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Internationalisation of Higher Education

Chapter Two

The International Dimension of Higher Education in the United States of America

In this chapter, the development of the international dimension of higher education in the United States of America will be described, in order to clarify the specific characteristics of the international dimensions in that country when compared to Europe, examined in Chapter Three. As explained, in the period between the two World Wars, as well as after the Second World War and during the Cold War, the United States have determined to a large extent the development and characteristics of the international dimension of higher education, under the umbrella term of 'international education'. After the Cold War, Europe and to a certain extent also Australia and Canada have taken over the leading role in developing internationalisation strategies for higher education.

The system of higher education in the United States includes community colleges, four-year colleges and (research) universities. There are both state (including land-grant colleges), religiously affiliated and private universities. There are over 3500 institutions of higher education. The Carnegie Classification is the most commonly accepted system for classifying the heterogeneous higher education of the United States. "One can hardly call it a system. No central body at the national level controls or even coordinates higher education in the United States, even with respect to international programs and activities," as Thullen et al. (1997, 3) remark. One has to keep in mind the specific, heterogeneous character of American higher education when analysing the international dimension of its higher education in comparison with Europe – itself, as we will see a far from homogeneous system. In addition, the fact that by constitution the government’s role is limited in educational policy but extensive in foreign affairs, defence, trade and commerce, suggests that federal policy on international education will be more linked to these areas than to education itself. That which Ulrich Littman (1997, 16) describes for exchange in Germany and the United States is true for the whole of Europe: "American ‘educational exchange’ and German ‘akademische austausch’ reflect differences in what might be expected from mobility, and moreover reflect basic differences in the structures of higher education."

1. Historical aspects of the international dimension of American higher education

Although it will become clear from the first paragraphs that international education in the US already existed since the end of the First World War, after the Second World War it moved to

---

4 It is important to note that the observation that the role of the US Department of Education in international education is limited, does not imply that it is completely absent. Both the ‘Center for International Education’ (CIE) and the ‘Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education’ (FIPSE) are responsible for administering several programmes for international studies, area studies, foreign language studies (CIE) and the EU–US mobility scheme (FIPSE). In particular the ‘Title VI’ programmes under the ‘Higher Education Act’, administered by CIE, are important for the development of the international dimension of American higher education. However, in these cases as well the impetus has come from outside higher education.
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Mestenhauser (1998a, 10-12) identifies three phases of international education since the late 1940s. The first phase, which he calls "euphoria", lasted from 1946 to the Vietnam war and the oil crisis in the 1960s and 1970s; the second, termed "darkening clouds", ran from the fiasco of the International Education Act of 1966 to the end of the 1970s; and the third, called by him "defense through the associations", began in the early 1980s with a threat of enormous budget cuts to international education programmes by the Reagan administration. At the end of the 1990s there are signs of a new phase, in which the internationalisation of higher education according to some enters in a new "euphoria". The following paragraphs will analyse these trends and phases.

1.1. Before the twentieth century: export of European models and individual mobility to Europe

Higher education in the United States, often regarded today as the dominant model in international developments of higher education, was based on European influences and continued to reflect these for a long time. Oxford and Cambridge were the models for the first colleges established in the colony. Later, with the creation of Johns Hopkins University, the German model of research university was also imported. In addition to these external influences, in 1862 'Land Grant Colleges' (now universities) were established to provide agricultural and applied engineering training for America's development, and to give access to higher education to others than the elite.

As a side effect, many faculty and students sojourned to the universities in Europe, on which these institutions were modelled, to pursue further studies. As Craufurd Goodwin and Michael Nacht (1991, 1) put it: "Faculty members in US colleges and universities have ventured overseas from the earliest days. As leaders of a colonial culture, they looked back to their metropolitan heartland for direction. Later, within an adolescent new community they turned still to the Old World for intellectual training, leadership, standards, and inspiration. They went back to Britain in search of roots, but to the continent as well for the experience of postgraduate training and a breadth of contacts appropriate to a young developing nation. Continental Europe remained the destination of most itinerant US scholars throughout the nineteenth century."

During colonial times there was an active movement of the children of rich planters to Europe, in particular the United Kingdom, for studies such as medicine and law. But as Halpern (1969, 17) notes, opposition developed after the revolution: "Jefferson and Webster opposed sending young Americans to study abroad because they shared a common distrust of European ways and because they feared that American students would become denationalised." Although many American scholars and educators still went to Europe in the nineteenth century for further study and insight, (Ibid., 24) "yet many of these same men, when they rose to positions of leadership in American education, became hostile to the practice of Americans going abroad for their education, particularly Americans who had not yet completed their undergraduate education."

Halpern (Ibid., 24) provides several examples of political and educational leaders in the United States speaking out against foreign study. An example is Charles W. Eliot, written in 1873: "Prolonged residence abroad in youth, before the mental fibre is solidified and the mind has taken its tone, has a tendency to enfeeble the love of country, and to impair the foundations of
public spirit in the individual citizen. This pernicious influence is indefinable, but none the less real. In a strong nation, the education of the young is indigenous and national. It is a sign of immaturity or decrepitude when a nation has to import its teachers, or send abroad its scholars."

Halpern (Ibid., 25) illustrates that this attitude can be explained by a strong desire to break with the educational and cultural dependence on Europe, using the following citation by Mark Hopkins, also from 1873: "We are not to undervalue what has been done in the old world, but it is not the office of the new to copy it. Availing ourselves of it as far as possible, we are to absorb and reproduce it in new forms and under better conditions (...) In my opinion, a higher tone of character, greater usefulness, and more happiness will ... be secured by an education ... under the inspiration and formative power of our own history (...) institutions and hopes."

Nonetheless, American faculty and students continued to flow to Europe throughout the nineteenth century. Around the turn of the century one can see a shift. On the one hand (Ibid., 26) "the proliferation of American graduate schools during the last quarter of the nineteenth century meant that American graduate students, for the first time, were presented with viable alternatives to study abroad." On the other hand (Ibid., 26-27) "for the first time in American history foreign students in large numbers were attracted to the United States (...) partly out of recognition of America's new position in the world, partly as a result of the attractions of wealth and opportunity and partly because American education was dynamic and experimental. Foreigners, particularly non-Europeans, came to view America much as America viewed Germany in the nineteenth century" Halpern speaks of a new era in the history of travel for educational purposes.

1.2. The first half of the twentieth century: peace and mutual understanding

During the late nineteenth century, academic mobility from and to the United States became a regular phenomenon, but without a formal and institutional structure. This changed when private organisations, foundations and universities began to recognise the educational value of study abroad. In 1890 the American Association of University Women created the first fellowship to enable a college professor to pursue research abroad. In 1902, the Rhodes Scholarships were founded to promote understanding between English-speaking people. In 1905 The American Academy in Rome established research fellowships for study in Italy, and in 1911 the Kahn Foundation started to offer fellowships for secondary school teachers to travel abroad. Another organisation that dates from this period is the American–Scandinavian Foundation (1910). In 1911, the ‘Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students’ was established with the objective of counselling foreign students and gathering statistics on foreign students in the United States. Between 1905 and 1912 Harvard, Columbia, Chicago and Wisconsin universities established exchange agreements with German and French universities. (Ibid., 27-28)

One example of international exchange and co-operation at the start of the twentieth century was the use by the Chinese government of $12 million in indemnity funds, owing to the massacre of Americans during the Boxer Rebellion, to send selected scholars to the USA for further training. A second example was the creation of the Belgian–American Educational Foundation in 1920, the result of the liquidation of First World War relief funds in Belgium. Thanks to this foundation, over 700 Belgian and American students were exchanged between the
two countries. These two examples from before the Second World War can be compared to the first and most wellknown example of internationalisation from after the Second World War, the Fulbright Program, in that its funds similarly did not come from the national budget, but from relief sources. However, there were also more regular bilateral exchanges between countries, for instance with Germany via the 'Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst' (DAAD) and the 'Institute of International Education' (IIE).

Institutions were less active than foundations. Before the Second World War, it was mainly women's colleges that were involved in setting up junior-year-abroad programmes in Europe: Marymount College in 1924 (Paris); Smith College in 1925 (Paris) and 1931 (Florence); Rosary College in 1925 (Fribourg). Taylor (1997, 1518) argues that this arose because women needed more chaperoning when studying abroad, and that while female students went abroad for cultural enrichment, the men remained in the US to work on their careers.

As Goodwin and Nacht (1991, 3) make clear, what happened with exchange and cooperation also applies to the curriculum: "The demonstrated unpreparedness of the United States to comprehend the process of which it was part, both during World War I and at the Peace Conference afterward, suggested to many young Americans the need both to understand other countries better and to reflect on different ways to arrange relations among states. The study of international relations increased in the United States between the wars, with practitioners lodged both in universities and in non-governmental research institutions like the Council on Foreign Relations, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the Brookings Institution."

A strong rationale for the internationalisation of higher education has traditionally been the promotion of peace and mutual understanding. According to Halpern (Ibid., 28-29), this had its roots in the growth of the American peace movement after 1900. "Members of newly-founded peace associations such as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the American School Peace League and the World Peace Foundation believed that educational travel was an ideal mechanism for fostering goodwill and mutual understanding among nations. Instead of students and professors travelling for purely academic reasons as they had done in the past, the new breed of student and scholar would be ambassadors of enlightenment, promoting respect for themselves and their nations. In turn, they would learn to understand better the people among whom they lived and interpret these people to their countrymen at home." The dark cloud of the upcoming First World War made this rationale for study abroad even more urgent. At the same time, the war itself provided, according to Halpern (Ibid., 29), a new impetus to study abroad. American soldiers serving in Europe on the one hand and the immigration of Europeans to the United States on the other acted as a catalyst. Although Halpern (Ibid., 88-89) calls the strong

---

5 For an example from this period of the relationship between one Belgium university and the Université Libre de Bruxelles and the USA, see: Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1996. For Belgium–American exchanges in this period, see Galpin (1943).

6 See for instance Littmann (1997), in particular Chapter I, 'New Beginnings after the End of the First World War, 1923–1933'.

7 Even though the first junior-year-abroad programme was, according to Halpern (1969, 110) established by the University of Delaware in 1923 in France.
belief between the two world wars that people, simply by educating themselves would develop views conducive to promoting peace and understanding "naive optimism" and "utopian", resulting from the fear of the First World War and the hope inspired by the League of Nations, after the Second World War this optimism continued to be a driving rationale for international education.

In Europe, as we will see, similar trends can be observed, but in Europe the pursuit of peace and mutual understanding has influenced the international dimension of higher education less and for a shorter period than in the United States.\(^8\)

In the United States this argument continued to be used during the period of the Cold War, both by politicians and academics. In 1994, Senator William Fulbright (1994, 9) consistent with his views during his entire career and with the views expressed by many other American politicians and educators, called "the most important objective of transnational education the civilising and humanising of relations between nations in ways that are within the limits of human capacity." He spoke of educational exchange as, "from the standpoint of future world peace and order, probably the most important and potentially rewarding of our foreign policy activities." He was followed by others such as President George Bush, saying in 1989: "International exchanges are not a great tide to sweep away all difference. But they will slowly wear away obstacles to peace as surely as water wears away a hard stone."

Chambers (1950, 8) assumes that "if men of good will in all corners of the world can come to know more of each other at first hand on an increasing scale, likelihood of wars will be lessened."\(^9\) Chambers (Ibid., 9) though also makes reference to academics being critical to these sentiments, citing an anonymous scholar, "education for international understanding is a subject on which woolliness has positively run riot during the last thirty years". There are few fields other than this, the scholar added, "on which it has been possible to talk more nonsense and to get away with it in a smoke-screen of sentimentalism." Gayner (1996, 7) observes on the Fulbright Program that "it requires a leap of faith to conclude that the Fulbright program will create a more peaceful globe." However, even among academics, this optimist view is still present, as the title of an essay by the former director of the Education Abroad Program of the University of California, William H. Allaway, (1994) shows: "Peace: The Real Power of Educational Exchange."

Therefore the first two decades of the twentieth century show a growth of mobility, in particular to the United States; more attention from private organisations and foundations for study abroad; and the start of institutional exchange and study abroad programmes. Peace and mutual understanding became a driving rationale. What is striking in all this is the nearly exclusive focus on Europe.

The foundation of the Institute of International Education (IIE) in 1919 was supposed to

---

\(^8\) Via the League of Nations Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, academics on both sides of the ocean met each other in their actions for peace and mutual understanding, an indication of the international character of the movement in that period. (Halpern, 30-31)
give the nation a centre to promote and co-ordinate international education. The original idea came from Professor Stephen Pierce Duggan of the School of Education at the College of the City of New York (CCNY) who was joined by the President of Columbia University, Nicholas Murray Butler, and former US Secretary of State and chairman of the Carnegie Endowment, Elihu Root, and together they founded the IIE on February 1, 1919 in New York, with a grant of US$ 30,000. Duggan became its first director, a post he held for 27 years.

IIE’s first activities were also directed to Europe. After the end of the First World War, it soon became clear that exchanges with Europe were not yet possible, given the devastating situation in Europe. However, between 1920 and 1923, forty-four professors were supported financially with a Carnegie grant to spend their sabbatical leave teaching abroad, mainly in Europe but also elsewhere, for instance Japan. In addition, IIE began to promote exchanges and visits of faculty, and study abroad and exchanges for students. Foundations such as the Rockefeller Foundation also provided scholarships for foreign academics to visit the USA.10

Funding though was a problem. Where in Europe institutions such as the IIE and its activities would have been created or at least supported by national governments, in the United States both the creation and the financial support relied on private funding by foundations and sponsors. That this has not always been easy, is demonstrated by Duggan’s failure in the 1920s to get a Foreign Student’s Revolving Scholarship Fund off the ground (Ibid., 55-56). He had more success with fellowships for IIE’s junior-year-abroad programme in that period.

In the 1930s, the political clouds of nazism forced American higher education and the IIE to change their plans. Europe became mainly a place from which to rescue refugee scholars. Institutions such as the New School of Social Research in New York were shaped by this influx of refugee scholars who had been helped to escape.11

The international situation forced American higher education to look for other regions, closer to home, for international co-operation and exchange: Latin America. The Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations established opportunities for educational exchanges. American business interests, but in particular the anti-American propaganda of the Axis powers in Latin America (including the offering of fellowships to Latin Americans for study in Germany and Italy) (IIE b, 1994, 7-9), created a public–private partnership in stimulating cultural relations between the US and Latin America. During the war, the State Department asked the IIE to administer an exchange programme for scholarships to more than 1000 Latin American students between 1941 and 1943. The involvement of the US government in cultural and educational diplomacy thus dates from the 1930s, in response to external threats. As Rupp (1999, 58) states, “Intellectual imperialism, the imperialism of ideas, was at that moment just as serious a threat to the security and defense of the hemisphere as the possibility of a military invasion.”

---

10 Many international scholars received Rockefeller fellowships to visit the US, such as the Dutch historian Johan Huizinga – who was, in addition to being a respected academic and author on The US, president of the Netherlands Commission for International Academic Relations and of the Netherlands–America Foundation – in 1926 (Huizinga, 1993).

11 For an account of that period, see for instance Littman (1997), in particular Chapter II, ‘Partnership in conflict, 1933-1945’.
1.3. *After the Second World War: foreign policy and national security*

The Second World War, as Goodwin and Nacht (1991, 3) observe, added far more to the international experience of American scholars than its predecessor. In military service, but also in intelligence, planning and, after the war, occupation and recovery, they travelled not only to Europe, but also to Asia and the Middle East. "For the first time many of these scholars were faced squarely with the necessity to understand the languages and cultures of both friend and foe and to comprehend the nature of past and potential global systems." Area studies, for instance Japan Studies, also had a new impetus as a result of the war, because knowledge of the enemy and the countries where Americans had to fight became important.

While the early development of international education between the two wars was strongly driven by private initiative and by the rationale of peace and understanding, as well as Europe-focused, the Second World War caused a radical change. Although peace and mutual understanding continued to be a driving rationale in theory, national security and foreign policy were the real forces behind its expansion and with it came government funding and regulations. In addition, although Europe continued to be an important point of orientation, the world outside the United States became broader than the traditional orientation on the European continent. With the new responsibilities of the United States in this new world order, "it was", as Goodwin and Nacht (Ibid., 4) note, "no longer a luxury, but a necessity, to travel the globe to master all of its intricacies." American higher education as a whole was transformed by the war even more from periphery into centre than had already been the case in the previous decades of the twentieth century.

Most clearly identified with the immediate post-war period and federal government involvement in international education is the creation of the Fulbright Program in 1946, "a trailblazer and catalyst" (Gayner, 1996, 6) for academic exchanges, within the US but also beyond.

The programme's principal goals were, in the words of senator Fulbright (quoted by Gayner, 1996, 1) at the celebration of its 40th anniversary: "To increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries by means of educational and cultural exchange...and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic, and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world."

In this quote, the pre-war idealism of peace and mutual understanding, and the post-war foreign policy and national security rationales are brought together. However, the emphasis came to be placed more on the second rationale than the first. As Rupp (1999, 59) writes, "After WW II, American leaders primarily directed US foreign policy towards forming a strong and stable Atlantic Alliance with Europe. In that sense, the Fulbright Program was to legitimise America's leading role in this alliance. Americans found among Europe's public elite - and among leftist intellectuals in particular 'much misunderstanding and an appealing lack of knowledge and vision' about their country; in Europe, on the other hand, the question was raised as to whether the US would be capable of leading the Free World, a situation from which the Soviet Union might easily profit. European countries needed 're-orientation'. Germany and Japan (...) needed 're-education'. A better understanding of America had to be formed."
The administration of the Fulbright Program was put in the hands of the IIE and as both Halpern (1969) and Rupp (1997, 207) describe, this decision was part of a debate on how strong the relation should be between foreign policy and exchanges, or to be more precise: how strict within cultural diplomacy, the division between information services and educational and cultural exchanges should be.

The Sargeant Report, ‘United States Program for the Exchange of Students and Industrial Trainees’ of 1946, recommended the assignment of the IIE as the agency to administer the placement of foreign students. But there were also references to the effect that student exchanges should implement United States foreign policy, and this generated concern in the IIE and in the sector of higher education. Laurence Duggan, who had succeeded his father as director of the IIE in 1946, wrote to Assistant Secretary of State William Benton on December 2, 1946, that granting fellowships to foreign students “is not and must not be a means whereby our Government hopes to influence foreign students in the United States in favor of particular policies and programs.” (quoted from Halpern, 1969, 189) In the end the IIE accepted the administration of the Fulbright Program and other government-sponsored programmes, but on condition that this would be done “free of government control and devoid of political motivation” (Ibid., 204). A Board of Foreign Scholarships would guarantee this. Halpern notes that nonetheless the IIE, by accepting the administration, “relinquished sufficient autonomy to make it vulnerable to governmental pressures.” (Ibid., 205)

His main argument is that the Board is appointed by the government and has the final say over the programme, whereas the IIE only administers the programme. His second argument is the acceptance by the IIE of contracts with the United States Army. However, as he has to acknowledge, the Board has always been closer to the IIE than to the government, even in the 1950s, when President Truman started his ‘Campaign of Truth’ against the communist threat of the Soviet Union and China and wanted to bring the programme under governmental control. Originally, the Board endorsed the statement by the State Department that the Information and Educational Exchange Programme, that since its establishment in 1953 became co-ordinated by the US Information Agency (USIA), was “an arm of American foreign policy” (quoted, Ibid., 206). However, later, under pressure from the higher education sector, the Board distanced itself from this position. The Council on Student Travel (CST) managed also to make the State Department back down in 1958 with support from the academic community, when the State Department tried to block the creation of a Leningrad study programme and other CST-activities in the Soviet Union.12

Although Halpern (Ibid., 210-211) is right in his conclusion that, by accepting during and after the Second World War, the responsibility for government sponsored programmes, IIE moved away from its original role of an autonomous, private organisation devoted to promoting academic exchange, he overstates the threats it imposed on the original ideals of the organisation.

12 Based on a unpublished personal account by the former CEO of the Council on International Educational Exchange, the successor of CST, Jack Eagle.
1.4. The impetus of the Cold War

However, as Holzner and Greenwood (1995, 38) observe, "the arenas of defense and foreign policy have played an important role on several occasions" in international education, in particular during the Cold War. That period has influenced international education in the United States perhaps more than any other period. The 'National Defense Education Act' (NDEA) of 1958, according to Vestal (1994), was a direct reaction to the launch the year before of Sputnik I by the Soviet Union and an effort by the USA to regain international leadership.

Internationalisation of the curriculum has been stimulated by the federal government by way of 'Title VI' of the 'Higher Education Act' of 1960. Title VI has helped to develop multidisciplinary Area Study and Foreign Language Centres, as well as programmes for International Studies and International Affairs. As Goodwin and Nacht (1991, 110) state, the reason for the involvement of the federal government was based on the United States' new-found role as 'leader of the free world'. "If the United States was to contain communism abroad and assist new nations to evolve with democratic governments and free market economies, the American people had to understand both a great deal about friend and foe and much about the world system that was being reconstructed from the ashes of the empires."

Area Studies received a further big push as a result of the Cold War, in particular via the 'National Defense Education Act' and the linked 'Title VI' of the 'Higher Education Act', even though, as Wallerstein (1997) says, not always delivering the results the military had hoped. He refers to this push of area studies for geopolitical reasons as a top-down enterprise, while other interdisciplinary studies as ethnic studies and women studies, although closely linked to area studies, were a bottom-up response. Area studies in Europe lack this outside impulse. They emerged earlier in the context of colonialisation and were developed further in a more academic than political setting. Both Wallerstein (Ibid.) and Bender (1997) emphasise the political motivations for the development of area studies during the post-war and Cold War period and its strong orientation on Soviet and Chinese studies for that reason. At the same time, they mention a scholarly and intellectual agenda for the development of area studies and the role of foundations in funding, alongside foreign affairs and defence funding.

Foreign development assistance in the US finds its rationale in President Truman's inaugural address of 1949, where he introduced his four-points policy for peace and freedom in the world, of which the fourth point became the basis for technical assistance programmes, also in education (Smuckler, 1999). Administered since 1961 by the 'United States Agency for International Development', USAID), technical assistance programmes, as Holzner and Greenwood (1995, 39) remark, came also to be seen soon "almost exclusively in the light of Cold War conceptions of the national interest."

The failure of the 'International Education Act' (IEA) of 1966 makes that perhaps even more clear than the implementation of the NDEA. The IEA was a major attempt by the government to stimulate international education. The IEA was proposed by President Johnson and passed Congress, but was never funded by the new Congress elected shortly after it was passed. The Vietnam War and internal tensions in American society in that period meant that attention for international education and the IEA drifted away. As Vestal (1994, 32-33) observes "Federal
funding for international education has been passed most successfully when brigaded with practical and strategic concerns: national defense (NDEA); public diplomacy (...); and intelligence (NSEA). (...) Funding for IEA-like programs then will depend upon the recognition of policy makers of the importance and relevance of international education to the national interest of the United States. " The case of international education on its own was clearly not strong enough and the relevance of the IEA for the national interest not manifest enough to make the act work. At the same time, both Vestal (Ibid.) and Holzner and Greenwood (1995, 40) observe that the IEA did not get enough support from the academic community either. The failure of the IEA was the start of a period, lasting until the beginning of the 1980s, in which both the federal government and foundations shifted their attention from international education to domestic issues.

In summary, the post Second World War period and the Cold War – with an interval between 1965 and 1980 in which support to international education was reduced as a consequence of the Vietnam War and a related focus on national issues – drove American governments for reasons of defence, public diplomacy and security to stimulate international exchange and cooperation. Even after the end of the Cold War, as the NSEA illustrates, these continued to be the main rationales for federal support.

1.5. The 1980s: competitiveness

In the 1980s, at the same time as the European Union was launching its programmes for research and education and in which the collapse of the communist block had begun, a revival in federal support can be observed. After the end of the Cold War, the United States had found it exceedingly difficult to define its 'national interest', offering at the same time new strategic opportunities (Rice, 2000). The 'National Security Education Act' (NSEA) of 1991 (Vestal, 1994; Holzner and Greenwood, 1995; IIE, 1997; Heginbotham, 1997), was a response to the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War and a mechanism in maintaining its now less-disputed international leadership. The programme was, such as the NDEA, funded from the Defence budget, which, in 1991, caused concern among institutions of higher education, who feared for the safety of their students and potential damage to individual and institutional relations with institutions and governments in those countries, if sponsorship and supervision came from the Department of Defence and national security budgets (Holzner and Greenwood, 1995, 45). The fact that the head of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) had a seat on the board of the programme was seen as an indication. The obligation for participants to perform a period of national service on their return was seen by the critics of the programme as a recruiting device for the CIA. A 'school of spies' and 'sending students with a CIA-tag on their backs' were phrases used by these critics. But those concerns gradually faded away once the programmes were implemented. Only in certain area studies associations (Africa Studies, Middle East Studies) is there still opposition to the programme. Indeed, the national service obligation is seen by students these days as one of the more attractive aspects of the programme (Desruisseaux, 2000). So, foreign policy and national security continue to be a factor, but are less dominant than in the past.

In the new area of globalisation, the argument of 'competitiveness' enters the international education vocabulary of the federal government, still closely linked to that of foreign policy and national security.
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The creation of the Centers for International Business Education and Research under Part B of 'Title VI' of the 'Higher Education Act' is an illustration that "national interest came to be supplemented (but certainly not replaced) by the competitiveness paradigm" (Holzner and Greenwood, 1995, 40). As an internal document of the 'Education Abroad Program' of the University of California (Education Abroad Program, 1995) states, "With the demise of the Soviet Empire, definitions of national interest shifted from such goals as influencing the 'non-aligned' and studying 'the enemy' to learning how to compete and prosper in a far-flung global economy." Holzner (1994) states that "no longer only acquainting young people with the ways of foreign cultures" but also demands for high competence in a more competitive global market place became dominant. Mestenhauser (2000, 34) also refers to the change of rationale from international understanding and avoiding wars and conflicts to global competitiveness in American international education.

A recent 'Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies on International Education Policy' by President Clinton, April 19, 2000, underlines this supplementarity but also the shift in priority: "To continue to compete successfully in the global economy and to maintain our role as a world leader, the United States needs to ensure that its citizens develop a broad understanding of the world, proficiency in other languages, and knowledge of other cultures. America's leadership also depends on building ties with those who will guide the political, cultural, and economic development of their countries in the future. A coherent and coordinated international education strategy will help us meet the twin challenges of preparing our citizens for a global environment while continuing to attract and educate future leaders from abroad." The memorandum also makes reference to the fact that the nearly 500,000 international students in the United States contribute some US $ 9 billion annually to its economy, and recommends action for co-ordinated marketing and recruitment, the first time that this issue is presented in economic instead of political terms.

Only time will tell if this memorandum will follow the same path as the IEA, or if it will get the strong political and financial commitment of the NDEA and NSEA. The absence of a strong foreign enemy and the pressure to focus on domestic issues are likely to receive more weight in the political arena than the argument of economic competition in the global economy.

1.5.1. EU-US co-operation

A specific aspect of the new emphasis on 'competitiveness' in international education in the US can be found in the pursuit of linkages with the European Union. Both at the federal level and the level of academic institutions, the fear of a 'Fortress Europe' as a result of inner European co-operation and exchange was enormous. The European mobility schemes, in particular ERASMUS, were considered as a seclusive attempt to strengthen the Union's competitive edge. For that reason, President George Bush convinced the president of the European Commission, Jacques Delors, of the need for transatlantic co-operation between the EU and the US, supplementary to the bilateral links of memberstates of the EU with the US.

On November 22, 1990, the EC, its member states and the US agreed on a 'Transatlantic Declaration on EC/US Relations', that included co-operation in the field of higher education. The
activities in the field of higher and vocational training are part of the ‘New Transatlantic Agenda’, launched at the Madrid Summit in 1995 to give new focus and direction to the economic and political co-operation between the EU and the US, and which resulted from the contact between Bush and Delors. The New Transatlantic Agenda sets four main goals:
- promoting peace, development and democracy
- responding to global challenges by co-operation
- contributing to the expansion of world trade and closer economic ties
- building bridges across the Atlantic: people-to-people links. (Davidson and Andrew, 1998)

The declaration was followed by a pilot programme, 1993–1994, based on an agreement in principle signed in Washington on May 20, 1993. The creation of an exploratory phase pilot programme, instead of immediately starting with a formal scheme, was caused by political delays on both sides of the Atlantic. In the US, budgetary debates frustrated its start. Within the EC, discussions on subsidiarity and complementarity of the programme caused delays. (Haug, 1998, 28)

The objectives of the EU/US programmes (Englesson, 1995) are to:
- promote mutual understanding between the peoples of the EC and US including broader knowledge of their languages, cultures and institutions;
- improve the quality of human resource development;
- improve the quality of transatlantic student mobility, including the promotion of mutual understanding, recognition and portability of academic credits;
- encourage exchange of expertise in new development in higher education and vocational training;
- form or enhance partnerships among higher education, vocational education or training institutions, professional associations, public authorities, business and other associations as appropriate;
- introduce an added-value dimension to transatlantic co-operation which complements bilateral co-operation between Community memberstates and states of the US as well as other programmes and initiatives.

In the programmes, the emphasis is on the development of joint curricula, recognition of credits and diplomas, and mobility of students, teachers and administrators. In addition, the EC stimulates the development of European integration studies by funding, as of 1998, ten European Union Centres in the United States, intended to provide a framework for nurturing and developing existing knowledge of the EU and the transatlantic relationship in the US. The main mechanisms to develop these activities are ‘joint consortia projects’, including a minimum of three partners on each side of the Atlantic. The US and the EC, in addition to existing bilateral agreements with member states, also include as part of the EU/US scheme a small number of Fulbright fellowships for the study of EC-US relations (two research and teaching awards for EU academics, and advanced doctoral study and postdoctoral research grants for US citizens to study in the EU).

1.5.2. Regional co-operation in NAFTA

A second political initiative was the inclusion of trilateral co-operation in higher education in the NAFTA treaty of 1994 between Canada, Mexico and the United States of America. This
regional higher education co-operation was discussed in two preparatory conferences, 12–15 September, 1992 in Wingspread, Wisconsin, and 10–13 September, 1993 in Vancouver, British Columbia.

The Wingspread conference set the following objectives:
- Develop a North American dimension in higher education
- Encourage an exchange of information on themes of mutual interest
- Promote collaboration among institutions of higher education
- Facilitate student and faculty mobility
- Promote the strengthening of relations between higher education institutions and the public and private sectors in areas linked to the quality of higher education
- Use the potential of the new technologies of communication and information to help implement the above objectives.

The Vancouver conference proposed nine actions: the creation of a North American Network of Distance Education and Research; the introduction of a trilateral mechanism for education and business on mobility, transfers and professional certification; the enhancement of relations between teachers and administrators; the establishment of an electronic data bank; the development of a trilateral programme of exchange, research and training for students; the founding of a North American Corporate Higher Education Association; the elaboration of a plan for distance graduate training; and the increase of financial support by agencies and foundations.

The plans faced several obstacles however, as became clear at the third and last trilateral meeting, April 28–30, 1996 in Guadalajara. Some of the most important challenges mentioned were: promoting collaboration in spite of diminishing public resources; widening participation to involve more sectors; supporting specific partnership projects rather than 'general frames of reference'; including academic collaboration in North American foreign policy; establishing academic networks of excellence; and maintaining government support as facilitator and provider of funds without bureaucratic structures. (Crespo, 2000, 24-25, see also Barrow, 2000)

These challenges, according to Altbach, (1994) are a result of the variations and inequalities in educational, cultural and technological power among the three countries; the concern about US dominance of the other two partners; the ignorance in the US on the cultures of the two other countries; and the lack of interest of, in particular American, academics in links with colleagues of the two other countries. If one compares this to the regional co-operation in the European Union (Chapter Three), the variations and inequalities there, although certainly present, are not as large as in the NAFTA case. In combination with the substantially lower amount of public funding for the co-operation, the impact is less than in the EU case. Although both Crespo, Barrow and León García et al. are generally positive about the development of academic linkages as a result of NAFTA, they stress the limitations. Crespo (2000, 34) mentions the forced focus on trilateral links and the lack of funding as the main reasons; Barrow (2000, 118) notes the lack of support from non-governmental associations and organisations to supplement the limited role of the three governments. León García et al. (2000, 47-51) mention funding, language, the different needs in the three countries; migration and visa problems; and sustainability as the major problems. Barrow's argument on non-governmental funding is more in line with the tradition of American higher education than the arguments of Crespo and León García et al., who stress the
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technical obstacles more. But the experiences in the EU indicate that only substantial financial support at governmental level and a facilitating governmental role in overcoming obstacles can make the difference between marginal projects and programmes and the emergence of an open education space.

2. Other stakeholders in international education

Until now attention is given mainly to the role of the national government and agencies such as the IIE that administer programmes for the federal government. But these were and are not the only bodies active in international education. In addition, governments of several states such as Massachusetts, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas and Virginia; philanthropic foundations such as the Carnegie Corporation, Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation and the Kellogg Foundation; scholarly and professional associations; and foreign–funded and/or based foundations such as the US Japan Foundation, stimulated international education during this period and continue to do so. Holzner and Greenwood (1995, 50-53) give an informative overview of all these national and international organisations and support structures by activity.

In absolute terms, private associations, foundations and (consortia of) institutions moved and are still moving far more faculty and in particular students around the world than the federal government, and contribute to the development of international activities in higher education.

After the Second World War, the number of study abroad programmes grew rapidly, owing to economic opportunities (lower transport costs to and living costs in Europe) and political reasons (the importance of international understanding). The number of study abroad programmes sponsored by American colleges grew between 1950 and 1976 from 6 to 669, mainly in Europe (479). England (114), France (98), Germany (54), Spain (53) and Italy (33) were the main destinations. The same is true for summer programmes (313 out of 410). (Taylor, 1520)

One organisation of many involved in this movement is the Council on Student Travel (CST), later Council on International Educational Exchange, that from 1949 onwards has moved thousands of students each year to Europe and later also to other parts of the world, first mainly by ship and from the end of the 1960s by air. The CST was created with the goal of sending American students to Europe to live and work either as volunteers in reconstruction efforts or for worthwhile educational experiences. From that moment, the Council grew into a large not-for-profit organisation with a student travel company, a study abroad programme and programmes for workplacements, internships and secondary school exchanges.

In addition to organisations such as the Council and AFS, and institutions such as Beaver College and Butler College, which operate extensive study abroad programmes for American students, at the end of the 1950s one can see a growing awareness in institutions of higher education of the international dimension. It is the combination of incentives from the federal government, a shared concern for parochialism in American society and among students in particular, as well as the memory of the post–war idealism of peace and mutual understanding, that drives American institutions of higher education in developing activities for the enhancement of the international dimension. External pressure by political and business leaders and internal pressure by students and faculty have played a role in this.

34
Halpern (1969, 229) describes the implications for international education in general and the IIE in particular as follows: "With both professional skills and large sums of money available to them, and in many cases with handsome subsidies from the United States government, these institutions began to develop hundreds of programs involving the exchange of academic personnel. With the creation of each new program, the definition of international education seemed to broaden, and the monopoly of the Institute in this field, diminish. By the early 1960’s it was apparent that international education had come to encompass so many diverse activities that it was impossible for a single organization such as the Institute either to frame general policies or to keep up with all that was going on in international education. By this time it was clear that the era of the Institute’s hegemony was over.” Although Halpern overestimates the hegemony of the IIE until the end of the 1950s, his observations about the growing diversity of activities and programmes and the more pro-active role of institutions are valid.

After the Second World War, the professionalisation of international education administration became more and more important in institutions of higher education. At first, the emphasis was on foreign student advising. This resulted in 1948, on the initiative of the IIE, in the creation of the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA). Of the 218 persons participating in the founding conference at the University of Michigan, May 10-12, 1948, 115 came from American universities and colleges, 3 from institutions abroad, 75 from agencies involved in international education, 17 government observers and 23 observers from embassies in Washington (NAFSA, 1998, 9). Ten years later, 1958, membership had grown to 690, and conference participation to 443; in 1968, membership is 1768 and conference participation 764; in 1978, the numbers are 2607 and 1010; in 1988, 5591 and 3018; and in 1998, 7777 and 5500. The development of NAFSA over the past fifty years is a clear indication of the growth of the professionalisation of international education. Although in the beginning, as the name indicates, the emphasis was on foreign student advising, NAFSA soon covered other areas of international education as well, organised in several professional sections: study abroad advising, international admissions, English language teaching, community outreach, etc. In line with this development, NAFSA first changed its name in 1964 to the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs. Its professional section on US Students Abroad (SECUSSA) was created only in 1971, giving special attention to outward mobility. In 1981, a second, smaller association was created, the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), bringing together the chief international education officers on campuses, who felt that their specific role and interests were no longer recognised within NAFSA. In the 1990s, NAFSA changed its name to the Association of International Educators, to recognise its broader coverage of international education and its international membership, even though it continued to be in the first place an American professional association.

The emerging professionalisation of the field after the war and its gradual expansion in the past fifty years is an expression of the relative importance of international education in institutions of higher education, but also has contributed to the internal and external advocacy for its further expansion.

For longer, to a larger extent and more professionally than anywhere else, American higher education has been developing a broad variety of activities, programmes and projects in
international education: international curriculum development, area studies, foreign language training, study abroad, exchanges, foreign student recruitment and advising, development cooperation and assistance, and in particular at the undergraduate level. Groenning (1990) speaks of a 'many-splendored chaos with momentum', "a disorderly development, lacking clear definition, boundaries, and agreement". Greenwood (1993, 16) correctly states that "the scope of activities included now under the rubric of international education administration is thus dizzying."

Ann Kelleher (1996), with reference to an article "Internationalizing the University, the arduous Road to Euphoria" by Humphrey Tonkin and Jane Edwards, (1990) distinguishes between international education as a process and as a condition in her analysis of campus case studies in international programme development. The condition model is one in which different programmes stand side by side, without interrelation. The process model is a campus-wide, dynamic overall process of international education. She states that many institutions and international educators adhere to the process model but most cases of international education in the US come closer to the condition model. Holzner and Greenwood (1995, 54) also state that most institutions of higher education do not have an international strategy for the whole of the institution. According to them, international education strategies are ‘component’ strategies, relatively isolated from each other: development assistance and co-operation, area and language studies, international studies and international affairs, research and scholarly collaboration, international students and scholars on campus, study abroad and exchanges, ethnic and cultural diversity, internationalising the professions, and public service and outreach.

The strategies for these different components are in most cases well defined and operationalised; they have also had a significant impact on the mission statements of many institutions, and their leaders speak in many cases with great enthusiasm and support about the importance of international education. But one will find very few attempts at comprehensive internationalisation in American universities up to the 1990s. Rahman and Lamar Kopf (1992) describe how Pennsylvania State University is striving to create an institutional strategy, based on commitment, centralisation and co-operation. Other examples of well-elaborated internationalisation strategies can certainly be found, but they are exceptions. There is still a need for a conceptualisation of international education as a ‘multi-faceted package’ instead of strands that are dealt with in isolation, as Harari (1992, 53) states. Alice Chandler (1999) is quite pessimistic about the current situation of international education in the USA. Foreign language studies enrolments are going down, international student enrolment growth is slowing down, sustainability of international curricula and area studies without federal funding is questionable. She makes a plea for a renewal of commitment and additional support by federal government and foundation funding. But in line with the autonomy of American higher education, one could say that it is primarily a responsibility of American universities and colleges to analyse their role in the new global environment and bring together the different isolated components of international education into an integral strategy for their institutions.

3. Concluding Remarks

Characterising the environment in which higher education operates in the US in its effect on internationalisation, Elaine El-Khawas (1994, 90) mentions four important points:
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- There is no national, governmental policy that guides campus action
- The main sources of advice and guidance for campus action are private
- The actions of each college and university with respect to international activity depend, to a substantial extent, on the decisions of institutional leaders
- International activities, by and large, must depend on self-financing mechanisms.

There is a direct relationship between the phenomena that El-Khawas describes, the unstructured approach to international education, the dominance of political rationales, and the overall character of American higher education. As Clark Kerr (1994 a, 9) states, "In America, colleges and universities have never inhabited the upper stories of that fabled Ivory Tower of the historic myth. They have always been subject to some pressures and constraints from their surrounding societies." At the same time, American higher education has been "a world of comparative institutional autonomy and comparative individual academic freedom."

In comparing American higher education, Burton Clark (1994, 365-376) comes to the conclusion that central bureaucracy cannot effectively co-ordinate mass higher education; that the greatest single danger in the control of higher education is a monopoly of power; that another great danger is domination by a single form of organisation; that institutional differentiation is the name of the game in the co-ordination of mass higher education; and that planning and autonomous action are both needed as mechanisms of differentiation, co-ordination and change. Issues that are closely linked to the characteristics of El-Khawas for American international education.

In the twentieth century, American higher education has become dominant. The world of academia was turned upside down at the change of the nineteenth to the twentieth century, as Goodwin and Nacht (1991, 4-5) describe, or as an American physicist explained that transformation to them: "In the 1920s we went to Göttingen; then we brought Göttingen here." A sense of superiority is not absent in American higher education these days.

On the other hand, another aspect of American international education is its emphasis on overcoming parochialism. A feeling of cultural parochialism prevails. "Americans frequently tell themselves and are told by others that they are a parochial lot, ignorant of world geography, people, and events," according to Richard Lambert (94,12). Maurice Harari (1992, 56) also points to the fact that "it is unfortunately clear that at the national level we remain somewhat parochial and monolingual, if not monocultural." This explains why international education, in particular study abroad, in the United States has been mainly an undergraduate issue, part of the general education that students had to receive in preparation for specialised education at the graduate level, and for their future career.

This phenomenon is linked to the generally insular character of American higher education. Burton Clark (1994, 365) explains the isolated and insular character of American post-secondary education in the following way: it is the largest national system; it is the most widely acclaimed system since the second quarter of the twentieth century; it is geographically separated from other major national models; it has many unique futures; and it is a hectic system, demanding a high level of attention.
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It is this combination of parochialism and arrogance that determined for most of the twentieth century and still to a large extent, today, the worldview of and the motivation for international education in the United States.

The fragmented development of a large number of not directly related activities, projects and programmes (study abroad, international students, international studies, area studies, technical assistance), in general brought together under the umbrella name of 'international education'; and the prevalence of political rationales (foreign policy, national security, peace and mutual understanding) over other rationales, determine the international dimension of higher education in the United States between the beginning of the twentieth century and the end of the Cold War.

In the context of marginal federal policy for post-secondary education, the drive for internationalisation has to come from other factors, both outside higher education and from inside the institutions. If one looks at the development of international education, both trends are clear. Foreign policy and national security on the one hand and a strong emphasis on personal development, peace and mutual understanding and multicultural exposure on the other dominate among the rationales. In that sense one can generalise what Halpern (1969, 90) says about the Institute of International Education to international education in general in the United States, “confronted, as it was, with the demands of patriotism and internationalism it chose the former while espousing the latter.” Economic rationales and academic rationales have only recently begun to get more attention.

Such a context explains the strong ethos approach in American international education, present at both the institutional level and the intermediate level between the federal government and the higher education sector; as well as the relatively strong presence of private foundations and organisations in international education; and the strong advocacy culture.

The Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange (Alliance) is an association of not-for-profit organisations comprising the international exchange community in the United States, that advocates in Washington D.C. on their behalf. The Alliance has over 50 members and publishes together with USIA an ‘International Exchange Locator’, a resource directory for educational and cultural exchange that lists in its 1998 edition over 130 organisations involved in international exchanges in the United States, another example of the strong presence of private foundations and organisations and the advocacy culture.

As Holzner and Greenwood (1995, 35) state, “in a pluralistic, multicultural republic, governed within the framework of a federal constitution with strict limits on governmental authority, this national framework is not only governmental, even if the government’s role is highly significant. It includes funding and service-providing organisations that link private as well as public efforts at the national level with various types of higher education institutions. It also includes a significant number of higher education lobbyists who are familiar with their state concerns and are known to all federalist representatives, and whose role it is to attempt to guide legislative outcomes which favour their constituents. (...) In other words, single institutions of higher education in the US tend to form their strategies in the context of a large, complex national system of institutions and agencies.”

In summary, the international dimension of higher education in the United States became more organised and structured between the two world wars and in particular immediately after the Second World War. This dimension was stimulated by a combination of a call for peace and mutual understanding and in particular by foreign policy. The post Second World War period and the Cold War drove American governments to stimulate international exchange and co-operation for reasons of defence, public diplomacy and security. Even after the end of the Cold War these continue to be main rationales for federal support, although competitiveness is increasingly entering the arguments for internationalisation. It was a combination of parochialism and arrogance that determined for most of the twentieth century – and still to a large extent today – the worldview and the motivation for the international dimension, commonly referred to as international education in the United States. For longer, to a larger extent and more professionally than anywhere else, American higher education has been developing a broad variety of activities, programmes and projects in international education, mainly at the undergraduate level: international curriculum development, area studies, foreign language training, study abroad, exchanges, foreign student recruitment and advising, development co-operation and assistance. However, at the same time, most institutions of higher education do not have an internationalisation strategy for the whole of the institution. As Mestenhauser (1998 a, 10) notes, international education in the US is unintegrated and fragmented. This can be explained through the specific characteristics of American higher education and the role of the federal government and private foundations with respect to higher education.

13 This heterogeneity expresses itself, for example, in the existence of six major national higher education associations: American Council on Education (ACE); American Association of Community Colleges (AACC); American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU); The Association of American Universities (AAU), the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). (Holzner and Greenwood, 1959, 48)