

talk the language of practical politics based on his or her expertise in higher education. There are exciting and challenging years **still** ahead for Korean higher education.

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION: AMERICA ABDICATES LEADERSHIP

Philip G. Altbach and Hans de Wit

Philip G. Altbach is professor of higher education and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. Hans de Wit is director of foreign relations at the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands, and is the 1994 president of the European Association for International Education. He is currently a visiting scholar at Boston College.

Internationalism is a central focus of higher education policy worldwide. Nations recognize that they operate in a global economy, and that understanding other societies and cultures is both valuable in its own right and necessary to be competitive. Our argument here is that internationalism is mandatory for any higher education system in the 21st century. What is amazing to us is that while the rest of the world's universities are becoming more international, the United States shows signs of de-emphasizing internationalism in its higher education system. In the United States, international programs are under attack in Washington, while America's major competitors—the nations of Western Europe and Japan—are rapidly expanding their international efforts, devoting money and energy to a wide range of initiatives. The Fulbright program, America's flagship international education effort, faces severe budget cuts in Washington. The National Security Education Program, established in 1991 as the first major federal initiative in international education in several decades, is threatened with extinction even before it is fully underway. While many colleges and universities have included a greater emphasis on international studies in curricular reforms in recent years, fiscal problems have prevented full implementation.

The United States is a paradox. On the one hand, the U. S. academic system contains significant international elements. And it is arguably the center of research in most scientific fields worldwide, attracting international attention. English is the dominant language of world science—the Latin of the modern era—and most of the major scientific journals are edited in the United States. According to the Institute for International Education, the United States is host to 450,000 foreign students out of a worldwide total of approximately one million. The United States also takes in more than 60,000 visiting scholars annually. Many scientists and scholars from abroad hold professorships in American universities. This dominant international

presence in American education and research, contrary to general belief, is largely financed by external sources. International education and research are export commodities that make significant contributions to the national U.S. economy as well as that of many local communities. Higher education is a major “export industry”—one that deserves stimulation and not contraction. Current trends, in our view, will mean that the United States will lose its competitive edge in yet another area.

According to a recent Carnegie Foundation survey of faculty in 14 countries, American professors are the least internationally minded. U. S. faculty go abroad for research or sabbaticals less than do their peers in other major countries, and they seldom read journals or books published elsewhere. In general, American professors do not actively support international education, fearing enrollment losses in their majors or simply feeling that internationalism is not central to their subjects and disciplines.

Fiscal cutbacks have meant that international initiatives are suffering at the state and campus levels. Some state governments recognize the importance of competitiveness, and realize internationalism's role. But beyond trade missions overseas, there is usually little follow through where it counts—with the next generation of business and high-tech leaders now on the campuses. Allocations to higher education have commonly been cut, and international initiatives have not been supported in state budgetary allocations. Colleges and universities, faced with difficult budgetary decisions, seldom choose to expand foreign language offerings or support study abroad programs.

American universities are notoriously poor in teaching foreign languages, and few students have a working knowledge of a foreign language. Only an infinitesimal number take such important but “non-mainstream” languages as Japanese, Arabic, Chinese, or Hindi. Only 70,000 American students study abroad—about 1 percent of undergraduates at four-year colleges. And most of those go for a semester, take part predominantly in American packaged programs, and have England as the major destination. There is very little participation and even less diversity.

What are America's major competitors doing? They are investing heavily in international education. A decade ago, Japan declared the goal of hosting 100,000 foreign students by the year 2000, and this goal is likely to be achieved. Most of Japan's foreign students come from its major Asian trading partners. Japan is also building dormitories and other facilities for its foreign students and scholars, and is investing both in teaching Japanese to foreigners and in developing some courses of study in English. Currently, 43,000 Japanese study in the United States, while only 1,800 Americans study in Japan. Japanese universities are rapidly internationalizing their curricula, and every Japanese high school and university student studies English.

Western Europe has long recognized the need for in-

ternationalizing higher education, not only to solidify European integration but to position Europe in the global economy. The European Commission stimulates cooperation in research and education through well-funded programs such as ERASMUS, promoting the mobility of students and scholars within Europe; LINGUA, which stimulates the study of European languages; and COMETT, aimed at fostering university-industry links. Recently, the exchange concept was expanded to secondary education as part of the new SOCRATES umbrella program, which covers a number of disciplines as well as several levels of education. Professional education is internationalized with the LEONARDO program.

Some outside Europe feared that a "Fortress Europe" mentality was developing, focused exclusively on the European Union, but this has not happened. The EU authorities, national governments, and individual academic institutions have stressed the importance of global cooperation and exchange. The TEMPUS, program, another EU-funded initiative, stresses exchanges with Eastern Europe, while the ALFA program deals with Latin America, and MEDCAMPUS deals with the Mediterranean region. In cooperation with the U. S. Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, there is a joint program to stimulate US-European exchange, but it is quite small in comparison to the other EU initiatives because of limited funds and the constant pressure of budget cuts.

For a half century after World War II, American higher education has been the undisputed leader in higher education internationally. Cold war competition, a booming U.S. economy, and a rapidly expanding student population were contributing factors. American higher education remains very strong, but it is losing its competitive edge in the international marketplace. The slide has begun, and growing insularity will mean that the United States will fall behind its competitors. Internationalism in higher education permits us to understand the rest of the world, as well as to function in the new international economy of the 21st century. Others understand this—Americans must too.

SOME CRITICAL ISSUES FACING JESUIT HIGHER EDUCATION TODAY

Vincent J. Duminuco, S.J.

Vincent J. Duminuco, S.J., is Secretary of Education, Society of Jesus, C.P. 6 139, 00019E Rome, Italy Fax: 39-6-687-9283

Our own enthusiasm about the future may depend on how much we feel that the higher education institutions we now call "Jesuit" still retain their Jesuit identity. While some people in our institutions may care little about Jesuit ideals, many others do identify strongly with Jesuit

education, and **still** more will want the university or college to retain its identity as a "Jesuit" school. But what do we mean by Jesuit education? To answer that, to establish Jesuit identity, we must **link** our work in education with the Ignatian spirituality that inspires it.

Here let me mention but a few Ignatian themes that enlighten and give impetus to **our** work in higher education: the Ignatian worldview is world-affirming, comprehensive, places emphasis on freedom, faces up to sin, personal and social, but points to God's love as more powerful than human weakness and evil, is altruistic, stresses the essential need for discernment, and gives ample scope to intellect and affectivity in forming leaders. Are not these and other Ignatian themes also essential to the values a Jesuit college or university endorses? And in *so* doing Jesuit education challenges much that contemporary society presents as values.

Each academic discipline within the realm of the humanities and social sciences, when honest with itself, is well aware that the values transmitted depend on assumptions about the ideal human person that are used as a starting point. Our institutions make their essential contribution to society by embodying in our education process a rigorous, probing study of crucial human problems and concerns. It is for this reason that Jesuit colleges and universities must strive for high academic quality. This amounts to something far removed from the facile and superficial world of slogans or ideology, of purely emotional and self-centered responses, and of instant, simplistic solutions. Teaching and research and all that goes into the educational process are of the highest importance in our institutions because they reject and refute any partial or deformed vision of the human person. This is in sharp contrast to educational institutions that often unwittingly sidestep the central concern for the human person because of fragmented approaches to specializations.

In addition to rigor and critical analysis, there is something we can and should do together. When working on his essay "The Idea of a University," John Henry Newman demonstrated that the very name *universitas* highlights the fact that the university is not a place where there is merely a quantitative accumulation of knowledge or simply a conglomeration of faculties and institutes. In a university each scientific discipline is seen to be insufficient in itself to explain the fullness of creation. Thus a qualitative integration of inquiry is sought that can lead to an appreciation of more comprehensive truth. How far this is from the view that portrays the university as merely an administrative umbrella for unconnected fields of research.

It is a pity that an interdisciplinary approach, the only significant way to heal the fracture of knowledge, is still considered a luxury reserved to occasional staff seminars or a few doctoral programs. Of course, an interdisciplinary approach is not without problems: it runs the risk of sim-