Session Two

Human Resource Development and University Networks in the Asia Pacific Region

Chairman: MUN Beung-Geun, Professor, Pusan National University

Presentation

Edgar PORTER
Associate Dean, School of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Studies
University of Hawaii

Thank you very much. I am going to begin with an introduction to the University of Hawaii's School of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Studies where I serve as the Associate Dean. After that, I am going to talk about a new initiative that has been funded to our school through the Ford Foundation, which deals with area studies. The School of Hawaiian, Asia, and Pacific Studies is comprised of ten area centers, representing Hawaiian studies, Pacific Islands studies, and then practically all of Asia. We have South Asia, Southeast Asia, Philippines, China, Korea, Japan, with two small programs dealing with Russia in Asia and Buddhist studies. So the faculty at our school is for the most part affiliate faculty, although we do have our own core faculty. Ten years ago, the structure of the school was basically the same as what it is today. However, in the past couple of years, while the structure may be the same, the scope has begun to make some changes. The change is coming about with the challenge and it is interesting to note that the challenge came initially to us from our students. We have programs to come and study Chinese studies for example. You study Chinese language and you focus on the history, culture, and language of China. But we had our students coming to student forums and coming to our offices saying, "I am primarily interested in China but I want to know more. I want to know how Vietnam is now relating to China. I want to know how India is now relating to China. I don't want to only know about China." This was somewhat disconcerting to our faculty who have all been trained in single country studies with few exceptions. And there was some discussion about how to deal with this but it did not really get off the ground very much from our faculty. But the students persisted.

Then in 1998, the Ford Foundation issued a challenge to two hundred universities in the United States to re-configure area studies. Of those two hundred universities, not all of them, but most of them did submit grants [for a] competition. We were invited to join in the competition. So we sent in a proposal to re-configure area studies within the University of Hawaii. We were fortunate enough to be one of the thirty universities chosen out of the two hundred to receive an initial, what we now call "stage one," grant to experiment with and look into changing area studies.

The University of Hawaii is a special place and we take advantage of our special nature; and I think the School of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Studies shows this. We have Asian studies, which is well studied around the United States. We have Pacific Island studies, which is under-studied around the United States. So when we in the University of Hawaii and the East-West Center talk about "Asia Pacific," we very clearly and consciously mean Pacific Islands as part of this and not just the borders of ASEAN. And then we have Hawaiian Studies which is a dynamic indigenous people's center that affiliates closely with Maori studies in New Zealand and other native indigenous peoples' studies around the world. It is a growing and, as I said, dynamic center at the University and perhaps during the discussion and question period we can talk about how that plays in with this. I am now going to try to summarize what we are trying to do with the Ford Foundation grant, how we have approached it at the University.

A fundamental irony of the modern discussion on Asia Pacific is that it often ignores the geographical center of that region. This scholarly erasure of the Pacific Islands within the context of "Asia Pacific" illustrates the challenge facing conceptions of the local in an area of globalization. Our project, which we call "Moving cultures, remaking Asia Pacific studies," addresses this blindness and seeks to elucidate an important but little understood reality in the region, that of rapidly evolving relationships between Pacific Islands and Asian states. Pacific island cultures are routinely thought to be disappearing, exemplifying the assumed plight of indigenous peoples world wide. Yet far from disappearing, Pacific Islands people today live in newly independent countries that affirm the value of traditional cultures, and are engaged in movements for de-colonization or indigenous rights; Hawaii and New Zealand are the two that we are most familiar with. We are also looking at the vibrant new diasporic communities in the metropolitan cities in the Pacific Rim, of the people who have moved out of their indigenous land and set up their own lives and cultures within other places. The most significant forces of change affecting islanders today clearly stem from transnational interactions increasingly involving Asian governments, corporations, workers, and tourists. The development policies of some island nation attract large number of migrants from Asia, radically altering the local cultural, social, and physical landscape. This project, the initial project we have just completed, decided to focus on the Pacific island of Palau, a Micronesian Island state, a former colony of Japan from 1914 to 1944, which before independence was administrated by the United States. The demographics of Palau were the attraction to us. There are 17,000 indigenous Palauans. As many as 44,000 tourists go there every year, mostly from Japan and Taiwan. There is a foreign workforce: semi-permanent residents of approximately 6,000, chiefly from the Philippines, but also from Taiwan and Bangladesh. At the same time, about 5,000 Palauans lives outside their native islands and in other Pacific islands and the United States.

Confounding a popular image of island culture isolated in time and space, Palau is entangled in a broad web of social and cultural forces stretching to Tokyo, Taipei,

Manila, Honolulu, Washington D.C. and beyond. Our research examines both the cultural politics of this indigenous island community, inundated by Asian tourists and migrant workers, as well as the Asian cultural forces fuelling its transformation. We hope that this will open a unique window onto Asian society by providing insights into a growing Filipino network around the world and by tracing the circuits of cultural production and economic exchange associated with tourism. International tourism and foreign workers have also created their own what we call "border zones" of considerable significance. So what we are trying to do here basically is see not just how Palau is affected. The goal is to see how the Philippines is affected, how Taiwan is affected, how Japan is affected so that the culture on both sides is no less important than the other. I want to stop here for a minute to talk about some of the problems inherent in this kind of study. These are the problems you would hear from an administrator, which is what I am in helping to oversee some of this.

We had, when we first started to do this, to initially address the issue of "are we just doing the same thing that has always been done under a different name?" We did not want to be accused of, and we did not want to participate in a thing where we just parachuted into Palau and looked at this culture like anthropologists or sociologists or social scientists had done for decades. We did not want to be put in that position of having just a case study. So that was a sensitive issue that we addressed and we did it through close collaboration with Palau Community College and with universities throughout Asia. We were very keen to have the Community College in Palau to be a part of this. So that is the first thing, true collaboration.

The second one was getting our faculty who were not Pacific Islands faculty interested in this project. We had initial meetings and the faculty – the Asian faculty, not all of them – would come to the table and say "Why should I be interested in a small Pacific island, my field is Vietnam," or "my field is Japan." So it took reminding them what our students have been saying – that they want to know more than the single country; they want to know how all of this dynamic works together – to draw certain faculty in. In fact some did not want to participate. They felt it was taking them away from their primary research, which was based on a previous generation, frankly, of area studies. So that was the second problem.

The third problem was actually crossing another border. We have crossed one border here and that is between Asian countries and Pacific Islands countries. The other border is crossing disciplines: that is the old problem that most of us have in research universities, especially in the United States of getting our social scientists and our humanities faculty and our science faculties to collaborate at a more in-depth level and to analyze what is actually going on. One of the ways we did this is through popular culture: for example for Palau, we look at music and the influence of the popular culture. So those are some of the problems. We had our own internal border to cross, as we try to cross the others.

I am going to try to explain now stage two. We "did" Palau in the sense that we had conferences in Palau between faculty from around Asia and the United States and Pacific Islands to talk about, basically, tourism, the influence of tourism, the influence of foreign workers, the influence of capital pouring into Palau, and the problem of how the Palauans are responding to this, and also how the countries that these people were from are being affected. That is the key here. So we had conferences there. We had an undergraduate initiative. This is primarily at this time an undergraduate initiative. The focus is on, and the goal is on creating a more dynamic undergraduate experience, which will then find its way into the graduate programs later.

So we did that for one year. The Ford Foundation invited those thirty universities who received the first grant to apply for a second more substantial grant. The first grant was 50,000 dollars. We were told about two months ago that our second grant, which is an expansion of the work in Palau, has been funded at 350,000 dollars. And so we are now to about to embark on this in a major way. We are one of the 18 universities chosen out of those 30. So we felt quite pleased about that. I think part of the reason the University of Hawaii did receive it is because it is somewhat unique. There is no one else looking at the issue of Asia and the Pacific Islands as we are and it must look somewhat intriguing to the reviewers.

So briefly on the second grant which is about to begin. Stage one explored the idea that area studies could be re-made by examining hybrid cultural sites created by capital, people and ideas flowing across geo-political borders. Stage two builds upon stage one accomplishments to institutionalize an approach to Asia Pacific studies that focuses on the challenges moving cultures present to notions of the local in an era of globalization. Activities are aimed at the site where the culture of area studies is reproduced, and that is the classroom. What we are hoping to do in this second one is primarily focus on curriculum, that is changing the way we teach area studies, not just changing the way certain researchers look at area studies. Within the University's School of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Studies, we find that we are ready for this. Currently we have only one cross-listed course, taught by a Pacific island expert and an Asian expert, that came out of stage one of the Ford Grant. That was the initial move towards changing the curriculum. Again I stop to talk about the problems of doing this. Again it is faculty having to be convinced that students need to see the world like this. We have some creative faculty members who have started this, and we trying to pull along some of the others. We will have multi-sited virtual classrooms in the places that will be studied in the Pacific and in Asia, as well as the University of Hawaii. An entirely new cluster of courses at the University of Hawaii will expose students in Hawaiian studies, Asian studies, and Pacific Islands studies to the regions' moving cultures, establishing a vibrant intellectual commons where these programs intersect. So one of the goals is to create within this new curriculum new core courses that could be team-taught by people who cross these different boundaries to show the connectedness between all these programs.

The moving culture initiative embraces the specialized focus on local languages, cultures, and histories that distinguishes area studies from other forms of inquiry by adding a comparative dimension to complement the more usual single country or regional approach. The initiative also recognizes the dynamic relationship between place and culture often ignored in traditional area study practices. It is both collaborative and reflexive, encouraging participants to cross conventional, institutional, and conceptual boundaries, engage in meaningful conversations with partners and studied communities – that is again collaboration with those cultures that we are going to be studying on an equal footing – and confront the powerful place-based discourses of the field of study itself. We hope to use the moving cultures approach to remake Asian Pacific Studies at the University of Hawaii and produce a model for area studies elsewhere. Our integrated program of intervention and activities is designed to effect fundamental institutional change. When we were talking about this, those of us who put this proposal together spoke in those terms. We want a fundamental change, we want an institutional change in how we look at the area – Asia and the Pacific Islands. Specifically we aimed at three things initially. One is innovative pedagogy: we are going to teach it differently. Over the next three years, we propose to build a new undergraduate core curriculum for the University School of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Studies that focuses on the flows of capital, on the flows of people, and on the flows of ideas linking parts of the region and the moving cultures that they create. We take advantage of new technologies to establish multi-sited virtual classrooms with those areas that we will be working with, which will include in the new project Fiji, Palau and the Philippines, with each playing a vital role equally in the construction of this pedagogy.

Second, we want to create a new intellectual commons. Faculty and students with expertise in specific languages and cultures will meet on this intellectual commons to study the trans-national flows that increasingly affect cultural forms throughout the region. An entirely new cluster of required courses will expose these issues to our students.

And third, of particular interest I think to this conference, is international exchange between faculty and students at the University of Hawaii and their counterparts at other regional educational institutions. We have, of course like every one in this room, been doing academic exchanges for years. We want to infuse our exchange programs now with this new and still evolving form of how to look at area studies.

Hawaii as I said is a particularly unique place to do a project like this. We are going to continue our collaboration with Palau Community College. But we are going to pursue similar flows of capital, migrant workers, and tourists from Asia to two other Pacific island destinations. I mentioned Fiji, but also we include Hawaii in this mix. Both of these places are what we call Asia Pacific "border zones" exhibiting all the tensions and contradictions inherent in the contemporary study of place and culture. Regional cultural boundaries intersect in Hawaii in quite complex ways for example, just to let you know a

little bit about the state. Indigenous Hawaiians represent less than 14% of the students on our campus, far outnumbered by those of Asian ancestry – 52% of our students are of Asian ancestry. Caucasians are 19%. Within these groups, of course, there is great diversity. So, we do not want to leave out where we live, as a part of this whole mix: for example there is a small Palauan community within Hawaii that we will be talking with. We have people at the University and within the state from Fiji also. And of course the Philippines are also well represented in Hawaii.

Fiji, whose population is divided equally between indigenous Fijians and descendants of migrant workers from Asia, hosts the University of the South Pacific, a regional university with 11 satellite campuses in other Pacific Islands countries and considerable experience in using communications. So we will be working directly, not only with Palau Community College, but with the University of the South Pacific. We will also be working in the Philippines, on the southern island of Mindanao. The Philippines is connected to the migrant migration to Hawaii and to Palau, and Mindanao is an integral part of East ASEAN growth area.

If stage one demonstrated the value of moving cultures, looking at things differently through an intellectual intervention – that is, through something of a research intervention – it also indicated the limitations of an approach to reforming area studies practices strictly through a focus on research. Stage two focuses on the curriculum development and pedagogy as the main engines of institutional change.

Let me conclude with some of the specifics that we hope to accomplish. A team of faculty and students which we call the Fiji team will work with counterparts of the University of the South Pacific in Fiji during the 1999/2000 academic year to plan a collaborative course to be offered on an experimental basis in Fall 2000. The course called "Moving cultures, place, identity and globalization in Asia Pacific" will examine topics such as migration, multi-culturalism, tourism, globalization, and popular culture. Classes will be scheduled to run roughly parallel on the two campuses. All course materials, readings and student assignment will be posted on a class web site which will also hold faculty and student moderated discussions in real time. Video conferencing will also be part of this. The Philippines team will develop a revised version of moving cultures, place, identities and globalization in Asia Pacific in conjunction with the University in Mindanao. We are also involved in close consultation with our counterparts in the planning place. The Palau Community College collaboration reflects the particular needs articulated by faculty and staff in stage one. We learned a lot in stage one. The Palau team will explore ways of bringing Palau into the virtual conversation on place and identity. One of the problems we had when we worked with Palau was that we could not even do e-mail very effectively. E-mail would be backlogged three or four days sometimes before we could get through and so communication problems were something we had to overcome and be very creative about, but we are working through that and they are upgrading. We actually sent a communications expert for six months to Palau to

work with the Palauan Community College officials to improve their communication technology so that we could continue this work. In addition to these individual projects, there will be periodic conferences where all of the participants come together where we will reflect and support each other, in improving how we approach various studies. So I will finish with that and later we can have some discussion. Thank you.

Discussion

Chairman: Thank you very much Professor Porter. Professor Porter presented some excellent ideas about moving cultures. According to Professor Porter, the concept of geo-political borders is changing. Borders are shifting in the borderless world. He presented three basic key ideas: on innovative pedagogy for area studies; on how to create a new intellectual commons in the Asia Pacific region; and how to institutionalize regular international exchanges between faculty and their students. This is a more concrete and in-depth context that we will have to discuss in more detail later. Professor Lewis will give his ideas as a discussant.

Professor Lewis: Thank you very much. I think that there is an interesting interaction and contrast at the same time between what Professor Porter has spoken about and what I am going to, in that he represents a project that is focusing on undergraduate students, while I am going to talk largely about the needs of master's level graduate students. And what I am going to do in the time allotted to me is just give you a very brief portrait of my institution which is the School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University in New York, and then tell you about a particular project that we have in cooperation with the government of Vietnam that I think suggests yet another possibility, another paradigm, for increased networking in the Asia Pacific region. The School of International and Public Affairs offers master's degrees. The principal program in the school is the Master in International Affairs Program. We have about six hundred students. And then we have a smaller program of about 300 offering the Master in Public Administration. But the two programs are in many ways integrated. Students study an inter-disciplinary curriculum and this is a school – it's over fifty years old – that is very much internationalized. In this past year we had 77 countries represented and 41% of our students came from outside the United States. So it is very much an international student body. The average age of students entering our masters program is 28, so that we more or less insist on a minimum of three or four years of work experience in related fields. We train people from ministries, government organizations, NGOs and private companies, both in the United States and abroad. Of course we also train individuals who sponsor themselves. In the context of this particular conference and the themes of this conference, I should say that our approach at Columbia to cooperation, both in this region and in other regions, is a little bit different from that of some of the institutions here.

We have not focused very much at all, and are not involved very much at all, with exchanges. There are a number of logistical reasons for this. One is cost, that is that New York is such an expensive place that achieving any kind of parity with exchange partners is always very difficult. The cost of tuition in American graduate education in

particular is extremely high. Our tuition – just tuition, no living cost – for the coming year is 27,000 dollars per year, so this is a staggering sum of money for many Americans and people abroad as well. Secondly, we have stayed away from exchanges because in fact there are what you would really call human resource problems involved. Faculty exchanges create holes in our curriculum, that are not easily filled. There are difficulties in obtaining housing. There are difficulties in re-locating families of faculty for short periods of time. And all of these are problems. And finally the fact that unlike undergraduate programs where students are in attendance for four years, our students come to New York for two years and in some cases, if they have advanced degrees previous to their study in Columbia, for only one year. So it is not a very attractive proposition to them to shorten their time in New York by going elsewhere, except for a brief study tour.

Our goal instead has been to identify and address needs of partners in Asia and in other regions that specifically address the needs, and particularly human resource needs, of institutions abroad; and to participate in cooperation with them, not on an exchange basis, but rather on a project-based or a project-focused basis. So, the project I am going to speak about in a minute in Vietnam I am involved in not strictly as a representative of my university, but rather as an individual that has been given very temporary leave, a few weeks at a time, here and there, to work on this project along with my colleagues from other universities in the United States, including the American University. The Dean of that school, Louis Goodman, recently accompanied me to a conference in Hanoi.

So this is a somewhat different approach. This is not inter-institutional but rather involves individuals working on a project-by-project basis. We have focused in the Vietnam project on three stages of development. Our partner in Vietnam is the Institute of International Relations, which is the teaching and training arm of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the government of Vietnam. It is located in Hanoi. It has for a number of years had a large (about 8-900 students) undergraduate BA degree program which until recently was a five year BA and is now a four year BA. But the problem that the Vietnamese have faced in the last five years is that they do not have the capacity to offer graduate professional training such as the training that Columbia and American University and other American professional masters programs offer. In view of this problem, we decided to proceed, and it is a coincidence that the funding for this is has largely come also from the Ford Foundation and is quite substantial. But we proceeded to work with our partners in Hanoi to design and implement a new Master of International Affairs program in Hanoi. And the idea behind this is really very simple, and that is really a long-term project. We are at the early phases of it, although we have been working for five years, and that is to work with our Vietnamese partners, so that Vietnam can develop the capacity and the institutional capacity to train their own diplomats and experts in international affairs in the coming generations.

In the past, before the end of the Cold War of course, Vietnam sent most of its experts for training in Russia and Cuba and to a lesser extent Eastern Europe and some of

the Western European countries. Since the end of the Cold War, most of the professionals coming for training are increasingly in the Southeast Asian region, in Australia, and in the U.S. and the U.K. We wanted to do something, to design a project that would break what you might call this cycle of dependence on foreign training, and build an institution from the ground up in Vietnam, that could provide training to larger numbers of people who could then go into not only the government, but ultimately the growing private sector and non-governmental sector in Vietnam. Clearly both sectors are going to be significant in the future. They are still in their infancy right now.

So we have developed a program with several stages. The early stages involve what we called short course, three months courses taught by visiting professors from the United States and Canada offered at the Institute, but not just for employees of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but also [for people] from other parts of the Vietnamese government as well as local government and municipal government around the country. These courses were thematic. Each was focused on a specific issue: political developments, economic issues, trade issues and each of them had a slightly different theme. And this was the first phase. The next phase, which we are well into now, involves actual curriculum design. We have had a series of workshops on this, both in the United States and in Vietnam. As we speak, this week, we have a visit from a small team of experts in the area of library and information technology who will be working to help the institution develop capacity in that area. And finally, something that is also on-going is that we are going to send, starting this fall, ten young faculty from the Institute of International Relation for masters and doctoral studies in the United States. And they will then return and comprise the core faculty of the new masters program. There are participating institutions: Columbia University, Syracuse University, the University of Washington in Seattle, Johns Hopkins, and the Fletcher School. Next year there will be a second batch and I think American University will be involved as well.

It is really a collaborative project. A number of American universities are working together to provide this training that will then enable, in fact, Vietnam not to have to send us their experts for training in the future. So this is a very deliberate attempt to build institutional capacity. There are three main elements, and not surprisingly they are elements that are similar in many ways to the elements that Dean Porter mentioned as the focus of some of the reforms in the University of Hawaii. The first of these is curriculum development. We are working very closely with our colleagues on a draft of curriculum. We are sharing ideas, trying to determine which topics and which approaches will be most specifically useful to Vietnamese professionals. Secondly, we are focusing very much on innovative pedagogy as they are in Hawaii. That is I think we all agree and I think we will hear more later today about the need to develop new ways of teaching a broad range of international topics. In Vietnam as in many other countries, the tradition is strictly a lecture tradition and we are working very hard to design a program from the beginning that utilizes more collaborative and more participatory modes of instruction.

And finally, we are also involved as I mentioned before in essentially human resource development, that is training a new generation of Vietnamese professors, analysts and teachers who will be able to offer training which right now is only offered outside Vietnam.

I should also mention that one of the elements that we have worked into the structure has to do with cooperation with Vietnam's ASEAN partners. This is obviously a very important element and we have proposed building the curriculum around short term visits from partner institutions around the ASEAN region and of course the Institute of International Relations as well as other Vietnamese institutions – I notice the Vietnam National University mentioned as part of the APU network – are also involved in similar relationships. This is also very important. Our idea here though is to bring in working professionals: diplomats, administrators, people from NGOs as well as in some cases from the private sector, to offer practitioner-based training programs, not purely academic ones.

So, in a nutshell, this is a project we have been involved in and will continue to be involved in. It suggests, as I said, a somewhat different model than the inter-institutional models that we have been discussing so far. And I look forward to hearing your responses and your ideas in the sessions that follows. Thank you very much.

Chairman: Thank you very much Professor Lewis. Professor Lewis gave an excellent case study that he is doing now. We will share more ideas later on these case studies.

Professor Fellizar: First, I would like to express our appreciation to Hotta-sensei and Dr. Sakamoto and the rest of the APU people for giving us, myself and my wife, an opportunity to participate in this important conference.

What I will do is not share any model, but to try to distill some ideas coming from the discussion of Professor Porter and try to relate this to the way we should be thinking about searching for international networks, to enhance global education on this side of the world. And while listening to Professor Porter, I was reminded of a famous American educator and writer, Paul Goodman, who said that the philosophical aim of education must be to get an individual out of his isolated class into humanity. This is what the project in moving cultures is all about and we are interested to listen to him.

And also again another line I borrowed from E.A. Hubbard, when he observed that the world is moving so fast these days that the individual who says it can't be done is generally interrupted by someone doing it. Indeed these are challenges that education is confronted with at present and in the future. And the challenges are brought about by the emergence of technology – educational technology, but most importantly information technology. Of course there are rapid changes. An example of that would be the changes in culture, the diffusion of culture around the world. But most importantly the challenge to global education would be fewer resources: more and more we realize that resources

are not abundant any more and therefore you will have to manage them efficiently to meet our objectives of education. Of course we see now that the third challenge is the rapid, changing, and diverse population of our students. We see students who are professionals who decided to change career midway and we have to provide them with access to education just the same.

We also have this morning realized that the world is getting smaller and the problems are inter-related, and therefore while they have local origins and causes, they may have to be addressed globally. That is the thinking behind thinking globally and acting locally, and addressing them, using local strength and resources. So given this challenge, I propose that all of these would have academic and educational implications. And therefore it behooves us to think of education as more of a system, more so when we consider global education. And looking at education in a more comprehensive and holistic manner would require us to look at the different sub-systems of education. I would like to call our attention to this as I discuss them later because I believe that we can only create changes and innovations as well as modifications where needed only if we understand more or less the value system we are working with. And as we are introducing innovation, there are at least three areas on which we can focus our discussion. One is trying to improve governance of education, either in university or globally. How do we mange education, at university level, at the national level, at the regional level? The second would be, how do we raise the standard of education? Knowing the diversity in stages of development of different countries, we have to come up with certain standards. And of course we have to understand the pervasive role that technology has in this changing world. We talk of virtual teaching, virtual classrooms and all facilities. But of course these are only engineering means and not necessarily a panacea for solving educational problems. And we have to look at the values. What are the values that we are looking here? We in education would like, of course, to achieve access and to provide access to all people. And we would like to propose that there should be equity to access to education: women, children, the handicapped, black, blue, white, yellow, they should have equal access to education. But we have to ensure quality and at the same time provide efficiency in the use of our resources. And of course as Ed Porter said, we have to be relevant to problems that will be confronting the regions of the world, as well as individual countries.

So looking at the system, as I said, first I would like to think of the first sub-system, which will be the clients and the customers. I would like to make a distinction between who the clients are and who the customers are of our educational systems. I like to believe the customers will be the students who come to us. But the clients are the people like Ford Foundation, like Rockefeller Foundation, like your governments who will support scholarships for the customers. Given the resources are limited, it will be good to understand who the clients are. And of course the third one will be the beneficiaries who are the people in the community, the people in the region, the people in

the countries who are directly and indirectly benefited by educating a certain percentage in the population, so that people can go back and instruct them in their proper places.

The second element of global education that I would like to look at would be products and services. And again we talk about moving cultures. I believe that you are not only after the curriculum. You are not only after research support but of course you would like to come up with better graduates. The end point would be the graduates. So for my mind I was just asking: what must be the profile of an undergraduate or graduate student in the 21st century given that he will play in a different technological arena in the years to come? And there will be cosmopolitan graduates or professionals. So I am thinking about the ability and the utility of their knowledge for existing problems. The third element in my system would be the strategies. Now we are talking about networking as one of those. We talk about creating open universities. We talk about more ties and distributed learning modes for education, and of course in the case of the East-West Center in the University of Hawaii, it will be the joint program in area studies.

So we are coming up with different sets of strategies for collaboration before educating our people. The fourth element I would like to introduce here would be the process. Since yesterday I have been talking with some people who raised the issue of whether we ready for this. Because this would have implications as to our hiring, to our recruitment, to the privileges, to the compensation, but most importantly because I am an administrator, I would like to think the greater burden lies not so much with the faculty members but more for the support administrative staff who would do the accounting, would do the reporting, and support you people. Especially when you have multiple donors coming in and our accounting facility and systems are not attuned to this kind of reporting. Our experience here would be that a grant from the Asian Development Bank requires one kind of financial reporting, Rockefeller Foundation requires another, and Australian Aid also has another format, so that people in the university are confronted with an administrative overload. At times, this creates irritation because they cannot support efficiently and effectively the needs of the faculty and the researcher. Within the process also, I would like to highlight the need for looking at the proper link between research and instruction and which is the tail and which is the head. At times in certain universities, it is a research-driving curriculum and at times it is curriculum-driving research, and I think we have to come up with proper combinations when and where the need arises ...

Now when we talk networking and international alliances, I think we have to be clear that when we do research we do this to support instruction. And as I said, in some cases it will be the other way around. Of course I said there will be a need for more resources and resources are just limited, especially when the demands are so conflicting and so varied at times in universities. And if you are working with universities with limited resources, this would probably post one of the danger signals, where we can work together and try to come up with some intervention.

Of course we will say that one process-oriented or organizational management related issue would be creating borderless small and flexible organization as well. In most countries in the developed world, they are now into what they call "sub-contracting" or "out-sourcing" of services, so that given [new] programs they do not undesirably enlarge their organization, but they contract services. And this could also be true in cases of professors. You can commission them on a project or program basis. And I would like to see here also professors with multiple appointments, I mean appointed by different universities for a project or borrowed for a project. In my university for instance, where I have been a professor for twenty-seven years, right now I am not in active teaching but I am seconded to a research institution like SEARCA. Before SEARCA, I served as vice-minister for science in my country, and again I was appointed as seconded staff to the national government, and this gives professors also the chance to widen or broaden our horizons.

I will now move to the fifth element in my systems perspective, and it is people. Many times we refer to problems like "inter-disciplinary conflict," the "turf issue" and how you manage this. I for one had a very painful experience doing this when I was Dean for six years in the College of Human Ecology at the University of the Philippines. When you talk about human ecology, this is the interaction of men and the environment and you have people from social science and natural science. And in terms of creating a universal language, in terms of terminologies and concepts, it will take you about a week or month discussing a lot of things here, and you realize you are not getting anywhere. So the best way we did this is to actually work on concrete problem. No matter how you define your concept, poverty is still poverty, and pollution is still pollution. Come and let us work together. So an area-based study is a good way of putting these people together.

The other one would be how do you re-tool, re-skill, or reorient our faculty and our staff to the new paradigm. And this is one concern that networking should really tackle, because networking and working together in inter-disciplinary areas studies are new things that our faculty are not trained to do, traditionally that is. So that, given this particular perspective, let me now distill this by coming up with at least seven lessons to learn from the presentation of Ed Porter.

One is to try to define global education. To my mind, what he is saying is, global education is addressing global concerns, through global means and local strengths. That is what you are trying to say, if I get it.

The second lesson I got from you – maybe you can answer this or discuss it later – is that there will always be costs involved in networking and alliances. The issue here is, who bear the cost, and on the other side, what will be the value added of networking and alliances to specific institutions?

The third and possibly very sensitive issue here would be the issue of sustainability. And once you talk about a grant, a donation, or an endowment fund, the question that comes to my mind is, how long can your network support itself or go on

when the Ford Foundation grant is spent? When the money is gone, what are the sustainability mechanisms so that the partnership would go on and on? And we have experienced this a lot in my own country, in my own university. When faculty members have a lot of honoraria they are so active, because they have extra bread to help from the project. But once this is over, then the program too suffers.

The fourth one is developing flexible, adaptable, and importable pedagogical language and methods. That's what Ed is saying. How do we transport learning using understandable language and methods across cultures and across universities?

Of course the fifth one which I have mentioned, and would like to discuss in length, would be the issue and pains of trans-disciplinary turf issues in research and instruction.

And the sixth, again as I mentioned, would be the role of research in action programs as well as vis-a-vis instruction, and how best can we enrich the two sides of the coin, their complementarity.

And of course the last one is again the role of technology. Some people are so enamored with information technology that educators have tended, or are tempted to believe that IT is the answer to everything. But these are just mere engineering solutions to human problems. And as educators were are working on human problems, and improving the human lot. So again for international networking and global education I would again refresh my mind with this thought, that truly and indeed the aim of education is to get involved in the problems of humanity, and that in the classrooms. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Fellizar: I am going to speak from a graduate student's point of view. I am enrolled in the Open University of the University of Philippines. This is a distance education program. And you know that the geography of the Philippines is such that we are composed of different islands, so we have an open university that is based in Los Banos, but we have learning centers in different parts of the country. We have a graduate school program with different courses. It is just a four-year old program at the moment so we have just started. But I know that we have what we call learning centers, because once a month the students come together, if they can, to discuss whatever lessons were given. The first meeting you are given your modules and you are given your instructions with your assignments, and each month for one semester you are supposed to meet with your tutor. And I was thinking that if this could be applied globally, maybe this will be a cost cutting benefit because you can make use of the local universities which are qualified to teach, and possibly network in that sense. Los Banos, where we are, is a learning center, and almost all regions have learning centers. But we are actually studying the same modules, we will be taking the same examinations. So these are our gauges as to the learning procedure, whether we have been taught properly by ourselves and by the tutors. And additional teaching materials are given on the internet if you have a computer, or by

fax if you have a fax machine, and if is not too costly by long distance telephone, and by mail of course – whichever. So I was thinking that this could be one of the ideas where, instead of sending people to go to different countries, like faculty members for example, who you have to relocate and they have to bring their families, it might be better if you could make use of the locals in learning more about each other.

Professor Brenner: Let me offer a suggestion based on a model in the United States that I know about, a very new model that may be applicable to the resource problem that you have described. You know, the United States is a country of many different ethnic cultures, as we call them, different cultures. The teaching of children in the United States for the most part has focused on the dominant culture, the white Anglo-Saxon culture – German, English, but with very little regard for the contributions that have been made by many groups that have migrated to the United States. There is a new project that we are trying to develop at American University in conjunction with another organization that will provide materials for each state – there are fifty states in the United States – to write its own history focusing on the contribution of each immigrant group. The main piece of material that we will provide is a basic history that suggests how in each period of the United States, you can incorporate the contributions of immigrant groups. And each state will write its own history. They will receive money from American University. American University will obtain this money by selling advertising on a website that corporations will pay for. And then money will be given to each state to write the history for each state. In turn, this history will be put on the website, so that a student in Maryland can learn about immigrant groups in New York or California, etc. This provides a kind of model that in fact could be applied globally where you have not only countries but sub-regions writing histories that are from the perspective of that region. But that becomes available to everyone on the network. And the resource problem and the very important problem of sustainability that Dr. Fellizar mentioned is overcome because in fact these corporations want to have advertising space on what is called the "portal" of your website. And so they will pay for this. They want the opportunity to expand their market. And so they pay for this. You do not need foundation money. It provides the resources available. And it is a way of thinking about developing networks and using the information from each sub-region that can contribute to the whole.

Professor Porter: One of the beneficiaries you left out was the private sector. In the United States especially they are not paying the costs of a lot of this stuff but they get a lot of the benefits. And when it comes to advertising, I know the way they pro-rate things it is about ten cents a hit. They look at your website to see how many visits, and they will say, this is how much advertising we will give you based on the number of hits you get. So all of a sudden we are in a popularity contest of advertising to get more people to visit your website because that means you get more money in advertising to support your

education. And all of a sudden the line between academic freedom, freedom of research, starts to get a little bit compromised by wanting to advertise, making sure that for example my case studies do not criticize a company too much who is giving us money. I think there is a real problem there of keeping our freedom while at the same time raising these funds from the private sector who are the beneficiaries of a lot of this. I wonder if you could respond to this, especially in the Philippines, and how you react to that there.

Professor Fellizar: Right, it is a reality that indeed the private sector has a lot to gain from research and from the graduates that we are giving them. But they hardly foot the bill for the university or for the education. Now one modality we are using in the Philippines is actually based round vocational education. We have what we call the "actualtec program" where students while learning in the schools are engaged on the shop floor for actual experience, and part of the tuition is being paid by the private sector, by the shops. But this is very good because as soon as the students – the good ones – graduate, they are absorbed by the company. But this sort of advertising we have not yet done this in our country, except that there the trend now is [towards] private education especially in higher education. At the graduate level, the private universities are doing very well, in fact much better than the state universities at this point because they are able to exact higher fees than the state universities, which are basically [run on] the funds provided by government, and it is through legislation. Like in my university, the state university, our facilities are actually of Jurassic origin and perspective at this point. But if you look at universities like Ateneo de Manila or De La Salle University, you will find that they are more of the state of the art kind of facility. So again in bringing this home to our networking objective, there is a kind of a balancing needed working with a private university as against a government or state university, especially in developing countries. We have to do some good balancing there.

[Unidentified speaker]: I just want to ask Professor Porter, related to what we discussed in the project that you have been working in Palau, is there any involvement of the private sector in that island?

Professor Porter: Not initially. There is involvement with the government of Palau. The only involvement with the private sector initially is the study of tourism, which is a little sensitive to the private sector that is involved in the tourism. So they have not been brought in yet at a very detailed level. But I would see that down the road [it will be] tourism and also construction. It is developers from Taiwan in Palau that are actually the prime forces in driving the economy right now through building new five star hotels and turning it into a tourist attraction for people. So the discussion has been elementary at this level with them. And it is also rather sensitive.

Mr. Omori: I was very much impressed by listening to Professor Porter's discussion on re-making Asia Pacific studies currently going on at the University of Hawaii. I was just wondering then in relation to the current session's topic of human resources development, what kind of a career objective that the student of your program might have? In other words, what kinds of job opportunities are available for the graduate of your program, especially in Asia Pacific Studies? Thank you.

Professor Porter: Well there is always the question that I hate to have to answer when you deal with area studies. I deal personally with this question a lot in counseling and advising students who come to me, and say "Why should I get a degree in Asian studies?" for example. And you have to separate Asian studies, Pacific Islands studies and Hawaiian studies, which I will do in just a minute. In the Asian studies area, the first thing I tell them is, because you have to love doing this. That is the first thing that you have to know before you want to do this, because there are no guaranteed jobs for any area specialist. The second thing I tell them is that if you do love this and you really want to spend your life dealing with the issues involved, then it is our job at the university to network you. You use us as the network, we are very well connected around the region and so we will help you to do that. We will help guide you in the direction you want to go, be it business or academic or non-profit. So it is not a very satisfactory answer but I think it is a realistic answer that initially people do not go into this because they are very focused on that exact job they want out there to make a lot of money. They have to really want to do this. That is Asian studies. Pacific Islands studies is quite different. More and more the students going into Pacific Islands studies are Pacific Island students, that is the people from the Pacific Islands who come to the University of Hawaii to get a degree and to work while outside of their island population. To go back in, most of them are focused on governmental work, these emerging countries in the Pacific. And then in Hawaiian studies, of course it is the indigenous people of Hawaii, and their focus is basically to re-capture and re-invigorate their own culture through a lot of them going to education, and they also have their sights on government positions.

Chairman: I think the East West Center is the melting pot of Eastern and Western cultures so I would like to ask Professor Valencia if he has any ideas on this kind of topic.

Dr. Valencia: Actually the East West Center is quite different from the institutions represented here in the sense that we neither teach courses or offer degrees. However, we have been involved for many years in international exchanges, education and some forms of training, particularly multi-disciplinary as you observe. Now coming to this conference has been an education because I and my colleagues have been doing this for many years. But we haven't stepped back – or least I haven't very often – to think about why we love the thing and what we are doing. And listening to you people who are responsible for

doing precisely that has been very educational. One of the issues that I would like to put forward, which is something that we have had difficulty with over the years, is the question of standards. When we gather in students from all over Asia, from the Russian Far East to the small Pacific Islands, from Mongolia, Laos and Vietnam to some of the more advanced countries of the region, we find a rather mixed bag of students. It is true that we have requirements in TOEFL and for graduate record examinations. But, nevertheless, these are not always good indicators of how well the students will progress, of how serious they are about multi-cultural experiences, multi-cultural relations, how flexible they may be to adjust to this situation, and frankly how well they perform in graduate schools. And while we want every one we support to obtain a degree and go back as happy and productive participants, frankly this is not the case. We have cases more frequently than we would like where the student not only does not finish, but either does not go back, or does go back rather unhappily. And this is the downside of education programs, the downside of cross-cultural education, and so I raise this because we cannot ensure 100% success naturally. But how can we improve, shall we say, our record of bringing people and supporting people in these exchanges, in these educational programs that are truly valuable [so as to] truly succeed and truly advance the idea of what we are trying to do?

Professor Fukui: Columbia University's program in Hanoi is very interesting and meaningful, but I want to know the incentive for Columbia University as an institute tin this sort of project. Second, [what] is the incentive for individual scholars who are sent to Hanoi and teach the courses over there?

Professor Lewis: First of all, as I indicated, this is really not officially a Columbia University project. Columbia allows the project to borrow me periodically as well as other scholars. I think our incentive is that – I did not mention this but I should have – we have in fact received over a dozen young Ministry of Foreign Affairs officials from Vietnam over the last five or six years to do our masters degree and they are now back working in the Vietnamese government. This has been a terrific enrichment of our intellectual and international community at CIPA. But we frankly see this as a cycle that at some point or another in the case of Vietnam – and the Vietnamese feel this way also – needs to be broken; that if we do not begin now with a long term project like this, that 20 or 30 years from now, Vietnam will still be in the position of having to rely on other institutions in other countries to train their professionals. And that is not a good situation. I need not say that this is also very costly; and the amount of disruption in terms of the personal lives and careers of the young Vietnamese professionals, who have to often go away from their homes and families for two years or more, also makes this a less attractive proposition of continuing this forever. So that really is our incentive. A few of my colleagues have made fun of me and said that "you are going to take business away

from us; we are going to lose our customers," but I think this is a worthy goal nevertheless. Individual scholars and people like myself are interested because this affords us an opportunity to be involved in a very tangible way in just the kind of project that Dr. Fellizar mentioned, that is a project that is in the long term going to be sustainable. When the Ford Foundation money does end, hopefully this will be a project that has produced a new curriculum, a newly trained faculty, and it will be the responsibility and the mission of the Institute of International Relations to carry that on themselves. So this is a project that was designed from the beginning with the notion of sustainability as one of its criteria.

Professor Braddock: I just like to make one observation on that: roughly two years ago, by arrangement with the Ministry of Education and Training in Vietnam. I visited virtually all the universities in the north and the south, particularly Hanoi and Ho Chi Min City. And it seems to me that every single one of them – that is all the significant ones, excluding the minor and purely vocational universities – had programs that had been funded by foundations in the United States and Europe such as Swedish funded programs, and British ODA programs. Every single one of them was facing the problem that the money had already run out or was about to run out, and they were pleading for other institutions to take them over on an aid basis. The Australian government made the decision that it was not going to pick up those programs but had some initiatives that it might consider. I wonder if you could comment on that Professor Lewis, about the sustainability aspects, because I think that is a fundamental issue that is affecting not just Vietnam but many of the developing countries, and programs which have been set up, some of which have shown quite considerable degrees of excellence, are suddenly collapsing.

Professor Lewis: This is of course an important issue. I am not in the least surprised to hear firstly that you encountered so many programs because they seem to be proliferating everywhere in Vietnam as well as some of the neighboring countries. Secondly, I am not surprised to hear, too that – and we very much had this in mind when we designed this project –, some of them unfortunately have not been designed with the thought of where you go from there. They are sometimes the most successful ones, great as long as they last, and then suddenly you fall off a cliff as it were, and there is nowhere to go. To defend the designers of these programs, [there] is the hope and the feeling that both the Vietnamese economy and Vietnamese educational and governmental culture is changing in such a way so as to build institutional structures that can accommodate some of these programs that will no longer receive outside aid. This institutionalization has been happening on the one hand, to my mind, remarkably quickly, but still not quickly enough to accommodate some of the needs of these programs that are, as you say, coming to the end, or have already come to the end, of their rope of foreign funding. So that I can only

say again that we had this danger in mind when we designed this program. And the answer indeed is to have a component in all these programs that looks to build a robust institutional structure in each of these educational institutions that can sustain the project beyond the infusion of foreign funds. That is easier said than done, in some cases: some institutions in Vietnam and some sectors in Vietnam are better equipped than others to do this, but nevertheless I think that is the only way to go.

I also think that the structure of some of the actual projects needs to be conceptualized in such a way that the money is not all put into the immediate project but there is out-planning money that towards the end of the project forces participants on both sides to look to the next steps and to look specifically at the idea of sustainability. Too many of them, I am sure you saw this, say, we will have this project; we will have this seminar; we will have this meeting, we will have this training, and then we'll have a seminar to discuss what we have accomplished, and then every one looks at each other, and it is over and there is nowhere to go, even if you have some accomplishment to show for that. But it certainly is a problem. No one can predict where the Vietnamese economy will go. Of course, the growth has been slowed due to the Asian economic crisis, although Vietnam's growth rate is one of the best in Asia and remains so. And the political change and the cultural change within the government are something that is very important.

I should just say briefly that one of the issues that we had to face was really that within an institution like the IIR – and this is true from top to bottom in official Vietnamese culture – is the generation gap. You have the older generation which is just retiring, who come from the older dispensation largely trained in the East block, and one of our challenges in the IIR was to figure out a way in which some of the older faculty who clearly would not be appropriate for training programs in the U.S. could also be participants and feel included in this. That is where some plans we have in conjunction with American University will come in, where we hope to do these faculty curriculum workshops that will bring together the young people studying in the U.S. with some of the older faculty in Hanoi for a brief period to come to the U.S. and actually observe and participate in some of the new pedagogies that we have been talking about, because that is another important feature. We are all veterans here of conferences and we know what it is like to come and talk about ideas, and when it comes to pedagogy, we can describe to our colleagues day and night how we teach certain things in the U.S. in ways that we think might be useful. But it is another thing entirely to have them as participants and we need to do that. We need to bring them to see presentations and stimulations, workshops and collaborative pedagogies as they look in action in our universities and colleges. So this is another feature that we were thinking of very much.

Professor Hotta: Three questions, the first to Dr Porter. It seems to me that the University of Hawaii has experienced financial difficulties in the past years. How were

you able to overcome them along with the East West Center? Your budget has been reduced by 50% in the past years, so I would to like to have either a comment from Dr. Porter or from Dr. Mark Valencia. In the same vein, I am very much interested in a question to our Dalian colleague, Professor Yu from Dalian Dungbei University of Finance Economics and Finance, since you are growing in financial terms but that at the same time as a national institution of China, how are you maintaining sustainability in human resources development? My last question goes to Professor Ishii. She is an expert in Malaysian studies. Perhaps she can elaborate on Malaysian effort to overcome these issues.

Professor Porter: It is true that the University of Hawaii is feeling the crunch of a very bad state economy right now. To answer your question directly, it is up to the people in leadership related to Asian and Pacific studies to continue to remind the University of Hawaii central administration and board of regents that the strategic plan of the University of Hawaii quite clearly stipulates that Asia Pacific studies comes second to none. That it is in writing in several places. So basically you stick to the mission of the University. And it comes to me and others in our position to continue to remind the University of that. Having said that, we still get cut. And then the discussion becomes: where do you cut? We have made very difficult decisions within our own program, within SHAPS, the Schools of Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Studies. We have downsized our Buddhist studies program. It had no students. We began to articulate these decisions based on student interest. And our Center for South Asian Studies was downsized, basically for the same reason. We had very few students, maybe one would come in one year, maybe none the next year, maybe two years later, as compared to the interest in other regions. So we had to make those rather painful decisions. We did not eliminate, but we did downsize. They are ... waiting for [the time] when the money comes back and we will be able to put it into them. Of course, we are then criticized by people from those centers saying well if we do not have the money, how can we increase and get in more students? It is that discussion and that debate that is going on. On the one hand, we make our point clearly that the University has to follow its own mission, and secondly we have to make the hard decisions.

Professor Yu: [in Chinese] Today I don't want to say anything about yesterday's topic, but instead I want to say something about Chinese universities, how to deal with human resource development to maintain sustainable growth. In recent years, China has also been discussing such problems, because since 1978 China's development has been proceeding very fast. Now we pay a lot of attention to this point. And during this economic development, the key problem is how to keep the development of the entire country in step with the economic development of the regions. Sustainable economic development needs sustainable training of human resources. In recent years, China's

higher education has seen great development, especially since the end of last year. Since last year, China has implemented new policies on higher education and this means we need different methods of training, especially in higher education. Here I will say something about what this means for the different sectors of higher education. In China, the first main sector is the state-owned universities. These are controlled by the Ministry of Education and some other ministries. The second sector is local government controlled. This is very similar to the state universities in the United States, controlled by the states and not by the whole country. As a third sector, from this year new private universities may be set up, just like private universities in foreign countries. We have also had other kinds of universities in recent years, for example, a university of which about 70% is owned by the state, the other 30% being owned privately.

During this year, other colleges or institutions will be approved by the government. These kinds of universities, colleges and schools are called higher technical universities, and they are specially focused on professional training. I have visited the United States and some European countries, and was deeply impressed by professional education in these countries. In this kind of professional training schools or colleges, the main focus is on professional training, training people with practical skills. From this year, China higher education may experience a great change especially through the diversification of higher education.

We have just talked about the structure of universities and colleges, but in recent years China has experienced another change in relation to courses and majors. Now China pays a lot of attention to practice and practical management. This is because China will need managers with practical skills to help with reform in the next few years. From this year, the enrolment of students for university in China has also greatly increased: there has been an increase of 440,000 students enrolling in 1022 universities. In Liaoning province, the level of higher education is rising, especially in Dalian. Dalian's higher education is developing very well. This year, the percentage of high school graduates entering university in Liaoning province is nearly 70%. In Dalian it will be nearly 80%. I am just talking about some places in the coastal region. Here the number of high school graduates entering university can reach this kind of percentage, but in less developed areas, especially in the interior of China, they will probably be much lower.

China can perhaps resolve the problem of sustainable development in these three ways: through reorganizing higher education, through changes in courses and major subjects, and through increasing the number of university students. I think another policy is for China to turn to the rest of the world, especially the more developed countries and regions, and to send students to study abroad. We are discussing how to send students overseas, to foreign universities. This involves problems like how to make the competition fair, so that everyone has an equal chance. Every one here is from famous universities, in your own countries. Now Chinese universities are also making great efforts in order to become first rank universities.

Professor Ishii: I do not know the Malaysian situation well, but probably in the 1990s, the situation of higher education of Malaysia has been changing fast because during 1990s the Malaysian government stated its future objectives in Vision 2020. Vision 2020 means joining the group of developed countries by 2020. This vision is very, very good and hopeful. To meet these objectives, the Malaysian government intends to make progress in the information technology field. They allowed established private universities in the 1990s. Until the end of the 1980s, there were only national universities in Malaysia. But in the 1990s the Malaysian government wanted to use the power of private industry and institutions to improve education. So they admitted private universities. One example is the Multi-media University. The Multi-media University was established in Malacca and is involved with the multi-media super highway. And that university intends to accept many international students, probably over 30% in the future. They intend, of course, to give the students information technology or information software technology education but the teachers in the Multi-media University intend to create a new technology culture in Malaysia. I think that this kind of private university will be a very, very active school in Malaysia in international exchange programs for both education and research. I think that these are the possibilities in Malaysia.

Professor Valencia: [At the East West Center], the news is frankly not good. As Professor Hotta said, the Federal government, the Congress, slashed the budget at the East West Center three years ago from 25 million dollars to 12.5 million dollars. We had to reduce our staff by 50% and most distressing we have reduced our student intake by much higher than that. Formerly, we supported at any one time over 300 students at the University of Hawaii receiving graduate degrees, masters and Ph.Ds. At the present time, it is around 50, and the entire program is being reevaluated. So, in terms of the student component of the East West Center, the support for that has decreased dramatically and there is a rethinking going on whether this is in fact the best way to achieve the Center's goals, that is whether formal student education is a viable program at such a low level. The original idea at the height of the Center's budget and operations, was that the students would come being supported fully by the East West Center, but taking their graduate degrees at the universities. And the thesis or dissertation that they pursued was related to ongoing research projects at the Center, so that the students became part of multi-disciplinary international teams. They were working on problems of mutual concern and consequence to nations of Asia Pacific, including the United States.

Professor Brenner: The next presentation will be by Dr Richard Braddock, with comments by Dr Young Jo Lee and Dr Supachai. But before we start, let me focus on why I think this is an important session. If I could ask how many of your institutions have an exchange program in one form or another? So everyone has exchange programs. I

think we have to think first what we mean by exchange programs because it could be very different among all our institutions, but I think we have a lot of collective wisdom here. And if we follow the guideline of the question that Professor Hotta asked yesterday, we should focus not only on the negative lessons but also on the positive lessons. We often focus on the negative. We often think we can learn from the mistakes. I think we can also learn from what is positive. In the discussions here, if we can first focus on defining what an exchange program is, because I expect that there will be many different forms, and then if you can focus on what is positive about your exchange programs, I think we will have a very useful session.