

**SEVENTEENTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES**

LETTER

FROM

**CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES ADVISORY
COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE**

TRANSMITTING

**THE 17TH SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON THE EDUCATIONAL
EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES FROM JULY 1 THROUGH
DECEMBER 31, 1956, PURSUANT TO PUBLIC
LAW 402, 80TH CONGRESS**



**MAY 13, 1957.—Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs
and ordered to be printed**

**UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1957**

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE,
May 13, 1957.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: The United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange submits herewith its 17th semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) from July 1 through December 31, 1956.

This report fulfills the requirements of section 603 of the above-mentioned act, which states that this statutory Commission shall transmit—

* * * to the Congress a semiannual report of all programs and activities carried on under authority of this Act, including appraisals, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the programs and such recommendations as shall have been made * * * to the Secretary of State for effectuating the purpose and objectives of this Act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations.

The membership of this Commission is as follows:

Rufus H. Fitzgerald, chancellor emeritus, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., Chairman;
Arthur H. Edens, president, Duke University, Durham, N. C., Vice Chairman;
Laird Bell, lawyer, member of the firm of Bell, Boyd, Marshall & Lloyd, Chicago, Ill.;
Arthur A. Hauck, president, University of Maine, Orono, Maine;
Anna L. Rose Hawkes, dean emeritus, Mills College, and president of the American Association of University Women, Washington, D. C.

A duplicate copy of this report is being furnished the Senate.

Very truly yours,

R. H. FITZGERALD,
*Chairman, United States Advisory Commission
on Educational Exchange:*

(Enclosure: Advisory Commission's 17th semiannual report to the Congress.)

**SEVENTEENTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT
TO THE CONGRESS**

BY THE

**UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE**

(JULY 1-DECEMBER 31, 1956)

CONTENTS

	Page
I. Appraisal of the development of the educational exchange program..	1
II. Coordination of international exchange programs.....	2
III. Other activities.....	3
Appendix I.....	4
Appendix II.....	5

SEVENTEENTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES

I. APPRAISAL OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

During the period covered by this report the Commission reviewed with care the development and major accomplishments of the Department's educational exchange program which is carried out under Public Law 402, 80th Congress, and for which the Commission has statutory responsibility.

The Commission is convinced that educational and other cultural exchanges have come to be recognized as most effective instruments of foreign policy. Yet we feel the potential value of these exchanges is not being realized because of lack of adequate financial support.

While this Commission is a policy and program appraising body and does not deal with administrative problems, we feel that if the program is to get the desired results the operation must be on a larger scale.

The educational exchange program of Public Law 402 was formally authorized on a worldwide scale in 1948, at which time this Commission was appointed. In 1948, \$4,751,868 was used for educational exchange activities.

It is to be noted that in succeeding years the appropriations were made steadily larger to provide for an expansion of the program to new countries and an increase in its volume. (See appendix I.)

It is of concern to the Commission that while the United States developed these programs, unfriendly nations have adopted them and have financed them on a far larger scale than we have.

Last year, according to the Immigration Bureau of the Japanese Ministry of Justice, 736 Japanese visited Communist countries, many of them at full expense. This included 313 members of the Japanese Diet, 159 labor leaders, and 59 businessmen. We are informed that the Soviets are spending in Japan alone the equivalent of \$20 million, which is the current appropriation of the International Educational Exchange Service for its entire worldwide activities.

The Communists have quickly sensed the value of this program. In one remote province of France, the Bas Pyrenees, 42 officials were invited to Iron Curtain countries last year. Compare this with the 39 awards for leader grants in fiscal year 1955 made by our Government to the whole of France.

The Smith-Mundt and Fulbright laws are far-seeing acts of statesmanship. But the cultural exchanges contemplated have been overshadowed by military and economic aid and other more spectacular activities. Cultural exchanges secure more lasting results. They achieve long-range benefits at modest cost, as well as having immediate effect.

It is the unanimous opinion of the Commission that the development and continual growth of the educational exchange program to its current level is impressive and indicative of the highly satisfactory manner in which the program is being operated. We feel that the program has been projected along sound lines and that substantially increased funds should be devoted to this important operation. Certainly, eventually \$50 million to \$75 million can be used effectively.

Therefore, the Commission, under its appointment by the President, felt obligated to recommend to the Executive vigorous support of a request for \$35 million for fiscal year 1958. This recommendation was submitted to the Secretary of State on October 26, 1956.

II. COORDINATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Recommendation of Dr. J. L. Morrill, president of the University of Minnesota and consultant to the Department of State

The Commission on Educational Exchange discussed with officers of the Department of State a report prepared by Dr. J. L. Morrill, entitled "A Proposal for the Coordination of the Exchange of Persons Program of the International Educational Exchange Service and of the International Cooperation Administration."

Dr. Morrill's study of "the relationship of the international educational exchange program (of the Department of State) and the exchange of persons which is used to implement certain functions of the program of the International Cooperation Administration" was undertaken by request of the Department of State pursuant to the conference report (No. 1043) of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, 84th Congress, 1st session.

For certain questions included in the Terms of Reference prescribed by the Department of State, conclusions reached by Dr. Morrill as a result of this study, and a summary of his recommendations, see appendix II.

Action taken by the Department of State as a result of Dr. Morrill's recommendation

The Department of State accepted the general principles of the report and has incorporated them in the arrangements for joint planning and coordination of the international cultural and technical exchange activities for the purpose of strengthening all of our cultural and technical programs so that such programs will be of maximum support to the conduct of our foreign relations.

Organizational changes within the Office of Public Affairs

The Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs was assigned the responsibility for achieving the necessary coordination within the Department of State.

At the same time, ICA delegated to the Deputy Director for Technical Services the function of being the main contact between ICA and the Department for this coordination work.

Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Information and Cultural Affairs.—This reorganization provided for an additional Deputy Assistant Secretary who would devote his full time to the international relations of that office.

The Cultural Planning and Coordination Staff.—The Cultural Planning and Coordination Staff was established to

assist the Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Information and Cultural Affairs in this coordination. In addition to the State Department personnel, it is composed of ICA personnel who bring their experience of ICA operations to bear on problems which are looked at in terms of the total interest of the United States Government. This joint staff has continuous liaison with ICA, IES, and USIA and serves as the focal point within the Department for cultural matters with the immediate purpose of improving coordination between the ICA and IES programs.

Conclusions of the Commission

The Commission is convinced that the Morrill report has stimulated the Department to do something which probably has been long overdue in connection with the exchange activities. Although the Department could not accept the recommendation concerning the new position of Assistant Secretary or that of Special Assistant, we believe the setup as proposed is a distinct improvement.

The Commission is further convinced, as a result of its observation of the overseas operations, that the success of this arrangement to resolve questions of over-lapping and confusion of jurisdiction between IES and ICA will depend greatly upon the officers in the field who are in charge of these two programs. It seems to us that it is equally important that the same type of coordinating mechanism be established in the overseas missions. We understand that these coordination activities are being implemented with this view in mind.

The Commission is of the opinion that the officers of the Department of State have given the implementation of this coordination proposal vigorous and forward-looking leadership and have brought together an excellent staff to assist them.

We are unanimous in reporting to the Congress that steady progress is being made in this new undertaking. The Commission will watch developments with interest and we urge for it continued attention and constructive criticism by the Congress and the public.

III. OTHER ACTIVITIES

The staff of the International Educational Exchange Service is to be commended for the thoroughness and high quality of the job done in analyzing and commenting on the observations and recommendations¹ of Chairman Fitzgerald and Mrs. Hawkes following their survey of educational exchange activities in Europe, the Near, Middle and Far East last winter.

It was a source of great satisfaction to the Commission to know that prompt attention has been given to the recommendations suggested and the criticisms made of the program.

¹ Reported in the Commission's 16th semiannual report to the Congress, H. Doc. 40, 85th Cong.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

DEPARTMENT OF STATE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE SERVICE BUDGETS FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES, 1939-56

The following table indicates budgetary allocations for educational exchange activities of the Department of State from 1939 through 1956. Figures for the period 1939-49 for "exchange of persons" are difficult to estimate exactly, since they were spread throughout the Department's cultural activities with Latin America, and not presented as a whole in a separate budget item.

The following figures also reflect expenditures during World War II under the President's emergency fund for China, the Near East, and Africa.

Fiscal year	Dollars	Foreign currency	Total	Fiscal year	Dollars	Foreign currency	Total
1939.....	\$29, 240	-----	\$29, 240	1949.....	\$6, 059, 137	\$4, 201, 458	\$10, 260, 595
1940.....	75, 000	-----	75, 000	1950.....	15, 454, 599	4, 443, 788	19, 898, 387
1941.....	508, 620	-----	508, 620	1951.....	19, 901, 491	6, 081, 625	25, 983, 116
1942.....	877, 390	-----	877, 390	1952.....	16, 275, 808	7, 485, 678	23, 761, 486
1943.....	1, 685, 000	-----	1, 685, 000	1953.....	14, 203, 881	9, 061, 616	23, 265, 497
1944.....	4, 500, 000	-----	4, 500, 000	1954.....	10, 725, 398	9, 048, 712	19, 774, 110
1945.....	4, 183, 000	-----	4, 183, 000	1955.....	11, 428, 752	8, 812, 599	20, 241, 351
1946.....	5, 048, 340	-----	5, 048, 340	1956.....	11, 189, 399	7, 673, 639	18, 863, 038
1947.....	6, 040, 964	-----	6, 040, 964				
1948.....	4, 751, 868	\$484, 650	5, 236, 518	Total....	132, 937, 887	57, 293, 765	190, 231, 652

¹ The major increases for fiscal year 1940:

(a) Foreign currency..... \$3, 716, 808

(b) China aid program initiated..... 159, 137

Total..... 3, 875, 945

² The major increases for fiscal year 1950:

(a) Transfer of German exchange program from Department of Army..... \$6, 315, 692

(b) China aid program..... 2, 252, 453

(c) Finnish program initiated..... 127, 317

Total..... 8, 695, 462

³ The major increases for fiscal year 1951:

(a) Foreign currency..... \$1, 637, 827

(b) Public Law 402 programs..... 2, 634, 200

(c) China aid program..... 1, 203, 415

(d) Transfer of Austrian program from Department of Army..... 396, 162

Total..... 5, 871, 604

⁴ The major increases for fiscal year 1955: Transfer from FOA for educational exchange in southeast Asia, \$1,200,000.

⁵ Includes \$75,000 of Public Law 480 funds.

NOTE.—Figures furnished by Department of State.

APPENDIX II

Excerpts From the Report of J. L. Morrill, May 1, 1956

**A PROPOSAL FOR THE COORDINATION OF THE EXCHANGE OF PERSONS
PROGRAMS OF THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION EXCHANGE SERVICE
AND OF THE INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION**

TERMS OF REFERENCE

"* * * The 'terms of reference' prescribed by the Department for the study were widely inclusive, among them being such questions as—

"1. The relationships of the State Department-IES and the ICA exchange programs to each other in terms of overall United States foreign policy objectives.

"2. The extent to which these programs are 'really separable in concept, desired outcome, and methods.'

"3. Whether 'some or all phases of administration of the exchange persons in each program (should) be combined.'

"4. The possibilities for increased coordination in eight listed respects to achieve 'increased efficiency and economy of operations.'"

CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY

"Two paramount conclusions emerge from the study which define the need for, and the general character of, by recommendations. These are—

"(1) *Authoritative coordination of the two programs, which have developed independently but which are rapidly merging in fact, is needed in all common sense. The 'gray area,' the area of overlap, duplication, and competition, urgently requires attention.*

"(2) *The time has clearly come for an upgrading of United States exchange activity in governmental, congressional, American public and foreign consciousness. There is not only the plainly necessary task of coordination to be undertaken, but also the function of leadership and governmental spokesmanship in elevating cultural and technical exchange to the level of a major instrument of American influence and assistance in international affairs.*"

SUMMARY OF THE RECOMMENDATION

"It is recommended that the Department of State appoint a Coordinator for Cultural and Technical Exchange working, of course, in cooperation and agreement with the International Cooperation Administration.

"The Coordinator should occupy a new position with the title and rank of Assistant Secretary of State.

"Alternatively, however, the Coordinator might be appointed as a special assistant to the Secretary, or the Under Secretary, with the rank but not the title of Assistant Secretary—if this seems more feasible and preferable to the Department.

"The establishment of such a position and the appointment to it of an outstanding person seems to me to be the only practicable solution to the present unsound and unsatisfactory situation. In the course of this study, I have reviewed, I believe, all possible alternatives for solving the problem.

"Under this proposal the Coordinator would have clearly defined responsibilities by the authority of the Secretary of State. His role would be that of coordination (unless the Department of State should determine to give him line authority over IES). It is not recommended that he have line operational authority over ICA exchange activities. But his functions would include the following:

"(1) Providing, in behalf of the Secretary, an authoritative administrative focus for joint ICA-IES policy and planning, country by country, for exchange activities.

"(2) Coordinating the budgetary requirements of the two programs in such a way as to insure that the total exchange program and its implications are clearly understood by the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress.

"(3) Assuring conformity with agreed joint policy and planning by the operational staffs of ICA and IES.

"(4) Stimulating increased exchange activities by private agencies and taking account of these in the lessened or augmented planning of governmental exchange.

"(5) Developing explicit assignment of responsibility to IES and ICA of categories of outgoing and incoming exchange personnel so that the work of the two agencies will not overlap but will complement and supplement each other in a well planned pattern of cooperation.

"(6) Organizing the cooperation of ICA and IES staffs in the joint placement, orientation, and scheduling of certain categories of outgoing and especially incoming exchange personnel in both programs at educational institutions, governmental and other agencies, private institutions and the like.

"(7) Taking special cognizance of the ICA 'college contract' enterprise in order to coordinate the relevant IES cultural exchange resources with the technical activities of ICA as carried out under this college contract program.

"(8) Developing in cooperation with ICA and IES a pattern and procedure in countries where both ICA and IES operate exchange programs whereby coordination can be effected vis-a-vis Washington including procedures for a more effective follow-up on the activities of foreign nationals who have been in the United States under the auspices of one or the other of the programs.

"Finally, it seems to me evident that the success of the recommended planned pattern of cooperation between the two programs will depend in part on an increase in the funds presently available for the IES program. This could be accomplished either through an increase in the IES appropriation or through some budgetary transfer arrangement effected between IES and ICA."

