

cant amount of information concerning at least one foreign culture and who do not take the entire world, its past as well as its future, into consideration in research and instruction in their own discipline, whatever it may be."

Congressmen have been overwhelmed by the Vietnam issue, but they have been insensitive to the needs of supporting international education. If Americans had an understanding of Vietnamese history, its people and culture, we might not have intervened in their internal affairs. At least we might have been more cautious in formulating our Vietnam policy. But how many Vietnam specialists did we have in the academic community? For that matter, how many Southeast Asian and African specialists are there in government or in the university system? Not many, for we have not yet, as a nation, devoted ourselves to international studies, and so we have not yet caught up with our responsibilities as a world leader. It is not through less communication, but through more, that we can insure either the strength and integrity of American education or the strength and integrity of American foreign policy.

A proposal to remedy the de-emphasis in international education is to establish an effective lobby in Washington, comparable to the American Medical Association and the National Rifle Association. Private organizations that are involved in international education have traditionally acted as independent units and have been primarily concerned with their own particular programs instead of unifying their efforts. Recently, a deep groundswell of discontent in the scientific communities with respect to appropriations prompted President Nixon to add \$10 million to the \$480 million ceiling that had been placed on National Science Foundation research spending. Likewise, prominent organizations such as the Institute of International Education, Foreign Policy Association, and the Experiment in International Living should coordinate their efforts and exert constant pressure on the new Congress to fund the I.E.A. and to restore allocations to the Fulbright program to a decent level. More important, former Fulbright grantees and international centers on college campuses should make an herculean effort to support and preserve these programs. The Councils on World Affairs can play an important role in establishing a "hot line" to Washington by emphasizing the significance of international education in their respective communities. One method of funding international education programs would be to make greater use of the foreign currencies that have accumulated under the Food for Freedom programs. What is required is new legislation appropriating those surplus foreign currencies for use by the State Department to

expand the exchange programs in Europe, Africa, and well as Asia.

If international education is to survive, it desperately needs a spokesman in Washington. If we are to meet today's demands for quality education, support and encouragement are necessary from the Federal Government. The Federal Government should re-think its responsibilities and obligations to international education. In addressing Congress, President Johnson stated, "we can not ignore international education . . . our national interest warrants it, the work of peace warrants it."

Responding to a resolution by former U.S. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, the United Nations proclaimed the year 1970 as "International Education Year." Goldberg stated that "such an observance in 1970 could mobilize energies and inspire world-wide initiatives that would give this subject the priority it deserves." A milestone in this direction would be for Congress to fund the International Education Act which it enacted in 1966 and to restore to the Fulbright program the 72 per cent slash in funds. It is now a fundamental and overwhelming fact of contemporary life that an education without an international dimension is an inadequate education for Americans in this century.

## correspondence

Dear Sir:

For my doctoral dissertation I am making a comparative analysis of the attitudes of the Methodist and Anglican churches of Great Britain and South Africa toward the trade union movement, between 1914 and 1968. I would appreciate hearing from any of your readers who remember actions or statements made by these churches, their members or their clergy, especially with regard to

Great Britain	South Africa
General Strike, 1926	Rand Strike, 1922
World War II Strikes	African Miners' Strikes, 1946
London Busmen's Strike, 1958	Banning of Trade Union Leaders, 1950's & 1960's
Communists in Trade Unions	Communists in Trade Unions
	Nancy van Vuuren
History Department, University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213	

July-August 1969 11