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IMMIGRATION AND INTELLECT:
FOREIGN STUDENT POLICY IN THE POST-INDUSTRIAL ERA

Immigration is the movement of people across boundaries. Viewed simply, the traffic is usually one-way -- from less desired to more desired nation. Viewed more broadly, the immigration of people is only one part of "an increasingly complex set of exchanges (trade, technology, capital, culture) between countries that possess differential power (economic, military, and political)"¹ and that have different kinds of resources to offer. The movement of foreign students, usually as temporary immigrants to their country of study, is part of the worldwide migration picture. It, too, is usually a one-way movement-- from less-developed to more developed nations. But the benefits and relationships are always reciprocal, almost always intricate, and often ambivalent.

Some of this intricacy results from the varying patterns of pulls and pushes that direct the movement of foreign students. The "pushes" include inadequate higher educational systems in the home country, lack of economic development and opportunity, and at times the pressures of repressive or discriminatory political regimes. The "pulls" include the attraction of more open and prosperous societies, the hope for desired personal skills and knowledge, and, increasingly, the need-- both for the student and for the home
country--of the specialized professional training that universities provide.

The responses to foreign students on the part of the receiving country are often more ambivalent and shifting than the fairly consistent motives that send them there. The degree of welcome they receive is largely dependent upon time and circumstance: on the perceived cost-benefits of educating them; on the level of skills, wealth, intelligence and knowledge that they bring; on the economic and social climate of the receiving country; and on its receptivity to immigrants of different racial or ethnic stock.

Foreign students are, of course, but a small part of an increasingly vast mass of immigrants and refugees. Roughly a million worldwide, the total number of foreign students is dwarfed by such figures as the eight million legal and illegal immigrants who entered the United States in the 1980s alone, the four million German guest workers, or the estimated 18 million international refugees. But while the number of foreign students is relatively small by global standards, their significance is great. They are the intellectually elite--among the best and brightest their nations have to offer. With less prosperous students increasingly priced out in the world market, foreign students increasingly come from the wealthier and more powerful segments of their home societies. By birth and subsequently by training they are likely to be the future economic and political leaders of their country.
and its opinion makers as well. Because of their potential leadership role in their home countries, they are--in reasonable numbers--seen as politically and economically desirable by the receiving countries. Indeed, it is an interesting footnote to foreign student policy to know that in most major receiving countries it is more often shaped by ministries of foreign affairs and trade ministries than by education ministries.

Foreign students are also usually deemed to provide an immediate financial benefit. As tourists, or temporary residents, the goods and services that they purchase can be a direct revenue source to the receiving nation. The Vancouver Board of Trade, for example, "estimated that in academic year 1985-86 international students contributed over $500 million to the Canadian economy, with $400 million originating outside of Canada."\(^2\) Estimates for foreign student expenditures in Great Britain go as high as £1 billion, almost 15% of total tourist revenues.\(^3\) Beyond their contributions to the economy as a whole, foreign students can also provide additional tuition revenues to the universities that enroll them. In countries charging "full-cost fees," such as Great Britain, that amount can run as high as 5% of total operating budgets for the university sector.\(^4\) Australian universities, which quite candidly look upon foreign student enrollment as an export industry, anticipated earnings of almost $A300 million in 1989 alone.\(^5\)

Also part of the cost-benefit equation are the substantial indirect
revenues that foreign students can generate: the research and teaching they conduct as graduate students, the multiplier effect of that research as some of it is transferred into the economy, and the further economic value of those foreign students who do not return home immediately upon graduation and provide a specialized professional labor pool for the country that educated them. These positives have some obverses as well: the perceived competition between foreign and domestic students for jobs and educational places, the issues of "brain drain" and potential losses to the sending countries, and the rising levels of cultural misapprehensions and antagonism that occur when foreign student enrollments become large and visible. Indeed, the whole issue of foreign students and foreign student policy provides an excellent window both on the centripetal forces of science and technology and of an international business community, which increasingly reduce the significance of national boundaries, and the rising tides of ethnophobia and racism that threaten to destroy it.

Up to the 1960s foreign students were small in number and, almost invariably, intent upon absorbing and assimilating the foreign culture that they studied. The young Gandhi with bowler hat and furled umbrella studying at the University of London was typical of the young men (and foreign students were almost invariably male) who came to study at the shrine of Western civilization and who
were received, with varying degrees of condescending kindness, by what was usually referred to as the "home country."

All that has changed since the 1960s. The rise in sheer numbers has been enormous and foreign students are less and less prone to the unquestioning absorption of the Western cultural tradition. For a variety of reasons, their motivations have been increasingly practical. They study abroad to acquire economically viable professional and technological competencies. They value expertise rather than culture. Indeed, it may not be going too far to view study abroad as a form of human capital formation and to interpret the movement of foreign students across national boundaries as part of the trade in intellectual goods and services that increasingly characterizes our international economy.

Because of their concomitantly advanced educational and industrial systems, it is the most economically developed countries which receive most of the world's foreign students. The major players at the colleges and the university level are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>407,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>131,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>86,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>77,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>43,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>34,854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Australia..............20,219?

The former Soviet Union was reported to have about 70,000 foreign students several years ago, but little is known either about numbers or policies. (Ironically, both the Soviet Union and Eastern Bloc countries are known to have included systematic Marxist indoctrination as part of their educational program for foreign students. One can only imagine the increasing bemusement of their foreign alumni in recent years.)

With the exception of the United States and Japan, the five other major receiving countries have remarkably similar histories when it comes to foreign students and foreign student policy. That history, over the past thirty years, falls into three main phases: (1) a period of relatively uncontrolled rapid expansion dating from the 1960s through about 1980s during which the generous enrollment of foreign students was largely viewed as a post-colonial obligation by many of the receiving nations; (2) what might be called the "backlash" era of the early 1980s; and (3) the more pragmatic and entrepreneurial current climate.

The most vivid—and in many ways cautionary—exemplar of these shifting policies is Great Britain. Troubled by the 250% increase in foreign student numbers that had taken place in the 1970s alone, Britain's Department of Education and Science in 1979 unilaterally, and allegedly without consultation with any other governmental agency or any of the major sending countries, threw up a fee
barrier for foreign students. Designed to discourage foreign student enrollments, the 1979 "full cost fee" policy, which raised previous tuitions six to fifteen times, was immediately successful in its aims. The new fee structure caused a drastic drop in foreign student enrollments, which plunged by one-quarter in the next three years.\textsuperscript{8} The foreign policy impact was even more dramatic, however. Whitehall rocked with the torrents and tirades of complaint from such former colonies as Hong Kong and Malaysia, which were largely dependent on Great Britain for meeting their educational needs. The Malaysian government, indeed, imposed a "Buy British Last Policy" and directed its foreign student flows to countries other than Great Britain in ways which can be measured to this day.

France, too, went through a similar period of attempted constriction of seeming unquenchable foreign student numbers at almost exactly the same time. With foreign student numbers there up by 600\% between 1960 and 1980 and with foreign students representing 13\% of the numbers and hence 13\% of the cost of higher education in that country, the need to pull back seemed evident. The importance of cutting the foreign student flow seemed particularly evident in large cities such as Paris, where foreign student numbers probably approached 20\% of that volatile student population and where the predominant enrollments of students of African extraction made their numbers obvious. Since French tuition is essentially free, the option of controlling foreign student immigration by steep cost increases was not viable in that country.
Instead, the French government attempted to impose a preinscription policy to limit the foreign student flow. The so-called Imbert Decree of 1981 required a centralized review of immigration documents for students and imposed a standardized French language entry examination, even for students from the Francophone countries of Africa. The results were perhaps not so globally cataclysmic as in Great Britain. But foreign governments were publicly irritated. Student demonstrations included at least one street-battle, with Molotov cocktails pitched from the roofs of the University of Paris VII and one alleged death of a passer-by.

Similar patterns of restriction in foreign student admissions, though not as spectacular as in Great Britain and France, were either imposed or considered elsewhere in the early 1980s: in Germany through tightened student immigration policies, in Canada through differential provincial fees for foreign students, and in Australia through a combination of fees and more restrictive immigration policies. For a brief period it appeared that the protectionist forces had won out and that either unfavorable price mechanisms or restrictive centralized policies would henceforth reduce or at least contain the entry of foreign students into most major receiving countries.

But if indiscriminate admission of foreign students was a problem, indiscriminate constriction was worse. No sooner had the narrowing policies been imposed than the necessity for more liberalized
policies toward foreign students became obvious. Foreign ministries objected to the negative foreign relations fall-out. Trade ministries and the international business community foresaw damage to foreign trade and long-term economic relationships. The university community complained loudly of both the academic and financial losses. Whether through highly publicized discussion and debate, as in Great Britain, Canada, and Australia, or more quietly, as in France and Germany, the period of centralized restriction soon came to an end. In place of broad brushstroke regulation came new more carefully tailored approaches toward foreign student admissions. Targeted and decentralized, these new approaches were usually highly market-oriented, designed to take advantage of the economic benefits such students could provide.

Great Britain, for example, had by 1983 adopted a whole new set of policies and procedures—the so-called "Pym Package." Named after the minister that developed it, the "Pym Package" provided special tuition rates and expanded scholarship programs for students from favored nations—usually Commonwealth countries or trade allies. It also developed scholarship programs, such as ORSAS (Overseas Students Research Awards Program) to attract the most talented graduate students from all over the globe.

France, too, changed its policies. Having been burned politically by the flames generated by the Imbert Decree, it decentralized the decision-making process for foreign students' placing the real
responsibility on the universities themselves. The centralized French language examination was eliminated and all language requirements were suspended for students from the Francophone countries. With the exception of some minor regulations designed to prevent the excessive concentration of foreign students in Paris and other key cities, the selection and admission of foreign students was relegated to the individual universities. Immigration authorities required only that foreign students show that their credentials were comparable to the French baccalaureate and that they had adequate means of support.

Most significant, under the new more liberalized policies, is the degree of enterprise that the university sector is showing in many countries as foreign student enrollments become big business for them. We are all aware of the brisk trade in I-20s that has been reported here in the United States. Similar activity is also to be found in Britain, Canada and Australia, where full-cost fee recoveries from foreign students are an important source of university revenues. With higher education budgets suffering recurrent cuts in the 1980s, it is not surprising to learn that British overseas recruitment is energetically pursued in all corners of the world. Enrollments in universities, polytechnics and colleges there have not only recovered from the earlier debacle but are now at highest ever levels. Similar increases, fueled by active entrepreneurialism on the part of university staffs and faculty members, are also to be found in Canada, where overall foreign
students enrollments climbed by 10% last year. Even more striking increases in foreign student numbers are to be seen in Australia, which switched in 1990 from a complex tripartite scheme of admissions to a simple dualism under which foreign students are either admitted under an Equity and Merit Scholarship Scheme, applicable to needy and talented students from developing countries, or at full-cost fees directly by the university. Under this new program Australia's foreign student numbers have grown by 50% between 1990 and 1991 alone. Indeed, as one Australian vice chancellor commented, "Foreign students. We live by them and for them."

But it is not simply money that acts as an inducement. For both foreign students and for the university sector, perhaps the most powerful strand in this post-industrial society is its attraction for scientific and professional student. With the exception of France, where the humanities still enroll the largest fraction of foreign students, all other major receiving countries report their predominant enrollments in either engineering and technology or business and management studies. We have already noted that foreign students seek out these disciplines, usually at the graduate level, to acquire the specialized skills and knowledge that are often unavailable in their home countries. But it must be reiterated that the educational systems of the receiving nations also benefit from foreign student enrollments. Indeed, they are highly dependent on them. In the more advanced industrial nations,
where demographic trends swing downward and where the lure of high-paying jobs make prolonged graduate study cost-ineffective for domestic students, foreign students fill in the vacant places. Their presence makes it possible to sustain graduate programs that would otherwise be underenrolled. In the United States, for example, with student interest dwindling in many graduate disciplines, it is foreign students who make up the traditional cheap labor pool of graduate students. More than half of all engineering doctoral degrees annually in the United States are awarded to foreign students, who increasingly are staying on to fill research and development jobs in this country. Foreign students similarly comprise more than 66% of all post-graduate business and management enrollments in Great Britain and 53% of its engineering and technology post-graduate students. Even Japan faces these problems. At the Tokyo Institute of Technology, a national university specializing in science and engineering courses, approximately 30% of the students undertaking doctoral courses are from overseas, and figures as high as 40% and more have been reported for these disciplines at Kyushu, Nagoya, and Tokyo universities. These imbalances worry the Japanese government, which anticipates a shortage of at least 300,000 engineers by the year 2005.9

These patterns of enrollment--oriented to the sciences and heavily concentrated in post-graduate work--are typical of foreign students worldwide. With the exception of Australia, which has yet to earn
a reputation for its doctoral work, the other major receiving countries report strong—and usually increasing—concentrations of graduate students in graduate studies, often in higher percentages than those applicable to domestic students. In Canada, for example, the number of foreign graduate students rose by 50% during the past five years. These trends reflect in large measure a growing tendency, largely for economic reasons, for foreign students to pursue their undergraduate studies in either their home countries or at recognized regional universities and then go further afield for their doctoral studies.

iii

But the pragmatic, technological, rationalist aspect of foreign students and foreign student policy is only half the picture. While less easy to describe or quantify, issues surrounding foreign student immigration carry the same mixed messages of idealism and hostility that tend to surround all significant immigration questions. Japan and the European Community provide good examples of these ambivalences—both of the positive drive toward internationalization and cosmopolitanism that creates a welcoming environment for foreign students and the darkening cloud of prejudice and xenophobia that often mark and mar the foreign student experiences.

Very much a late-comer to the world of foreign students, Japan
startled and somewhat amused the international higher education community when it announced in 1984—at the very time that most countries were first imposing their restrictions on foreign students—that it was aiming to enroll 100,000 foreign students by the year 2000. The total enrollment of foreign students at that point was only 12,000 and critics were quick to point out how unprepared Japan was to attract or accommodate foreign students. As usual, the naysayers were proved wrong. Japan today enrolls 44,000 foreign students and is ahead of schedule. An expansive and generous scholarship program offered by Monbusho (the Japanese Ministry of Education) support about one-sixth of all foreign students. The rest pay the regular cost.

Japan's motivations take some looking at, however, since they show both the hopeful and more ambiguous aspects of foreign student enrollment. Japan's aggressive recruitment posture is seen as a necessary concomitant of its changed international position. As stated in the so-called Maekawa Report of 1984 (Report of the Advisory Group on Economic Structural Adjustment for International Harmony), "the time has come for Japan to make a historical transformation in its traditional policies on economic management and its lifestyle" and to "contribute to the world community" not only economically but also in scientific, technological, cultural, and intellectual fields. Although unstated, the premise is the same for as for the other countries we have been examining. Foreign students are good ambassadors. As future business and political
leaders, they will tend to favor the country that has educated them and buy the equipment and technology that they have become accustomed to using. The Japanese add to this reasoning, in such documents as the Second Report on Educational Reform issued in 1986, a more distinctively Japanese theme: that as a small, insular nation they must accustom themselves to living in a global environment and to benefiting from the creativity that other cultures can offer their own conformist educational systems.

But the Japanese foreign student story has it obverse as well. The goal of mixing cultures may be to increase tolerance and creativity. In actuality, the result is often friction. A Keio University study reveals that foreign students, particularly those from other Asian nations, tend to giving low sociability ratings to the Japanese, characterizing them as "cold, unapproachable, unfriendly, and prejudiced." A recent editorial in the Asahi Evening News uses the phrase "three layers of curtain" to describe the cultural barriers that foreign students feel in gaining acceptance from the Japanese. That same editorial also faults the Japanese government for its delays in creating housing and other supportive services for foreign students, citing the "sense of isolation and loneliness" that such students often feel.

Although specifically applicable to Japan, the comments about Japanese ethnocentricity and student loneliness are far from unique. Underscoring all aspects of foreign student policy and
certainly part of the foreign student experience for many young people are the dark themes of racism and ethnophobia. Looking back at the years around 1980—the period we have characterized as the era of contraction—it is clear that foreign student numbers became constrained precisely at the point that students from developing countries became visible in the urban universities. The insistence that foreign students specify a university other than the University of Paris, the use of fees in part as a filter,\(^{13}\) the new requirement that foreign students in Germany be accepted for residency by the local Ordnungsamt—all point to the sensitive nature of ethnic concerns and to their impact on foreign students. Indeed, with the possible exception of Australia, there is no country where foreign students do not report significant unhappiness over racism, just as there is no country with substantial numbers of foreign students which has not seen some manifestations of local unrest over their presence.

These ethnophobic manifestations appear currently to be taking their extreme form in Germany, although such reactions are to be found throughout Europe as a reaction against huge inflows of East European and Third World immigrants. In Germany, as elsewhere, these hostile behaviors are applied not only to African and Asian immigrants but to members of other immigrant groups as well. The mobs which are increasingly harassing these foreigners make little distinction between foreign students, refugees, and guest workers.\(^{14}\) Cities in the former East Germany have already seen several such
attacks in which students from Third World countries have been harassed and even assaulted. In a private letter to the author, Karl Roeloffs, former General Secretary of DAAD, writes that "in some East German university towns the Arabic or African students hardly dare to go our into the street or to board a streetcar except in a group."

But if the attempted internationalization of students and immigrants from visibly different backgrounds and cultures is in trouble in many countries, there are movements of coalescence among countries with close cultural and political ties. The consolidation of the European Community is an unprecedented relinquishment of sovereignty, typified by the permeability of boundaries and the deliberate development of transnational relationships. At least within the European Community nations themselves, many of the time-honored issues of immigration will cease to have meaning, as temporary immigrants, at least, can move freely across borders and as such time-honored symbols of sovereignty as coinage give way to more internationalized currencies.

This cultivation of a Pan-European consciousness is nowhere better exemplified than in the development of the ERASMUS program, specifically designed to use foreign study as a vehicle toward cosmopolitanism. Under the ERASMUS program at least 10% of each country's university students are expected to spend a year in a university in some other EC country, learning its language fluently
and developing a sophisticated comprehension of its culture. Complex agreements are beginning to allow for the equivalency and articulation of study programs and appropriate bursaries and fee structures make such enrollments feasible. This year about 50,000 are involved in ERASMUS and some other EC educational programs, and enrollments are rising rapidly. According to at least one member of the European Commission Task Force on Higher Education, is already so successful that an extension of the ERASMUS program beyond the 10% level is next on the agenda. Concern has been expressed, in fact, that the increasing Europeanization of higher education will increasing force out students from the developing countries.
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How does the United States fit within this worldwide picture? With more than 400,000 foreign students enrolled last year, the U.S. seems almost off the scale numerically. This country enrolls almost three times as many foreign students as France, with the highest number; five times as many as Great Britain; ten times as many as Japan. On a percentage basis, however, the numbers are less impressive. Foreign students comprise little more than 3% of the vast United States higher educational network, the lowest percentage of any of the major receiving countries except Japan, where the percentage of foreign student enrollment is growing rapidly. In France and Britain, by contrast, foreign students now
constitute more than 10% of total higher education enrollments; they are almost almost 5% of total higher education enrollments in Australia and Canada.

As a nation without a centralized system of education, the United States makes a very limited public financial contribution to the support of foreign students. America does not subsidize foreign students as France and Germany do, and its state universities and colleges usually impose significantly higher tuitions on foreign as on out-of-state students in order to avoid subsidizing them. For many private colleges, of course, foreign students, paying full tuition costs, are a major revenue source. While it would be extremely difficult to calculate total expenditures in this country in support of foreign students, it can be safely said that the scale of U.S. public expenditure in no way matches the roughly $2.0 billion spent in Germany annually or even the $1.3 billion spent in France.¹⁵

While unique in its absence of a federal role in higher education, the United States does parallel the other major receiving countries in its dependence on foreign graduate students and in the academic interests that foreign students reveal. Business, engineering, mathematics, and the sciences account for more than half of all foreign student enrollments. Fewer than 10% study letters or languages. The United States also resembles most other major receiving countries in its shift toward enrolling students from
wealthier family backgrounds and from wealthier nations as well. United States figures for 1990-91 show a continuing decline of students from African and Latin American nations, which is part of a worldwide trend. (As expected, the number of Asian students rose and now represents more than 50% of all U. S. foreign students).

Until recently, the United States has also been in the global mainstream in regard to employment regulations for foreign students. However, recent regulatory changes in such areas as employment and taxation could soon make this country less competitive in attracting foreign students. The United States certainly resembles a number of other major receiving countries, in the priority and somewhat increased flexibility being given to the new "aliens of extraordinary ability" category. Here, too, it is clear that the trade in brains--the importation of intellect--has become a national priority.

It is in regard to issues of ethnicity and identity, that America begins to differentiate itself from most other receiving nations. Foreign students in this country are only a minor element in our heterogeneous national population. While concerns are occasionally voiced about their competing for places in public universities, foreign students per se are seldom a specific target for major hostility in this country, except when United States foreign policy, as with Iranian and Iraqi students in recent memory, suddenly creates antagonisms. Whether foreign students are
particularly well treated or even well-used as cultural resources is, of course, another question.

Where the United States appears to differ substantially from other countries is in matters of definition. Although the definitions are not without their contested areas, foreign students in this country are by definition truly foreign. They are temporary entrants into --technically "non-immigrants"--under U.S. visa categories. This generally narrower definition of foreign students, despite some associated controversies, sets the United States apart from countries such as France and Germany, where the children and even the grandchildren of guest workers or permanent residents, whether born in that country or not, are automatically counted as foreign students and usually treated as such. There is, for example, a body of regulations in Germany dealing with the education of so-called bildungsinländer, whose parents may well have lived in Germany for a generation or more and who may well have been educated in German schools, but are still subject to certain entrance quotas and other regulations.

But these differences are perhaps more apparent than real. We in the United States have our bildungsinländer, although we do not identify them as such. Although not technically classified as foreign students, the number of permanent residents of foreign birth themselves or born of foreign parentage seeking higher educational opportunity is already on the rise. They may be the new
"diversity immigrants" who, by definition, have at least a high school diploma in hand, or the children of persons in this or other categories, for whom the attraction of American higher education --especially in the low-cost public sector--is very great indeed. Documented or undocumented, their significance, as this conference well testifies, should not be overlooked.

V

If there is any lesson to be drawn from this worldwide review of foreign student policy, it is the importance of trained intellect. The training itself is part of the export sector--higher educational goods and services that are made available (usually at a price) to foreign student consumers. The intellect is part of the import sector--the borrowed intelligence of foreign students as teaching assistants and researchers. Not surprisingly the most recent Australian study of foreign student policy is called Exports of Education Services. Summing up the practical interrelationships studied so far in this paper, it begins with the statement that the educational "export industry is of cultural and economic importance to Australia, to international students and to institutions."16

The balance of trade in the "brain industry" is rather difficult to assess at this point. With commingled motives, the industrialized nations provide students from abroad with the specialized higher educational and research facilities that less
developed nations cannot afford. On the positive side, one sees "brain gain" from this sharing of educational resources, as in the return of a record number of American-trained Taiwanese high tech personnel to spark the development of that country's semi-conductor industry recently and in myriad other examples of the role of foreign student returnees in the development of their home countries. So far the limited data available indicate that "brain gain" is still outweighing "brain drain"—that more students educated abroad are returning home than are being siphoned off from their home countries. According to a recent Commonwealth study, only 7% of all Commonwealth foreign students (a pretty good cross-section of all foreign students) actually change nationality after being educated abroad. The vast majority of them return home. But other evidence shows that foreign student stays are growing longer, and the temptation to for the host countries to absorb this imported intelligence grows with the complexity of there economies and with the shortage of students willing to undertake the needed graduate study.

The ethical questions surrounding foreign student policy go far beyond the issues of "gain" and "drain," however. Viewed more broadly, they lead into the critical question for the 1990s—the power of education to fight parochialism and xenophobia and to create an atmosphere of cultural understanding. The reports of specific hostilities against foreign students in Germany are not hopeful, and one need not look to Germany alone for rising
prejudice. In such a climate, it may seem premature or even Quixotic to talk of using foreign students to expand intellectual horizons or to help in fostering global cultural links. There is certainly little effort in the United States or elsewhere to balance the overwhelming enrollment of foreign students in scientific and professional studies, with programs to attract students interested in arts, letters, or the social sciences. But pilot programs with goals similar to the EEC's ERASMUS program might help to point the way to more expanded efforts. Surely one small step toward the seemingly unattainable goal of greater mutual comprehension is to be found in sensible and humane policies toward foreign students and in a greater recognition of their potential role as international cultural ambassadors.


6. The most recent German figures reflect the assimilation of East German universities and their foreign students into the newly federated educational system.
7. It should be noted that definitions and reporting dates differ from country to country. Australian terminology underwent a change in 1990. Foreign student data for France and Germany includes sizable fractions of what the United States would term permanent residents.

8. Here, as elsewhere in this paper, data is restricted to post-secondary university and college education.


13. Australia presents an interesting case study of the substitution of a full-cost policy for an increasingly complex and unworkable national quota system.


