

cials largely refuse to acknowledge that corruption is an issue at their institution and, as a result, found the need for rules unnecessary. Occasionally, they mentioned that they did not believe that any formal rules could prevent bribery.

The state of formal control mechanisms that explicitly regulate corruption appears to be weak.

The state of informal norms related to corruption is difficult to detect, and the findings reported here should be interpreted with caution. Some organizational participants consider money exchanges for grades between students and professors acceptable and appropriate. Seventeen percent of faculty members see nothing wrong with educational corruption and about 12 percent of faculty think that charging students for a grade is either an acceptable or generally ignorable behavior. Although these numbers are not high, they may describe the beginning of a disturbing trend.

Interestingly, about 70 percent of students think that educational corruption is a disturbing phenomenon requiring administrative intervention. However, over 65 percent of students report that if a teacher requests payment for a grade they will satisfy the request without complaining to the administration. Apparently, students' expectations that administrators will support their complaints about teachers' demands for bribes are rather low. This may be interpreted as indirect evidence of administrators' turning a blind eye to corruption.

According to students' responses to open questions in the questionnaire, they are likely to comply with teachers' demands for a bribe at the exam because a refusal might hurt their chances to get a satisfactory grade regardless of their performance. Others may agree because it gives them an opportunity to obtain an "easy grade." This is especially pertinent for the poorly prepared students who are able to afford a bribe. Students say they are not likely to complain to the administration out of fear of an aggressive reaction by officials and a possibility of being expelled from the university. This raises questions about the nature of the leadership culture of the university.

The Impact of Corruption

There appears to be some agreement among faculty, and to a lesser degree among students, regarding the consequences of educational corruption. The majority of fac-

ulty members (about 72 percent) and half of the students surveyed consider educational corruption harmful to society and in general a problem. But 50 percent of students and 28 percent of faculty do not see any negative impact on society from corruption in the higher education system.

The general picture presented here is troubling. Feelings and beliefs about the impact of educational corruption and the necessity for policies targeting its prevention and eradication are greeted by both students and faculty with mixed feelings. Administrators appear to ignore the problem, which leaves little opportunity for students to raise it as an issue. Further research on corruption in the post-Soviet region is necessary to understand the causes and consequences of this phenomenon and to develop effective policy recommendations. ■

The End of Civic Diplomacy and International Education

Philip G. Altbach

Philip G. Altbach is Monan professor of higher education and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College.

Half the battle in the Middle East is for the hearts and minds of the Islamic world. A longer-term goal for the United States is to build relations of respect not only with nations but with people around the world—especially with students, scholars, and intellectuals—the opinion makers of today and tomorrow. Last week, a symptomatic event occurred—evidence of how the United States is putting itself in a position that makes it completely impossible to win that battle. The State Department suddenly revoked the visa already granted to Professor Tariq Ramadan, on the basis of undisclosed information supplied by the Department of Homeland Security. Professor Ramadan is not just one of the many individuals caught up in the machinations of the post-September 11 world. He is one of the most visible, if controversial, Muslim scholars in Europe. His work on Muslim-Christian relations and the role of Muslims in Western nations is at the cutting edge on a set of issues central to contemporary society. He is a professor in Geneva, Switzerland, and was invited by the University of Notre Dame to teach a course on Islamic ethics. He had already arranged for his children to attend schools in Indiana.

The Ramadan case is yet another example—widely reported in Europe and internationally—of how foreign individuals are treated by an American government fearful of people and perhaps ideas it does not completely

understand. Notre Dame is in fact doing exactly the right thing. It is engaging controversial people and ideas in an effort to stimulate dialog and perhaps mutual understanding. The university is bringing to the United States a prominent intellectual to interact and perhaps to learn about American ideas. Notre Dame is not concerned that Professor Ramadan might not agree with American approaches to the Middle East.

For decades, the United States has benefited from the presence in its universities of students and scholars from abroad.

For decades, the United States has benefited from the presence in its universities of students and scholars from abroad. Almost 600,000 students and 84,000 scholars from other countries are studying in the United States at present. Many foreigners from all over the world are teaching at U.S. universities for varying periods of time. Indeed, many of our best professors and researchers, including Nobel Prize winners, are from other countries and have chosen to work at U.S. universities. Foreign students and scholars constitute one of the few areas in which the United States has a highly favorable “balance of trade”—many foreigners are attracted to U.S. higher education, producing more than \$12 billion for the economy. Much more important are the ideas that they bring and the things that they learn and bring back to their home countries.

The Ramadan case is important because it exemplifies U.S. thinking and practice in the post 9/11 world. Foreigners are routinely mistreated when they apply for American visas, work permits, or permission to study. There is by now a vast array of anecdotal evidence from all over the world concerning the tribulations of dealing with American officialdom. Tales abound of uncivil consular officials in foreign posts, inordinate delays in processing visas and other documents, and seemingly arbitrary and capricious treatment of applicants. The buzz in student dormitories and faculty offices from Mumbai to Montevideo is that America no longer welcomes foreigners.

So far, polls show that the United States remains a favored destination for foreigners wishing to study overseas. Foreigners like U.S. universities and American culture, but they feel that access is no longer possible or worth the trouble or achieving. Flows of students and scholars worldwide remain strong, but the United States is being overtaken by such

competitors as Britain and Australia. There is still a reservoir of support for American education and culture around the world, but it is quickly being drained by official policy and bureaucratic procedures.

Fear seems to be the motivating force behind how the United States is thinking about dealing with the rest of the world: fear of individuals and fear of ideas. Tariq Ramadan poses no threat to American security—he may communicate with people who are distasteful to some Americans, and he may hold ideas that can be questioned. But the worst outcome of this case, and of many other less-publicized ones, is to keep him out of the country. This robs Americans of the opportunity to hear opinions about religion, culture, or world events that are relevant to central issues of the day and to interact with key thinkers. And in the Ramadan case it sends a message around the world that the U.S. government is intolerant.

All of this is not merely an academic debate. It goes to the heart of how America deals with the rest of the world. If the United States is to successfully engage with ideas and people from abroad, it must restore its openness—of course, with appropriate safeguards for post 9/11 security. But security is one thing, and building walls against ideas and individuals who might hold unorthodox opinions is quite another. Tariq Ramadan should be welcomed to Notre Dame, and the thousands of students and scholars seeking to study and learn in the United States should be similarly welcomed. To do otherwise guarantees both ignorance and defeat in a world where knowledge and ideas mean a great deal. ■

Higher Education in the 21st Century: Global Challenge and National Response 2005–2006 Fulbright New Century Scholars Program

The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State and the Council for International Exchange of Scholars announce the opening of the 2005–2006 competition for awards under the Fulbright New Century Scholars (NCS) Program.

Under the guidance of an appointed Distinguished Scholar Leader, NCS Scholars engage in collaborative, multidisciplinary examination of a topic of universal concern and together seek solutions to critical issues affecting all humankind. The topic for the current competition is “Higher Education in the 21st Century: