense?

Dr. MEADOR. All our communications with the field in international activities abroad go through the International Communication Agency. We do not work directly with the intelligence community at all. Nevertheless, we are aware, as they make information available about the general state-of-the-art in some subject fields of interest to them, that are shared by ICA, by ourselves, and by the academic community at large.

I might observe, while coordination of an administrative, procedural nature may be adequate, broad policy questions concerning the overall national interest and how to focus our resources are areas where we do not coordinate well enough. We must continue to see to it that our domestically based programs and their overseas counterparts are well understood, correctly perceived, and acceptable to all concerned.

Dr. MOYE. Mr. Simon, I would add that one of the weaknesses I uncovered in the program was that we did not have a clearly defined policy development unit which would indeed take the lead in this regard and also interact with other agencies.

My proposal to reorganize our office will include a policy development unit which will have as one of its mandates the interagency coordination to which you referred.

Mr. SIMON. Dr. Thompson?

Dr. THOMPSON. Mr. Simon, I could make a comment on this fourth question as well. Since I joined the Office of Education in 1969 I have been a member of the Interagency Language Roundtable which is an ad hoc, informal organization that, as Mr. Meador had pointed out, attempts to insure that there will be reduced duplication among the various Federal agencies.

The GAO came along about in 1971 and 1972 and made a study involving the work of that particular interagency group and found favorably I think on its behalf that it is an effective mechanism.

The kind of people we regularly sit and talk with, not on policy issues but on issues like the very practical administration and coordination of language programs and research development for materials, are people like the representatives of the Defense Language Institute in Monterey. As you are well aware they used to have an east coast operation. They still have a Washington office. These folks sit regularly on that committee which meets roughly every 5 weeks.

Other representatives from the CIA, the NSA, the Department of State, the Foreign Service Institute, as well as other agencies that you would be surprised to learn, such as the FBI, Agriculture, Immigration and Naturalization, all of these agencies have needs for training individuals in modern foreign languages, and then representatives meet on a regular basis.

We very carefully coordinate these activities.

The question that has been very difficult to crack, which you had specifically asked, is the one of what are their perceptions as they might define "national need" for their purposes.

Previous attempts to secure from some of these agencies projections as to what their manpower needs would be have gone largely unanswered because they are not in a position to make public such information.

A survey which was conducted called "Languages for the World of Work" approximately 3 years ago again attempted to get this information and was not very successful in doing so.

It remains very difficult, although we do sit and carefully coordinate our plans and activities on literally a month to month basis with them, to get their projections. We know the kinds of people they need trained and we know also currently some of the major employers of foreign language and area studies personnel are precisely some of these agencies that you are talking about.

Mr. SIMON. I am going to follow through on that but I had better yield to my colleagues.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Continue, Mr. Chairman. You are doing a fine job.

Mr. SIMON. Would there be any problem with statutorily requiring some type of coordination? In this area of coordination I am concerned about this whole problem, of it being too broad a coverage and our failure to zero in.

It seems to me, somewhere, someone ought to be taking a look and asking if somebody is covering Samalia adequately. We should be saying that at Florida State University or somewhere we have Samalia experts. Where do we go for New Zealand and so forth?

I have kind of a feeling that the whole thing has kind of grown up by whim rather than response to national need. Somehow we should be responding to national need a little more.

Dr. MOYE. I will start by answering the first question. I do not think there would be a problem demanding there be coordination. We would not see that as difficult at all.

I have also asked your question of my staff. How do we know that the areas we are covering are the adequate areas? Most of our work has been predicated on the reports that came out of the Lambert study. We recognize that is now quite a bit outdated.

We have constantly talked about the need to reassess the national need and how best to achieve this. It would be my hope that our policy development unit would do that without giving a prescription as to how that will be done. It would be my hope that would become a big part of their operation.

Dr. MEADOR. I would like to add that, in addition to addressing the possibility of a reorganization of the International Division, there is an issue former Commissioner Ernest Boyer raised as a member of the President's Commission.

It has been suggested that one effective means of coordination and policy direction would be to establish a commissioner's advisory group, a national advisory body that would help USOE set international education policy, looking at the issues, the coverage by activity, level of education, world area and so on.

Such a body, while it would have to be fairly large, would not have to meet en masse frequently. It would, however, be available for the Commissioner to call upon and could serve as an advisory body for implementation of policy by the unit Dr. Moye has just described.

I think drawing upon this country's intellectual capacities in such a fashion would be welcomed by the academic community. Also, I feel this would be an effective means for following up the work of the President's Commission. As we make the very difficult decisions of allocating funds as we look to new clientele that must be served—on all these issues, if we had 45 or 50 carefully chosen and periodically renewed policy advisers helping us, I think the overall quality of our programs and decisions would be improved.

Dr. MOYE. Mr. Simon, to support the position I took previously, Dr. Thompson has advised me that we have the authority now or the mandate to coordinate through title X of the National Defense Education Act which says the Secretary shall advise and consult with the heads of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

There is no problem with having that provision included in the law,

Mr. SIMON. Perhaps even strengthening it somewhat.

Mr. JEFFORDS?

Mr. JEFFORDS. No. I am here to learn, Mr. Chairman. You are a good teacher.

Mr. SIMON. We both are here to learn.

Dr. MOYE. Mr. Simon, I have one more point. We have not ignored the financial weakness question you have raised.

We recognize the limitation of funding and to a great extent there is not a lot we can say besides the fact that the funding seems to be quite small compared to the total outlay of funds in the programs we administer.

Mr. SIMON. Are you concerned at all with the language suggested by the administration, "such sums as may be necessary"?

Dr. MOYE. I have no problem with that at all.

Mr. SIMON. You would have no problem with a shift to a more specific authorization?

Dr. MOYE. No. "Such sums as necessary" is consistent with the administration's proposals for all programs.

With the current positive attitude towards these programs we would be quite safe in using that language.

Mr. SIMON. Will someone from your office be here for the balance of the hearings?

Dr. MOYE. Yes.

Mr. SIMON. We may want to be calling on you again a little later on.

Dr. THOMPSON. Mr. Simon, if I could comment on your questions two and three; namely, do we feel that perhaps in certain areas our coverage is too broad by attempting to tackle an entire world area and would not the interest be better served by focusing, for example, on less than a world area such as a country or portion of a particular world area.

One of the problems we have faced in trying to reach these kinds of decisions has been one of trying to first of all look and see how universities structure themselves, and to try to develop programs that would better match the kinds of programs institutions offer.

We have simultaneously been concerned with the total amount of money that we have available and the best way to spend that money, the best way to select the kinds of proposals that come in from institutions of higher education.

By and large we have found that a more effective kind of process is one that selects a proposal which promises to provide an individual student with a broader context of a particular world area and not simply a single country or combination of countries, but one which helps to put that within the context of the world area in which it sits at large.

To be sure, when one looks at a foreign language and area studies center one sees immediately that it is really made up of courses and faculty members and students and all of the things that normally go along with an institution of higher education.

We see immediately that the individual research interests of the particular faculty members tend to focus in many cases on a single country or portion of a world area. When you take the composite of all the individual interests of all of the faculty members in a comprehensive center it tends to provide two things. It provides some single-country coverage, as necessary, as well as putting that within the context of a broader language and area focus for that particular world area.

We would have no objections to well-developed proposals from institutions that in fact would focus on single countries. That would be an interesting new area to consider. They would be placed within the context of which proposal can provide the greatest amount and the broadest training compared with other proposals we have in hand. From that point of view we often tend to see broader proposals more competitive than proposals that seek to do less than broad coverage.

Mr. SIMON. If I may respond, my concern with that response is that you say you have no objection to single-country focus and I agree what is taught and what is acquired in the way of knowledge has to be kept in context. We want students who have that broad context.

There is also a need for some focusing. Have we learned the lesson of Vietnam? I think right now the difficulties between Mauritania and Morocco; what American university really has zeroed in on this problem? Here may be a national need. We do not know where this is going to erupt tomorrow.

My concern is our programs are so vague and so general that we are really not meeting what is a national need in more focus. I would like to see the program move beyond and do not have any objection to a single-nation focus. I want that larger context, but it seems to me in your office you should be able to say Mauritania, Northwestern University is the place where we have some real experts on the Mauritania-Morocco difficulty or whatever the problem is.

Dr. THOMPSON. We currently can do that to a certain extent. There is a problem with Federal offices keeping these kinds of files on individuals. To try to lessen the problem of keeping these kinds of files on individuals, about 3 years ago we made a grant to the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies to develop what

they called a "Dynamic Inventory of Soviet and East European Studies" in the United States, thereby putting in their hands responsibility for collecting data on what were the individual research interests and specialties of their membership—information that would be available upon request to meet professional needs of a variety of aspects of our society.

Dr. MOYE. I think the question you have raised and the very fact that this hearing is taking place and the fact that the Presidential Commission is reviewing our programs may lead to some very new directions for us. We certainly will consider your comments.

Mr. SIMON. I hate to do this to you and the rest of our witnesses but we have a vote on the floor. We will take a 10 minute recess at this point.

I have no more questions right now of the witnesses.

Mr. Petri, do you have any questions?

Mr. PETRI. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMON. If at least one of you can stay for the balance of the hearings today so we may get back to you if we need. The three of you can be relieved and we will be back shortly.

[Whereupon, the subcommittee recessed for a vote on the floor at 10:15 a.m.]

[The subcommittee reconvened at 10:30 a.m., Hon. Paul Simon, acting chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.]

Mr. SIMON. I would now like to ask Dr. Barbara Burn, Executive Director of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies to be our next witness.

Dr. Ward, would you want to join her at the witness table and then we can hear from both of you and maybe ask questions of both of you.

We will let Dr. Burn speak first. It is a pleasure to have you here.

STATEMENT OF BARBARA BURN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Dr. BURN. It is a pleasure to be here.

My remarks are going to focus more on the concerns that the President's Commission has been seeing about international studies and foreign language at the undergraduate level in our higher education institutions.

In that connection they will relate a bit to the issues discussed by the last witnesses on the broad coverage and adequate coverage, coordination and quality versus quantity.

The Commission certainly found a very appalling inadequacy in international studies programs at the undergraduate institutions in our country although it is very hard as we all know to document exactly what is or is not going on.

The community colleges as an example which are admitting half of our undergraduate students or enrolling one-third of our undergraduate students have been offering a declining amount of international studies and foreign languages. This in part reflects the students' interests.

I am leaving to my colleague, Robert Ward, to talk more at the advanced training and research level.

In any case what seems to be essential in the view of the Commission is a major quantitative breakthrough in terms of educating young people about other countries and major international issues. The programs mentioned earlier, the exemplary undergraduate program of international studies funded by title VI through the Office of Education since 1973 has done a very good job but it has been very limited, chipping away at this \$980,000 this past year for 25 programs.

What the Commission seemed to think was important was really almost an eightfold increase in the effort at the undergraduate level with not 25 programs but 200 funded at an average amount of \$40,000 each for periods of 1 to 3 years and presumably the longer period for those institutions which are working with others on a cooperative basis through consortia arrangements.

A major increase in undergraduate international studies programs and of different kinds, partly the more usual ones of studying other countries and international topics but also very much to try to encourage professional schools at the undergraduate level to do more in training their people and their students about international issues.

Our Iran study report showed business is interested in undergraduates coming out of our colleges with what they call a sophisticated understanding of the international environments. This is what business dealing internationally needs and they are having difficulty finding it.

Accompanying this undergraduate emphasis with the 200 programs I mentioned is a very important other element of what the Commission sees as a priority and this also addresses the notion of the geographic dispersion reaching numbers of institutions and that is the notion of regional and/or State centers of international studies.

These would be at the graduate level. They would be widely dispersed. They would be dealing with other countries and with topics and a variety of approaches to international studies but I think the important thing is these regional centers located at universities and colleges for the most part would have a major public responsibility or a major national responsibility to share their expertise and to share their facilities and their libraries with a variety of educational institutions.

Teachers teaching in kindergarten through high school would be able to come for the summer and strengthen their own knowledge or acquire new knowledge in the international field. Programs would be run during the academic year as well. Faculty from smaller institutions which have limited resources in international studies could come to the centers during the summer and could teach at them as well as do research and pursue their international interests in a variety of ways.

These regional centers would be particularly active in outreach of the kind that was described earlier.

I think those two major points I want to emphasize; undergraduate programs and a greatly increased number of them would reach many more of our young people. Regional centers whose clientele or as Alice Ichman used the word "parish," would extend very broadly to our schools and to our faculty of community and 4-year college would reach large numbers of people.

As one final remark and also I think an integral part or a terribly important part of the Commission's recommendations on higher education which was touched on earlier by Mr. Meador is this proposal of an advisory committee to the international studies branch of the Office of Education.

As the Commission has discussed this it should indeed include representatives of other agencies concerned with international studies and research such as State, labor, CIA, and so on. I think it is terribly important; it should be including representatives from the private sector such as labor, business, and from the various groups having an immediate interest in international studies and such an advisory committee would indeed be helpful in reviewing the kind of coverage offered by all of our various title VI centers and programs—whether it is too broad and I think it would be bringing in a rather important element, especially the business and labor representatives, to try to have some notion of employment prospects for the products of these centers, whether it is community college centers or advanced graduate centers.

I am not saying that they should necessarily be concentrating unduly on job outlook for graduates but that this should indeed be one element in all the considerations of the funding and directions of the programs.

Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you. I hate to do this to you but we have another vote on the floor. If we can recess again for 10 minutes we will get right back.

[Whereupon, the subcommittee recessed for a vote on the floor at 10:37 a.m.]

[The subcommittee reconvened at 10:45 a.m., Hon. Paul Simon, acting chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.]

Mr. SIMON. The subcommittee hearing will resume.

If this is all right with my colleague from Wisconsin we will go ahead and hear Dr. Ward and then question Dr. Ward and Dr. Burn if we could.

Dr. Ward is the head of the Center for Research in International Studies at Stanford University and former president of the American Political Science Association and a member of the President's Commission.

Dr. Ward?

**STATEMENT OF ROBERT WARD, CENTER FOR RESEARCH IN
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, STANFORD UNIVERSITY**

Dr. WARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I had planned to approach this somewhat differently but your six questions persuaded me that would be a pretty good way of organizing it. If I may, I will throw aside what I had planned to do and speak to your six questions and I think in so doing I will incorporate most of the points I also had in mind.

Financial weakness was the first of these and I would like to say a word about that because, practically speaking, it comes down to the moneys that are available to support these programs if we are going to have them either at the general or the more advanced level.

It seems to me helpful to let you know what has happened in this respect. The story that is involved is really more a story of success than it is of failure, until recently.

My own career goes back to the Second World War period and if I speak in those terms I hope you will pardon me. I look at the enormous advances that have been made in our knowledge and ability to cope with foreign societies and foreign cultures since that time.

There was a survey just before the Second World War that indicated that in this country there were actually 13 people in the universities of the United States competent to use the Japanese language seriously for research purposes. We now have probably somewhere between 1,000 and 2,000 people and this experience represents, by extension, the circumstances in other fields as well, and I will come to this when I talk about your point on coverage.

All of this was accomplished in the first instance on the basis of funding from American universities principally and from American foundations secondarily and after 1958 and 1959 on the basis of Federal funding under title VI of the National Defense Education Act.

What has happened and what brings us to the Congress at this point is the simultaneous failure or insufficiency of all three of these normal modes of support. The foundations, as one might expect over a period of time, have chosen not to stay with this field. They thought it important to get it started.

They do not believe they should remain indefinitely with particular fields and the Ford Foundation is the best example of what has happened to funding there.

During the 1960's they were putting in an average of upwards of \$20 million a year into the field of international studies and they are now putting in about \$3 million a year.

At the same time the actual value of the Federal funds appropriated has gone down more than 50 percent in terms of real dollars since the 1960's. Where the universities are concerned I do not think I need describe to you what inflation has done.

Let me pass on to your second point, whether coverage is too broad and needs to be more focused geographically speaking.

I think you have a very serious point there and it is easily demonstrated in terms of recent historical developments that have taken place at great cost to the United States. The most recent example, and one of the more persuasive, it seems to me, was the blank ignorance in our intelligence community and our Government of the circumstances that were emerging in Iran.

We can look back before that to cases in Yemen, in Angola, and I am afraid to a long history of areas with which we were unprepared to cope when a crisis arose. The clear lesson of that prolonged history is that one can never be quite certain where and how seriously our national interests are going to be engaged.

I could go back to the reading of history and to whether or not any of these episodes were avoidable had we been better informed at the time. You can go back, if you will to the history of the Second World War and now it seems reasonably clear in terms of recent scholarship that had we been better informed about domestic Japanese politics at that time, not that the war with Japan would have been avoidable but given sufficient information, our chances of postponing it, which is certainly advantageous, would have been appreciable.

The same thing is clearly true of the Korean war. We simply were so ignorant of developments within China with respect to China's national interests and political sentiments at that time that we stumbled into a war that was quite clearly avoidable.

I will not even comment on Vietnam in this context.

It does seem to me that the lesson you are talking about of the need for coverage is absolutely essential.

I would go ahead from there to speak about the present mode of coverage in terms primarily of area coverage and broad regional coverage. There are certain academic realities that have to be taken into account. It is highly improbable that any American university is going to support a center that would be devoted to every one of the 150-odd countries which exist in the world today.

It is difficult for me from the academic perspective to conceive of a Mauritanian center or a Moroccan center. Because there is cultural similarity in the areas that are involved and historical similarity and linguistic similarity, it strikes me that the major mode of organization by region is a good one but what we do need is the sort of scrutiny of these centers to make certain that at some one of these centers there is the type of skill with respect to each one of these potentially critical areas that you are seeking.

Academically it is unrealistic to aggregate these in smaller units, partially because of a lack of student interest. It would be terribly difficult to get any student involvement in something as narrowly focused as that.

If you were turning out an expert on Northern Africa, that is another matter. That person then has knowledge which is salable and employable. In more narrowly defined terms I doubt this is true.

At the same time I strongly support your notion that there should be a national inventory to make certain we do have these individual specialists that you are talking about. They are worth their weight in gold and we need them and we need global coverage in that respect.

Your third point had to do with whether or not coverage was adequate geographically at the moment. Obviously it is not. We do have to make the determination somehow to see what the major gaps are and how they can best be filled in.

But there has not been mentioned this morning another type of coverage which it seems to me is of extreme and increasing importance. I am talking now about the other dimension of international studies, what you would call the problem focused or the functionally focused approach to international studies. This has to do with global problems of one sort or another, problems such as energy and food and resources and the law of the sea, a variety of things of this sort that are really of equal importance to the area approach.

Federal legislation so far has been distinctly biased in favor of the area approach. This is due to its historical antecedents. It emerged as a result of the experiences of the Second World War.

We have been far less inventive and far less adequate in our support for functional problems of one sort or another.

I would suggest to you that these are not competitive interests. Quite obviously problems are set in particular national and cultural settings and knowledge of those settings is of extreme importance.

Knowledge of the problems is of great importance also. I would hope that in any revisions of the title VI legislation it would be possible to give place or greater place and greater support to these functional problems than has been done in the past.

During the years when Secretary Kissinger was in power, a group of us from academia used to consult with him from time to time about

the problems of the Department of State. The greatest complaint he had was where these so-called new diplomatic problems were concerned. The Department was not adequately tooled up in terms of personnel because they were not things the universities were training for specifically in those terms. Now the universities have begun to do so and you have around the country a number of so-called centers of international studies or institutes or programs of international studies that are devoting themselves to some of the most truly critical problems of our time.

For example the role of science and technology in international affairs is of absolutely enormous importance today, yet it is not a subject that is traditionally studied in programs of international relations around the country. It should be. It is beginning to be. But these interdisciplinary programs by and large are starved and stagger from one financial year to the other. I think that they merit both Federal interest and Federal support.

Where adequacy of coverage is concerned this was a point that I did want to make as strongly as I could. These are not mutually exclusive interests, areas, and problems. They are complementary and that is the way they should be seen.

The President's Commission in this respect is going to recommend to the Congress and to the President that there be established a series of centers some 45 to 55, of which should be national centers for area purposes and another 20 to 30 should be problem focused centers or combinations of these two approaches.

The fourth point which you offered, Mr. Chairman, had to do with coordination. I would like to say a word about it. I think it is both neglected and a very serious omission under present circumstances.

The coordination that has been discussed so far this morning seems to me to have been largely intragovernmental coordination. The representatives of HEW and the Commissioner have been speaking largely of liaison with ICA and with the Department of State and the other agencies of Government that are concerned.

I would submit there are other parties that are left out of a consultative apparatus of that sort which are of extreme importance. One of them obviously is the group I represent here, that is the scholars who are involved in the field.

From our standpoint the program would benefit greatly were it possible to have arrangements for routine consultation. I mean in the form of a formal advisory committee, advisory to the new Secretary of the Department of Education, if that is the way it is going to be or to the Commissioner if the present arrangements continue.

It is our interests that are affected. Without doubt we are the most knowledgeable about the problems involved. If such an advisory body can be created with respect to international studies and international interests, it would seem to me there ought also to be other private representation in addition to academia. One of the problems with international studies in this country is that we do not make enough use or effective use of the resources we have.

Private business has a great deal of knowledge and a great deal to say that is useful to the national interest in this respect, but there is no routine forum where the various elements of Government that are daily concerned with this sort of activity can be brought into

conjunction with scholarship in the area and with business and labor interests and business and the labor knowledge in this area.

One of the things that the President's Commission is going to recommend to the President and to the Congress is the establishment of a new Federal Council on International Training and Research which it is hoped will recognize in a degree that has not been recognized in the past the enormous complexity of the problems we face in foreign relations today.

It is not only that they involve domestic affairs to a much greater extent than they did in the past. The two are so intermingled, foreign and domestic, today that it is impossible to segregate them.

If we are to take into account the enormously increased complexity which results from the injection of all these new global problems that we face, we feel that the country is not adequately tooled up structurally and there is obviously not enough discussion within the Government between the various agencies that are involved and certainly not enough discussion between the Government on the one hand and academia and business on the other.

We would argue for and hope to persuade you of the value not only of an advisory committee to the Department of Education with respect to international studies but of the wisdom of some larger organization that could bring together on an interagency basis representatives—high level representatives—of the departments that are concerned with representatives of business and labor and academia.

Other types of coordination seem to us useful. The scholarly community itself is ill organized on this score. There is really no apparatus for bringing together the scholars either of the area persuasion or the problem focused persuasion to discuss the state of the field, the needs of the field, and this sort of thing.

It occurred to us in the respect that it might be a very useful adjunct to the proposed Federal Council on International Training and Research if there were also a complementary body called something like a National Committee on International Training and Research that could be put together for the purpose of bringing together scholars to administer federally assisted research or training programs that it would not be suitable for the Federal Government to administer if policy relevant research were concerned. Such a Committee would provide opportunity to organize international scholarship somewhat more effectively in both the scholarly and the national interest.

But this is not going to happen automatically as long as universities and programs operate separately and with no formal or routine consultation among themselves. We are not going to improve significantly the national circumstances unless there is some opportunity for planning of this sort.

Your fifth point was the need for more and better language training. All of us on the President's Commission of course endorse this most wholeheartedly.

I will not speak of it at the moment from the standpoint of K through 12 or from the standpoint of undergraduate education but more from the standpoint of the quality of the language education that is available in this country and the need for language instruction particularly in some of the more uncommon languages.

It is not so much a matter of exposing people to 1 or 2 years of instruction in a foreign language. It does not do a great deal of good. It takes 3 or 4 years before you are going to learn anything useful unless you are doing it under intensive circumstances.

We can demonstrate this from endless experience at this point. When I began to study Japanese we figured it took 5 or 6 years to acquire reasonable fluency in the language. With our improved methods today we can do it under intensive circumstances in 2 years or 2 years and a summer.

Part of that time has to be spent abroad. You really have to spend some time in the culture where the language is spoken normally.

As a result of that I would bring to your attention the existence of a series of overseas campuses operated on an interuniversity basis. I operate out of my office at Stanford, for example, the Center for Advanced Japanese Language Training in Tokyo and the Center for Advanced Chinese Language Training in Taipei. Both of these are interuniversity centers, eligible and open to anyone who can pass a vigorous screening national examination.

These programs now train between 60 and 80 percent of the people who are going on to become advanced specialists in these fields in this country. They perform an absolutely essential function.

I would call to your attention the need for support of operations of this sort if we are to achieve, particularly in the uncommon languages, the type of sophistication and skill that is necessary.

Your final question, Mr. Chairman, had to do with the need for both quality and dispersion. This is one way of bringing up the old problem of elitism versus populism, quality versus access, and who knows what other names have been attached.

To my mind this is a completely false dichotomy. I think you are so correct when you say the country needs both quality and dispersion in this fashion.

I hope the President's Commission has an answer that will be helpful in this respect.

Barbara Burn has said a little bit about the undergraduate aspect of it. There are also elaborate recommendations at the K through 12 level.

What I am talking about is really the advanced part of the training process which is directed more toward quality than dispersion, but not completely so.

The Commission is going to recommend a two-level system of national and regional centers. In general the regional centers, while having important research and teaching responsibilities, ought to be concerned primarily with the spreading of information and knowledge and understanding and sophistication at the general level, the level of the average undergraduate and of the K through 12 schools.

It is an attempt to get more cooperation and more effective use made of the skills that are available at this level. We will be recommending the establishment of 60 to 70 regional centers of this sort, one in each State at least and the District of Columbia, and possibly a few more where there are concentrations of able universities, with the primary function of trying to broaden the level of sophistication and knowledge of university and other populations in this field.

The Commission will also recommend a smaller number, in all some 65 to 75, of so-called national centers. The sole test for such status

will, we hope, be that of quality and excellence. These are intended to be the prime centers in the country for the turning out of highly advanced and trained specialists to meet the needs not only of academia. But also of Government, business, labor, and the other major segments of the American community.

I hope that these centers will provide an answer to this problem of quality versus dispersion.

If I may in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, say just a few words about the earlier testimony with respect to the proposed revisions of title VI.

I listened with great interest to Mr. Moye's testimony and his colleagues' comments. I would like to speak from an academic standpoint about the proposed revisions of title VI.

They are very vague as they stand now. It is terribly difficult for us to tell what the Department has in mind.

There are certain aspects of the proposals that seem to me to merit comment. For example, the proposed transition from independent status for the National Defense Education Act to becoming a portion of the Higher Education Act.

If I look at this proposal from the standpoint of the constituency that I represent, the university constituency, it seems to me unwise at this point or at least untimely. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, largely as a result of your influence, international studies and international education have been incorporated as one of the main purposes of the proposed new Department of Education.

If that is so, Dr. Moye's recommendations seem to me to pose organizational problems.

I would hope as a representative of international studies that there could be more independent, more secure, and more influential status for international studies in the new Department than simply a branch of the Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education.

If there were any chance whatsoever of getting independent and more influential status organizationally speaking in the new Department, I think we would be very foolish to foreclose that opportunity at this time before we know what the new Department is going to look like.

Second, there is an element of unreality in the proposal in the sense that not all of title VI as it presently stands relates to higher education. Section 603, which has become under the new legislation 604, obviously relates primarily to K through 12 and adult and continuing education, and might be out of place in the Higher Education Act.

If 603 were to be moved anyplace it would seem to me that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would be the appropriate place for it.

Third, there is an aspect of what is proposed in 601(b) that limits Federal support under this legislation to individuals who give creditable testimony to the effect they will either go into the teaching profession or into public service. This seems to me dreadfully shortsighted.

What we are trying to do among other things is to improve the degree of sophistication and knowledge of international studies and foreign languages possessed by the business community and by the graduates of law schools and schools of education and agriculture.

Why should we deny them Federal support? It makes no sense whatsoever. We are trying to generalize such skills, not limit them. They would be so limited under the proposed legislation.

I was very much relieved this morning to hear that section 602 would be reinstated. It has in practice been a very valuable part of title VI and I am relieved to learn that it will figure in the new legislation, if this should go through.

It seems to me again inappropriate, or unwise at least, to include in the revised provisions support for new purposes which have never figured in an act that has historically been drastically underfunded. An example would be supervised student travel abroad. This is very expensive in a program where there is not now nearly enough money to do the things that are needed.

English language training for foreign scholars and students, again a very worthwhile sort of activity, is presently being financed largely, I understand, and rather satisfactorily on private grounds.

I would note also that sections of the proposed new legislation seem to authorize grants or contracts to forprofit agencies as well as to nonprofit agencies. This seems to me a dubious inclusion, without further scrutiny at the very least.

I am quite disturbed about section 605 which speaks of geographical dispersion. I am not opposed to geographical dispersion, but if this then becomes a primary qualification, as it may well be under the new legislation, it interferes with or rather contradicts the emphasis in the President's Commission's report upon the importance where national centers are concerned of using only excellence and national need as standards of selection. It does conform, however, to the regional centers which we are hoping will be geographically dispersed.

This is too broad, too general, and too all inclusive a provision it seems to me in its terminology.

I cannot but help lament also the departure of a specific authorized ceiling which has been \$75 million. It at least gave us a goal to shoot for and a point of argumentation when we came to talking with you people.

If we are denied this in favor of phraseology as vague as "such sums as may be necessary," I feel that we have lost a talking point at least.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much, both of you, for your testimony.

Let me say first by way of the timing, we have some timing problems that are unfortunate both as far as the President's Commission, this act and the creation of the new Department. We are just going to have to deal as best we can with an unfortunate and, perhaps in some ways fortunate meshing of events.

The one point you mentioned I am pleased to say that the Conference Committee is kept in my amendment which gives as one of the main functions of the new Department the focus on area studies and foreign language study.

I think when you talked about independent status, did you mean Assistant Secretary status or what specifically?

Dr. WARD. One can dream, of course, but I feel it would stretch it a bit far to expect that we would get Assistant Secretarial status in the new Department. I would hope, however, that we would get at least bureau status in the new organization.

If more were possible it would be fine. One of our problems, as we see them in the past, has been the very low level of status and influence within the Commissioner's Office enjoyed by international studies. It used to be higher and somewhat more influential than it is now.

This has caused great difficulty in getting access to the higher and decisionmaking levels of the Office. If we could reverse that and get as ready access as is enjoyed at the bureau level, it seems to me it would meet many of our problems.

Mr. SIMON. The two of you outlined a series of things. To what extent do a number of things and as an example the area studies plus the topical studies programs, it looks to me like they could fit in within the statutory framework we are talking about here. You are not talking about statutory changes.

Dr. Ward specifically talked about statutory changes. Dr. Burn, do you have any suggestions in the way of specific statutory changes you would like to see from the way it has emerged up to this point from the administration?

Dr. BURN. I think the Federal council Dr. Ward proposed would require statutory change

Mr. SIMON. Are you talking about a Federal council that is totally independent of all departments or are you talking about under the aegis of the Department of Education?

Dr. WARD. There had earlier been some discussions with the Department of State as you know about this and whether or not they would be willing to take a leading role in such a venture.

The result is somewhat uncertain in my mind. I do think State is interested but just how interested I am not quite certain.

There are, of course, a number of interagency councils. They have not been notable for their efficiency so far and that gives us some doubts where this one is concerned.

What bothers us is the fact that there is no realistic recognition within the Government at present of the complexity of international affairs. There are ad hoc discussions between State and Treasury and between State and ICA, but there is really nothing that represents the true compass of the problems involved. We are not talking about all international affairs but simply about international studies where there are major and important overlapping interests between Government on the one hand and academia on the other.

Government is a major employer next to academia of the highly trained specialists we are turning out. It should be interested in the quality and the type of training that is given in the colleges and there should be a mechanism for their expressing their views on that.

There are experts and specialists within Government that need retraining and replenishment from time to time. The theory that operates in the Government today is: "Once an expert always an expert." That is nonsense. They have to replenish this knowledge from time to time. The world changes rapidly today.

Government research is also so time-limited and so time-bound. They are all busy trying to solve the problems of 10 minutes from now and 15 minutes from now. Their research has little depth and little trend analysis to it. That is the sort of thing that universities can do. We have more time.

There are so many overlapping points of interest of this sort where it would be useful, it seems to me, to bring together these interests and talk about points of common concern. There is no mechanism that permits this.

Mr. SIMON. Is it possible to merge this idea of a Federal council and this advisory committee?

Dr. WARD. To the Department of Education?

Mr. SIMON. We are talking about an advisory committee on this whole international studies program.

Dr. WARD. On the one hand we are speaking of the Federal council with overall interests of that sort. On the other we were thinking primarily of title VI and the Department of Education and its administration of title VI.

Theoretically, it would be possible to merge these. The only question, I suppose, would be whether the result would not be too general a body to function effectively where the functions of title VI are concerned.

Mr. SIMON. What I sense from the Federal council as it emerges from our discussion and I regret I could not be present at the President's Commission when this was discussed but you are really talking about a separate statutory authority.

Dr. WARD. If it were to be an interagency council I am not sure that it would require statutory authority. It could possibly be done under Executive order, could it not?

Mr. SIMON. It would not be part of the act that is under consideration.

Dr. WARD. No, it would not be part of that. An advisory committee to the international studies portion of the responsibilities of the new Department of Education could be part of this revision, however I would very much like to see this.

Mr. SIMON. The advisory committee, should we mandate they meet four times a year? Do you simply set up an advisory committee and hope they meet?

Dr. WARD. I find it very wise to be specific in matters of this sort. I would certainly suggest twice or three times a year, Mr. Chairman, and composed broadly of not only academic interests, because I think it is important that private interests be brought into this as well as academic interests.

In that case you will have a forum that can speak with some discernment about the national interest as perceived from a variety of standpoints. I would not trust the academic interest alone in that respect any more than I would trust departmental interests alone.

Mr. SIMON. You mentioned your association with Taipei and Tokyo centers. They are funded in what way now?

Dr. WARD. They differ enormously. We have been much more fortunate with the funding of the Japan one than we have with the funding of the Chinese one. Let me tell you specifically what is involved.

The Japan one is funded about one-quarter by the Federal Government through title VI or through Fulbright-Hays. They have had to seriously reduce that funding this year. Second, from the Japan-United States Friendship Commission which is very interested in this field. They provide about one-quarter of our support. An other quarter comes from Japanese sources, specifically the Japan Foundation which is an official branch of the Japanese Government, and then, of course, a final quarter from tuition and payments made by the universities involved.

Where the Taipei center is concerned, matters are far more difficult. About half of their funding comes from the Federal Government under Fulbright-Hays. That has been badly chopped. The other half

comes from tuition and payments from the universities that support it. There are 10 universities which help support it. It is on the verge of bankruptcy at the moment.

Mr. SIMON. Any title VI funding at all to either of these?

Dr. WARD. Not title VI but Fulbright-Hays.

Dr. THOMPSON. Except for the fellowships that are used are under title VI.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Petri?

Mr. PETRI. I do not really have a question. I would like to make a brief statement. First, I commend you for the effort you are putting into what is really a much more important area than is generally recognized in this country. I will do anything I can do to help promote developing true expertise of foreign language and cultures on a long-term basis in this country so we do have people who are able to give their life work to understand Kurdish, as an example, looking at the cultural entities.

I think we will be able to behave in a much more sophisticated, mature, and effective fashion on the international stage and avoid compounding things like Vietnam in the future.

I think you are attempting to help lead us in that direction, and I am here to promote that in any way I can.

Dr. WARD. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Following my colleague's comments and in line with an earlier discussion, I recognize the academic problem. You cannot have a Moroccan center. I do have the feeling that we are spread much too thin and many centers that now go under the name of African centers and Latin American centers and Asian centers in fact do not offer anywhere near as much substance as they should and maybe if they were the North African center or at least some much smaller region, maybe we really would get a little more focus.

Do you have any feeling on that?

Dr. WARD. Yes. The problem is particularly acute of course where Africa and Latin America is concerned. I think that is where you find it worse.

I think the aggregations in other places are more manageable, for example, in Southeast Asia. There are 10 countries. Among the three major centers that you find in the United States there is reasonable coverage but not as much as we would like to see. We could use more. There is reasonable coverage of the 10 states of Southeast Asia.

Where Africa and Latin America are concerned, what you find is unannounced or unproclaimed specializations, for example, you may find that a Latin American center may deal primarily in Argentina and Brazil and maybe one or two other countries, as well.

What I would suggest would be taking a careful look at the composition of these centers and simply making sure that in our national combination of Latin American centers you have the sort of coverage you seek. I think that could be done while preserving the academic advantages of larger entities. It would take some scrutiny.

Mr. SIMON. As far as you know that is not being done now?

Dr. WARD. I am sure in some cases it is not adequately being done because we turned up a great dearth, for example, when the Yemen business came up. It turned out not to be terribly important but who in this country knows anything about South and North Yemen? There are also very few people that know much about Oman.

Mr. PETRI. We spent a great deal of effort and money on the Soviet Union but not too much on Georgians or Kazahks. Ethnic minorities are a problem they have and something we completely ignore.

Dr. WARD. That has become a subject of increasing attention in recent years. You will find now there is more attention to the Soviet nationalities. I happen to know this because at both Indiana and Stanford there have been programs of that sort recently that have been doing something.

You are quite right that for a long time it was quite neglected.

Mr. SIMON. If I may use the Albania example, you are talking about a nation where there is great difficulty in communication. Yet it does seem to me it is in the long range interest of the United States to develop a small group of people who really understand Albania because at some point there may be a breakthrough and we need that knowledge.

Dr. WARD. If you looked into it, Paul, what you would find would be that our Albanian specialists are probably all Serbs and you can guess how they feel historically about their Albanian neighbors.

Mr. SIMON. We appreciate your testimony. We are at a point where we are moving rapidly. We may be contacting you for further reactions as we frame amendments to the Higher Education Act.

Dr. WARD. Thank you very much.

Dr. BURN. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Our next witness I am pleased to say is a constituent of mine, Prof. D. H. Nguyen who heads the Vietnamese Study Center at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale.

I do not know if it is part of your testimony but I think it should be pointed out that Japan—and I am speaking for myself and not for the members of the subcommittee—Japan has what appears to me to be a more enlightened policy toward Vietnam in the way of recognition and moving in for trade and other things. Japan is training their language specialists at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Ill., which is a tribute to you, Professor Nguyen, and your center.

We would be pleased to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF DINH-HOA NGUYEN, DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR VIETNAMESE STUDIES, SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Dr. NGUYEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I should like first of all to thank you very sincerely for this opportunity to offer to the two subcommittees within the Committee on Education and Labor a few modest ideas concerning area studies programs in general and Vietnamese studies programs in particular.

I am very honored and grateful that Vietnam is allowed to be discussed first. Usually it comes alphabetically, last of all.

Area studies programs which prospered in the 1960's are clearly in trouble at the present time. The curtailment of the funds has hurt the continuity of many a university program.

Area studies including language studies need to be restored to their maximum level of funding at the tertiary level while pilot programs must be established both at the secondary and the primary levels.

The Federal Government should help and encourage State departments of public instruction to promote and expand global education

through the intensification of efforts in curriculum and materials development in the social sciences and in foreign languages.

It is wrong to say that we have enough textbook and lesson materials or enough research tools in this or that area or this or that language if the United States of America is to turn out European-style professional linguists and language teachers as well as multilingual and multi-cultural citizens destined to function in peace and harmony in this shrinking world of ours.

Fellowships, scholarships and stipends of all sorts should be made available to college students and high school students to enable them to study foreign languages wherever these are offered either during the school year or during the summer.

In pragmatic terms language courses cannot be separated from courses in the literature and culture of each of the areas, hence the need for anthologies and translations of representative works of more than one national literature.

May I just say that the U.S. Office of Education has once turned down our proposal toward the compilation of anthologies of Vietnamese literature as well as twice our proposals for lexicographical projects.

As for the institutionalization of programs at the college and university level, we should try to attain maximum diversity and in-depth expertise at the same time, on one hand by spreading the precious dollars around centers and institutes according to geographical regions, and on the other hand by devoting substantial funding to recognized specialized centers.

There is no use for a given institution to attempt omniscience regarding linguistic skills it can inculcate when the same school can easily remain first rate for a particular strength.

Consequently, some division of labor imposes itself. I am thinking of the "gentlemen's agreement" reached between Northern Illinois University and Southern Illinois University, for instance, whereby the former, NIU, assumes responsibilities for Southeast Asia minus Indochina, leaving Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, that is, academic studies thereof, to Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

This fine example of interinstitutional cooperation within the boundaries of one State leads me now to some brief comments on the only center devoted to Vietnamese studies in North America. This is the AID-funded Center for Vietnamese Studies at SIU-Carbondale, which barely survives the financial crunch as it enters the 11th year of its existence this very fall season.

The Agency for International Development in 1969 awarded to our university a \$1 million grant to help create, develop, and finance an institute devoted to the study of, and research on, all aspects of Vietnamese civilization.

I will be very brief by reviewing the threefold scope of teaching, research, and service: Language courses, fellowships, intensive summer sessions, a special B.A. degree in Vietnamese linguistics and literature, quite a unique program which, incidentally, speaking of outreach, has provided through our graduates workers in the area of refugee assistance work and also bilingual education around Illinois and some neighboring States; research including fellowships to doctoral candidates, library acquisitions, lectures and music recitals, publications, et cetera.

May I apologize again for speaking really in the past tense.

Continuing, service consisting of consultations, library services, art exhibits, concerts and recitals, translations, et cetera.

We have helped a great deal of people through our interlibrary loan program to serve a wide audience around the country that craves for recreational reading as well as research materials.

These three areas have led to reputable achievements which also attracted the flak of negative, unconstructive, nay destructive, protests in connection with the antiwar movement of the early 1970's.

If, in hindsight, 1969 was the wrong time to start any program about Vietnam in 1965 I was invited to teach Vietnamese language and literature in Seattle and nobody cared at that time, but certainly a few years later, you mention Vietnamese chopsticks and there would be a riot out there.

If 1969 was the wrong time, neither was the year 1974 a good time to stop funding one competent and genuine studies center.

The legitimate academic program, the first casualty, shall we say, lost instructors in literature, history, sociology, and agricultural industries in succession, leaving only political science and linguistics.

Although I have been teaching Vietnamese language courses as my overload since 1975, we speak of the gratifying experience of the young Japanese diplomat trainees who are now serving in Hanoi and who received language instruction on our campus. The Japanese Embassy in Washington, D.C., in August inquired about a course in the Lao language, which we are unable to offer.

A great loss is Southeast Asia, An International Quarterly, which was published at Carbondale, but could not be continued for lack of funds.

Research projects have now to rely on individually funded assistance. It is my duty to gratefully acknowledge the generosity of the National Endowment for the Humanities which has awarded, in addition to grants in other disciplines, of course, to our university one grant in 1972-73 to help the editing of Vietnamese historical source materials and, more recently, two grants to fund a dictionary project whose objective is to create an English-Vietnamese dictionary, which would be the first one to be compiled, edited, and printed in the United States—something the USOE did not participate in funding—and also to revise and augment my Vietnamese-English Student Dictionary, published in 1971 by our university press.

Our once vigorous publication program has come to a standstill, too. Typically, an excellent English translation, by a U.S. scientist well known in the office of Senator Percy, of the national poem of Vietnam still remains in manuscript form.

The attrition is well represented in the content and form of our Newsletter, now reduced from this format to four pages of semiannual coverage.

Regardless of who or which country is the instigator, we all shudder at the thought of another war in Southeast Asia. The question is, do we have to have a war—be it cold or hot—before we have a studies center set up to study about some people and their accomplishments, their dreams and their aspirations?

The United States of America with its human and material—and moral and spiritual—resources could have used, and I am understating

it, half a dozen centers of Vietnamese studies in the 1950's and in the 1960's.

Let us hope that, in the 1980's, which is a decade during which many new Americans of Asian extraction will make their valuable contributions to U.S. growth, richness, and beauty, Congress will appropriate sufficient funds to finance, on a continuing basis, Asian and Indochinese studies programs all over the country, in private and public colleges and universities, in secondary and primary schools, and in the latter case, in coordination with well-designed bilingual and bicultural programs and using the very scholars, teachers, scientists, poets, et cetera, among the refugee population.

I am afraid I will have to save time by asking you to perhaps pose questions, which I would be very glad and honored to answer.

Thank you for your patience.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much for your contribution.

Let me say for the record that we are talking about Vietnam which is a nation that is now the third largest Communist nation on the face of the earth in terms of population, where not too many years ago there was a great deal of interest to our country and, unfortunately, nowhere near enough today.

How many faculty are part of your center?

Dr. NGUYEN. Sir, in 1969, the grant agreement stipulated that no less than seven professorships were to be funded by the grant and then later assumed by the university. As things now stand, we have only a professor of political science left. I have always been on State funds and not on the grant funds.

Mr. SIMON. You have a faculty of two in effect now?

Dr. NGUYEN. Yes.

Mr. SIMON. Your budget is roughly what, if you happen to recall?

Dr. NGUYEN. Zero.

Mr. SIMON. In other words, your salaries are paid, but the publications you mentioned and those kind of things—

Dr. NGUYEN. I teach and do secretarial and janitorial work on my own—out of love.

Mr. SIMON. How many Vietnamese volumes would you have in the library and how would that compare with other universities? Are there other places that have a substantial holding if you have one?

Dr. NGUYEN. Yes, there are, sir. The Library of Congress is one, and also Cornell University. Both have large collections of Southeast Asian materials. I think the collection in Morris Library at Carbondale has been more selectively and discriminately purchased.

We do have valuable manuscripts in Chinese characters and in Vietnamese characters that scholars will need. Those were acquired when we still had the grant funds, and we purchased them from various libraries in Paris, Tokyo, and Hong Kong and what not.

We do now have some publications that we owe to various U.S. Government agencies. There are over 60 titles in Vietnamese language publications alone, periodicals published in Vietnam, but we no longer have funds to purchase books and other matters.

Mr. SIMON. How many volumes would you say you have altogether?

Dr. NGUYEN. I am very sorry I will not be able to quote an exact figure. It would be quite a substantial collection. I would venture to say it is the best collection as far as Vietnamese materials go.

Mr. SIMON. You mentioned you are not longer able to purchase any books or anything like that. Do you subscribe to any of the magazines or newspapers?

Dr. NGUYEN. A few major ones. We have the newspapers, the dailies and the weeklies and what not that are published in Vietnam. We do not have space to store them. Only the major journals are bound and put on stacks for the benefit of students.

Mr. SIMON. You mentioned getting some support from the National Endowment for Humanities. Do you get any other kind of foundation support at all?

Dr. NGUYEN. No, sir.

Mr. SIMON. You mentioned the publication, Southeast Asia which, I assume was concentrated on Vietnamese studies—

Dr. NGUYEN. No. It was Southeast Asia. I have a couple of copies sent to the subcommittees.

Mr. SIMON. Are there other publications? Does this leave a complete void when that is no longer published?

Dr. NGUYEN. That journal has been discontinued. The center publications are still selling, and we have a lot of demand for those. We have a list of publications that I also submitted to the subcommittee.

Mr. SIMON. Bob Ward is still here. Is there a counterpart kind of publication?

Dr. NGUYEN. There is one out of Singapore, sir. Ours was the only one in America.

Mr. SIMON. There is no other U.S. publication?

Dr. NGUYEN. No.

Mr. SIMON. You mentioned you have received an inquiry about teaching the language of Laos. Do you have personnel to teach?

Dr. NGUYEN. No. We will have to add a teaching staff member.

Mr. SIMON. Is there any university in the United States which teaches Lao?

Dr. NGUYEN. I am sure the people in Hawaii who handle Thai could handle Lao as well. We used to teach Lao and Cambodian as well as Vietnamese on an intensive basis in the summer, and again the last summer, unfortunately, the Office of Education impounded the funds at the last minute, so we had to lean back on the AID grant again.

We wish we could continue that kind of service, to hold summer institutes and workshops for the benefit of education officials or social service workers.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Petri?

Mr. PETRI. Assuming funds were available, would we be able to attract young people in this country to spend their professional lives in becoming scholars in Cambodian?

Dr. NGUYEN. Definitely. The United States has begun to develop very brilliant, promising young scholars in those exotic, uncommon languages. We should continue on a more intensive basis.

Mr. PETRI. If we expect them to make a commitment like that, they would have to have some assurance they would be able to at least keep body and soul together over a period of years.

Dr. NGUYEN. As far as I can tell, there has not been unemployment among those rare individual scholars.

Mr. SIMON. If my colleague would yield for a moment, what about those who study Vietnamese and who are your graduates? Do you find an unemployment problem?

Dr. NGUYEN. No. The four who got our special B.A. degrees are fully employed now, again working with the people who speak those languages in Wisconsin, Arkansas, Illinois, and elsewhere. This year we again have a few American students in the language course.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much for an insight into a program that does provide special focus and is making an important contribution. We appreciate you coming here and your testimony.

I am proud to have you as a constituent of mine.

I would like to ask Dr. Alex Rabinowitch, director of the Russian and East European Institute of the University of Indiana to testify. We welcome you. You may proceed as you wish.

STATEMENT OF ALEXANDER RABINOWITCH, DIRECTOR, RUSSIAN AND EAST EUROPEAN INSTITUTE, INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Dr. RABINOWITCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I very much appreciate the opportunity of participating in this hearing. I am here as an individual whose primary vocation is studying, teaching, and writing about Russian history but who has, in addition, derived a great sense of personal satisfaction from directing a large language and area teaching and research center for the last several years, the Indiana University Russian and East European Institute.

I appear here as well as an individual who personally profited immeasurably from participation in Indiana's Russian and East European studies program as a doctoral student 16 years ago. I think that personal experience helps to explain my commitment to the idea of language and area studies.

Mr. SIMON. If I may interrupt you just for a minute. I hate to interrupt, but it looks like we have to vote on a bicycle program on the floor. After Dr. Rabinowitch, we have five additional witnesses. Rather than having a lunch break, I would like to just proceed and go through the testimony.

I hope you can be patient. We will proceed from there.

[The subcommittee adjourned for a vote on the floor at 11:50 a.m.]

[The subcommittee resumed at 12:04 p.m., Hon. Paul Simon, acting chairman, presiding.]

Mr. SIMON. Our subcommittee's hearing will resume.

To add to the complications a little, I have just received word that there is an emergency meeting of the Budget Committee at 1 p.m., which I will have to be at. If we can keep our testimony brief as possible and if any of the witnesses wish to enter their complete statements for the record we can do that or if you would like to summarize them that would be helpful. I do not want to cut anyone off.

If it has to be we can recess at 1 p.m. I assume our meeting will not last longer than 1 hour. We could resume again an hour later. Let us proceed.

Dr. Rabinowitch?

Dr. RABINOWITCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will try to skip and cut as much as I can.

Mr. SIMON. We will enter your full statement into the record at this point.

[Prepared statement of Alexander Rabinowitch follows:]

PREPARED TESTIMONY OF ALEXANDER RABINOWITCH, DIRECTOR, RUSSIAN AND EAST EUROPEAN INSTITUTE, INDIANA UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

I speak to you today as an individual whose primary vocation is studying, teaching, and writing about Russian history but who has, in addition, derived a great sense of professional satisfaction from directing a large language and area teaching and research center for the last several years, the Indiana University Russian and East European Institute. I appear before you also as an individual who profited immeasurably from participation in Indiana's Russian and East European studies program as a doctoral student sixteen years ago. What I propose to do in my statement is to describe the place of international studies at Indiana and, in particular, to outline the development and work of my own program. My hope is that in the course of this discussion, the purposes, achievements, and limitations of language and area studies programs as they exist at American universities today, as well as the absolutely critical importance of title VI support for the overall success of our endeavors, will be put into somewhat sharper focus.

LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Indiana University first became involved in language and area studies programs in a major way in the late 1950's. Growing out of an army training program during World War II, the Russian and East European Institute was founded in 1958; it was the first area studies program in Indiana and one of the first in the Midwest. Indiana University has over the years developed a particularly strong commitment to international studies, based on the firm conviction of its administration and faculty that foreign language competence and an international perspective ought to be ingredients of higher education for all students and that strong research and professional training strength in the international area are essential for a major public university striving for international distinction. Included among our programs are NDEA Language and Area Centers in African Studies, East Asian Studies, and Uralic and Inner Asian Studies, as well as Russian and East European Studies. We have interdisciplinary programs in West European and Latin American Studies, which are not federally funded. We also have direct university-to-university faculty and graduate student exchange programs with Hamburg, Jerusalem, Vienna, Tenri, Strasbourg, Warsaw, Kiel and Berlin Universities. Negotiations are currently underway for a similar academic exchange agreement with a university in the People's Republic of China. In addition, the University offers academic year undergraduate overseas study programs in Bologna, Canterbury, Hamburg, Vienna, Jerusalem, Lima, Madrid, Strasbourg, and Sao Paulo.

The total budget for the support of international studies at the Bloomington campus of Indiana University during fiscal year 1979-80 is very roughly \$13,000,000. Of this figure, approximately \$650,000, or five percent of the annual budget, comes from federal grants under NDEA title VI. In the current fiscal year, budget allocations for the support of Russian and East European studies alone at Indiana are approximately \$1,776,000,¹ of which some \$176,000 comes from grants under title VI. Thus, over 90 percent of the annual budget for the Slavic area comes from the University.

THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY RUSSIAN AND EAST EUROPEAN INSTITUTE

Since the Russian and East European Institute's creation twenty years ago, its primary goal has been the development of a broad interdisciplinary academic curriculum offering outstanding language and area training relating to the Soviet Union and all of the nations of Eastern Europe. In the past, the main emphasis has been on acquiring the comprehensive resources and providing an intellectual climate suitable for the training of teacher-scholars in the Russian and East European fields, and this remains the case. In recent years, however, as the immediate need for newly trained teacher-scholars has declined, the Institute has given considerable attention to adapting its offerings to better meet the needs of individuals interested in other fields such as government and business. In close cooperation with our School of Business, for example, two years ago we created a training and research program focused on East-West political and economic

¹ This figure does not include \$36,567 provided under a 2-year Ford grant to develop a special graduate training and research program in conjunction with the School of Business.

relations; this program is aimed at helping to prepare students for Soviet-East European-related careers, primarily in government and business. Additionally, responding to an apparent national need, we have endeavored to expand our program in East European studies relative to that of Soviet Studies. Thus a new Polish Studies Center, created under an agreement between Indiana University and Warsaw University, was formally opened on the Bloomington campus in October 1976.

In the last few years, we have also devoted greatly increased attention to providing better language and area training at the undergraduate level. In this connection, we established a new undergraduate interdisciplinary area studies certificate program. The Indiana University Summer Slavic Workshop, which pioneered in the development of intensive Slavic language training programs, annually draws to the campus 150-175 students from all parts of the country. The improvement of teaching techniques and the preparation of more effective course materials are matters of constant concern; for example, one of my colleagues from the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures spent the better part of the past summer at the Institute of Russian Language for Foreigners at Leningrad State University working very fruitfully with Soviet experts on a joint US-USSR advanced Russian language textbook.

Equally important, through course offerings and frequent public events, we have strived to inject a Russian and East European component into the education of Indiana University students generally. And looking beyond the campus, we have conducted a variety of "outreach" projects aimed at facilitating utilization of the University's rich resources in the Russian and East European field by community groups, high schools, small colleges and other universities throughout the region. Our most popular "outreach" venture to date has been the operation of a Speakers' Bureau, staffed by faculty and advanced graduate students, most of them with recent firsthand experience in the field. We have also initiated an effort to have greater direct impact at the secondary school level; for example, this semester for the first time we are offering an in-service education seminar on Soviet society intended for Indiana teachers of seventh-grade global studies courses and tenth-grade world history courses. Similar campus-wide, regional, and national general education activities are now being conducted quite vigorously by each of the other major language and area programs at Indiana.

Finally, though certainly by no means less important, the encouragement and support of basic scholarly research has been a central program objective. Throughout its history, the Institute has worked hard to help faculty and graduate students acquire the research and travel funds and other resources necessary for the completion and publication of significant new investigations in the Russian and East European field. Over the years, scholars from Indiana University have made numerous important contributions to existing knowledge, particularly in the fields of political science, history, economics, and linguistics.

Approximately 500 courses in 30 different modern languages, and 600 area studies courses are taught at Indiana each year. Some 170 of these language and area studies courses are focused on the Russian and East European field. Moreover, each semester the program sponsors a broad spectrum of extra-curricular activities, (i.e., public guest lecturers, conferences, film showings, musical presentations, special seminars, workshops, and informal gatherings). Visiting participants in the wide variety of extra-curricular events that we sponsor range from internationally prominent scholars and educators from all parts of the world to foreign political, economic, and cultural figures; the interaction of these visitors with students and faculty from diverse disciplines in a stimulating intellectual environment furthers educational and research objectives and helps to foster greater mutual cultural understanding. Such intra- and extra-university impact and interaction are integral to the success of any language and area studies program.

FUNDING FOR LANGUAGE AND AREA CENTERS: THE IMPORTANCE OF TITLE VI

The rapid growth and development of Indiana's program in Russian and East European studies benefited greatly, especially during its formative years from substantial Ford Foundation grants. This initial heavy dependence on private funding is typical of most of the major centers. Private foundation funding for language and area studies has now slowed to a trickle; in part because of this, our program's present status as one of fourteen NDEA Language and Area Studies Centers for Russia and East Europe is of absolutely crucial significance. Such federal funding is equally important for other language and area centers at Indiana and elsewhere. Let me try to explain why, with reference to the present financial situation of my own program.

Earlier, I noted that at present nearly 90 percent of the funds to support Russian and East European Studies at Indiana come from the University. The bulk of the University's contribution, approximately one million dollars annually, is in the form of faculty and staff salaries; 45 of the 49 faculty members connected with my program are funded entirely by the university. \$41,000 in University funds is devoted to the Slavic library collection (the Indiana University Library contains one of the largest collections of Slavic materials in the country). Approximately \$195,000 of the University's contribution is spent on financial assistance of one kind or another to graduate students in the field.

Yet the fact is that because of increasing budgetary pressures, the University's level of funding even in these major categories, however large in relative dollar amounts, is insufficient for the retention of program breadth, depth, and overall quality; in the absence of the relatively modest supplementary federal assistance which we receive under Title VI for salaries, library acquisitions, and graduate student fellowships, many specialized or minor-language courses with low enrollments would have to be discontinued; library purchases, already sharply reduced, would have to be curtailed still more drastically; and many of our most promising and deserving graduate students would be forced out of the field. Worse yet, budgetary pressures within the University are presently so considerable that much of our activity in the area of "outreach" and an increasingly high percentage of the extra-curricular activities which we sponsor are almost wholly dependent on federal funding.

In short, at a time of rapidly increasing financial difficulty in higher education, Title VI funding for area programs such as ours provides that minimal funding margin necessary to retain program vitality and excellence and to begin to reach outside the immediate university community. Title VI support, I should add, also has symbolic significance. It is not simply that whether or not an individual International Studies program is recognized as a Center has become an important measure by which students judge the potential value of training facilities around the country. More important, in the present circumstances even the best interdisciplinary programs are quite naturally more vulnerable to damaging, perhaps fatal, university budget reductions than are the more firmly entrenched, traditional, single discipline, academic departments. In this kind of disadvantageous competitive situation, the national recognition of quality and status that "Center" designation provides can in itself be of considerable importance.

NEEDS FOR THE FUTURE

This is not to suggest, however, that modifications in Title VI programs as they relate to our work, as well as increases in present funding levels, are not badly needed if the requirements of international studies are to be well served in the future. Federal help is urgently required for a number of important items not now provided for under Title VI, or satisfactorily covered by other funding sources; these include individual and collaborative substantive research; research publication costs; and foreign academic exchanges. In the Slavic field existing sources of support for broader humanistic research are especially inadequate; the results of important specialized research that lacks commercial appeal is often poorly disseminated; and even now exchange possibilities of inestimable educational value are lost due to the insufficiency of funding. Other areas of great need not now satisfactorily provided for include support for our major research libraries, which are increasingly unable to retain necessary breadth and depth in the face of skyrocketing book and serial costs, and for student summer language training. Pedagogically, intensive work in the summer is particularly advantageous for learning or improving a foreign language.

It should be possible to partially alleviate damage to programs caused by reduced University budgets by encouraging faculty to acquire teaching competence in additional languages and by encouraging universities to share faculty and library resources to a greater degree than heretofore; incentives for such individual broadening and intra-institutional pooling of resources might be provided for in the new legislation. In any case, five-year cycles for both FLAS fellowships and Center grants should be established to facilitate sounder educational and research planning. As in the past, center grants should be renewable, subject to a rigorous impartial review and selection process, in which program quality and national interest are the primary consideration. Fuller, more frequent, and more systematic efforts should be made to determine national needs and prospects as they relate to the training of specialists in critical languages and disciplines, so that fellowship and center grant funding priorities and guidelines will be consistent and will reflect rapidly changing realities.

It has been suggested that language and area studies programs have outlived their importance, at least as far as imperative national need is concerned. In this regard, while none of us would deny that existing language and area studies programs have very definite limitations and weaknesses, it is essential to underscore their strengths and achievements. Our major international studies centers have proven to be fertile environments for major advances in research in virtually all fields; in part as a result, the United States is second to none with regard to the quantity and quality of advanced research in international studies. Another major achievement of language and area studies programs has been the training of a large and solid cadre of language and area specialists. Since 1958, my program alone has produced 185 Ph. D.'s in fields related to Russia and Eastern Europe and 100 of them have also received area studies certificates. Many hundreds of Indiana students have attained competence, in some cases near native fluency, in a Slavic language. Through area-focused courses, similarly high numbers of students have acquired a better understanding of Slavic history and culture and of present-day Soviet and East European politics, economics, society, and daily life.

However, the very preoccupation of language and area-studies programs with distinct parts of the world makes them less-than-ideal vehicles for dealing with problems that are not area-specific. My own feeling is that a greater degree of fruitful collaboration on issues of broad concern among area programs themselves and between them and other departments and programs in the University can be attained in the future. At the same time, it makes good sense to create additional global or trans-national study centers which, drawing in part upon the resources of existing programs, will deal exclusively with major topical issues of a universal character. Similarly the experience of the past several years suggests that there is much more of value that language and area studies programs can accomplish in the area of outreach. Nonetheless, it is equally clear that major initiatives and new, locally based programs are desperately needed to facilitate increased foreign language and area competency in primary and especially secondary schools. No one has a higher stake in such an effort than those of us in international studies in higher education, for there is no greater handicap to the development of our own programs than the insufficient grounding in foreign language and area studies among our entering undergraduates.

To acknowledge the limitations of existing language and area programs, however, is by no means to agree that they no longer have great national importance. For if the demand for university faculty specializing in many areas and disciplines has declined, the need for individuals with extensive language and area training in such fields as government, business, journalism, and primary and secondary education, not to speak of the military, has grown extraordinarily. Surely no one would dispute that the need for fuller, more sophisticated knowledge about other cultures, peoples, and nations of the world has never been greater than it is today. Speaking just of my own field, Soviet studies, I can say that our understanding of the Russian experience has been advanced enormously by the important new research of scholars who have profited from Title VI programs; nonetheless, much remains to be done in this field.

The need for an informed citizenry with foreign language competence and an international perspective is also greater than ever before. At Indiana, the interest in international studies programs continues to be high, although not as high as it ought to be. The challenges for international education are as formidable at the beginning of the 1980s as they were in the 1960s and 1970s; the major regional university-based language and area studies programs, if adequately supported, will play a crucial role in helping to meet these challenges.

Dr. RABINOWITCH. In my statement for the record I tried to describe the scope of Indiana's commitment to international studies over the years particularly since 1958 and to outline the purposes, achievements, and limitations of area and language programs by looking closely at the work of my own program, at our achievements, and our problems.

In regard to our purposes, and I am summarizing from my prepared statement, I emphasized that originally we had been primarily concerned with training teacher-scholars. We had tried to provide the broadest possible graduate curriculum and to organize the rich resources necessary for training teacher-scholars in the Russian and East

European field, providing training in all of the languages of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and, insofar as possible, in all the different aspects of area study.

Now, more and more, we have tried to adapt our program to better meet the needs of people interested in nonacademic careers related to Russia and East Europe; for example, to people interested in careers in business and in journalism and government.

We have also increasingly tried to improve training at the undergraduate level both in languages and in area studies. Moreover, we have tried, through our extracurricular activities and through our courses and cultural events, to inject a Russian and East European component into the education of Indiana students generally.

We have also in recent years become very heavily engaged in outreach projects directed to widely differing audiences throughout the State and also the region. We find it difficult to completely separate outreach from our training of students. Many of our students are heavily involved in outreach work. They get experience in lecturing to community groups and schools and universities. We see that as part of their training.

Finally, in my statement I emphasized that an equally important major goal of our program has been the encouragement of basic scholarly research.

I go on in my statement for the record to try to show the absolutely crucial importance of title VI programs to our work and the need for significant increases in Federal help if the job that desperately needs to be done is to be done.

I must say I completely agree with all of the speakers who preceded me in talking about the needs of language and area studies in the United States. I particularly refer to Bob Ward's comments. In discussing the need for title VI funding for programs such as mine, I noted that at present nearly 90 percent of the funds to support Russian and East European studies at Indiana come from the university. The bulk of the university's contribution, approximately \$1 million annually, is in the form of faculty and staff salaries. Forty-five of the forty-nine faculty members which are connected with my program are funded entirely by the university. \$41,000 in university funds is devoted to the Slavic library collection. I am proud to say that our library is one of the finest in this field in the country. Approximately \$195,000 of the university's contribution is spent on financial assistance of one kind or another to graduate students in the field.

Yet the fact is that because of increasing budgetary pressures, the university's level of funding even in these three major categories, however large in relative dollar amounts, is simply insufficient for the retention of program breath, depth, and overall quality.

In the absence of the relatively modest supplementary Federal assistance which we receive under title VI for salaries and library acquisitions and graduate student fellowships, many specialized or minor language courses with low enrollments would have to be discontinued. Library purchases, which we have already had to reduce significantly, would have to be curtailed still more drastically, and many of our most promising and deserving graduate students would be forced out of the field.

Worse yet, budgetary pressures within the University are presently so considerable that much of our activity in the area of outreach and an increasingly high percentage of the extracurricular activities which we sponsor are almost wholly dependent on Federal funding. And when I say extracurricular activities, I do not mean to suggest that these activities are somehow extra or superfluous. They are a major component of our training. They bring scholars and public figures from all over the world, particularly from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, to interact with our students and our faculty. I am talking about films and other cultural events, conferences focused on specific themes, et cetera, all of which have great educational value.

In short, at a time of rapidly increasing financial difficulty in higher education, title VI funding for area programs such as mine provide that minimal funding margin absolutely necessary to retain program vitality and excellence and to begin to reach outside the immediate university community.

Title VI support right now also has enormously important symbolic significance for those of us on the campuses. Today even the best interdisciplinary programs are very naturally more vulnerable to damaging, perhaps fatal, university budget reductions than are the more firmly entrenched traditional, single discipline, academic departments.

In this kind of a disadvantageous competitive situation, where we have to fight for every position every time somebody retires, national recognition of quality and status that center designation provides can in itself be of considerable importance.

All this is not to suggest that modifications in title VI programs as they relate to our work, as well as increases in present funding levels, are not badly needed if the requirements of international studies are to be well served in the future.

If the money does not come from the Federal Government it is impossible for most of us on the ground to see where the support is going to come from. Federal help is urgently needed for a variety of important requirements, most of which I gather are addressed in the President's Commission documents and were touched on by Bob Ward. I will skip over my own elaboration of those.

It has been suggested that language and area studies programs have out lived their importance, at least as far as imperative national need is concerned. In this regard while none of us would deny that existing language and area studies programs have very definite limitations and weaknesses, I think it is important to underscore their strengths and achievements. The fact is that our major international studies centers have proven to be fertile environments for major advances in research in virtually all fields. Partly as a result, the United States is second to none with regard to the quantity and quality of advanced research in international studies. That is not to say much does not remain to be done and that there have not been failures.

Another major achievement of language and area studies programs has been the training of a large and solid cadre of language and area specialists. Many hundreds of Indiana students and students elsewhere have obtained competence, in some cases near native fluency, in a Slavic language. And through area-focused courses similarly high

numbers of students have acquired a better understanding of Slavic history and culture and present-day Soviet and East European politics, economics, and daily life.

However, the very preoccupation of language and area studies programs with distinct parts of the world makes them less than ideal vehicles for dealing with problems that are not area specific.

My own feeling from working with an area program for 4 years now is that a greater degree of fruitful collaboration on issues of broad concern among area programs themselves and between them and other departments and programs in the university can be attained in the future. At the same time, it obviously makes good sense to create additional global or transnational studies centers which, drawing in part upon the resources of existing programs, will deal exclusively with major topical issues of a universal character.

Our experience these last few years suggests that there is an awful lot more of value that we can do in the area of outreach. But it is equally clear that major new initiatives and new locally based programs are desperately needed to facilitate increased foreign language and area competency in primary and especially secondary schools.

No one has a greater stake in such an effort, work at the primary and secondary levels, than those of us in international studies in higher education because there is no greater handicap to the development of our own programs than the insufficient grounding in foreign language and area studies among our entering undergraduates.

I concluded my statement by suggesting a few of the reasons why there is still a great national importance for language and area programs. I think most of these have already been discussed at some length today.

There is one last point I would like to make and it fits in again with something Bob Ward said about the importance of exchanges and foreign study. Specifically, I would like to make a brief comment about the current grave crisis in foreign exchange programs in general and, in particular right now, in the funding of our academic exchange programs with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

To my mind, the importance of these scholarly exchanges can scarcely be exaggerated. They are important for meaningful language training, for scholarly research, for acquiring a realistic understanding of Soviet and East European life, and for greater mutual understanding.

For myself personally, I can say my participation in the scholarly exchange program with the Soviet Union in 1963-1964 was clearly, to me looking back, the single most important aspect of my entire graduate training.

The experience was priceless in terms of sharpening my language skills; acquiring many of the most important resources for my books on the Russian revolution—which are the basis for whatever status I enjoy among scholars—and broadening and deepening my knowledge of Soviet politics and society and culture in ways that have been crucially important for my teaching ever since. The experience was also important in facilitating a number of personal professional contacts and friendships which have continued over the years.

The total number of people who have benefited from these exchanges in similar ways is now very large. The number of Russians who know Americans through the exchanges, or who were in the United States

and know the United States at first hand, and who will be less likely to be taken taken in by government propaganda in the Soviet Union, is now quite large.

In short it seems to me that we have gotten an immense value from a relatively very small investment in exchanges with the Soviet Union, not to speak of Eastern Europe. It is from that perspective that I believe the present funding crisis in our academic exchange programs with the Soviet Union and East Europe is so tragic.

The Ford Foundation which previously provided much of the support for IREX, which administers most of these exchanges, has gradually cut back its funding. Increases in funding by ICA and NEH simply have not picked up the slack. As a result some valuable programs have already been discontinued and many others are threatened with the same. This is a source of the greatest concern to most of us in the field. I hope that in the new legislation, somehow some provision will be made for this very important aspect of international study and international research and training.

Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you for your testimony. If I can comment on your last point. It is not the jurisdiction of this subcommittee but I could not agree with you more.

Alan Kassoff of IREX has pointed out we now spend for all of our exchanges with East Europe and the Soviet Union approximately what we spend on three-quarters of 1 mile on an interstate highway.

To be cutting back on these programs is simply not in our own national interest.

Have you had a chance to look at the administration's proposal on title VI?

Dr. RABINOWITCH. Yes, I have, I keep coming back to Bob Ward's testimony. I thought he touched on many of the things that seemed to me most troublesome. It was, I must say, a difficult proposal to work with, and somewhat confusing. I was very glad to see the original 602 come back in. It seems to me that we badly need continuing and systematic evaluations of needs and priorities so that Office of Education guidelines will reflect rapidly changing realities. I think that is awfully important.

We have been going with guidelines that given out of the Lambert Report. With no disrespect to Professor Lambert, who I gather will be coming up here after me, his study was done I believe in 1968 to 1971, or something like that. The needs have changed enormously since that time.

A second thing which I was very glad that Bob mentioned was the importance of somehow rewording the legislation to allow the encouragement of work in the field by people in the professional schools. Right now the existing and draft legislation is so worded that fellowship candidates have to commit themselves to teaching or to performing "some other service of a public nature, as may be permitted in the regulations of the Secretary," after graduation. I really think that this passage in the legislation should be reworded to read something like "such other service in the national interest as may be permitted in the regulations of the Secretary," thereby qualifying candidates for fellowships interested in careers outside teaching and Government.

It seems to me it is in our national interest to have our business people and our journalists, et cetera, receive training in this field.

Right now, despite the fact that we are encouraged by the Office of Education to try to work with the professional schools, I may actually be penalized for giving a foreign language and area studies fellowship to someone in law or business. I think that is very unfortunate.

Bob touched most of the other bases. It seems to me the new 605 which specifies the need for broad and equitable geographical distribution of centers throughout the Nation introduces a greater emphasis on geographic distribution than has been the case earlier. To be sure, I think geographic distribution is something that needs to be considered, but program quality and the national interest have always been of primary importance in the past and this ought to remain so.

Mr. SIMON. You mention that you reach Indiana students generally. You are talking about the University of Indiana. How do you reach beyond those who are in your jurisdiction?

Dr. RABINOWITCH. We try to be almost Sol Huroks in trying to design programs and presentations that will have wide general interest. We work hard on publicity—posters, leaflets, and announcements in classes—and on establishing new languages.

We try to get things that will be broadly popular. I am now organizing, for presentation this fall, a Yugoslav film series of recent contemporary important Yugoslavian films, most of which have not been shown in the United States. They have certainly not been available in Bloomington. That is an example of the kind of thing we do to try to broaden our impact.

Mr. SIMON. We thank you for your testimony and your appearance and for what you are doing.

Dr. RABINOWITCH. Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMON. I would like to call on Dr. Richard Lambert who is the director of South Asian studies program at the University of Pennsylvania and the most quoted man in this field.

I have been doing some reading and research in this field and I see the name Lambert appearing everywhere.

Dr. Lambert?

STATEMENT OF RICHARD LAMBERT, DIRECTOR, SOUTH ASIAN STUDIES PROGRAM, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Dr. LAMBERT. I appreciate being here. I can make the greatest gift to the subcommittee by brevity. Since Mr. Ward stole my speech at breakfast this morning I can cut short my comments very well. Many of the things he said are exactly what I would say.

We have learned over the years that it depends on which of us speaks first as to what is in each other's talks.

I have also got quite accustomed to being called obsolete again and again. Barbara Burns will indicate how my scar tissue has grown over that issue.

I think all I would do with your permission, Mr. Chairman, is to make a couple of additional remarks and direct myself very briefly to the questions you raised and then see whether there is any need for further comment.

Last year I did make a general comment—it may or may not be in your files—for the Subcommittee on International Operations. In it I tried to lay out the various types of Federal interest and what programs met those different types of Federal interest. It is a longer statement that probably is already in the committee's record and if not you need not put it in your record but I would be glad to hand it over to the committee.

Mr. SIMON. I am not sure we have it. I would be very much interested in seeing it. I have not seen it.

Dr. LAMBERT. Let me start with the bill before us. I am not a connoisseur on bills, but I find with Mr. Ward that this one has a strange appearance, almost a first draft, and some things have been left out.

I noted for instance that Dr. Moya suggested that the coordination mandate is carried in title X of NDEA VI but I do not see title X carried over in the new bill. This is probably just again an oversight, as was 602.

I do not see the statement of intention which was contained in the preamble. Folding a bill into the Higher Education Act without some statement of the special intentions for this portion probably calls for some attention. Nor are any of the statements of intentions, as far as I can see, carried over from the old International Education Act.

In short, reinforcing what he was saying, it seems to me that the committee is faced with the prospect of either finding a way to amend this particular version or finding a way to postpone action until it is dressed up in a more satisfactory form.

I note that as far as I know there has been very little external consultation on this shift in the form in the bill. I could not discover any colleagues I know who had been consulted. The question is whether this represents a substantial enough change that that kind of consultation should be called for.

There has been as you know, Mr. Chairman, particularly with the Presidential Commission a great deal of rather sophisticated discussion about the nature and shape of the future of the program. I find relatively little of that level of sophistication and future program planning reflected in the language of this particular bill. Once again, this poses a dilemma as to whether, given the timing of the committee, to wait until the Presidential Commission reports or to press forward with this particular version of the bill. I leave that for your consideration.

It is difficult to judge the bill without some notion of the programmatic behind it or for that matter what a simple budget would look like.

I share your uneasiness at the lack of specific reference to funding. I would reinforce Dr. Ward's comment and add that internal distribution among these various sections is also a crucial question in judging what the program will be.

I can characterize what over the past 10 years have been the anxieties of the field about this program: on the one hand, the Perils of Pauline, and that is each year there has had to be a descent on the Hill to try to resurrect once again from the wheels of the train the appropriation of NDEA VI; second, what I might refer to as slash and burn agriculture, that new programs must rise from the ashes of the old programs.

It would be very helpful to have some notion as to whether these trends will continue.

I do have a couple of additional comments. I mentioned the financial weakness portion of it. It makes me nervous as well.

Your focus on subregions is an interesting point. I would say two things about it. One, unfortunately, the kinds of records which used to be kept and routinely published even of the operation of the NDEA fellowship program seem somewhere along the line to have been dropped.

It is very difficult to get the kind of basic aggregate information that would enable us to answer the kind of question you raise.

This is doubly unfortunate in that we are now at a stage where we really should be much more empirical in our judgment about the nature of program changes. We know a great deal about such programs, particularly language and area studies programs. We can fine tune, including better representation of subregions if the information were available. Now it is very difficult.

I would urge that some attention to put toward the accumulation of serial, aggregate information so that these decisions could be wisely made and Dr. Ward and I would not have to sit and guess whether anybody is indeed teaching Lao.

I think the question of staffing for subregions and fringe languages raises a slightly different question.

Over the years, one of the problems has been that the rationale for NDEA VI was the increase in numbers of specialists and the success of the program was judged by numbers of students.

This is very useful strategy for the beginning of a program but it makes it very difficult now to adopt what one might call stockpiling strategy, that is making sure that a full range of specialists hold positions in universities particularly those specialists who command scarce languages or have scarce disciplinary or topical skills.

If I may shift to my dean's hat, until July 1 I was dean of instruction and academic planning for the arts and sciences at the University of Pennsylvania. If you must justify position by enrollments, or in the case of NDEA VI by the number of students trained, it is very difficult to convince a university that it should help highly specialized faculty, the kind you are talking about.

If you shift from a training criterion to the notion that you have to maintain a complement of specialists, then the basis for the staffing and for getting universities to staff has to be addressed. It is not sufficient for a university to be committed let us say, to staffing somebody who works in Malayam, or Tamil, or Nepali, or Kannada, to allocate a couple of fellowships. You are really talking about the universities maintaining a kind of position that in terms of its own cost accounting and is very difficult to justify. If you tie NDEA VI grants to the number of students trained, you would then be producing for a very limited market or wind up without the more exotic specialists you are trying to guarantee.

Some attention must be given to the notion of a national stockpiling of a cadre of specialists if you are going to maintain these subspecializations.

I want to direct attention to another aspect of the program that I do not think anybody has yet faced. If you really go to a "cadre of specialists" notion of what the national interest is, we are now paying

a great deal of attention to putting these skills into an ever expanding set of students, but nobody is looking at attrition. Nobody is looking at how many people have dropped out. In terms of language policy in particular, there is relatively little attention paid or anything known about how quickly and what kinds of people lose the hard-won language skills they have had.

I would urge that at some point very soon we must take a look at what the retention rate is in the stockpile specialists and, particularly, how to measure and reinforce the loss of language skills. It seems to me an essential component of our future planning.

I would agree with your basic concern for over concentration of staffing. I think in terms of regional coverage this is happening now. It is ironic in my own center that if NDEA VI funding were withdrawn, we would immediately lose South India and Nepal.

NDEA VI moneys are being used to maintain the capacity to teach the scarce languages that universities find it very difficult to justify on their own.

I would say on the language portion of it that I certainly share your emphasis. If there was one thing which came out of my study, it was that in some of the world areas there was an immense need to attend to the level and depth of language skills. This comes out in the Rand Report as well. There is the need to develop ways of measuring and reinforcing language skills.

Language programs should be judged not just by enrollments. I would even urge that you take a look at who is in the third and fourth year and find ways of measuring actual language skills, not just time spent in a course.

We must build into our training programs more advanced levels of language skills that we have now.

I agree with your concern about the dilemma between quality programs and dispersion. This is especially important in what I consider a welcome portion of this new bill, that is a shift from the creation of knowledge and creation of specialists to a concern for the transformation of the American educational system in general, and, once removed, to cosmopolitanizing the public at large.

This is indeed an important innovation. It seems to me there ought to be a little more testimony on precisely what is meant as that section gets put in the bill, because it clearly is a new direction. It calls for different kinds of things and trying to bend the old NDEA format to fit it seems to me somewhat unreal.

For instance, it seems to me we are at a different level of technology in international studies at the K-12 level. I agree with Commissioner Boyer's statement which was quoted yesterday in the Chronicle of Higher Education that one of the major needs is to develop the technology for instruction at the K through 12 levels.

Hence, it makes me particularly unhappy to see left out at the new bill a very strong section in evaluation. Over the years, what has troubled me has been that we only look at successes; but nobody looks at failures. It seems to me it is a very useful device to try to find what works and what does not work we venture into citizen education and cultural diffusion.

I would like to see built in an evaluation process as we expand into cultural understanding programs, a review of the operation of the many innovations that have already been supported by NDEA VI.

For instance, when the GAO report mentioned that the experiments and in graduate level general international studies programs had not been evaluated, the response was to drop the program entirely. A more meaningful response it seems to me would have been to examine what worked and what did not.

Right now when we need to know what we are going to do as we go into this new aspect of international education, it would be very useful to know in terms of what work.

I think the relevance of geographic spread and the definition of "quality" depends upon which function you are emphasizing. In your goal is the transformation of the American educational system, what you need is maximum geographic spread. You must get out into each State close to the local educational system. The most effective way of doing that I think is the key question. Whether one first sets up 6 or 7 centers to experiment with curricula or whether the better way is to set up 50 centers at the outset and have them experiment and then to cut it down to those that work is a question that needs a fair amount of discussion.

I am about finished, Mr. Chairman. I think there are many programmatic aspects that I see in the Presidential Commission report that do not find their place in this bill. I think the whole emphasis on the use of summers and the question about serving dispersed clientele when most of the recommendations are for concentrated centers, the questions of what to do about attrition, how to deepen the language training are programmatic, but it may not be appropriate to bring up at this time.

I hope I was brief enough.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much for your testimony. I am glad you agree with my concern that I express about too broad a coverage because as I recall I got that out of the Lambert Report when I read that 1973 document.

You mentioned something which intrigued me that I was not aware of. You talked about publishing took place at one point apparently of the studies that are taking place.

Dr. LAMBERT. No, sir. I must have misspoken. What I said is I have gathered together over this last week five different studies that are fairly sophisticated reviews and one of which is the Barber-Ilchman study.

Mr. SIMON. We are talking about two different things. You mentioned a few years back at some point there was some kind of a compilation.

Dr. LAMBERT. The Office of Education used to routinely collect and publish the figures on the distribution of fellows and courses. It is my understanding that this was dropped because I have not seen any of it for quite some time.

The kinds of aggregate information which would have enabled us to see shifts in coverage in particular areas, I understand are no longer routinely part of the assembly of the data. Perhaps one could ask the Office of Education this question.

Mr. SIMON. Dr. Meador?

Dr. MEADOR. The impression is correct. Basically, what we found was that we were collecting more data than we could effectively use. The international component in the Office of Education has had attrition in its professional staff to the point where we did not have the

people who could make use of the data collected. We had very hard choices to make on where to target our diminishing resources. With continuing attrition of staff we reluctantly let data compilation and monitoring slip. This continues to be a problem and we often must decide what fire to put out first and which alarms to answer.

Mr. SIMON. I am sympathetic with the problem. It does seem to me this is information that is so basic almost in trying to evaluate whether we are doing the job that needs to be done and it is something we may want to suggest in our committee report that the Office of Education once again resume doing.

Dr. Lambert, you mentioned in connection with the stockpiling of specialists taking a look at how rapidly or how slowly you lose a language skill and also another evaluation you asked for was an evaluation of really what we are doing.

Who should make those evaluations? Is this an NIE project? How do we move on this?

Dr. LAMBERT. Let me separate them. My comment on language skill loss was a bit disingenuous because I am now starting a program at the University of Pennsylvania, a national program precisely to study this phenomenon. We are having a meeting of a planning group tomorrow and in March under National Endowment for Humanities support. The truth is there is almost nothing known about the field in general.

The first thing we have to do is to find out how to measure skill loss. Once we have done the basic research, then I think the indices for scorekeeping need to be placed in some organization that is set up to deal with the kind of serial data I discussed, plus spot evaluative surveys.

I am of several minds as to whether to combine that with an advisory and OE oversight function. It seems to me you need some organization that can undertake to do both serial data collection in the field and to do spot key point surveys such as what has happened to the depth of language training in various fields.

It could be set up perhaps with NIE funding, as a separate body. Once it got established, and you knew exactly what you wanted to have, then I think it could well be folded into the routine collection of the Office of Education statistical section or a similar agency.

I think the tough parts are to get hard headed analysis that is not done by the same set of people who are making the policy and to get the respect of the people in the field so they will answer yet another set of questionnaires.

I would place it temporarily into an NIE or equivalent funded project to establish this and then decide which parts are better folded in to a governmental operation and which are kept out. I think the measurement of language skill attrition is exactly that kind of issue.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much for your testimony and for the contribution you have made through the years.

We are not going to finish by 1 p.m. I would like to recess at 1 p.m. and then come back. I regret doing this. For those of you who can stay, our witnesses remaining will be Dr. Joseph Metz, Dr. Betty Bullard, Mr. John Mullins, Dr. Joseph Chalmers, and Hal Martin.

Those of you who have never heard Dr. Betty Bullard, if you are not back at 2 p.m. you are missing something, let me assure you.

Dr. Joseph Metz, Center For Study of World Food Issues at Cornell University.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH METZ, CENTER FOR STUDY OF WORLD FOOD ISSUES, CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Dr. Metz, Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am a little hoarse today so I may not come through perfectly well.

I have prepared a statement for submission to the committee. I would prefer to use the available time to just comment on some of the specific questions you raised at the opening of this session.

Mr. SIMON. We will enter your statement into the record at this point.

[Prepared statement of Joseph Metz follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOSEPH F. METZ, JR., DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR ANALYSIS OF WORLD FOOD PROBLEMS, CORNELL UNIVERSITY

The world has become a community of interdependent nations in which the problems of one or more countries quickly become the problems of all. At the recent United Nations Conference on Science and Technology the issues of food, health, energy, and population were discussed as some of those needing greater attention. The developing countries with 72 percent of the world's population are seeking assistance to develop their own capacity to deal with these issues:

The United States is committed to assist the developing countries to achieve a higher level of living for their people. A major effort is being made to increase food production and improve nutrition within these countries. There is a great need for increasing international studies in the United States, and expanding the scope to include the major world problems. There is a great need in the United States to train people to understand and deal with the global problems. Title VI of the National Defense Education Act has provided limited support for international studies and language centers. In addition several centers concerned with special world-wide problems have been established. One of these is the Center for the Analysis of World Food Issues at Cornell.

Food is of mutual concern to all peoples of the world. It has been documented that millions of individuals in the low-income developing countries receive substantially less than recommended dietary recommendations for calories and protein. Millions of dollars are being spent by the United States, other high-income countries and the developing nations to improve agricultural productivity, distribution and nutrition in the low-income countries. Many volunteer groups are involved. There are many complex issues associated with world food.

Students and citizen groups have a great concern for the world hunger situation. They are seeking information that can help them to understand the situation, to evaluate alternatives that are proposed as solutions, to participate in developing alternatives, and as a first step in actually becoming involved in action oriented programs. The Center for the Analysis of World Food Issues focuses on providing this information directly to students at Cornell and other campuses, and to public groups.

The grant in support of the Center has made it possible to add several courses on international agricultural and rural development. At present, there are about 40 courses in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Cornell that directly focus on international agricultural and rural development. These courses are enriched by the presence of about 250 students from other countries. Enrollment in these courses has increased during each of the past five years and now numbers about 1,300 students. Professors from Cornell have been invited to give lectures at other colleges and universities in courses concerned with world food problems.

A major product of the Center's program is a series of papers on world food issues which are being made available throughout the country to educational institutions that offer courses on world issues, as well as to public groups. The series of papers present objective information concerning the issues, and include a substantially bibliography. The papers are intended to serve as a basis for discussions of issues rather than offering specific solutions.

Another out-growth of the Center's program has been the establishment of a Speakers Bureau on World Food Issues. Last year professors from the College met with 75 groups and spoke to over 10,000 people.

The program of the Center for the Analysis of World Food Issues benefits students at many colleges and universities, as well as the public at large. It focuses on a topic of vital concern and interest to people throughout the world.

International education at our universities must go beyond language and area studies, although these must be continued to be strongly supported. The next generation of leaders must be trained to deal with complex world issues including food, energy, health, and environment. Through such a program we build the capacity of the United States to help itself and to assist other nations in building their own capacities. This in turn contributes to the world-wide goal of an improved level of living for all and greater political and economic stability.

Dr. METZ. The center is one of the units that are focusing on a specific problem which was talked about earlier. You raised the question about financial status of the units which are being supported.

I might add that title VI funds represent a small but very vital part of the program that is going on at the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Cornell University that is related to international agriculture and food concerns.

Is there adequate coverage? You related this question to the geographic areas. I would like to add is there adequate coverage also of all the major world food problems?

As we look at some of the reports that have come out of the recent U.N. Conference on Science and Technology you see reference to a number of common world problems. In addition to food and nutrition there is health, population, energy, the environment, and so forth.

One center on a problem can serve as a major focus but it is difficult to meet the needs of the 2,600 colleges and universities around the United States as well as the general public.

Are we coordinated? In the particular area with which this center is concerned I would say yes. We have had many years of linkages with colleges of agriculture and other land-grant institutions including Illinois, Vermont, and Wisconsin and also with the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development.

We use information that is available from them as well as providing them with materials from our activities.

How do we reach the smaller colleges? I would like to add to this the general public as well. In addition to courses and seminars that have been developed on the Cornell campus focusing on world food issues we have developed a center outreach program. This is aimed at both small colleges or universities and the general public.

One of the things we have done is to establish a speakers' bureau that is made up of faculty members who are prepared to address a topic related to world food. Last year as an example there were 75 topics covered and 75 different talks given and there were roughly 10,000 people in attendance. This includes not only New York State but New England and in a few cases other States in the United States.

One of the other major activities that we have taken on is to develop a series of papers on world food issues and I am sure we have sent you a copy.

Mr. SIMON. I have it. As you know one of my interests is the area of food and population. If I may commend your center not only for its content but the graphics. Every once in a while you receive excellent material that is just designed in such a way that you really have to want to read it in order to read it.

You have done an excellent job there.

Dr. METZ. Thank you, sir.

We have sent flyers regarding the availability of this to all of the States and many of the institutions around the country. We have also made use of the Extension Service that is available in the States to get this information directly to the people.

We sponsored workshops on this. There will be another workshop in October. We are inviting primarily individuals from the Northeast, from universities, and from other public groups that are concerned with world food.

Mr. Jeffords may be interested in knowing that there is someone from Vermont who will be attending our next workshop.

Through these kind of activities we have been attempting to reach out to the public at large.

The thought passes through my mind that possibly similar materials could be prepared by other problemary related centers or even area studies centers that may not be doing so at the present time and making distribution to other institutions. We do not have the resources that are available where the centers are located.

I see opportunities for expansion of these problem focused areas, additional centers, and additional coverage for other parts of the country as well. One of the things I would encourage is consideration to giving more support for the initiation or continuation of any of the centers. It is rather difficult in a period of 2 or 3 years to not only develop a program but to keep it active and to make the greatest use of what has been developed.

We would hope possibly a minimum of 5 years might be a reasonable number for this.

Language area studies are clearly complimentary to the problem study centers. We feel that the strength and effectiveness of many of our overseas programs are closely tied to our having people who understand the political, social, and economic situations within these countries. We have a need for both the problem orientation as well as the language and area studies.

Many of the problems that are facing us around the world are becoming more complex in nature. This calls for greater emphasis on education and hopefully expansion of the title VI program as well.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you.

Can you give me a brief outline how your program is funded right now?

Dr. METZ. We are currently receiving \$90,000 a year. We have completed 3 years and we are on our fourth year.

Mr. SIMON. What is your budget?

Dr. METZ. From the Office of Education it is \$90,000. Our actual budget for our total program within the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences is considerably more than that. When we look at the effort in terms of faculty we count up to about 30 full-time equivalents devoted to the international program. This is basically related to food and of course rural development as such.

It is a rather substantial program beyond what title VI is funding.

Mr. SIMON. The \$90,000 is what percentage would you say?

Dr. METZ. I would say maybe 7 to 8 percent of our activities. I would want to add this is extremely important because basically the salaries of the faculty are being paid, those who are contributing part of their time to the center. It is the other funds that make possible the

kinds of things that we do such as holding the workshops and putting out brochures and other materials. We consider those to be extremely important for the overall program as we see it.

Mr. SIMON. You have had a chance to take a look at the legislation as drafted?

Dr. METZ. I have not seen the complete revisions at all.

Mr. SIMON. As I sense from your testimony there would be no reason that the legislation as drafted could not accommodate the needs of the kind of program that you have?

Dr. METZ. That is my understanding that it could.

Mr. SIMON. We thank you very much for your testimony.

Our next witness is the irrepressible Dr. Betty Bullard of the Asia Society. Your official title is what?

Dr. BULLARD. Education director.

Mr. SIMON. As you will quickly find out she is not a native of the city of New York. Dr. BULLARD, we are very pleased to have you here and look forward to your testimony.

STATEMENT OF BETTY BULLARD, DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION, THE ASIA SOCIETY

Dr. BULLARD. Thank you, Chairman Simon.

I have given copies to your assistant of my formal statement which I hope you have.

Mr. SIMON. We will enter it into the record at this point.

[Prepared statement of Betty Bullard follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BETTY BULLARD, DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION, THE ASIA SOCIETY

One of the Charter charges to the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies is that it "recommend ways to extend the knowledge of other civilizations to the broadest population base possible and to build these topics into the general curricula for students of all ages at all levels of study throughout the nation." Throughout the past twelve months research, hearings, conference have taken place all over the country; briefs and statements from concerned individuals and organizations have been studied (several hundred in number). From all of this has emerged the knowledge that there is a public awareness of need, yet a continuing frustration in implementation.

The reauthorization you are presently considering, Title VI, offers the only hope in the country for financing international education in kindergarten through grade twelve and community education.

Kindergarten through grade twelve contains the largest number of students in the educational spectrum of the country (more than 45 million students this year) and is the only compulsory part of the educational spectrum. What is learned in these years, then, forms the backbone of the adult's education as a citizen and, therefore, takes on even greater importance as we consider its role in upholding this nation's strength and security.

When we realize that within the next fifty years one in every four persons in this country will be over the age of 65, another continuing great need emerges—that of assuring our nation's leaders of a public informed about national needs and issues in the world context. One of the briefs prepared for the Commission stated "there is an important distinction, however, between educating adults and educating young people. Young people are being prepared to be good citizens or to fulfill national manpower needs, * * * adults are already citizens, wage and salary earners. * * * A national effort to increase adult understanding about and competency in world affairs implies that information levels and attitudes are to be changed." These are two very important parts of the national clientele who must retain their eligibility under Title VI in order to carry out the charge for an internationally strong citizenry.

You are to be praised for your farsighted legislation which we are considering today—Title VI. This imaginative piece of legislation is in fact broader than what is usually described as higher education. The legislation provides for international education in kindergarten through grade twelve and non-formal education under this Title VI. This open-ended, broad piece of legislation is now being proposed as a part of the Higher Education Act. In its original authorization, however, it was under the National Defense Education Act. In my opinion, this legislation serves better the need and national interest as identified by the President's Commission within the context of the National Defense Education Act than as an addition to the Higher Education Act. Definitions of Higher Education do not normally include kindergarten through grade twelve nor non-formal education, and the Higher Education Act necessarily has priorities that would not include the above constituencies. In the event the Department of Education comes into being, the entire international education program may be folded into higher education and be lost forever as a program working across grade and discipline lines. The nation will be the loser. Surely, this was simply a typographical error and can be quickly righted.

One major part of the initial Title VI is the original 602 "Research" section. This appears to have been inadvertently excluded in the reauthorized version. The only visible authority for educational research on broad international concerns has traditionally been the "Research" section under Title VI. The references to research permitted under the specific care of the area and language, international, and advanced centers is locked into the recipient institutions of higher education. The "Research" section, formerly 602, made possible specific research projects on topics affecting language and area studies, as well as pedagogical research. The Commission, in addition to being committed to strengthening policy-relevant and basic aspects of research which will provide insights into current or prospective concerns of the government or the national interest, is as well committed to pedagogical research to improve effectiveness of learning languages, areas, and topics of national concern. Higher education, as well as other education bodies concerned largely with pre-collegiate education, was able under the legislation to undertake projects. I hope you will consider returning a much strengthened "Research" section to Title VI.

We all know that legislation must be respected by the agency which administers it. Congress needs now to be careful not to divert the intent of its legislation. The legislation is written to be opened up to a wide range of clients—to shrivel the field is not the intent of Congress. Kindergarten through grade twelve and adult education need a protective arm more than any other dimension of Title VI and should be safeguarded until strengthened.

The funding of kindergarten through grade twelve is traditionally a local and state matter. International education is seen as a federal responsibility. Federal funding is necessary to establish the initial steps within states to put to rest the "skittishness" on the part of some state legislatures, school boards, administrators, and the general public, who for whatever traditions, contend that to learn about other nations, other civilizations is perhaps a little bit un-American. Community and adult education organizations, more than any other under Title VI, receives its funding from private or community services; yet, it is they who establish a public acceptance for greater emphasis on languages and foreign area studies in the schools. Higher education until the mid-sixties received generous funding from Ford Foundation and defense-related agencies. With the passage of the International Education Act, these former backers pulled out; IEA was not funded; and the entire field has suffered. Yet, it is work performed by the universities in language and area research and training that is so very necessary to our national interests and that often influences what is taught at pre-collegiate levels. The country needs all three dimensions to get international education into the nation's consciousness. The problem arises when the title is authorized without any more money; risks arise that one dimension would be funded at the expense of others.

Finally, in section 604 "Grant Programs to Promote Cultural Understanding," the stated intent is to assist citizen education. Yet, one term for the program target, "student," is picked up from last year's 603 legislation; but, unlike that, there is no definition provided. By a small addition of a definition, the broadened clientele would indeed be served in the national interest. It appears that wording such as "student: a person in a learning process" would take care of the intent and prevent a narrowing of the legislation.

I urge your consideration and positive action on these concerns.

Dr. BULLARD. In the interest of our time and energy levels and your time I will focus specifically on some comments I have for the title VI: Higher Education and then address myself to the questions you asked at the beginning of the session.

Mr. SIMON. Also any comments you have about the restructuring as you see it presented by the administration.

Dr. BULLARD. The reauthorization which you are presently considering, title VI, offers the only hope in this country at this time for assisting international education at the kindergarten through grade 12 level as well as community education.

As you know the kindergarten through grade 12 area contains the largest number of students in this whole country and is the only compulsory part of the educational spectrum. What is learned in these years then becomes the backbone of the adult's education as a citizen and therefore really takes on greater importance as we consider its role in upholding our Nation's strength and security.

There may have been five States 10 years ago that had any kind of a program or any kind of visible international studies within its curriculum. Today there are 30, but no State feels that it has the kind and depth or program that it would like to hold up as a national example.

You are to be praised frankly for your farsighted legislation which we are considering. Title VI is indeed one of the most imaginative pieces of legislation and as a matter of fact is broader than what is usually described as higher education.

The legislation provides among other things some hope for assistance in international education as I said earlier at the kindergarten through grade 12 and nonformal education levels yet this open-ended broad piece called title VI is now being proposed as a part of the Higher Education Act.

In its original authorization, it was under the National Defense Education Act. It is my opinion that this legislation serves better the need and national interest within the context of the National Defense Education Act than as an addition to HEA.

There is now an HEA title VI that deals with finance of higher education. This is a duplicate title it seems.

Definitions of "higher education" do not normally include kindergarten through grade 12 nor nonformal education and the Higher Education Act necessarily has priorities that would not include those constituencies.

In the event that the Department of Education comes into being the entire international education program may be folded into higher education and its genius be lost forever as a program able to work across grade and discipline lines.

As a person who has worked for the past 23 years on all sides of the flower garden dealing with international education and classroom and television and in State administration and now with a nonprofit organization dealing nationally with schools and teacher education I find that the symbolic relationship as it were among the various constituencies in this country of colleges, universities, nonprofit organizations and the schools of this country make up an end product of much higher caliber that could be achieved as one small group. Each one gives the other strength.

I am wondering if perhaps the switch to HEA was not a clerical error or simply a typographical mistake that was not caught.

I was happy to hear earlier this morning that the research section has indeed been replaced in title VI. I know it has traditionally been directed more toward higher education but it also has traditionally remained the one place in title VI for individual research in areas that would help the elementary and secondary level teacher training areas for research with foreign language, teaching materials, teaching pedagogic issues and concerns that can be used in the classroom substantially as well as pedagogically. This is the only place in title VI and has been very helpful to us over the years.

We all know that legislation must be respected by the agency which administers it. Congress needs now not to divert the intent of hopefully the legislation as it has been traditionally and the legislation frankly is wisely written to be opened up to a wide range of clients particularly with the addition of last year's 603. To shrivel the field does not seem in the interest of the legislation.

Kindergarten through grade 12 and adult education really do need a protective arm more than any other dimension of title VI. It needs to be safeguarded and encouraged and still strengthened. Title VI can do this.

I heard earlier today small references to the disappointment with the trigger having been removed and the request that it be reinstated. If something of that nature should happen I would like to suggest another approach to it. Perhaps the area concerned with elementary and secondary education and community education be established in a way that would take care of the situation and then the trigger be placed for higher education beyond that.

Mr. SIMON. Can you clarify?

Dr. BULLARD. As you know for instance this past year, an amount up to say \$15,000 a year—

Mr. SIMON. I understand the trigger. I do not quite understand how you are getting the kindergarten through 12 prior to the trigger.

Dr. BULLARD. Do it the other way around. Make the base for elementary and secondary and let that be the trigger and above that for higher education.

Mr. SIMON. I follow you. There might be some disagreement on that.

Dr. BULLARD. I suspect there would be. I did not think in this group it would be a very popular idea but I could not resist, sir, sharing my thought with you.

I spoke about the symbolic relationship and that is in my prepared statement in a more spelled out fashion. Each area needs the other.

Elementary and secondary education has never specifically had a large Federal funding at the international studies level. That is probably one reason why it is not stronger. State and local funds have primarily been the funding areas as you know. In community education it has been primarily community or foundation moneys and we all know the history of higher education in the international field.

What happens through this whole title VI has a lot to bear on elementary and secondary education because what happens in the area centers eventually has a large influence on the schools.

I know from all of my positions that I have always looked to the area centers for the new research and for identifying the new ma-

terials as we have heard here today. We are then able to scour for utilities below the cause level. This is a very appropriate use.

The problem arises when the title is authorized without any more money and the risks arise that one dimension would be funded at the expense of others and that gives me pause.

In section 604 which is the new draft, the "Grant Programs to Promote Cultural Understanding" the stated intent is to assist citizen education yet one term for the program target, the word "student" is picked up from last year's 603 legislation but unlike that there is no definition provided.

By a small addition of a definition the broadened clientele which you intend would indeed begin to be served in the national interest. It appears that definitive wording such as "student—a person in a learning process" would take care of the intent and prevent a narrowing of the legislation.

A current National Science Foundation study shows that most teachers in this country are pretty well down the road in experience and in advanced degrees. With this in mind it is incumbent on us to find a mechanism or technology to provide incentive and motivation for teachers to want to study more to broaden in an area of international understanding.

Toward this end the President's Commission has considered a number of recommendations. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, would you prefer they come out with the report? Primarily they are recommendations that stem on a strong staff development key toward helping broaden the teachers' awareness and substantive background in international knowledge and with this the work toward curricular designs within States that can be used as models within States and perhaps replicated in other States. It is a very strong program in this direction.

Let me turn for a moment to your questions.

Financial weaknesses. Ask an elementary and secondary person on the international scene. It is just not there at this point.

Do we have adequate coverage to meet the national need? I wish we could see somewhere in the whole center idea more of a realization of the binding together of area centers and schools of education. The dimension that the area center has to offer has got to come through sometime in a substantive way in the preparation of teachers in this country even before they get out of college.

It is another point of view from the area or specific topic that you have been addressing yourself to.

Are we coordinated? I have listened closely to the interagency coordination ideas that already exist and the Federal advisory body recommendations. I would hope that within any of these there would be also with the area specialists and language specialists someone whose background truly is pedagogic, who can understand and speak for that part of the spectrum.

The fourth question, area studies programs, the lack of language orientation going back to Dr. Lambert's study about the Ph. D. being gotten without a word of language. This is true and is a very important aspect. Let me take that example to a school situation.

Would it be better for a supervisor of social studies or a teacher of 9th grade African studies to have spent 12, 18, or 24 semester hours of college studying Swahili or would it have been better for that person to have spent those college hours studying geography, religion, philosophy, and history of the area?

It is a real question. I do not think any of us would argue against language competency but in teaching about an area there is also a content breadth that is terribly important even with the doctorate. I would urge a broader consideration of that idea in the thinking particularly as it involves K through 12th.

Your sixth question is to maintain quality program concerned with reaching community colleges or the general public. There is a difference in standards of quality. I quite agree with all the comments that have been made on quality within area centers and language proficiencies and skills that are needed and levels of attainment which are needed for the national security and national interest.

There is also a broad stroke that K-12 and the general public need as well to be quality but does not have to be the same kind of quality. It is not a quality of specialization. It is quality of breadth. It is something that is very attainable I think.

It goes back to what is in 605 now and what is also available through research that these kind of mechanisms are possible now provided funds are available.

I will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Let me toss to Dr. Meador and Dr. Thompson from the administration two points which Dr. Bullard has made. One is where she refers to, tongue in cheek, the clerical error that resulted in this being placed in the Higher Education Act.

Do you want to comment on the reason for this shift?

Dr. MEADOR. To the extent that I am able to speak to the whole comprehensive issue of reauthorizing legislation, I will make an attempt.

Former Secretary Califano in his testimony concerning the administration's interests, and educational priorities, spoke to the very great need to simplify legislation and reduce the tremendous loss due to paper workloads that results from so many separate pieces of legislation enacted for so many special interests. This has resulted in duplication and an extraordinary amount of work.

In his opening statement on reauthorization Mr. Califano said one of the major goals of the agency was to reduce the number of specific pieces of legislation and thereby save the States and local education agencies. The costs in reporting on programs for Federal funds received, in applying for grants and administering these activities in accord with Federal regulations.

We feel that this is a very desirable goal. I have not been privy to the discussions on the pros and cons on where the international programs should be placed—whether they should be free standing or not—what will be the ramifications of placement with regard to the Department of Education if it comes into being—however, it seems to me that these are also legitimate concerns to be carefully addressed.

Mr. SIMON. Let me ask the second question. This is a concern I do have that Dr. Bullard has expressed and that is that this K-12 emphasis portion of it might get lost as title VI is administered as part of the Higher Education Act.

One of the ways you can help on that obviously is if we create this advisory committee and make sure we have K through 12 represented on that advisory committee.

Is this a concern which is a legitimate concern? How can we make sure this does not get lost in the machinery?

Dr. MEADOR. I think this is a legitimate concern. I have heard various individuals say that the Department of Education if created would have a very strong emphasis on elementary and secondary levels. Such a Department, with a higher education provision which included international activities, it is argued, would be stronger than would be a free-standing international component or unit, especially if the Department appeared to be heavily tilted toward grants based upon population, and K-12 emphases.

On the other hand, the issue about identity of the longstanding NDEA VI and the breadth of coverage of international programs—the fact that the Fulbright program operates at all educational levels with all sorts of clientele—could serve as a counterbalance to the question of location.

I think mechanisms for the Department could be put in place through a national advisory group or perhaps through some specific legislation of the kind Dr. Bullard described.

While I wish there were a "correct" answer it is very difficult to predict the future vitality of NDEA VI in the HEA versus the vitality of a free-standing international unit in a Department of Education that has not yet come into being.

Mr. SIMON. If you can convey to your colleagues in the office that there was some concern expressed here in the subcommittee. My hope is we will express that concern in the report language that we will report to the House. I think the probability is we are going to authorize this advisory committee in statute, I think we will probably make sure that K through 12 representation is there.

Beyond that I have no questions. I thank you. It is good to see you again.

Dr. BULLARD. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. I think we will call our next witnesses as a panel. They are Mr. John Mullins, Mr. Harold Martin, and Mr. Joseph Chalmers. Mr. Mullins is a trustee of the American College in Paris. Mr. Martin and Mr. Chalmers are trustees of Franklin College in Switzerland.

**STATEMENT OF HAROLD C. MARTIN AND JOSEPH A. CHALMERS,
TRUSTEES, FRANKLIN COLLEGE, LUGANO, SWITZERLAND**

Mr. MARTIN. I am Harold Martin. With your permission I will read the statement because it will be briefer than if I try to talk it.

My name is Harold Martin. I am professor of English at Trinity College, Conn. and I am here with Joseph Chalmers who is dean of admissions and records at Georgetown University.

We represent Franklin College in Lugano, Switzerland, of which both of us are trustees. Our specific concern is the eligibility of American students at Franklin College for benefits of student financial aid programs provided by the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended.

First a word about Franklin College. Founded in 1969 it was granted degree-granting authority in 1973 by the State of Delaware. In 1974 it was given recognized candidate status by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and in 1975 it was awarded full accreditation.

By Swiss law it is represented in Switzerland by a Swiss foundation but its actual governing body is a board of trustees represented through an office in New York City and composed of members of whom currently all but one are American citizens the exception being the acting president of the college who is a Swiss national.

Currently over half the students attending Franklin College are American citizens, the others coming from a variety of European, Near-Eastern, and African nations. Among the American students are some enrolled for only one term or 1 year. I mention specifically a group which has come each year for several years from Claremont Men's College in California whose course work at Franklin is fully recognized by their home institution.

The college also has a fine record of placement for those who complete work for the associate degree there and an equally fine history of successful performance in the American institutions to which they transfer to complete the baccalaureate degree.

The curriculum of the college emphasizes international and intercultural study, proficiency in foreign language and direct experience with the people and institutions of Europe and Great Britain.

Tuition costs at Franklin are high for three reasons. One: Because its program requires a multilingual faculty-sufficiently versed in economics, history, political theory and comparative sociology to conduct its important off-campus study trips. Two: Because its ratio of faculty to students must be kept high to make the most of an intensive educational experience and three: because it is financed entirely through student fees and gifts from friends of the institution.

Those costs have been radically increased in very recent years by a dramatic decline in the exchange value of the dollar against the Swiss franc which is one of the strongest currencies in Europe as well as by recently accelerating inflation within Switzerland.

Five years ago the total cost of attending Franklin College compared favorably with that of attending an eastern private college in the United States. Today it is substantially higher.

Despite the substantially higher costs what Franklin College has to offer that is different and valuable is significant enough that in the current year nearly 1,000 formal inquiries about admission were received in the New York admissions office.

Between 1972-73 and this year 1979-80 the number of completed applications has fallen sharply despite the fact that in that period the college moved to full accreditation and was able to demonstrate distinctive success in the transfer of its graduates to colleges and universities of excellent quality and reputation throughout the United States.

The evidence confirmed by many letters and uncounted telephone calls is that the overriding reason for that decline is cost.

At the present time a great deal of support for the cost of higher education for many families is potentially available through provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended. Under current interpretation of the wording of that act American students at Franklin College and at the small number of other colleges similarly situated are not eligible to take advantage of most of the provisions of the act.

The restrictive interpretation appears to hinge on the reading of the phrase "an educational institution in any State" in title XII, section 1201. What we ask as representatives of the Board of trustees of

Franklin College is that clarification or if necessary amendment of those and any related terms be given your thoughtful consideration, specifically that they be construed or revised to include accredited institutions chartered by a State as well as located in a State.

We base our petition on the following arguments. One: That as a not-for-profit educational institution chartered by one of the States of the United States and fully accredited by a recognized accrediting association Franklin College should be accessible to American students on terms equivalent to those for other colleges so chartered and so accredited.

Two: Particularly for American citizens resident by reason of occupation in Europe that exclusion of Franklin College and others of like character from the list of eligible institutions entails some basic unfairness by effectively denying their children access to nearby American institutions.

Three: That such exclusion is inconsistent with the known interest of the American Government as repeatedly expressed by some Members of both Houses of Congress and quite recently by President Carter in what is commonly referred to as emphasis on a "global perspective" in higher education.

Four: That such exclusion results in the denial of the unique educational opportunities available only at Franklin and like institutions to students of modest economic means, the very group which this act is designed to help.

Five: That there is substantially no difference between the rationale for eligibility of students enrolled in colleges and universities within the United States and its territories who take some of their studies abroad under the sponsorship of those colleges and universities and the rationale for eligibility of American students in a State-chartered and fully-accredited college which has its entire program of residence and study in a foreign country.

The effect of clarification or amendment of the Higher Education Act as here petitioned will be insignificant in the budget, the number of students, even potentially eligible, being so small.

By contrast the effect of the institutions involved, if we may judge from the situation at Franklin College, may be critical.

We believe that the value of these institutions, few and small as they are, is high, and we therefore respectfully request your considered attention to this petition.

We thank you for the opportunity to make this presentation on behalf of Franklin College.

My colleague, Dr. Chalmers, would like to offer a few observations about the implications of a change in this aspect of the current law and then we will both be happy to respond to any queries or comments.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Chairman, my name is Joseph Chalmers. I am dean of admissions and records at Georgetown University. I serve with Dr. Martin as a trustee of Franklin College in Lugano, Switzerland.

I would like to add a few word to his comments about the effect of broadening the current eligibility requirements for Federal student aid programs.

Let me observe that it is our view that the interpretation which has been given by the Office of Education to section 1201 of the current law is incorrect. That section defines an "institution of higher education" as "an educational institution in any State which * * *" among several other requirements, "* * * is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education."

Current interpretation insists that the institution in addition to being legally incorporated and licensed within a State must also operate within a State. This excludes a small number of American institutions like Franklin College which not only are chartered and licensed within a State but also have undergone the rigorous process of accreditation by, in our case, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Second: I point out that we suggest a change only in the definition of "eligibility" to apply for these programs in full knowledge that other criteria are later applied by the Office of Education with respect to financial reporting, administrative strength and so forth in order to permit initial and continued participation in the student financial aid programs.

One might reasonably ask how many additional institutions might be made eligible under our proposal. The 1978-79 issue of Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education lists 10 accredited institutions outside the United States of which 2 are already eligible by virtue of location in a U.S. trust territory and one is excluded because it is operated by the Department of Defense.

In addition, five are recognized candidates for accreditation of which two are operated by the Defense Department.

This gives a total of 10 institutions; 7 currently accredited and 3 recognized candidates of which some smaller number is incorporated or licensed in a State.

What would the budgetary impact of such a change be? Enrollments at these institutions are not large. At Franklin College current enrollment is less than 100. Many students are not U.S. citizens or permanent residents and thus not eligible for such aid. We conclude that the budget impact would be insignificant.

Our recommendation is that section 1201(a) be revised to delete the words "in any State" while revising the requirement in section 1201(b) to require that the institution be "legally authorized by a State to provide a program of postsecondary education."

Once again we thank you for this opportunity and we will be happy to respond to questions.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chalmers.

Mr. Mullins?.

STATEMENT OF JOHN M. MULLINS, TRUSTEE, AMERICAN COLLEGE IN PARIS

Mr. MULLINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will summarize and emphasize certain portions of the written testimony but will pass over many points in that written material which has been turned in. I would appreciate it being part of the record.

Mr. SIMON. Your prepared statement will be inserted into the record at this time.

[Prepared statement of John Mullins follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN M. MULLINS, TRUSTEE, AMERICAN COLLEGE IN PARIS

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, my name is John M. Mullins. I am Vice President and Treasurer of the College Entrance Examination Board, but my testimony is not in that capacity. Rather it is as a Trustee for the past fourteen years of the American College in Paris, a small, private, non-profit, four-year college of arts and sciences located in Paris, France. Founded in 1961, the College is incorporated in the District of Columbia; it is fully accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools; and it is licensed by the Educational Institution Licensure Commission of the District of Columbia to confer the Bachelor of Arts and Associate in Arts degrees.

The Honorary Chairman of the Board of Trustees is the Hon. Arthur A. Hartman, U.S. Ambassador to France, and the Chairman of the Board is Mr. Pierre Salinger. Other members include key U.S. figures in American business firms in Europe, educators, senior U.S. government and international organization officials, and a number of French community leaders, including the brother of the President of France.

The student body of the American College in Paris, which comes to the College with impressive academic credentials, numbers approximately 550, seventy percent of whom are Americans, with half coming from American families abroad and half directly from the United States. The remaining thirty percent is composed of foreign nationals representing some 45 different countries. Students from the College are sought for their language skills, for their international experience, and for the maturity that life in a major urban center abroad both requires and encourages. Whether they choose employment in the diplomatic service or international business, as many do, or whether they return to live in the United States, the students of the College increase the outreach of the institution through the application in their own lives of an understanding of another people.

The educational program at the College combines a broad liberal arts curriculum with an international living experience. The College offers sound preparation for undergraduate majors in fourteen areas of study, including the sciences and business administration. In addition, a four-year Bachelor's degree program exists in five areas in which the College has access to exceptionally rich teaching and research resources—Art, History, European Cultural Studies, French Studies, International Affairs and International Business Administration.

The College is a natural center for international educational exchange, both internally among students and faculty and externally through programs designed to bring students into contact with Europeans and their traditions. As a teaching center of American intellectual culture, the College represents America directly to its foreign students and to the French community. Beyond the events held for the public and the many visitors who see the College as an extension of America in Europe, the growing international reputation of the American College in Paris as a serious institution of high quality is a credit to the United States.

Considering itself an integral part of the U.S. higher education network, the American College in Paris in 1974 approached the U.S. Office of Education to seek possible assistance under the various pieces of higher education legislation. In addition to exchanges of correspondence, personal visits by several Trustees and the President of the College were made to the Deputy Commissioner of Higher Education and the Assistant Director of the Institutional Eligibility Staff of the U.S. Office of Education. Although a sympathetic hearing was received, the various officials declared that the College was ineligible to benefit from the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 since the eligibility clause (Title XII-General Provisions: Section 1201 (a)) states that the term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State. Ever since those declarations, the College has committed itself, as one of its highest priorities, to seek eligibility which would permit it to participate in Federal higher education programs.

There are several cogent reasons to support the case of the American College in Paris to seek eligibility under the Higher Education Act of 1965:

(1) Since the American College in Paris qualifies under the eligibility language of the Higher Education Act of 1965 on all criteria except that its location is outside the United States, denial of Federal student aid funds unjustly penalizes American students who choose to study abroad at the American College in Paris.

Among Americans residing overseas, this exclusion of student aid is particularly painful to the business community in Europe and employees of the Department of State and international organizations. On the other hand, Department of Defense dependents have long enjoyed postsecondary educational opportunities in Europe which have been traditionally supported by Federal funds.

(2) Ineligibility of students at the American College in Paris to benefit from the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 restricts access to the College only to students who can afford the entire cost of tuition. It is surely unhealthy for both student and institution if the criteria for studying at the American College in Paris is based solely on the financial resources of the student, since this has the effect of limiting an important international educational opportunity within the American system of higher education to families of relatively high income in a manner clearly contrary to national policy on educational opportunities.

(3) The establishment by President Carter of the Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies would seem to provide clear evidence of a commitment towards the encouragement of study abroad by American students. Unfortunately, this commitment loses all meaning as long as current policy is hindering the ability of institutions like the American College in Paris to put such opportunities within the reach of more Americans and to extend these opportunities to non-traditional students such as the spouses of Americans employed abroad.

(4) The lack of assistance to institutions like the American College in Paris is doubly depressing in the light of the many foreign study programs sponsored by U.S.-based institutions which make it possible for students enrolled in those programs through the home institution to apply Federal benefits to their study abroad.

(5) Continuing and life-long educational opportunities, which are provided by the American College in Paris and its adjunct, the Women's Institute for Continuing Education, are likewise the object of discrimination in that they are excluded from Federal support.

(6) Two thrusts of current American educational policy—the elimination of discrimination by residence and the need for international programs—point to the development and assistance of colleges such as the American College in Paris, which are accredited, have proven their ability to serve a diversified clientele, and which constitute an already existing infrastructure for the improvement of educational opportunities for Americans in Europe.

American higher education must be encouraged to expand its horizons internationally, and the few, fully accredited, non-profit U.S. institutions which are located abroad should be eligible for the same Federal programs as those located in the United States. Granting eligibility through a change in legislation to institutions such as the American College in Paris would not open the floodgates for the outflow of Federal funds since there are presently only ten institutions located abroad, five of which are private, four public and one offering only correspondence courses, that can claim full accreditation by a U.S. regional accrediting association.

In sum, the anomaly of the situation which is faced by the American College in Paris can, perhaps, best be expressed by quoting from a January 1978 letter from Senator Claiborne Pell to the President of another overseas American college. Senator Pell states: "It does not make sense to me that students in foreign institutions which are accredited by American accrediting associations should be denied student aid benefits which they would otherwise be eligible to receive if they attended college within the United States." Sadly enough, at the American College alone, there are each year more than 350 students who are discriminated against by the existing Federal higher education legislation.

Thank you.

Mr. MULLINS. There are obviously many points that both Franklin College and the American College in Paris can make. I will seek not to duplicate them.

I am vice president and treasurer of the College Entrance Examination Board but my testimony is not in that capacity. Rather it is as a trustee for the past 14 years of the American College in Paris which is a small private nonprofit 4-year college of arts and sciences located in Paris, France.

Our interest this morning is the same as that of Franklin College, eligibility of our students for financial aid programs provided under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

I will not go into a detailed description of the college or its programs for such material was sent to each member of this subcommittee by our board chairman, Pierre Salinger, some 2 months ago.

You should know that the student body of the college which comes with impressive academic credentials numbers approximately 550 and 70 percent of whom are Americans with one-half of those coming from American families abroad and one-half directly from the United States. The remaining 30 percent is composed of foreign nationals representing some 45 different countries.

The educational program at the college combines a broad liberal arts curriculum with an international living experience. The college offers sound preparation for undergraduate majors in 14 areas of study including the sciences and business administration and a 4 year bachelor's degree program existing in five areas in which the college has access to exceptionally rich teaching and research resources, art history, European cultural studies, French studies, international affairs and international business administration.

The college is a natural center for international educational exchange both internally among students and faculty and externally through programs designed to bring students into contact with Europeans and their traditions.

As a teaching center of American intellectual culture the college represents America directly to its foreign students and to the French community and is an important medium for improvement in intercultural understanding.

There are several cogent reasons to support the case of the college for eligibility under the Higher Education Act of 1965. Let me cite three of the six, set forth in the written testimony.

Since the college qualifies on all criteria except that its location is outside the United States, denial of Federal student aid funds unjustly penalizes American students who choose to study abroad at the American College in Paris. Among Americans residing overseas by virtue of their employment this exclusion of student aid is particularly felt by the business community and by employees of the Department of State and of international organizations.

Second: The lack of assistance to institutions like the American College in Paris is doubly depressing in the light of the many foreign study programs sponsored by U.S. based institutions which make it possible for students enrolled in those programs through the home institution to apply Federal benefits to their study abroad.

Two thrusts of current American educational policy, the elimination of discrimination by residence and the need for international programs, point to the development and assistance of colleges, such as those appearing today, which are accredited and have proven their ability to serve a diversified clientele and which constitute an already existing infrastructure for the improvement of educational opportunities in Europe for Americans.

In our view, American higher education must be encouraged to expand its horizons internationally, and the few fully accredited nonprofit U.S. institutions which are located abroad should be eligible for the same Federal programs as those located in the United States.

As Dean Chalmers testified, the granting of eligibility through a change in legislation would not open the floodgates for the outflow of Federal funds.

Sadly, some 350 students at the American College in Paris each year are ineligible for financial aid programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to appear today. I also stand ready to answer any questions which you may have.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much.

What are the tuition costs at your two schools?

Mr. MULLINS. The American College in Paris is about \$3,400 this year, tuition alone.

Mr. SIMON. Tuition alone and not having room and board.

Mr. MARTIN. \$4,800.

Mr. SIMON. For example, the two of you from Trinity and Georgetown, would there be some way of a tie-in with an American school? There is a problem that I can see from the viewpoint of the Office of Education of auditing and supervising and so forth. That may not be a problem. They may be very eager to go to Switzerland or Paris to do this.

That is one problem. A second problem I see as I read, for example, Mr. Chalmers' testimony that, legally authorized by State to provide a program of postsecondary education, I could be legally authorized by the State of Illinois to have a barber college in Paris. I am not against barber colleges in Paris, but I am not sure that is not your intent to move in that direction.

I see the problem you state, and if there would be some way of a tie-in with an American institution so that we could avoid some custodial supervisory cost, because I can see if we have a problem erupting in the stories about American tax money going to pay for something in Paris, or who knows where, and they will not help programs in general.

Mr. MARTIN. The problem, sir, very clearly would be one of control, authority, and responsibility. I think informal liaison would probably satisfy what you have in mind. An informal relationship would require, I suppose, the subordination of one institution with another as a branch bank sort of thing.

The other gentlemen may have something to say about it. I think it is not a likely move from the point of view of American institutions, let alone the foreign institutions.

Mr. SIMON. You mentioned Claremont College has a tie-in with your school. I would be interested in any reaction. I am thinking of something like that. I would be interested in any comment from Dr. Meador or Dr. Thompson.

Dr. MEADOR. The issue really affects a point of the interpretation of the law and has to do with student financial assistance and how these student loans and student directed assistance programs may be monitored, as you indicated.

I think the case that they have presented is very persuasive. I have to set some limits on my own observations, however, as I am a parent who has been supporting a college-age student in Europe for the last year. I am well aware of the escalating costs and also the problems of applications for loans, of eligibility and accreditation standards, and the difficulty of matching these legitimate institutional concerns with

this aspect of international education and what I see to be the agency's legitimate concerns for monitoring and seeing to it that funds are effectively dispersed.

I feel that, probably, it could be handled with some type of administrative mechanism, but I am not sufficiently familiar with the student financial assistance regulations or procedures that I can really comment specifically. However, I would not see this as a monumental hurdle for reauthorization.

Mr. SIMON. I do not mean to be personal, but in your case you have a son or daughter in school overseas.

Dr. MEADOR. I have a daughter who spent last year overseas in Italy. Thus, I found myself as an administrator of international programs in the Office of Education and a parent supporting an international education program for a member of my own family.

I learned firsthand about varying exchange rates, calls upon the family coffers for support and assistance, books and travel. It proved to be very interesting to experience this type of "international education" as a parent and, at the same time, work in the Office with the Fulbright program and see the impact of inflation in some countries and the changes in the purchase power of dollars appropriated for international programs, and experience the same sorts of decisions regarding the family interests.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to say one word about that. I see the points being made. I see the point of your remark about supervision. Fundamentally, if I send my son to Stanford University and he decides to spend a term or a year at one of Stanford's four overseas centers, he takes this program with him. If I decide to send him directly, there is no program for him to go on. That is the fundamental inequity that is involved.

I should think that the administrative oversight and auditing and so forth really ought not to be a barrier. I do not think it is a sufficiently difficult problem to guarantee among these institutions, with all of them fully accredited, a decent kind of accounting.

Mr. SIMON. I believe the minority staff indicated they have some questions.

Mr. CLOHAN. The administration is recommending eliminating accreditation as a benchmark for institutional eligibility for these programs. That recommendation has not been adopted in H.R. 5192, but it may be at some time. Therefore, program review will be enhanced significantly; that is, it will be the major focus of whether an institution or the students attending an institution should be eligible. The accreditation factor would not be as significant. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN. That is, the barber college would become eligible. Is that the intention?

Mr. CLOHAN. Not necessarily. It is just that accreditation in and of itself would not be sufficient to make an institution eligible for a Higher Education Act program.

Mr. MULLINS. It seems to me the nonprofit status that the licensing within a particular State or, in the case of the American College in Paris, within the District of Columbia, to award degrees should certainly be some evidence of seriousness of purpose.

Mr. CLOHAN. In the District of Columbia it would, but many States do not have authorizing legislation right now. I believe there are 10

States that do not. That is a problem. It is one of the problems with which Congress must deal with if it eliminated accreditation as a benchmark.

Mr. MULLINS. Are those nonprofit institutions in those States?

Mr. CLOHAN. They would be eligible. Eligibility is provided by accreditation.

One thing we ought to do here is distinguish between Basic Educational Opportunity Grants and what is called the campus-based programs—the Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, the National Direct Student Loans, and College Work Study. Those funds are given to a State and distributed to the institution.

How do you see that working?

Mr. CHALMERS. I have some familiarity with the financial and legislation, since that is one of the departments at Georgetown that reports to me. I am not a financial aid person professionally, so I do not have total familiarity to get at the first part of your comment.

We are addressing both the eligibility for the campus-based programs and the eligibility for Basic Grants. As you implied, that particular problem does not exist with Basic Grants since it is a direct program. With the campus-based programs, it seems to me that again is a technicality that would need to be dealt with at some stage, but need not serve as a barrier.

The reason I say that is, I believe there are provisions for dealing with the distribution of those funds to institutions that do not fall within the normal definition of a State. I am thinking, for example, of the institutions in the trust territory. I do not know whether that is a separate State, for purposes of this legislation, or not.

I also believe there are provisions, or at least historically have been provisions, for some portion of those funds to be set aside and to be allocated by the Commissioner of Education, based on some other formula or for a set of principles.

It seems to me that something along the lines of those things might be brought in to deal with the allocation of funds to these institutions.

I would stress that we are talking about very small numbers within the context of the total appropriation for student financial aid.

Mr. SIMON. In that connection, you mentioned seven accredited institutions and two of them are represented here and you have a total of about 650 students in those two.

What would be the total enrollment in all seven, roughly?

Mr. CHALMERS. I am not in a position to give you a good answer.

Mr. SIMON. We can check that out.

Mr. MULLINS. I do not know the answer to the question, but I think one point that we should emphasize is that not all of the students in either institution are eligible because, in the case of the American College in Paris, some 30 percent are not American students. We are talking about 70 percent of our total and some percentage of the Franklin College total.

Mr. CLOHAN. One concern is that, if institutions like yours are made eligible or students at your institutions are eligible for the financial aid, there may be a proliferation of other schools that would try to attract American students in order to capture the U.S. Federal dollars.

How would you respond to that?

Mr. CHALMERS. I have two observations. One is, I am not sure to what extent that would differ from the situation which exists within the United States. The second point is, I think some controls or some screening is appropriate.

None of us are professional lobbyists or attorneys or otherwise skilled in drafting legislation. I think what we are trying to suggest is that the screening that now exists, which is simply a technical matter of, is the institution located and operating physically in the United States or not, is a rather blind screen. Surely a better screen exists that would allow institutions with a certain amount of stability and with a certain stature, as represented by passing through the very expensive and difficult accreditation procedures, which are far more difficult for an institution abroad for the same reason one worries about auditing institutions abroad, teams of people have to go and all that. These institutions have gone through that.

It seems they have enough stature that whatever kind of screen might be constructed would pass these kinds of institutions through it.

Mr. CLOHAN. Are any of your students eligible for Guaranteed Student Loans?

Mr. MULLINS. Yes.

Mr. CHALMERS. Yes. I might observe, a great problem with that is that the Guaranteed Student Loan by itself is the only source of financial aid and does not provide sufficient funds to an individual student to make a significant difference or to many individual students to make a significant difference.

One has to package financial aid and put different programs together. That is of some help, but it is not the solution to the problem.

Mr. MULLINS. Mr. Chairman, may I make one observation?

Mr. SIMON. Certainly.

Mr. MULLINS. While we do not think the possibilities of tying or linking with a stateside institution are practical as a solution to this, the other side of that coin seems to me to be, perhaps some of the American installations that are numerous in Brussels or another European capital could serve a function delegated by the Office of Education to do certain audits, if that were necessary.

Mr. SIMON. We do not have any answers. We will have staff check into this further and check out the possibility of working something out. At this point, I cannot speak for the subcommittee that we will work either favorably or unfavorably. I do not know precisely what direction it is going to take. We appreciate your calling this problem to our attention.

Mr. MARTIN. Thank you for hearing us.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much. This concludes our hearing. [Whereupon, the subcommittee was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.]