THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF THE UNIVERSITY

by David P. Gardner, President
University of California

I am greatly honored to be delivering the Tenth Pullias Lecture. I have long admired Professor Pullias and the scholarly contributions he has made with such brilliance and effect. I also respect him as a person, for his caring attitude toward and concern for students, and for the personal warmth and integrity that are his hallmark. And I have a special reason to be in his debt: he was the University of Chicago's delegate at my inauguration as President of the University of California. In the years since, Professor Pullias's scholarship continues to inform and enlighten us about the challenges and problems of higher education. I continue to learn from him, as do countless alumni of USC who learned at his feet and now themselves impart their knowledge to others throughout the length and breadth of our land, and especially here in Southern California.

I have taken as my theme tonight the internationalization of the university; and I wish to set the stage by glancing backwards at the universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, institutions not many observers of contemporary higher education regard as overly relevant to a comprehensive view of today's more modern centers of learning. The medieval university was, after all, innocent of fund-raising campaigns, legislative budget hearings (although they had their own set of problems with the powers that be, both ecclesiastical and civil), environmental impact reports, parking problems, and losing football teams — blessings that we in today's America take for granted. They were, of course, well versed in town-gown relationships, student protests, red ink and sturdy but well-used buildings constantly in need of repair and better maintenance. We are also in their debt for the terms "professor," "rector," and "regent," and for the quaint idea that degrees should be awarded to students who satisfactorily complete a stipulated course of study.

But I wish to remember these remarkable institutions for their international character. The medieval university welcomed students from all over the western world to study and advance the cause of learning. Students travelled freely across political boundaries under the protection of the Pope. The language of instruction and discourse was Latin, irrespective of the host university's locale. The masters were peripatetic,

sometimes on their own initiative and other times at the urging of others. Their curriculum, while unwelcoming of what we would call electives, was rigorous and demanding, sweeping as best it could across the diversity of knowledge and ways of knowing. In its fundamental attitudes and assumptions, the university of the Middle Ages was a profoundly international institution; and fundamentally more so than our institutions today, I reluctantly add.

The Latin term "universitas," in fact, reflects this characteristic. Originally, it referred simply to a group of persons; more technically, a legal corporation or juristic person of some kind, and it was mainly applied to guilds. In academia, it came to refer to "the scholastic body whether of teachers or scholars, not of the place in which such a body was established, or even of its collective schools. (Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages,* Vol. I, p. 7.) Eventually it came mostly to mean the guilds of foreign students, who banded together to protect their interests and safety — a strategy of necessity in medieval society, where foreign students could be made subject to laws far harsher than those that nominally applied to residents of the town or region in which the university was located. Hastings Rashdall, a noted scholar of the period, points out how integral the international focus of these early universities was to everything they did. "To appreciate the fact that the university was in its origin nothing more than a guild of foreign students," he says, "is the key to the real origin and nature of the institution. (Rashdall, p. 1163)."

Ours is a more parochial time in many ways than then, oddly enough, and our great universities, as in the Middle Ages, tend also to reflect their times as well as influencing them. And it is about the role of universities in influencing our times — rather than in reflecting them — that I wish to comment on this evening. Our universities have a vital role to play in rekindling the spirit of internationalism, and they have, in my view, good chances for success.

That is because of the decentralized nature of American higher education, which — whatever its drawbacks — makes for a highly fluid situation in which change and innovation are possible precisely because of the absence of central control. In the more centalized university systems of Europe, decisions must of necessity be implemented from the top down. Thus, experimentation and change are correspondingly more difficult to accomplish — witness efforts to reform French higher education in recent years.

At the same time, however, the United States has a long history of isolationism and suspicion of foreign influences, matched only by our comparative ignorance of the world in general. The reasons are rooted deep in our history. For generations we were preoccupied with the internal problems of settling a vast continent and creating a nation; our self-sufficiency in natural resources and our enormous internal markets made us uncommonly independent of the rest of the world in many ways. Besides, we are protected on the east and on the west by two huge moats, the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. For much of our history these were formidable barriers that only long, dangerous, and tedious travel could breach. We created and sustained a tradition of independence from the rest of the world — freedom from "entangling alliances," as our Founding Fathers expressed it.

But today, the world is not so easily kept at bay. Economically, the globe is one huge market; economists tell us that the discrete national markets we have long been familiar with are becoming less and less relevant to what actually happens in the global marketplace. Whether we like it or not, the United States is in the throes of a vast adjustment to a world in which our products no longer dominate world markets but must instead compete vigorously with those of other nations. Economic decisions made in Tokyo or London or Paris reverberate in New York, Chicago and Los Angeles, Singapore, Hong Kong, Beijing and Moscow. The National Commission on Excellence in Education pointed to the consequences of these new economic realities in its 1983 report, *A Nation at Risk:*

> The time is long past when America's destiny was assured simply by an abundance of natural resources and inexhaustible human enthusiasm, and by our relative isolation from the malignant problems of older civilizations. The world is indeed one global village. We live among determined, well-educated, and strongly motivated competitors. We compete with them for international standing and markets, not only with products but also with the ideas of our laboratories and neighborhood workshops. America's position in the world may once have been reasonably secure with only a few exceptionally well-trained men and women. It is no longer.
>
> The risk is not only that the Japanese make automobiles more efficiently than Americans and have government subsidies for development and export. It is not just that the South Koreans recently built the

> world's most efficient steel mill, or that American machine tools, once the pride of the world, are being displaced by German products. It is also that these developments signify a redistribution of trained capability throughout the globe. Knowledge, learning, information, and skilled intelligence are the new raw materials of international commerce and are today spreading throughout the world as vigorously as miracle drugs, synthetic fertilizers, and blue jeans did earlier.

Revolutionary advances in communications and travel have brought the world — including its financial markets — closer together than ever before. Harlan Cleveland points out that "a quarter of a century ago, computers and telecommunications began to converge to produce a combined complexity, one interlocked industry that is transforming our personal lives, our national politics, and our international relations *(The Knowledge Executive,* p. 19)." The expanding capacity to store, call up, and transmit information instantaneously around the globe is revolutionizing many of our institutions, including universities. Ease of travel is bringing more Americans than ever before into contact with other countries and other cultures. For example, American business people take more than four million international trips annually, a number that increases every year *(Points of Leverage,* p. 47).

Politically, we live in what is for America a shrinking world, more interdependent, complex, and closely linked than ever before. The industrial and scientific revolutions, the advancement of technology, and the industrialization of labor — what the historian and philosopher Hichem Djait refers to as the forces of "modernity" — are confronting and challenging the world's great civilizations more than those civilizations are confronting and challenging one another.

Demographically, America is undergoing profound changes. This is partly a function of differential birth rates among the nation's many ethnic and racial groups, and partly the result of the mass migration of peoples from Pacific Rim countries to the United States. This development is, as you know, especially pronounced here in California. This state and the nation are experiencing a wave of immigration that rivals that of the turn of the century. Immigration is especially heavy from Pacific Rim countries — Mexico, Central and South America, and Asia. California has been receiving some 30 percent of these newcomers, far out of proportion to its 10 percent of the nation's population. By the year 2000 or shortly thereafter, California is expected to become the first mainland state with a population that consists predominantly of members of minority groups. We are already seeing the effects of this growing diversity in our schools, where minority youngsters make up 49 percent of total K-12 enrollment. By the year 2000, that figure is expected to reach 58 percent.

But it is not only in California that the expanding diversity of our population is evident. Nationally, each of our 25 largest city school systems has a majority of minority students. The United States has always been a diverse society, but that trend is accelerating dramatically.

Therefore we have a double reason for helping to prepare American leadership to function competitively and knowledgeably in what will be a global environment in far greater measure than has been the case for their counterparts throughout our history — the changing nature of the marketplace on the one hand and the changing nature of our society on the other.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, our nation was riding the crest of a wave of interest in international affairs generated by Sputnik. That wave, as you will recall, ebbed in the aftermath of American disillusionment with the Vietnam War. Today, however, we are seeing a resurgence of interest in America's global circumstances. Local and regional groups virtually everywhere are promoting the study of international affairs. We seem to be in the midst of one of our periodic national cycles of waking up to the fact of a larger world.

But I believe that this is a less cyclical and more enduring trend than before, precisely because of the revolutionary advances in communications and travel that are changing our world not temporarily or at the margin, but permanently and at the core.

Our country has been slow to recognize the implications of the growing interdependence of the world, at least compared with other advanced industrial nations, and certainly in stark contrast to the developing nations of south and east Asia, whose economies are rooted in their aggressive participation in world trade, and whose students have been attending our colleges and universities in larger and larger numbers. And although the great increases in the overall number of foreign students that took place in the 1970s have levelled off somewhat, a great imbalance still exists between the number of foreign students who study here and the number of American students who study abroad. In 1985-86, for example, approximately 344,000 foreign students enrolled in American colleges and universities. This compares with an estimated

50,000 U.S. students studying abroad, or less than one-half of one percent of total U.S. university and college enrollments. This is a *real* imbalance in trade!

According to UNESCO figures, one-third of all foreign students worldwide come to study in the United States. So it is clear that a significant portion of the world is making an effort to learn about us. What effort are we making to learn about them?

Nearly a decade ago the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies lamented our "scandalous incompetence in foreign languages" and pointed out that only eight percent of American colleges and universities required a foreign language for admission — a figure that probably has not changed dramatically in the past decade *(Strength through Wisdom,* p. 7). A more recent study made the broader point that "America just does not prepare enough of its own citizens to be true cosmopolitans the way other countries do *(Points of Leverage,* p. 29)."

In spite of the current upsurge of interest in international education, we are not doing as much as we can and should to educate ourselves about the rest of the world. Our colleges and universities have a more urgent and consequential role to play in preparing for these changing times — a point most of the recent studies of undergraduate education have made.

I should add, of course, that some American colleges and universities have excellent programs, some new and some old, in international fields. The University of Minnesota, for example, has a long and distinguished record of campus-to-campus relationships with Chinese universities; Oberlin and Yale also have long-standing, recently revitalized, connections with Chinese institutions. Dartmouth students are encouraged to spend a term studying abroad, and almost three-fourths of its undergraduates do so. Stanford also encourages study abroad — roughly one-third of its undergraduate students have that experience — and sponsors language schools in Taipei and Japan. And of course the University of Southern California has outstanding overseas programs for its students, as well as the distinction of welcoming the largest number of non-immigrant foreign students of any university in the country.

Along with a great many other universities, we at the University of California have been thinking and planning over the past few years about how we can respond to these new circumstances. I wish briefly to describe some of the activities we have undertaken as a result.

First, we are scrutinizing the education we offer our undergraduate students, including the international dimension of that education. Three years ago I asked a task force of UC faculty, students, and administrators to examine lower division education at the University, and to make recommendations about how we can improve general education at the University. One of the overriding emphases of the task force's report was the supreme importance of educating students for a world in which the process of internationalization is developing with breathtaking speed. In the words of the report:

> Most political thinking and most of the relevant academic disciplines have rested on the assumption that the basic unit of social life is the discrete nation, society, or culture. The fact is, however, that the twin phenomena of internationalization and interdependency are rendering this fundamental premise questionable and demand novel ways of thinking, analyzing, and understanding. *(Lower Division Education in the University of California,* p. 30).

Among the report's recommendations are more interdisciplinary courses with a multicultural or global dimension, and more language instruction in areas where our offerings are less developed than one would wish — various Asian languages, for example.

We are dramatically expanding our Education Abroad Program, a universitywide program administered at UC Santa Barbara, which arranges for UC students to spend their junior year at a foreign university. In 1982-83 UC students could choose to study in one of 46 institutions around the world; this year they can select from among 70, and next year they will be able to choose from among 82. Much of the expansion has been in Pacific Rim countries — Australia, China, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, and others — but some has been in other areas as well. In 1986-87 we established a study center at Karl Marx University of Economics in Budapest, and just recently we concluded an historic agreement with Leningrad State University, the first such agreement ever struck between an American university and a Soviet university without the involvement of either government, and only the second of such scope between universities in the Soviet Union and the United States. Nearly 1,200 students are participating in Education Abroad this year — significantly more than were participating even five years ago — and we would like to see even more students take advantage of the opportunity to learn firsthand about another language, another country, another culture.

Second, we are trying to bring the scholarly resources of the

University to bear on questions of importance to California as a Pacific Rim state. The Pacific Rim Research Program, inaugurated in 1986-87, is a major new activity. Faculty on all nine of our campuses work with colleagues at other California universities and at foreign institutions around the Pacific Rim on issues of interest to California — trade, finance, economic development, public policy, cross-cultural communication, and changing technology around the Pacific Rim.

Third, just last fall we opened the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies on UC's San Diego campus, the University's first new professional school in 20 years and the first of its kind in the country to look mostly westward and southward to the nations of the Pacific instead of mostly eastward to Europe. There is a large and expanding need in California and the nation for professionals in business, government, and education who have training in the politics, culture, economics, religions, and languages of the Pacific Rim peoples. We need to begin preparing them now, not next year.

We are very encouraged with the progress of our efforts in this area, but we also recognize that much more needs to be done.

Universities, for example, are the principal places where instruction in the less commonly taught languages — African and Asian languages, for instance — can be found. Our area and language studies programs provide an invaluable source of information and expertise to assist our government and our society to understand an increasingly complex and interrelated world. Taken together, these scholarly resources comprise one of the great intellectual treasure houses of the world.

We need to do a better job of connecting these splendid resources with those outside the academic community who can use them. Business people, for example, can clearly benefit from the specialized knowledge about a particular country's economy, mores, cultural practices, history, and language that area studies centers are so well-equipped to provide. Policymakers in trade or commerce or immigration or many other fields can use this same expertise, if only it can be made more readily available. Richard Lambert, a scholar who has examined our national strengths and deficiencies in international affairs, points out that campus language and area studies centers are a uniquely valuable source of information and expertise that should be better utilized by business people and others.

We need to give more students the unique experience that can only be gained by living, studying, and working in a foreign culture. We need to expand the number of international faculty exchanges between colleges and universities worldwide, not only in the established and familiar countries of Europe but also in the growing and less familiar countries of the developing world. We need to recognize that our colleges and universities are ill-equipped to teach students fluency in a foreign language when their only acquaintance with it — if any — is through a few years spent in high school. Virtually every advanced nation except our own begins foreign language instruction in grammar school; we should do the same. We need to give an international dimension to the education our young people receive, from kindergarten through graduate school, to educate the next generation for the global opportunities and responsibilities it will be theirs to embrace. We need to plan ways to manage the steadily expanding flow of information between and among nations so as to make the best and most appropriate use of it. We need, in sum, to look at our responsibilities and our opportunities in light of the international spirit that, scholars tell us, is an integral characteristic of higher education in the West since its beginnings at Salerno and Bologna, Paris and Oxford and Salamanca.

I began by mentioning the tradition of insularity and isolationism that has had such a profound influence on our history. But we also have powerful counter-examples in the American experience.

For one thing, our universities themselves are the result of an interesting combination of foreign influences — the English undergraduate college, the German research university, even the tradition of lay governance that can be traced directly back to the universities of Scotland and Holland, and indeed stretches all the way back, in one form or another, to the medieval Italian institutions. Thus, American colleges and universities have always had international characteristics that set them apart from the isolationist stream in American history, and that connect them to a long tradition of international influence and contact.

Our political history offers another example. Last year we celebrated the bicentennial of the Constitution, America's most enduring document and its most creative and singularly brilliant expression of global leadership. The framers of the Constitution, as we all know, were counted among the political, social, intellectual, military, agricultural, and business leaders of what had been the colonies. But besides these con-

ventional attributes, they brought to their task a disciplined, informed, and sophisticated appreciation of their culture and the civilization of which they were a part. They possessed not a parochial but a universal view of the world and their place in it. *The Federalist,* for example, reflects the authors' acquaintance with ancient and modern history; it also reflects, in its often stunning prose, Hamilton's love of literature, Madison's sophisticated and almost uncanny comprehension of political philosophy and theory, and Jay's grasp of the law and its civilizing role.

These men were prepared for their task because of the breadth, depth, and richness of their education and training. The tendency today is falsely to assume that commitment, desire, and raw intelligence will prove equal to the task of leadership. They will not. Those were essential attributes for the authors of our Constitution to possess, as they are today for the nation's leadership; but in the end it was what they wrote that counted, and what they wrote was drawn from a fund of knowledge, incisively engaged and brilliantly expressed, sweeping and strategic in its scope and significance, suited not just for their time but for ours as well.

Our nation is in urgent need of that kind of leadership today. We live in a world that neither the founders of the European university nor even the founders of our young nation could have imagined. Yet both created, out of the chaos and turmoil and challenges of their world, institutions that transcended the ephemeral and temporary to endure into our own times. In a crucial sense, both chose a global rather than a parochial perspective. In doing so they chose the road to the future; and so must we.

LIST OF WORKS CITED

A Nation at Risk, Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, David P. Gardner, chairman. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, April, 1983.

Cleveland, Harlan. *The Knowledge Executive.* New York: E. P. Dutton, 1985.

Lambert, Richard D. *Points of Leverage.* New York: Social Science Research Council, 1986.

Lower Division Education in the University of California, University of California Task Force Report, Neil J. Smelser, chair. University of California, 1986.

Rashdall, Hastings. *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages.* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895.

Strength through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability, Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies, James A. Perkins, chairman. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.