FRONTIERS:
THE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF STUDY ABROAD

Responding to the Needs of Our Nation: A Look at the Fullbright and NSEP Education Acts

Demerise R. Dubois

Education abroad has held a place in American higher learning since the early colonial period. The first colleges were modeled after Britain's Oxford and Cambridge, and many young men sojourned to the mother country in further pursuit of their ministerial studies. Later, American scholars visited German research universities as well as those in Spain, France, and Scotland, borrowing from these examples to enhance institutions of higher education at home. During the nineteenth century, it became fashionable for members of the upper class to engage in a "grand tour" of Europe, a means by which to finish their indoctrination into the cultured elite.

Historically, the U.S. government has played little role in international education. Among the reasons for its lack of involvement include the American traditions of isolationism, limited government, education as a local concern, and the State Department's distance from the public at large. To date, most foreign academic exchanges continue to be conducted on institutional or private bases. In fact, the early precedents of federal support for private education overseas came by way of the back door.

The national government's first venture into educational exchange resulted from the Boxer Rebellion in China. The Boxers, a secret society aiming to scourge China of outside influences, massacred hundreds of foreigners in the early 1900s. To compensate families of the deceased, leaders of the Chinese government offered indemnities to those nations, including approximately $24 million to the United States. This amount was deemed excessive, so the U.S. government intended to return half of the sum unused. Instead, the Chinese government proposed to apply those funds toward sending selected scholars to the United States, where institutions of higher learning were held in high regard. This resolution became hailed as "one of the most effective measures ever taken by our country toward the promotion of international good will and the cementing of international friendships."

After World War I, another opportunity happened to finance overseas study. The Belgian-American Educational Foundation was formed in 1920, resulting from the liquidation of WWI Belgian relief funds. Between the two world wars, more than seven hundred Belgian and American students were exchanged. The warm reception to these exchanges led Herbert Hoover, head of the commission that oversaw the early stages of the program, to doubt whether there was another country "where the ideals and purposes of the American people are so well understood and so respected as they are in Belgium" and vice versa.

By using leftover funds from the Boxer indemnities and from Belgian relief sources instead of appropriating new funds, the government demonstrated its initial indifference to international education. In fact, the Fulbright Act came about in much the same way. The next part looks at how the late senator made creative use out of federal funds, which otherwise would have gone to

waste, in order to finance academic exchange.

2. The Fulbright Act

The fact that Fulbright exchanges still take place between the United States and other countries is a great testimony to the strength of the program. The forty-nine years since its passage have witnessed many operational changes in the Fulbright program while remaining true to its mission of promoting international understanding. Without detailing the entire history, I summarize a few phases the program has undergone since its inception.

Senator Fulbright's legislation amended the Surplus Property Act of 1944 in three ways. First, it made the Department of State the disposal agency for American war property remaining overseas after World War II. Second, the secretary of state could stipulate that the sale of property be paid in foreign currencies or credits when in the interest of the United States. Finally, the amendment authorized the secretary to enter into executive agreements with foreign governments to finance American educational activities in those countries and to sponsor transportation for foreigners attending American institutions of higher education. President Truman signed the bill into law on August 1, 1946.

Among the provisions, a Board of Foreign Scholarships was established to oversee the program. This ten-member board, representing foreign policy and higher education sectors, was instrumental in designing the criteria based on the State Department Act. American students were to apply for the merit-based scholarships, which would finance a year of graduate work abroad. Recipients were selected from a range of academic disciplines; they were chosen to reflect geographical distribution throughout the country; and preference was given to qualified war veterans. Non-governmental organizations, like the Institute of International Education, were contracted to serve administrative functions of the selection process. Binational commissions were set up overseas to monitor the reciprocal program, and, in those countries with low participation, attaches from the U.S. embassies were engaged. The international exchange program was intended to prepare the leaders of the future, in hopes of achieving permanent peace based on mutual understanding.

In 1961, the original legislation was superseded by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act. This new act consolidated several international activities funded by the federal government, greatly expanding the scope of Fulbright exchanges. Among its changes, the legislation authorized new sources of government funding, since the war surplus had been depleted; increased the size of the Board of Foreign Scholarships to twelve members; created a position of assistant secretary of state to oversee educational and cultural exchange; encouraged foreign governments to share in the financial burden; and opened the program to additional countries previously not covered under the Surplus Property Act. The Fulbright-Hays Act, as it is now called, solidified the program in much of its present form.

Today, Fulbright alumni number more than 200,000, of which over 68,000 are Americans. Additionally, each year more than 1,000 American faculty members hold lectureships and research positions in over 100 countries; approximately 1,200 visiting scholars and 1,300 foreign students come to the United States; 550 grants are awarded to American graduate students; 350 American elementary and secondary school teachers go abroad, with 250 foreigners teaching here; and 80 American institutions of higher education receive money to set up linkages overseas. Reasons for the Fulbright program's longevity will be explored later; it is now time to turn to the newest actor on the block.

2. The Boren Act

Senator Boren's program came to passage within the context of the Intelligence Authorization Act of 1991. Title VIII, called the National Security Education Act, outlines a plan for providing financial support of education with respect to "critical" areas of United States foreign policy. It was based on seven findings, paraphrased here:

Security continues to depend on the ability of the United States to exercise international leadership.

National security is defined increasingly as political and economic, as well as military, strength.

A new kind of international stability is needed due to declining cold war tensions and to increasing economic competition, regional conflicts, and terrorist activities.

National security and economic well being rely on the ability of U.S. citizens to communicate and compete by knowing the languages and cultures of other countries.

The federal government must ensure that its employees are well versed in these areas.

It is in the government's interest to take action to alleviate our inadequacies in international fields of study.

American colleges and universities must place a new emphasis on foreign languages, area studies, and other international fields.

The National Security Education Program (NSEP) was intended to "complement, not duplicate or replace, the foreign language and area studies programs previously authorized," so it has many features distinct from the Fulbright scholarships. One fundamental difference is that the NSEP is not an exchange. The legislation provides for the unilateral flow of American students overseas. In addition, individual recipients have an obligation to serve as federal employees or educators in their field of study after coming back to the United States for a minimum period of time in return.

The Department of Defense in its intelligence budget allocates financial support for Boren's program. NSEP provides assistance for the equal funding of three types of activities:

* scholarships to undergraduate students who are U.S. citizens, for at least one semester, to study in foreign countries that are critical countries

* fellowships for U.S. citizens who are pursuing graduate degrees in foreign languages, area studies, or other international fields that are critical areas of those disciplines

* grants to American institutions of higher education for programs that are critical areas of those disciplines

* The sum of $150 million was authorized in the form of a trust, $35 million of which to use for administration of the activities, with the remainder placed in an endowment for future use.

The definition of "critical" is determined by the National Security Education Board. Similar to the Board of Foreign Scholarships, this board is made up of individuals (or representatives

thereof) within the government and from higher education: the secretaries of defense, education, commerce, and state; the directors of Central Intelligence and the U.S. Information Agency; plus four individuals appointed by the president who are experts in the various fields of international studies. Again, similar to the role played in the Fulbright program, the NSEP Board is responsible for overseeing the awards by establishing candidate selection criteria, disseminating information, contracting with private organizations for the administration of the program, submitting annual reports for review, and so on. A year later, several slight changes altered the original act. For example, it was renamed the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991. In addition, graduate students had to apply their awards in American institutions at home; now their grants can also be used abroad. Finally, the board now includes a National Endowment for the Humanities representative and two additional educators. At this time, it is too soon to analyze the results of the program in action. Although the National Security Education Act authorized funding for the program starting with fiscal year 1992, logistical and structural problems have delayed its implementation. The first award recipients studied during the 1994-1995 academic year. (In the year since this paper was originally written, NSEP has granted the following awards: 317 scholarships to undergraduates, 172 fellowships to graduate students, and 9 grants to U.S. institutions of higher education.)8 For now, it is helpful to examine the motivations behind the acts and how they may have influenced the two programs of international education. I begin by looking at their creators the Senators Fulbright and Boren.

The Personal Ideals of Two Men

J. William Fulbright is considered the "father of U.S. academic exchanges," and professionals in the field of international education deem this the "Fulbright Age."'(' The senator, who passed away on February 9, 1995, at the age of eighty-nine, has left behind a great legacy in domestic politics and in foreign relations. Now a new generation of internationally minded citizens comes of age. So that the benefits of mutual understanding across national borders will not be forgotten, many people have looked to David L. Boren in hopes that he will be the next century's J. William Fulbright. To shed light on this possibility, I examine how the two acts reflect the personal ideals of these men.

On the surface, Fulbright and Boren appear to be made from a similar mold. Senators from Arkansas and Oklahoma respectively, both Democrats were awarded the chance to venture beyond middle America on Rhodes scholarships. Cecil Rhodes was an Anglo industrial pioneer who made his fortune in South Africa at the turn of the 1900s. He established a foundation that brought students from the British colonies, America, and Germany to Oxford University with aims of furthering the English heritage and language. Traveling around Britain and continental Europe broadened the rather sheltered lives of the two young men. The Rhodes experience gave rise to their appreciation for international understanding, forming the common basis of their foreign education initiatives. How the pieces of legislation differ can be attributed to how the ideals of the two senators diverge from there.

Of the two, J. William Fulbright started his career with stronger ties to higher education. At the age of thirty-four, he became the youngest college president of the day when he was elevated to the position at the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville. As a U.S. Representative in 1943, he was appointed by Secretary of State Cordell Hull to chair the American delegation at a seventeen-nation conference on postwar education in London. In 1945, by then a senator, he served on the Education and Labor Committee. His involvement in education proved instrumental in the formulation of his war-surplus amendment.

The pure advancement of knowledge was not the only concern of Senator Fulbright, however. His proximity to the United States' involvement in the two world wars fundamentally influenced

his views. In his own words: "We should consider trans-national educational exchange not solely or even primarily as an intellectual or academic experience but as the most effective means (in the words of Albert Einstein) 'to deliver mankind from the menace of war.' " This statement reflects the dual nature of his exchange program-a response to the wave of internationalism in the mid-1940s

Based on his internationalist sentiments, Fulbright wanted to see the world move beyond its system of national boundaries. In his role as legislator, he aspired to "institutionalize, in the form of law, those measures which mark the slow lifting of mankind up from the rule of the tooth and claw.'" His first impact on America's foreign policy agenda came in 1943. Along with Senator Tom Connally of Texas, the two proposed support for a postwar collective security organization. The Fulbright-Connally Resolution established a foundation for creating the United Nations Organization.

To Fulbright's dismay, the United Nations did not reach far enough to overcome the barriers between nations. The U.N. Charter came to be based on the "principle of the sovereign equality of all its members." In his opinion, that statement "reaffirmed our allegiance to the concept of national sovereignty under which our civilization [had] so closely approached self-destruction.'" This prompted Fulbright to find other solutions, like international educational exchange, in order "'to wage a creative war for a creative peace . '"

In comparison, David L. Boren could be considered the career political scientist of the two. In 1963, after graduating from Yale with a B.A. degree in history, Boren spent time working as a propaganda analyst for Soviet Affairs at the U.S. Information Agency. During his stint at Oxford the following year, Boren traveled to more than sixty countries, delivering speeches on American affairs for the Speakers' Bureau of the U.S. Embassy in London. He held his first position in office as governor of Oklahoma and became a U.S. senator in 1978. Although a Democrat, he views himself as a "self-styled 'maverick conservative.' "15

His conservative views in foreign policy guided Boren throughout the United States' involvement in recent military activity. Despite the apparent end to the cold war, he expressed reservations over the Soviet Union's compliance with the Intermediate Nuclear-forces Treaty signed by President Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in 1987. He endorsed the Reagan administration's arming of contra rebels fighting Marxist-led Sandinistas in Nicaragua. In addition, he was the "lone hold out in a 99-1 Senate vote calling on the administration to curtail the escort by American ships of neutral oil tankers in the Persian Gulf during the war between Iran and Iraq.'" He also served as chairman of the Senate Select Intelligence Committee from 1987 to 1993, during the height of the Iran-contra scandal.

His career has since come full circle. In October 1994, David L. Boren stepped down from his Senate position, with two years left in his term, to become the thirteenth president of the University of Oklahoma. Whereas Fulbright began his public career as president of the University of Arkansas before heading to Capitol Hill, Boren has taken the reverse path, leaving Washington to become the president of his own home-state university. According to Boren, his reason for leaving is based on a disillusionment with the growing partisanship that has dominated Congress. He has also faced political infighting, as in his opposition to President Clinton's economic recovery package. In an op-ed article, Boren concluded: "If America gets everything else right but fails to provide for the education of the next generation, we will lose our strength as a society. A reporter asked me, 'Why would you give up power and influence to become a university president?' My answer: At this point, I feel I can do more good at the university.

As of now, the former Senator Boren has not been as prolific as J. William Fulbright. It is also too soon to take stock of his National Security Education Act. Definitely, part of the two men's divergence is dependent on the times. Almost fifty years ago, Senator Fulbright thought the nations had seen the "war to end all wars," which may account for his pacifist vision. The decades since have not been immune to military conflict. This reality could be attributed to Boren's conservative bent. It is appropriate to say that their personal beliefs have made a mark on their provisions in the two plans for international education-for example, Fulbright's commitment to mutual reciprocity and Boren's emphasis on the unilateral study of "critical" areas.

Regardless of their ideals, both men needed congressional votes to get their pieces of legislation passed. It could be argued that Senator Fulbright was a practical idealist,' and Senator Boren an ideal practicalist. How they made each respective act appeal to fellow legislators deserves attention in the next part.

Many factors sculpted the provisions in the Fulbright and Boren Acts. Not only did the personal beliefs of the two men play a role, but so did outside influences like the political, economic, and social moods of the nation. Senator Boren also had the advantage of hindsight in looking over the past decades of the Fulbright program. Although Senator Fulbright had precedents to follow, "the scholarship program came into being because of the efforts of one man."' Irrespective of political finagling, both pieces of legislation displayed concrete features that aided their passage.

First, it has already been mentioned that federal funding of higher education needs justification. International academic exchange has not met legislative approval for the pure sake of universal knowledge. The origins of the two bills give weight to that fact. The Fulbright program found its footing under the guise of the Surplus Property Act, and Boren's NSEP was couched in the Intelligence Authorization Act. The promise of meeting foreign policy objectives under the auspices of the State Department granted legitimacy to the government's involvement in study abroad.

Furthermore, it was imperative that such involvement pose no financial burden to the American public. In Fulbright's case, he made use of non-valuable war property. Taxpayers had already paid for the surplus goods used overseas during the war effort. There was no benefit in shipping the property back to the United States, and selling it would not have garnered much money; besides, foreign credit was not convertible into dollars. Before introducing his bill, Senator Fulbright envisioned opening the exchange program to any nation; however, the actual text specified only those countries in which there was surplus property credit. He knew that an overall plan would not meet passage, so any expansion would have to come after the program had already established itself.

To justify his bill as well, Senator Boren found ways to make his program finance itself. Its endowment provision would lead to a selfsustaining source of income in the future. As dictated by the service requirement, too, individual recipients of the Boren scholarships would pay back their awards by working for the government or in education. National service met an additional need. In retrospect, one criticism of the Fulbright exchanges has been the lack of alumni involvement. Although strides have been made in this area by encouraging alumni to continue sharing their experiences on returning from abroad, the National Security Education Act guarantees that the newly acquired knowledge will be used in an official capacity. Congress is much more likely to authorize legislation that gets something for relatively nothing.

Other specifications addressed social concerns of the day. Following the G.I. Bill of Rights, the

initial Fulbright Act gave preference to war veteran applicants, all other qualifications being equal. Partly due to the overcrowding situation on college campuses after World War II, it also stated that the enrollment of foreigners in institutions would not take priority over providing space for American students. Today's focus on multiculturalism in America prompted Boren's act to stipulate that selection would take into consideration "the extent to which the distribution of scholarships and fellowships to individuals reflects the cultural, racial, and ethnic diversity of the population of the United States" {Section 802(c)}. Senator Fulbright's first proposal had a provision for similar diversity, but it was left out of his bill. In 1946, the time was not ripe for such an inclusion if Congress were to grant its passage.

To appeal to a range of constituents, Senator Fulbright outlined two tactics. First, he established the Board of Foreign Scholarships, now called the J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board, whose makeup would represent officials from the federal government and institutions of higher education. Second, he loosely stressed choosing recipients with regard to geographic distribution to overcome the predominance of scholars from the Northeast. This made the plan favorable to educators and legislators across the country. Following this lead, Senator Boren included provisions for a comparable advisory board and for the distribution of scholars throughout the United States. He also went one step further by limiting the number of contracts allowed to private organizations for operation of the program. All these measures were aimed at ensuring a proper balance among national foreign policy, higher education, and outside enterprises.

It is interesting that Fulbright used historical precedents to make a case for his legislation; whereas Boren refrained from mentioning the Fulbright program in his speeches on the Senate floor. In fact, Senator Boren stated: "It is a sad thing that we are about the only leading country in the world that provides no Government help to allow our students to gain the skills they need by studying abroad, learning other languages and other cultures firsthand." This disavowal of government funding for international education was intentional. To demonstrate need for his particular program, Senator Boren needed to separate the National Security Education Act from the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961. He had to show Congress that his objectives could not be met through preexisting programs.

Instead, Boren used the example of the National Defense Education Act, the response to the Soviet launching of Sputnik, which augmented studies in math and the sciences. He paralleled that threat in 1958, to the contemporary threats of Japanese economic hegemony and post-cold war instability. Without mentioning the Fulbright program by name, Senator Boren stressed the unique features of his program. Citing the fact that Western Europe is the destination of almost three-fourths of all American students abroad, he emphasized the focus on previously underrepresented "critical" areas of foreign study. He also made a case for NSEP's niche in providing grants to undergraduates. These examples, and more, gave legislators reason to believe that the country needed this additional aid to international education.

The inclusion (or deletion) of certain provisions shows how Senators Fulbright and Boren acted shrewdly to get their pieces of legislation passed. One reason for the acceptance of the National Security Education Program in addition to the Fulbright program was the apparent evolution in America's foreign policy needs over the years since World War II. I now turn to the changing concept of national security.

6. National Security

That the Fulbright and NSEP programs address national foreign policy interests explains the

federal government's willingness to finance higher education abroad. Over the past fifty years, the concept of national security has increased in scope. Originally, it meant the containment of communism. Today, the definition has broadened "to encompass much more than military or political-military concerns." This part looks at the conceptual evolution of national security and how each act spoke to the concerns of policy makers relative to the United States' world position.

The involvement of the United States in World War II gave birth to the notion of national security. Isolationism had previously characterized the country. The combination of "intellectual challenges posed after 1945, by the emergence of nuclear weapons, the collapse of Europe's colonial empires, growing international economic interdependence, America's new commitment to both international organizations and collective security alliances, and the web of US-USSR conflicts labeled 'the Cold War'" gave rise to a national security concept. As the new leader in world affairs, early American policy concentrated on thwarting the threat of communism and on spreading the virtues of democracy.

Senator Fulbright's amendment to the Surplus Property Act surfaced during this period of American hegemony. Given its new status as a superpower, the United States could no longer live in isolation: "As never before in American history, it became vital to the national security to understand the minds of people in other societies and to have American aspirations and problems understood by others." Thus, the program for international educational exchange was established at a time when mutual understanding appeared to be key solution toward the prevention of further military conflict.

The Fulbright feature of reciprocity served our national security interests in a dual capacity. First, the presence of American scholars and students overseas would help foreigners learn about our institutions and the Western principles of free democracy. Some Fulbright recipients disseminated democratic principles expressly-by lecturing on subjects like American history, politics, and culture. More often, they left their mark in subtle ways-by virtue of their contributions to the host country during its postwar reconstruction or in its industrial development. Second, bringing scholars and students to the United States meant that foreigners would get to experience our institutions firsthand and take our examples back home with them. These two aspects of mutual exchange made the Fulbright Act appealing to the national interest of spreading democracy over communism.

At the time, few people voiced concern about the adverse affects of reciprocity, namely that Fulbright recipients would return from abroad with ideas subversive to American democracy. After all, the United States had just emerged from World War II triumphant, so the nation's principles must have worked. Any such trepidation as to the benefits of exchange were viewed as trivial. A personal incident involving Senator Fulbright exemplifies the light handling of this situation. In 1946, he suggested that Truman step down from office since a Democrat head-of-state coupled with a Republican-ruled Congress could result in nothing but stalemates. That the proposal resembling an English parliamentary system should have come from within the president's own political party led a U.S. News and World Report article to quip that Fulbright had gone to Oxford too early in his career. Likewise, the vote on his international exchange amendment was scheduled during the absence of a vocal opponent. Fulbright did not want the legislators to worry that the program's recipients would return with too many "foreignisms

One interpretation of national security did pose a dilemma during the initial operation of the Fulbright exchanges. Whereas funding was authorized via the State Department, some federal officials thought that applicants should undergo thorough security clearance. At first, the Board of Foreign Scholarships tried to accommodate this request, but it immediately found that the time invested by the State Department in checking the applicants severely delayed confirming

the decisions. Furthermore, according to scholars and higher education officials, fear of communism during the McCarthy era hampered the Fulbright awards' academic focus. It was decided that extensive scrutiny, other than name checks, would not be necessary since the recipients were not employed by the federal government. As American representatives overseas, Fulbright applicants did need to demonstrate loyalty to the principles of democracy in their study proposals; however, their topics were not "sensitive" by intelligence standards, so this variant of security" became a nonissue.

From an overseas perspective, some foreign government and education officials denounced the Fulbright exchanges as flagrant tools of American propaganda. Several provisions in the Fulbright Act, however, helped to quell these concerns. For example, the allotment of travel grants to foreign scholars reflected the reciprocal approach to the Fulbright exchanges. In addition, the establishment of binational commissions to administer the program abroad meant that each participating country would have input. Over the years, these countries have shared increasing financial and administrative responsibility for the operation of the Fulbright program. The binational commissions have also been instrumental in screening applicants acceptable to the United States-yet another component of national security.

Cold war sentiments dictated much of the United States' foreign relations during the decades to follow. The containment policy of national security played out in arenas such as the Korean War and the Bay of Pigs initiative against Cuba. It was the role in Vietnam that led to a growing disillusionment with America's involvement in international affairs. Attention turned inward, and domestic issues like civil rights soon became the targets of national interest. Finally, the events of the 1980s, which bore witness to the dissolution of the Soviet Union and culminated in the crumbling of the Berlin Wall, challenged the East-West notion of national security. No longer did national security entail a bipolar military threat.

Perhaps at no other time since World War II had the United States found itself in such a changed global environment. "America's mounting debt and fiscal insolvency; chronic trade imbalances; stagnant economic productivity; declining work habits; low savings rate; illiteracy; and high levels of domestic crime, drug addiction, and violence and the other symptoms of national malaise associated with the intensely debated 'decline' of the United States relative to its Japanese, German, and other competitors" took the spotlight. Defense and arms-control experts cautioned that over-looking security issues in the post-cold war era was based on two misconceptions: (1.) that national security involves only planning for wars and military technology, and (2.) that United States security hinges on Soviet-centered policies. A new definition of national security had evolved that granted legitimacy to the bill that Senator Boren introduced in the early 1990s.

The National Security Education Act addresses both of the above misconceptions. First, the one-way nature of the international education scholarships reflects the United States' weakened position in the international scene. "As American trade deficits soared in the 1980s, a national debate over productivity and competitiveness rages. One suggestion for remedial action is 'protection'-isolation of the American economy from the rest of the world. Another approach is to get to know the rest of the world and to beat them at their own games.'" It is the second approach to which Senator Boren spoke. Instead of spreading democratic principles and welcoming foreign learners to our country like the Fulbright Act advocated, NSEP protects national interests by supporting American students and higher education institutions to study foreign ways in order to regain this country's place in the global arena.

Second, the focus of NSEP on "critical" areas to United States' interests recognizes the multipolar world that exists today. The break-up of the former Soviet Union has led to a destabilization of

preconceived security notions. Political actors have multiplied with the formation of new Eastern European states, the development of Latin American and African societies, the burgeoning of Asian economies, and the reformulating of alliances in the Middle East. "The Persian Gulf War of 1991 is just a reminder that military force, whether used unilaterally in coalition with others, or in combination with international organizations, is far from irrelevant to the international politics in the post-cold war era." The introduction of Senator Boren's legislation on the heels of U.S. military involvement, combined with the fact that Fulbright activity has predominated in westernized countries, forced lawmakers to see the immediate need for expertise in less frequented corners of the globe.

Similar to the debates over the Fulbright exchanges, critics have argued that foreigners will perceive this new act as an extension of American propaganda. Claims by these opponents have greater weight because of NSEP's unilateral focus on areas "critical" to U.S. foreign policy. To counter these objections, the Boren Act states:

No person who receives a grant, scholarship, or fellowship or any other type of assistance under this title shall, as a condition of receiving such assistance or under any other circumstances, be used by any department, agency, or entity of the United States Government engaged in intelligence activities to undertake any activity on its behalf during the period such person is pursuing a program of education for which funds are provided under the program. (Section 802 (f))

The justification is that intelligence activity should not dictate studies at the individual level. Rather, the main provision of NSEP is its support for national security studies in those areas previously underrepresented in higher education.</PRE>

In conclusion, Senators Fulbright and Boren introduced their respective pieces of legislation during two distinct periods in American history. Each act gained its legitimacy relative to the security needs of the United States at the time. One topic that warrants further inspection is the issue of universal knowledge versus national interest. The question of international study as an instrument of American propaganda is revisited in the following part on higher education.

8. Higher Education

Not only did the nearly fifty-year span between the introductions of the Fulbright and Boren Acts witness an evolution in the concept of national security; changes in the higher education arena also influenced their passages. As microcosms of society, institutions of higher learning have not been immune to the changing environment in which they operate. As one scholar noted: "The world's thrust toward international cooperation and competition will not leave universities alone." This part looks at the evolution of higher education during that period and at the academic community's responsibility vis-a-vis the promotion of national interests.

The post-World War II era saw a boom in higher education. In the late 1940s, only 3 million students attended institutions of higher learning worldwide, compared with the current figure of approximately 48 million. One reason for this increase was the assumption that further education would be a necessity in an increasingly industrialized society. Several initiatives after the war, such as the G.I. Bill of Rights, opened the doors of postsecondary education to greater segments of the American population. Simultaneously, Fulbright exchanges have been credited, in part, for the expansion of higher learning overseas, especially in lesser-developed countries.

Despite the global expansion of higher education, the importance of international studies on

American campuses declined over recent decades. For example, "only 7.84f7 of all college students are enrolled in a foreign language course, less than half what the percentage was in 1960,"35 and "77% of American college and universities allow students to graduate without taking any foreign language." This decline was partly a reflection of the changing priorities of Americans at the time. As mentioned earlier, the Vietnam era symbolized the disenchantment with international involvement during the 1960s and 1970s. Higher education officials were more concerned with student unrest on campus and protest over domestic affairs than they were with foreign studies. This tide is changing now, as at no other time since World War II. Similar to the Fulbright exchanges' coming of age during a period of greater international involvement in the nation and on its campuses, the Boren bill was introduced during a second wave of globalization. Interdependency has had many implications for academics. Clark Kerr, the renowned University of California-system scholar and an advocate for education abroad, takes the position that "two of the several 'laws of motion' currently propelling institutions of higher learning around the world are (a) the further internationalization of learning and (b) the intensification of the interest of independent nation-states in the conscious use of these institutions for their own selected.

Kerr's first observation stems from the fact that the flow of students, scholars, and information over national boundaries has reached an all-time high. During the 1992-1993 academic year, U.S. colleges enrolled 438,618 foreign students and sent more than 70,000 American students abroad, and scholarly exchange also rose between other nations. (The more recent 1993-1994 figure puts the number of foreigners studying at U.S. colleges at 449,750.)39 In addition, curriculum changes have added an international perspective to cope with the interdependent environment. Kerr asserts that this academic interchange actually delivers universities back to their roots, when the stadium generales were "intellectual utopias for the wandering scholar."

In a separate article, Kerr argues that higher education's weakened international perspective during the middle of this century could have been attributed to the 'electives' system of education, widely accepted by colleges and universities. "Erosion of foreign-language instruction in the United States has been the result, for the most part, of institutional decisions that placed student demands ahead of intellectual and national interests."' But, this viewpoint raises the all-important question: What are higher education's responsibilities toward meeting the needs of the nation?

The use of higher education for national purposes is the second "law of motion." Kerr makes the assertion that "for 2,000 years, the scholar was a scholar first; however, for the past 500 years, the scholar has been a citizen first." Caught in this ever-present debate, Fulbright and Boren advocates and proponents alike have argued over the proper balance between academics and foreign policy in federally sponsored international education programs.

The early 1950s evidenced considerable pressure on Fulbrights that they should serve the current world situation if they were to be funded by the State Department. Many scholars, on the contrary, disliked this apparent negation of "truth for truth's sake." They did not want Fulbrights to serve as tools for "propaganda." A federal plan to move the program under the newly formed International Information Administration in 1952 created such an outcry from the academic community that it remained under the policy division of the State Department. Resulting from a State Department consolidation, the U.S. Information Agency, the IIA's predecessor, did assume responsibility for the operating budget of the Fulbright program in 1978. This move did create concern, although less so given the years of experience behind Fulbright exchanges and their reputation for academic quality and reciprocity. Perhaps, too, the sentiments echoed those after the passage of the Fulbright-Hays Act in 1961, which "restored, in effect, international educational and cultural relations programs to their original framework as a discrete area of our

official foreign relations, parallel with overseas information programs, technical assistance, and other{s)."

The issue of universal knowledge versus national interest remains to this date. Although representation by educators and administrators on the Board of Foreign Scholarships coupled with the involvement of private educational organizations have added influence to the federal program, a segment of the academic community wonders still if this input has been enough. A recent article titled "Scholars Push for Revitalization of the Fulbright Program," cited one of the problems as its guidance "for too long by people who do not understand higher education or the value of citizen-scholars exchanging ideas through the world."

NSEP has been placed directly in the heat of this debate. In fact, it has encountered extensive criticism from academia because of its unilateral approach to foreign policy objectives. Another article, "Pentagon Plans Major Revisions in Controversial Exchange Program," reports some of the changes that the Boren program underwent to pacify its critics: its original director, a career Pentagon official, was replaced by a person with extensive background in higher education; and jurisdiction over the program has moved from the Pentagon's intelligence sector to its policy division. (The controversy has not yet been resolved. Vice President Gore's commission on streamlining the government has recommended that NSEP be moved to the Education Department. To distance itself from the Department of Defense, the program's administrative offices have moved from the Pentagon to a commercial building in Virginia. And some academics, such as the ad hoc group the Association of Concerned African Scholars, have called for boycotting the program.)45 On one hand, "some welcomed the infusion of money into area and language studies.. .others-particularly those who do work in the third world-charged that scholars would be distrusted if they accepted money from the Pentagon." Federal funding is the primary bone of contention in implementing international education programs. In one corner, it is believed that "a key reason for the disappointing level of exchanges has been the federal government's failure to formulate a coherent plan for such contacts and to free significant amounts of new money to support expanded exchanges."' Yet the sentiment exists that if the federal government is giving financial support to such programs, then it should have the right to dictate how that money is spent. As one political science professor commented on the Fulbright Act: "Just for starters, since the program is actually an element in overall foreign policy, why not recognize it as such?" While some educators have exalted the additional funding of area studies through NSEP. others have continued to ask: "Has American higher education so forgotten its calling-so instrumentalized itself-that it will cheerfully be available for the purposes of any agency with money to distribute?" Again, this brings us back to the debate of higher education's role in meeting the needs of the nation.

Former Harvard University president Derek Bok, in his book, Universities and the Future of America , questions whether institutions of higher learning are doing enough to meet the challenges that affect the United States' ability to maintain its economic competitiveness while providing adequate security and opportunity to its citizens.. He advocates the need for overseas programs and maintains that the greatest outside force for reform is the federal government since "only Washington commands resources on a scale sufficient to alter the priorities of all higher education." Politically, it is doubtful whether international education would receive federal funding if it were not under the auspices of foreign policy. That being the case, should the American academic community sacrifice the benefits of educational opportunities like the Fulbright and NSEP scholarship awards? Furthermore, is it correct to classify these two programs in the same vein? The questions linger.

In general, federally funded education abroad programs need justification and higher education overseas needs funding. Despite the great internationalization taking place in society and on

campus, we are a long way from postnationalism. "In the meantime, and prospectively for a long time, institutions of higher education are inherently international institutions devoted as they mostly are to universal learning, but they are still situated in a world of nation-states."

Conclusion

In different forms, the Fulbright and Boren Acts aim to achieve the same end-a permanent peace through international understanding. After World War II, Senator Fulbright envisioned the long-term benefits that mutual academic exchange would have toward reaching that goal. But, sometimes, crises can illuminate areas of neglect. To this need, Senator Boren spoke almost fifty years later.

Given the changing position of the United States in an increasingly interdependent world, the internationalization of institutions for higher education, and the precedent already established by the Fulbright exchanges, Boren's legislation was required to address current needs. The National Security Education Act could not have met its foreign policy objectives under the disguise of an existing program. To incorporate such an explicit federal plan would have tarnished the Fulbrights' image of international education through reciprocity.

An editorial in the New York Times, titled "A legislative infant needing care. . .," voiced support for the Boren program. It stressed the need for non-Western studies, saying that "its moneys will fall like rain on a desert." I would argue, however, that, like any arid land, unless the conditions prove favorable and the ground is thoroughly adaptable, it cannot absorb any precipitation. Also, like a flash flood, quick responses to immediate needs could have devastating results. Only through a delicate balance between higher education goals and American security interests will foreign hosts welcome our NSEP scholarship recipients and will such international studies benefit our nation.

In the words of J. William Fulbright, " Education is a slow-moving but powerful force. It may not be fast enough or strong enough to save us from catastrophe, but it is the strongest force available for that purpose, and its proper place, therefore, is not at the periphery but at the center of international relations."