



BIFAD

Board for International Food and Agricultural Development

OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 5

The Implementation of Principles for Effective Participation of Colleges and Universities in International Development Activities



May 1981

Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523



BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PRINCIPLES
FOR EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

C. Peter Magrath

President
and Professor of Political Science

University of Minnesota

and

Member of BIFAD

This speech was originally presented at the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) Annual Meeting held in Atlanta, Georgia, November 16-19, 1980. The views expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the BIFAD, IDCA, or AID.

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PRINCIPLES FOR EFFECTIVE
PARTICIPATION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

I have come to Atlanta, Georgia today to talk about certain priorities that involve a discussion of federal policies and strategies.

The priorities that I want to focus upon are those that form the background of this session on "The Implementation of Principles for Effective Participation of Colleges and Universities in International Development Activities." Simply stated, it is my contention that higher education's success in implementing international programs will be determined to a far greater extent by the national policies that are set in Washington than by the organizational principles that we embrace here in Atlanta. If this contention is valid, then our nation's higher education leaders must begin -- immediately -- to develop new strategies that will translate those principles into action. I want to spend the next few minutes outlining several strategies intended to focus on these objectives.

First of all, in assessing the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges' principles for international development, we must keep a sense of perspective. As essential as principles can be, they are only that

-- principles for programmatic implementation. As one who helped draft the principles, I will not criticize them, but I want to emphasize that that they are not intended to be anything more than common guidelines for institutions that share common objectives. In this sense, as one of my faculty colleagues so aptly noted, the principles are not unlike many campaign promises: intentionally broad, flexible, idealistic, and, for the most part, uncontroversial.

The inherent limitation in these principles, as well as in most principles, is that their implementation and effectiveness are determined by a host of external and internal factors that are sometimes beyond one's control. In this case, two determinants are especially pertinent: (1) the commitment of an institution's faculty and administration; and (2) the availability of resources. While commitment might be an abundant commodity across most of our campuses, the availability of resources is hardly so. And here lies the major obstacle to developing effective programs.

Who among us, for example, would not subscribe to principles that recognize the important role of American universities and colleges in addressing what has been called "the global crisis?" And, who would doubt the importance of policies that foster "administrative and faculty commitment to international

development work," or "insuring the involvement of high quality faculty in development activities," or making efforts to provide "logistical support and professional resources for individuals engaged in such activities?" The answer is that few of us -- or at least so I hope -- would take issue with such guidelines.

Our problem, however, is not the need to convert one another. Indeed, we tend to spend too much time proselytizing among ourselves, attempting to save those who already have the faith. Instead, our immediate challenge must be to move from a statement of principles that most of us accept toward realistic modes of implementation.

The challenge I submit for your consideration will prove more difficult; the audience might seem to be less receptive; and the road to success is already littered with casualties from previous encounters. What I have in mind is a major federal commitment to expanding the international development activities of our campuses.

This calls for an expanded federal commitment to supporting higher education's international activities reflects three unmistakable realities or conclusions.

First, the American people look to Washington for definitions of, and solutions to, most world problems. This is an

obvious, but nevertheless fundamental premise to understand, especially in light of a national sentiment that otherwise tends to demand less federal involvement in our daily lives. The fact is that by tradition, statute, and constitutional mandate, the federal government is empowered to set foreign policy. Also, this government is empowered to create, fund, and implement programs that join issues of domestic and international character. Americans recognize and accept the federal role in such ventures. Similarly, higher education officials should recognize that whatever success they might enjoy in implementing international programs will be determined more by the decisions made on a federal level rather than by actions taken in state capitols, college or university trustee meetings, or campus classrooms and laboratories.

A second and equally valid conclusion is that our nation's colleges and universities represent valuable, yet significantly underutilized resources that can be applied to this country's international responsibilities. Put most directly, the potential of American higher education institutions to address the multifaceted problems of the modern world has hardly been tapped.

Our previous track record in international ventures is, if we are to be candid, a checkered one. At times, we have been quite successful in initiating programs of a short-term and limited focus. On other occasions, we promised much more than we could deliver, only to fall short of our objectives. Generally speaking, however, the difference between our successes and our shortfalls can be traced directly to a lack of adequate resources. This lack has created a gap between what our colleges and universities could do and have done in the international arena.

For example, the once-vaunted Fulbright program that has sent 45,000 American faculty and students abroad and that brought in another 85,000 faculty and students from other countries has been suffering from fiscal anemia over the past decade. As a recent article in The Chronicle of Higher Education pointed out, the present \$41.2 million funding base of the Fulbright program amounts to only 60 percent of what was provided in 1965 after one takes inflation into account.

The picture is no brighter in the foreign language arena where faculty interested in developing creative new programs must queue up before the offices of National Endowment for the Humanities, private foundations, or philanthropic organizations hoping to secure scraps of modest support. Here again,

the consequences are obvious. As was pointed out by the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, America's competence in foreign languages is "nothing short of scandalous, and it is becoming worse Our lack of foreign language competence diminishes our capability in diplomacy, in foreign trade, and in citizen comprehension of the world in which we live and compete."

A final example, one surely familiar to all of you, is the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD). Once again, there is a huge gap between the contributions that our universities could make and those that we have made. John Mellor, Director of the International Food Policy Research Institute, pointed out this difference in a scbering address before the BIFAD last August. He noted:

"I think one of the tragedies -- and I will probably offend (some) -- is that the capacity of the United States agricultural colleges, the Land-Grant system, on the international front has deteriorated tremendously over the last 10 to 15 years. We are not starting where we were in 1965 when we made a lot of

mistakes over the previous 10 years, (where we) had learned a lot from (our mistakes) and where we were ready to begin improving on that process. (But) we have lost much time between 1965 and 1980. We may not be all the way back to where we were in 1965 and 1950, but we may be."

John Mellor's argument cannot be dismissed: our contributions to resolving the world famine crisis have hardly kept pace with our potential.

In calling for an expanded federal commitment to international development programs on our campuses, I do not want to leave the impression that I am unmindful of a third, and perhaps the most critical reality: namely, that there will be inevitable efforts to cut national taxes, to reduce federal spending, and to curtail new publicly financed ventures over the next four years. As a realist, I recognize that higher education has never been a "sexy" topic of conversation in the Oval Office or congressional corridors, nor do I assume that we will appear more attractive to new Washington policymakers elected on promises to reduce national spending. Let us not fool ourselves. We in higher education will probably be called

upon to defend the legitimacy of our existing federal assistance programs. Furthermore, I do not think we can expect new resources to meet many of our new needs. If we are to be at all successful in generating support for new ventures, then we will have to be selective in our requests, persuasive in our arguments, and mindful of certain national priorities.

The sobering fiscal picture, however, is not entirely bleak. Rather, there are several arenas in which I believe higher education might well be presented with new opportunities over the next four years. One of those arenas involves our international programs. My cautious optimism here reflects the public mood on national security and foreign affairs. Although the recent campaign discussions of those two subjects were generally restricted to differences over the SALT Treaty, military preparedness, and national defense spending, it would be a mistake to permit the discussions to end there. We in higher education must not allow this! Instead, we have to seize the opportunity afforded by those two topics and include a simple, salient, and compelling argument: **SUPPORT FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS REPRESENTS A STRONG FOREIGN POLICY IN THE BEST INTEREST OF AMERICAN NATIONAL SECURITY.**

A nation that is willing to dramatically increase its expenditures on military hardware and nuclear missiles can also afford to fund programs that provide security through international understanding and development. If less than one percent of the proposed increases in defense spending were channeled into our nation's colleges and universities, we could support foreign language and international studies programs at a level never before imagined in our history. For the cost of a single MX missile or B1 bomber, we could send literally hundreds of agricultural scientists abroad to fight what a U.N. Commission called the most serious threat to international peace over the next 20 years: worldwide starvation. The absence of a single missile or bomber, I submit, will hardly detract from our security; the failure to fund peaceful international development activities will.

That is the message higher education officials must take to Washington. And along with the message we have an obligation to design understandable and persuasive models that will justify a national commitment to expanding programs aimed at addressing international development and education activities.

I have two models in mind.

The first is already in existence and is aimed directly at our international agricultural responsibilities. That model is

exemplified by the relationship between our institutions and the Title XII-BIFAD activities. The success of this relationship is still in the making, but I am confident that it can be applied in effective ways to the problems of the third world nations. My confidence would be bolstered, however, if I could foresee a fiscal commitment beyond the limited one that currently exists.

If our universities are to engage in the type of "institution building" that is required in underdeveloped nations, then those colleges and universities will require more than short-term minimal grants.

The "knowledge revolution" in American agriculture cannot be exported without such a federal commitment, and that commitment must be free of some of the red tape that currently binds our scientists. One cannot tie the hands and feet of our specialists and expect them to jump complex international ropes.

A second proposal that I submit for your consideration is broader and more ambitious. It seeks to address the expanding dimensions of our international responsibilities, the limited previous success we have enjoyed in securing adequate funding, and the absolute necessity to present more persuasive models that respond to a changing political reality. The proposal that I have in mind is based upon the Land-Grant model. It works! It's a proven model that has not only enjoyed great

success in agriculture, forestry, and home economics, but that also has spawned two recent offspring in the Sea Grant and Urban Grant programs.

Specifically, I propose a federal commitment of at least \$1.5 billion -- or the cost of manufacturing and installing 2-1/2 MX missiles -- to initiate an international education grant program that would serve as an umbrella structure for generating, coordinating, funding, and implementing new and expanded ventures in international education. Such a program would combine federal and campus resources, linking funding creativity. The types of specific activities that might be envisioned are as diverse as the dimensions of our campus talents. Examples -- and here I can only be suggestive rather than comprehensive -- might include the support of direct educational classroom activities through such means as:

1. Target grants to selected colleges and universities for the explicit purpose of expanding the number, type, and quality of foreign language programs. While such grants might well increase the total number of competent foreign language speakers, that should not be considered the primary rationale of this program. Rather, the objective should be focused upon insuring an adequate number of sophisticated speakers encompassing the foreign language field.

2. Combine federal and state funds for a matching grant program for support of foreign language and international education at all levels of American schools. This type of program might foster consortial arrangements between colleges and universities and public school districts in terms of expanding the breadth and quality of foreign language instruction and international education.

3. Establish a special grant program, involving colleges and universities in the U.S. and overseas, aimed at stimulating exchange scholarship programs on a bilateral basis for both graduate and undergraduate students.

An international education grant program should also provide funding for international educational research which will:

1. Provide support for research centers in the relatively few international study programs in the United States.

These programs, which were adequately funded in the 1960s, have fallen upon hard times -- to our nation's long-term peril.

2. Provide support for international research efforts, done on a mutually collaborative basis with scholars from

other countries, so as to stimulate collaborative bi-national and multi-national research on such fundamental world problems as pollution, water resources, overpopulation, agricultural and technical development, and energy.

3. Provide support for foreign publications and acquisitions by our college and university libraries. Over recent years, such publications have been among the first to be cut from the eroding budgets of our libraries. Such retrenchments ill serve either our researchers or our international interests.

Finally, an international grant program should have an explicit service and extension component that will:

1. Establish pilot programs to provide foreign language training for corporations involved in world markets. If American businessmen are intent upon recapturing international markets, they had better understand that there are 162 languages other than English that are spoken by millions of people around the world.

2. Establish support for foreign policy analysis centers in terms of agriculture, technology, health, economic, and general U.S. foreign policy.

3. Provide support for international symposia involving business representatives, government officials, and educational specialists.

4. Provide for trial projects aimed at "institution building" not only in third world nations but in countries that fail to fall within present AID guidelines.

My proposal, which in true perspective is modest, might generate at least two responses. It may be argued that some of the specific items I have outlined are already subsumed under Title VI of the Higher Education Act, Title XII of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975, or similar pieces of legislation. That is certainly true, but what is equally true is the fact that for at least 15 years, such legislative proposals have failed to receive adequate -- if any -- funding or have been very low priorities in Presidential or Congressional recommendations.

We cannot afford, as John Mellor pointed out, to lose another 15 years in our campaign against worldwide starvation; to do so runs a risk as serious as any we might confront for the rest of this decade. Nor can we continue along the path of embarrassing monolingualism; already, as the President's Commission of Foreign Languages and International Studies warned, "Nothing less is at issue than the nation's security." And we cannot be content with the proposed amendment to the Higher Education Act, which if approved for FY 1981 -- and that is even doubtful -- would appropriate only \$45 million, or less than \$5 per university student for international education programs.

A second possible response is that a proposal for an international education grant program is simply too expensive and fanciful in a period of fiscal stringency. I reject that view for the international responsibilities which fall upon this nation are anything but fanciful; the costs of providing national security are anything but cheap. Should we ignore either the world's problems or should we think that our security is assured through defense spending alone, then we are only whistling through the dark -- a dark night that can lead to an international nightmare.

If, as a common expression goes, a massive problem can be turned into an opportunity, then, ladies and gentlemen, right now in 1980, we have a massive opportunity to do something that is essential to our national and international interest. America's great universities and colleges -- institutions such as the University of Georgia, Michigan State University, Cornell and all of the rest -- can serve as vital a role in contributing to this nation's security and international peace as can MacDonal'd Douglas, Boeing, and General Dynamics. Let us try. It is the right thing to do, for our nation's and the world's peace, security, and stability are at stake. That is the message we must take to Washington.