

A Salute to Citizen Diplomacy

**A History of the National Council
for International Visitors**



**"Never doubt
that a small
group of
thoughtful,
committed
citizens can
change the world;
indeed it is the
only thing that
ever does."**

— Margaret Mead

A SALUTE TO CITIZEN DIPLOMACY

A History of the National Council for International Visitors



Honoring Citizen Diplomats

What do a hog farmer from Illinois, an auto company executive from Detroit, a software guru in the Silicon Valley, a banker from Fort Worth, a school teacher in Memphis, and a rancher from Montana all have in common? They all serve as volunteers and citizen diplomats who host participants in the State Department's International Visitor Program and other exchanges. They welcome foreign leaders into their offices, classrooms, and homes. As a returning International Visitor from India recently told a group of 300 WorldBoston supporters gathered to honor Seiji Ozawa as International Citizen of the Year, "You welcomed a stranger; you sent home a friend."

Each year, thanks to a Congressional appropriation, the U.S. Department of State brings approximately 4,500 foreign leaders and specialists to the United States for 21-day cultural and professional programs. These U.S. experiences are custom-tailored to enable these International Visitors to exchange perspectives with U.S. counterparts in their professional fields and to develop a better understanding of the history, heritage, and values of the United States and of the aspirations we all share.

Early on, the State Department wisely decided that the International Visitor Program would be most productive and that the credibility of the Program and its participants would be best preserved if the day-to-day administration of the Program was in the hands of the private sector, that is, nongovernmental organizations. Consequently, the depth of citizen involvement in foreign affairs reflected in the International Visitor Program and the private-public sector partnership that sustains it is unique and unprecedented anywhere in the world. The National Council for International Visitors (NCIV) is a professional association representing these private-sector partners, including program agencies and 98 community organizations throughout the United States.

We are celebrating the 60th Anniversary of the International Visitor Program throughout the year 2000. Inevitably this celebration focuses attention not only on the many distinguished alumni who have participated in the International Visitor Program over the years and the U.S. government officials who established it, but also on the citizen diplomats—mostly

volunteers—who have generously welcomed these foreign leaders into their homes, schools, and offices throughout the United States. Each year more than 80,000 volunteers are involved with NCIV member organization activities: serving on boards, organizing programs, and hosting professional meetings, cultural activities, and home hospitality. These citizen diplo-

Each year more than 80,000 volunteers are involved with NCIV member organization activities.

mats strengthen U.S. relations with other countries, as one of our members phrases it, “one handshake at a time.”

As NCIV’s Executive Director, it is my privilege to visit our member organizations and work closely with the community leaders who give them shape and vision. Daily I witness their impressive dedication, professionalism, and wide-ranging capabilities as they work with participants in the International Visitor Program and other exchanges.

Some of you may be familiar with the original advertisement used in 1860 to recruit Pony Express riders.

Wanted: Young, wiry skinny fellows under the age of 18. Must be expert riders willing to risk death daily. Wages \$25 per week. Orphans preferred.

If I were to rewrite this ad for the volunteers who are drawn to NCIV member organizations, it would read:

Wanted: Young-at-heart of all ages. Must be well-organized, eager to learn, and willing to risk breaking stereotypes daily. Wages won’t be discussed. Idealists preferred.

While NCIV volunteers come from all walks of life and represent the diversity of their communities, they are all idealists. They want to make a difference. Through their efforts to welcome the world to their communities, they work diligently to build stronger ties with the countries these international visitors represent.


How did this remarkable network get started? Who were the early pioneers? What motivated them to establish nonprofit organizations and to play such an active role in a field that previously had been largely the purview of traditional diplomats? It is a fascinating story that deserves to be told. And so the NCIV History Project was born. We decided to collect the histories of each of our community organizations for the NCIV Archives* and to capture their essence in a book designed to document this saga of citizen diplomacy and to serve as tribute to the remarkable people who serve as citizen diplomats.

Like most initiatives at NCIV, we assembled a group of dedicated volunteers to accomplish our goals. Jerrold Keilson of World Learning, Inc. orchestrated their painstaking efforts to collect, analyze, and preserve NCIV member history. He researched and wrote the well-crafted narrative that constitutes the first section of the book. Sora Friedman and Emily Mallory were instrumental in contacting each of the Councils to gather information, check facts, and compile Section Two. Wally Mertes ensured that the lifelong volunteers would be recognized for their service to citizen diplomacy. Kristin Rusch and David Payton devoted long hours to creating the visually appealing layout of the completed document. None of this could have been accomplished without the enthusiastic support and cooperation of staff and volunteers of the local Councils themselves and our colleagues at the Office of International Visitors, U.S. Department of State. To Jerrold and everyone involved we owe heartfelt thanks for *A Salute to Citizen Diplomacy*.



Sherry Lee Mueller, Ph.D.
Executive Director
National Council for International Visitors

*NCIV papers as well as the histories of our member organizations will be sent to the University Libraries of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. The University Libraries house a number of collections concerned with international educational and cultural exchange. The Special Collections Division is the repository for the papers of the late Senator J. William Fulbright as well as the historical collection of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (formerly CU and now ECA). The Council for International Exchange of Scholars and NAFSA: Association of International Educators, two organizations directly involved in the administration of exchange programs and services, have placed their records here. Special Collections also holds the records of the Fulbright Association, a membership organization of Fulbright scholar alumni.



**U.S. Citizen Diplomacy
and the
International Visitor Program**
by Jerrold Keilson



Section One

As a native of Jacksonville, I wanted to share this great city with these foreign visitors, and all of us wanted them to leave with an unforgettable visit. I really wasn't prepared to receive anything in return, except, perhaps, friendship. It wasn't long before I began to realize that these visitors were providing me with an education that one simply can't purchase. They opened my eyes to their cultures and languages; but most of all they made me realize that they viewed America and Americans from their own perspectives, which could be very different from the way we viewed ourselves.

—Maria Condaxis, former Executive Director,
founding Board member and first President,
Jacksonville, Florida, International Resource Center

In March 1993 Gabor Bencsik, a journalist and Secretary General of the Hungarian Journalists Association, came to the United States through the sponsorship of the U.S. Information Agency's International Visitor Program. While on his five-week trip around the country to learn about the role of journalism, he was a guest at the home of Doug and Susan Hand of Rock Falls, Illinois, a rural community. He enjoyed the hospitality provided by Mr. Hand, a fifth grade teacher, and his family. Included in the Hand household is one Elwood P. Dowd, a child-sized doll. Mr. Bencsik and Elwood struck up a fast friendship.

Doug Hand uses Elwood as an assistant in his fifth-grade class, teaching the children that any dream is attainable. Each year his students write to people around the world in the hope that Elwood will receive an invitation to visit their countries. When an invitation arrives, Elwood travels via UPS to his host and returns with souvenirs and pictures, which are then used in the classroom to help the students learn about other cultures. Mr. Bencsik was so taken with Elwood that he immediately extended an invitation for him to visit Hungary.

Upon his return, Mr. Bencsik arranged for Elwood, Mr. Hand, and members of his class to visit Hungary. Parents and students in Rock Falls raised the necessary funds from the community, and in March 1994 a group of five children, Doug, and Elwood traveled to Budapest for a week. They stayed with Hungarian families, toured the city, and visited a hospital bearing teddy bears from a U.S. benefactor for the sick children. The children visited a local school, an orphanage, and the Hungarian Children's Group that sponsored them. Wherever he went, Elwood Dowd explained to Hungarians his belief that all children had to have a dream, and that he was the personification of children's ability to achieve their dreams. On their own initiative, the American children decided to use only \$100 each of the spending money they had raised and to donate the rest, giving \$500 to organizations at each of the three locations they visited. The director of the orphanage cried when she accepted the donation from the students. Later in their visit they met and had tea with the president of Hungary, Arpad

Goncz. At the conclusion of their visit, Elwood invited five Hungarian students to visit Rock Falls for a week. Years later Elwood Dowd, Doug Hand, and Gabor Bencsik continue to talk and share information via email.

The tale of Elwood Dowd is but one of many thousands of stories about person-to-person and community-to-community ties that are created and fostered through the International Visitor (IV) Program. This program, the result of a U.S. government-funded public diplomacy initiative, has touched the lives of both individuals in the United States and participants in more than one hundred countries around the globe. Elwood Dowd's story resulted from a special and long-standing partnership between the U.S. government and a national network of community-based nonprofit organizations, known collectively as the National Council for International Visitors, through which citizens play an important role in diplomatic affairs.

Foreign Policy Issues at the Millennium

At the end of the twentieth century, diplomatic historians who engage in a retrospective examination of international affairs will undoubtedly write of a tumultuous century fraught with foreign policy challenges. On the one hand, the twentieth century has been marked by some of the most horrific events in the history of humankind. The scourge of war covered the globe, and the destruction it caused reached new levels. In the nineteenth century, fighting tended to occur between soldiers. In the twentieth century, war erased the boundaries between combatants and civilians. Nazi Germany targeted entire populations in conquered countries for extermination. The Soviet Union targeted millions of its own citizens. The United States dropped hydrogen bombs on two Japanese cities. In the aftermath of World War II, the world divided itself into two opposing camps; each camp developed nuclear weaponry of such power that they could destroy the planet ten thousand times over. Though the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 marked the end of the cold war, today, despite the

lessons we might have learned from the past, nations still engage in genocide. Countries both powerful and weak still retain nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction capable of obliterating life on earth.

On the other hand, the world is closely linked as never before. Technological changes have resulted in global interdependence across many sectors. The impact of faster, more secure, and less expensive means of travel and communications have tied nations together in a way unimaginable just a few decades ago. The effects are visible in economics, in health concerns, in environmental protection issues, in cultural relations, and in those areas that used to be considered the “internal affairs” of a nation.

Global economic interconnectivity means that what used to be merely domestic issues now have global impact. Changes in internal economic policies in Europe or Asia may have a significant impact on American businesses, as demonstrated most recently in the Asian economic crisis of 1996-1998. Concerns in Europe over genetically altered crops affect U.S. agricultural exports and the American farmer. Civil unrest in Nigeria, Iran, or Iraq threatens global oil supplies. International conventions have been enacted in fields such as intellectual property rights, patents, banking, and other financial services in order to provide more control over operations in the global economy.

In the health field, disease transcends national borders due to improved transportation. A person infected with HIV or Ebola virus may not have visible symptoms when he travels from country to country and may bring the disease to new locales. Mosquitoes and other insects that carry disease are often transported from place to place in shipments of agricultural products. In both instances a previously unaffected population’s lack of natural resistance to the disease can result in serious outbreaks of illness and epidemics.

Effects of environmentally damaging activities also have global impact. To meet short-term economic interests, both local communities and international corporations are razing

. . . any dream is attainable

Brazilian rainforests, affecting air quality throughout the world. The dumping of industrial waste in the North Atlantic Ocean has a detrimental effect on fish supplies for people thousands of miles away. Air pollution in industrial nations results in depletion of the ozone layer in Antarctica.

Advances in communication technologies such as the facsimile and email make it more difficult for tyrants and dictators to keep information from their citizens. The phenomenon was first observed during the Tiananmen Square democracy movement in China in 1989, when students faxed messages to supporters and news agencies around the world. Today, images of conflict and repression are almost instantly available in people's homes through television and computers. When fighting started in Kosovo in the spring of 1999, Kosovars and Serbs alike immediately fired off emails and set up Internet pages to plead their causes to the global community.

The inclusion of these issues as a dimension of foreign policy has resulted in the inclusion of new actors in diplomatic affairs, and to some extent in foreign policy's fragmentation. In the past, diplomacy was left to the professionals. Today there are a multiplicity of foreign policy interests and players. For instance, the scientific community has an increasingly important role in foreign policy deliberations. Local government officials and businesspeople have a greater stake in foreign policy issues than before. The average citizen is aware of events around the globe and is willing and eager to express his or her opinion. The citizen diplomat has become an important player in the implementation of U.S. foreign policy.

U.S. Foreign Policy in the Twentieth Century

At the beginning of the 20th century, the United States was just beginning to flex its intellectual, military, and economic muscle in international relations. For most of the previous century the avowed policy of the United States, as first articulated by George Washington in his

The world is closely linked
as never before

Farewell Address, was to “avoid entangling foreign alliances.” The rationale for this position was quite pragmatic. Throughout the 19th century the United States was a new and relatively small and weak nation. Both policymakers and citizens were concerned with domestic issues such as geographic expansion to the West; pacifying the native Americans and taking control of their land; economic growth; and wrestling with slavery, the Civil War, and its aftermath. Most Americans had recently arrived from Europe and often had come to these shores with the hope of leaving European conflicts behind.

A myriad of larger political factors also influenced American leaders’ perspectives on foreign affairs. They were worried that alliances would lead to involvement in European struggles that had the potential to divide the fledging nation, sap its strength, and leave it vulnerable either to reconquest by a European power or to splintering into separate countries. American forays into international affairs at that time focused on fundamental issues of free trade and sovereignty, such as opposing British impressing of American sailors kidnapped in international waters, or promulgating the Monroe Doctrine—not so much to preserve a U.S. sphere of influence in the New World, but to keep the Old World powers at bay.

The consensus among historians is that active U.S. involvement in international affairs began at the end of the 19th century with our participation in the Spanish-American War of 1898 and the acquisition of colonies and territory in the Caribbean (Cuba and Puerto Rico) and Pacific (Hawaii and the Philippines). However, historians disagree about the reasons behind this change in U.S. policy. One school of thought attributes it to U.S. desire to expand trading contacts east into China by using Hawaii and the Philippines as jumping-off points. Another school focuses on the war as a response to growing domestic political pressures, most commonly represented by the stereotype of war-hungry journalists such as William Randolph Hearst, who enflamed public opinion through hawkish selective reporting. Yet another school attributes a growing interest in foreign affairs to the dramatic growth in and changing nature

of immigration. Until the 1880s, the vast majority of immigrants had come from northern and western Europe. Then the pattern changed, and there was a surge of immigration from southern and eastern European countries. Some scholars assert that these immigrants retained their historic allegiances and ties to their home countries, contributing to a growing concern for events overseas.

Historians also disagree about the impact of the Spanish-American War within the United States. Several have written of the significant domestic opposition to our role in the war, based on concerns about the United States shouldering the responsibilities of a colonial power, the so-called “white man’s burden” of caring for the native populations. Another, smaller group was concerned about the ethical issues surrounding the conquest of another country. In the end, disagreement continued within the United States as to what our proper role in international affairs should be.

The next major foray into international affairs was U.S. involvement in World War I. From the war’s beginning in 1914 through the presidential election in 1916, stated U.S. policy proclaimed strict neutrality. However, American citizens did take sides, and there were clashes between those supporting Britain and those supporting Germany. Finally, in 1917 the United States entered the war on the side of Britain. The reasons for entering the war have long been debated by historians. The fact remains, however, that the United States once again stepped away from the isolationist policy promulgated by George Washington and actively engaged in international affairs.

U.S. industrial might and the influx of American soldiers made a significant impact on the war’s results. The United States was thrust into the position of playing a major role in the peace negotiations at the end of the war. President Woodrow Wilson articulated his belief that the United States was fighting to “make the world safe for democracy,” and this belief informed his postwar negotiation strategy. In particular, it led President Wilson to support the

principle of self-determination, that each nation had the right to determine its own future. To enhance the chances that conflicts could be resolved peacefully, he proposed establishment of a League of Nations. This created a furor within America; many people believed that support for the League meant abrogation of U.S. national sovereignty, while others strongly supported the noble aims of the League. The controversy over U.S. ratification of the League treaty led directly to the creation of community-based study and education groups, along with advocacy groups that both supported and opposed U.S. involvement in the League of Nations. Of course, the debate concluded with the rejection by the U.S. Senate of the League treaty and with America's retreat from active involvement in global affairs.

In the aftermath of World War I, through the 1920s and 1930s, the United States and Europe faced several critical foreign policy challenges. These included the establishment of a revolutionary communist government in Russia that preached global revolution and war against capitalism, the rise of an imperialistic and expansionist fascist regime in Germany, and the collapse of the global economy. One response by both policymakers and citizens was an idealistic and ultimately naïve attempt to legislate and outlaw war. The U.S. Congress passed legislation such as the Kellogg-Briand Act, which outlawed war as a legal response to international crises. Private citizens established international exchange programs in an effort to educate Americans about foreign policy issues. The Foreign Policy Association was established to create community groups that brought in speakers and discussed issues of the day in a nonpartisan, dispassionate manner. Other organizations such as the Institute of International Education, founded in 1919, and the Experiment in International Living, founded by Donald Watt in 1932, established programs that promoted exchanges between people from different countries in order to help them understand each other and, it was hoped, be less willing to go to war against each other.

The U.S. government also understood the need to come to grips with changing interna-

The concept of exchanges is simple

tional realities. Many of the responses followed traditional diplomatic practices and channels. For instance, the United States did not formally recognize the government of the Soviet Union until 1933. Treaties were negotiated and signed with Britain, France, and other World War I allies. At the same time, and in response to a growing isolationist sentiment throughout the period, the United States demobilized its military forces, adopted stringent immigration restrictions, and tried to remain aloof from much of the turmoil sweeping Europe. To the extent that the United States was actively engaged in foreign policy initiatives, they were

As the situation in Europe grew increasingly grave, the U.S. policy of isolationism was harder to justify.

limited to Mexico and Central America, the neighboring region that the United States had traditionally claimed for its sphere of influence.

As the situation in Europe grew increasingly grave, the U.S. policy of isolationism was harder to justify and maintain. State Department officials worried about the inroads being made by Nazi propagandists in Central and South America throughout the 1930s. The Peronist regime in Argentina, for instance, had developed close relations with Germany, and U.S. government officials worried that Argentines would be susceptible to Nazi propaganda. Argentina's proximity to the United States made this a pressing matter. In response, the U.S. government began to develop its own programs to combat such propaganda and to influence the thinking of key opinion leaders and decision makers.

One such innovation was government support for exchange programs. The concept of exchanges is simple and extremely powerful. These programs bring together key people from different countries to share knowledge, information, and approaches to an array of issues in

order to develop a common understanding of mutual problems and possible solutions. Operating outside the framework of formal government-to-government relations, they bring new actors and fresh perspectives to foreign affairs. Exchange programs can lead to the creation of strong, long-lasting linkages between people that go beyond the narrow confines of the specific program, creating friendships and professional ties that transcend the limits of borders and nation-states.

The Early Years of Exchange Programs

In response to the growing Nazi propaganda threat in Central and South American countries that were deemed to be of critical strategic importance, the U.S. State Department in 1938 established the Division of Cultural Relations and the Inter-Departmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation with Latin America. A special thrust of this Division was to promote cultural relations with Latin American nations being wooed by Nazi Germany. Nelson Rockefeller was appointed the first Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Affairs. The first efforts at citizen diplomacy involved bringing approximately 40 Latin American leaders to the United States for two-month programs. During those periods the participants would travel by train across the United States, meeting with national and local government officials, businessmen, and interested citizens. Once inaugurated, the program continued throughout the war years.

The U.S. Department of State, the government agency responsible for U.S. diplomacy, was not designed to act as a scheduler of meetings and coordinator of hotel and travel arrangements. Thus, it sought out groups that it believed would be interested in opening their communities to international visitors. Universities with strong Latin American departments were an important resource. Scholars were able to discuss with visitors at length key aspects of U.S.–Latin American relations, the benefits of democracy, and other foreign policy issues.

. . . and extremely powerful.

However, the State Department also wanted to expose visitors to the lives of average Americans. They wanted to involve community groups with an interest in foreign affairs as allies in these diplomatic efforts.

One such ally was community-based affiliates of the Foreign Policy Association (FPA). The FPA had been established in 1919 by individuals supportive of President Wilson's efforts to establish the League of Nations and to obtain ratification for U.S. membership through the Senate. Local affiliates of the national FPA, typically called World Affairs Councils, had been established in a number of cities throughout the United States. Their mission was to promote greater understanding of foreign affairs and foreign countries by hosting educational programs, speakers, and discussions.

By the late 1930s, in response to growing isolationist sentiment, many of the World Affairs Councils had lost members and financing. Some of the groups disbanded; others looked for new programs and activities to revitalize them. When approached by the State Department in 1939-1940, a number of these groups were willing, in fact eager, to assist this new program.

Brooks Emeny, president of the Cleveland Council on World Affairs in the late 1930s, was one of those consulted by Nelson Rockefeller as part of the effort to design the new visitor program. Emeny recalled a discussion he had with Rockefeller in October 1939: "[F]rom my own point of view the most important aspect of the full day's conference was my success in convincing all participants that the only way to achieve a continuing impact on public opinion was through private community organizations, such as the Cleveland Foreign Affairs Council ... the Foreign Policy Association branches, and other similar groups."¹

Though Emeny had hoped that Rockefeller would provide additional funding to support the private organizations, that funding never materialized. However, the Cleveland Council did establish a Pan-American committee, headed by professor C. Langdon White of Western

Reserve University. This committee was responsible “for carrying out the various propaganda and educational programs as directed by the Coordinator’s Office in Washington....”²

In addition to the community-based international affairs organizations established through the Foreign Policy Association and Council on Foreign Relations, newer grassroots groups also quickly agreed to support the Rockefeller program. For instance, in 1938 a group of Iowa citizens formed an organization to help European immigrants who were fleeing the impending

By the late 1930s, in response to growing isolationist sentiment, many of the World Affairs Councils had lost members and financing.

war and resettling in the United States. In 1941 this organization, along with other community groups, coalesced around the mission to bring international students to Iowa in order to help citizens understand each other and their cultures. Their first effort was to support programs for Panamanian students funded by the Rockefeller program. Initially called the Pan American Board of Education, the group arranged professional programs and homestays for nearly 150 Panamanian students during the war years.

Throughout World War II the State Department continued administering a relatively modest number of exchange programs with Latin America, focusing mostly on journalists. In 1943 the Department established a program that brought a small number of Chinese visitors each year. These token programs continued through the end of the war.

Exchanges During the Cold War

The next milestone in the establishment of a vibrant international exchange movement was the passage of the Fulbright Act on August 1, 1946, named after Senator J. William Fulbright

of Arkansas. Senator Fulbright had traveled extensively before World War II, and he understood the importance of personal contact and exposure in promoting better understanding among peoples of the world. In the aftermath of World War II, concerned about the growing danger of war with the Soviet Union, Senator Fulbright proposed a program that he felt would facilitate that contact and exposure.

“The prejudices and misconceptions which exist in every country regarding foreign people,” Fulbright told a friend, “are the great barrier to any system of government.” If,

“The prejudices and misconceptions which exist in every country regarding foreign people,” Fulbright told a friend, “are the great barrier to any system of government.”

however, the peoples of the world could get to know each other better, live together and learn side by side, “they might,” he believed, “develop a capacity for empathy, a distaste for killing other men, and an inclination for peace.”³ Fulbright’s idea for an international exchange program, along with initiatives such as the establishment of the United Nations and the creation of regional defense arrangements such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), marked the confirmation of the United States as a major player on the international stage.

The Fulbright Act established a mix of educational and cultural exchange activities, such as the well-known Fulbright Senior Scholars Program and a companion student exchange program. The Act also established what the legislation called a visitors program. The early days of the visitor component of the Fulbright Program focused on bringing to the United States Germans without previous Nazi party affiliations who were thought to be future leaders of a reconstructed Germany. The objective of the program, called the Foreign Leaders Pro-

gram, was to introduce the visitors to principles of American democracy and to acquaint them with American people and institutions. This coincided with the desire of U.S. officials in occupied Germany and Japan to send German leaders to the United States in order, as articulated by a senior State Department official in 1949, "to strengthen the democratic forces within Germany and ... to influence German thinking in the right direction of peace and democracy."⁴ Among the notable alumni was Willy Brandt, who visited in 1954 and later became Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Fulbright program also had the effect of engaging American citizens in foreign relations in new ways, as the following story demonstrates. In the late 1940s a group of law students from Germany enrolled at Southern Methodist University (SMU) Law School in Dallas, Texas, under the aegis of the Fulbright Program. The dean of the law school, Clyde Emery, was concerned that the students were lonely so far from home. He knew their basic expenses were being covered by the State Department, but he worried about what they were doing on weekends and in the evening. He shared his concerns with his wife, Lorinne, who immediately took matters into her own hands. First she invited the German students to her house for dinner. Then she called friends, representative of the upper echelon of Dallas society, and arranged for them to offer hospitality as well. Professor Emery was struck by the positive impact these gestures had on the German students' morale, but continued to be concerned that the students had limited spending money. After discussing this with his wife, Lorinne Emery responded by organizing a group of her friends to take German language lessons from the students at the rate of 50 cents per hour.

Lorinne Emery continued to arrange hospitality activities for German exchange students throughout the early 1950s. She was extremely committed to the program and successful in soliciting volunteers to provide hospitality. Starting in 1954, the Dallas business community asked her to provide hospitality and professional meetings for businesspeople, marking the

“ . . . a capacity for empathy,

genesis of what is today the all-volunteer, community-based Dallas Committee for Foreign Visitors.

In 1948, the passage of the Smith-Mundt Act dramatically expanded the scope and nature of the Fulbright exchange program. The Smith-Mundt Act, modeled after Rockefeller’s World War II Latin America visitor program, created the first-ever peacetime information agency. Its mission was “to promote better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase mutual understanding” between Americans and foreigners. A key element of the Smith-Mundt program was the creation of a visitors program for foreign leaders and potential leaders, called the International Educational Exchange Program (IEEP). The Foreign Leaders Program established under the Fulbright legislation was subsumed into this activity.

U.S. government officials were explicit in their determination that a critical purpose of Smith-Mundt visitors programs was to combat Communist propaganda. In public statements in 1953 and again in 1956, State Department reports articulated this purpose:

Today, when the Communists are trying to outbid the free world in winning the minds of leaders in many countries, the U.S. International Educational Exchange Program . . . is helping to convince neutral, uncommitted groups and individuals that the American people are sincere in their search for a peaceful but just solution to the imperative problems of the nuclear age.⁵

The program would offer visitors a “‘full and fair picture’ of American life and institutions so that they could disseminate accurate, and presumably mostly favorable, information about America to their fellow citizens upon their return home.”⁶

As government-sponsored exchange programs expanded to address geopolitical realities of greater complexity than that of simply exposing potential German leaders to democracy, it also became clear that there was a need for professional partners based in the cities and towns

a distaste for killing other men,

where the participants would visit. The State Department simply did not have the resources to arrange programs for visitors throughout the United States. State Department officials revisited the model they had used during World War II and sought out community organizations that would be able to host foreign visitors, organize professional appointments, provide hospitality, and arrange hotel accommodations and other logistics. They also began to seek out private, nonprofit organizations able to administer and coordinate all elements of exchange visitor programs at the national level. The first of these, the precursor to today's national program agencies, was the Governmental Affairs Institute (GAI). Along with the American Council on Education, in the 1950s GAI took over from the State Department the responsibility for administering visitor programs in the United States. To date, more than a dozen private nonprofit agencies have worked in support of the U.S. government's programs (see Box 1).

Box 1. National Program Agencies

Governmental Affairs Institute (Succeeded by Visitor Program Service and later by the Program Division of Meridian International Center)	1950-1975
American Council on Education, Committee on Leaders and Specialists (Succeeded by Experiment in International Living, 1963 to 1972)	1956-1963
Institute of International Education	1972-present
Africa-America Institute	1961-present
Delphi International	1984-present
USDA Graduate School	1982-1997
Mississippi Consortium for International Development	1998-present
Academy for Educational Development	1979-present
Phelps-Stokes Fund	1985-present
Free Trade Union Institute (Succeeded by the George Meany Center and later by the American Center for International Labor Solidarity)	1985-present
Academy for State and Local Governments	1985-1995

Reliance on Community Groups

The IEEP program administrators at the State Department recognized the importance of relying on community-based volunteer organizations to provide key administrative and

and an inclination for peace.”

programmatic support. Though there is a long tradition of volunteerism in the United States for the delivery of community services, volunteer organizations typically address local needs, such as establishing a library or providing fire and ambulance services. Dependence on volunteer-based citizen groups for such a significant foreign policy initiative was striking.

Two factors contributed to the government's desire to rely on community-based volunteer groups to support its international visitor programs. First, the groups gave credibility to a government-sponsored and -funded program designed to influence foreign leaders. Without private involvement, international visitors could easily have believed the program to be a propaganda tool of the U.S. government. However, by using the resources of local volunteer groups to arrange meetings and hospitality in the community, and by relying on private, nonprofit national program agencies to coordinate the national programs, the IV Program clearly became something very different from a propaganda effort. It was the product of a unique public-private sector partnership.

Second, local volunteers and community groups knew the resources available in their community in a way that the State Department could not possibly know. As Secretary of State Dean Rusk pointed out at a COSERV conference in 1965, "[T]he government simply can't do what you are doing. We can't render that kind of individual, sensitive and personalized service such as you can and do render in your own communities. This voluntary spirit is of course a keystone in the understanding which other people may have of us..."⁷

Some of the early community groups involved in supporting visitor exchange programs had been members of national organizations such as the Foreign Policy Association or the Council on Foreign Relations. The World Affairs Councils of Hartford, Connecticut; Cleveland, Ohio; and St. Louis, Missouri, are examples of community groups that added exchange programs to their portfolios. For instance, the World Affairs Council of Hartford was established in 1924 by a group of educators and business people to promote the discussion of

foreign policy issues. The Cleveland Council on World Affairs was established in the early 1930s as an affiliate of the Foreign Policy Association and began supporting international visitors when the program first began in 1940. The St. Louis chapter of the Foreign Policy Association was founded in 1926 and remained in existence for three years. It was resurrected

“The government simply can’t do what you are doing.”

in 1942 as the World Affairs Council and shortly thereafter began organizing programs for international visitors.

As the government-funded exchange program grew and the number of visitors increased, it became obvious to State Department officials and community leaders that the IV Program needed additional supporting organizations throughout the United States. Some community organizations were formed specifically to meet the growing need of the U.S. government to support international exchanges. In 1952 Harriet Eliel, West Coast Regional Director of the Institute of International Education in San Francisco, met with representatives of the Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students to establish a new organization to be called the International Hospitality Center (IHC), the precursor to today’s International Diplomacy Council. The IHC, according to its first president, Thomas Davis, was formed to “...dispel false misconceptions of the American way of life and of basic American philosophy. These misconceptions are dangerously prevalent among other peoples, due in part to ignorance, in part to anti-American propaganda.”⁸

It is clear that the impetus for the formation of the San Francisco IHC was to create an ally of the U.S. government in the Cold War against communism. President Davis, in his efforts to expand the IHC Board, reached out to the business community with the plea for its “...wise

Sharing a meal in a home

counsel so that the IHC might flourish as the central agency to provide a coordinated program of assistance and hospitality to overseas visitors, substituting sound impressions of American ideals and of their effect on our way of life.”⁹

During the height of the Cold War, the emphasis of the programs arranged by the IHC in San Francisco and its sister organizations around the country was on the more personal aspects of American life, particularly “home hospitality.” This was not naïve and ingenuous; the conviction of those involved in the program was that individuals sharing a meal in a home would engage in honest dialogue, share perspectives, and come to a deeper understanding than could ever be achieved through traditional diplomatic negotiations. U.S. policymakers also hoped that foreign visitors would take home their new perspectives and share them with other citizens, thereby extending the impact of the program. The State Department’s report on the visitors program in 1953 highlighted this aspect of the program:

The Communists are trying to convince the peoples of the world that international communism, not democracy, is the answer to their problems.... The Educational Exchange Program has proved that it is a sound antidote. It is building up a receptive climate of public opinion overseas. In this atmosphere our actions, our motives, and our policies can be correctly understood.¹⁰

A network of small communities in rural Illinois provides a powerful example of community-based, hospitality-oriented programs. In the fall of 1956, Gertrude Trogdon, a resident of Paris, Illinois, a small farming community, had recently recovered from a serious illness and, motivated by religious inspiration, sought opportunities to make the world a better place. She

would lead to a deeper
understanding

decided to organize a group of Paris residents who would open their homes to international students from various Chicago-based universities during the Thanksgiving holidays. She believed that foreign students were most lonely during typical American holidays and that they would welcome the chance to share Thanksgiving or Christmas meals and celebrations with American families. That first Thanksgiving, 141 students and their families traveled from Chicago to Paris in a car caravan in what was known as the Paris International Thanksgiving Fellowship.

The following spring, the Trogdons were approached by Jack Carriage of the International House at the University of Chicago. Carriage wanted to know if the Trogdons would be willing to arrange programs in Paris for international guests coming directly from government agencies in Washington, DC. They agreed, and began arranging hospitality for U.S. government-sponsored international visitors.

By 1958 the popularity of the Thanksgiving Fellowship program had increased, and Mrs. Trogdon felt that other Illinois communities might want to become involved. She began by reaching out to nearby communities through church groups. As a result, at their May Fellowship Day meeting in 1959, the United Church Women of Sterling and Rock Falls decided to join the project. A similar group in Freeport, a neighboring community, also agreed to participate in the project.

During the 1959 Thanksgiving weekend, the new group provided homestays for 53 foreign students from 23 countries. There were single students, couples, and families. Tours of farms, schools, factories, and businesses, as well as professional visits, were scheduled for the

than could ever be achieved
through traditional
diplomatic negotiations.

weekend, along with an Open House and World Fellowship Tea at the YWCA. Other activities included a Saturday night Community Program, a candle-lighting service, and square dancing by the Rock River Square Dancers.

Later that year, Reverend Don Bartholomew of the First Congregational Church in Geneseo, Illinois, was conducting church services in neighboring Princeton when he noticed a surprisingly large number of foreign faces in the congregation. Struck by this, Reverend Bartholomew inquired as to why there were so many people from abroad in a small Midwest

Visitors returned with “glowing reports on the few days living with the extraordinarily friendly families in the ‘real America.’”

town, and he learned about the International Thanksgiving Fellowship Program. He quickly signed up, and the community of Geneseo joined the Fellowship network.

By the mid-1960s this network of four small Illinois communities expanded their university-based programs to include supporting the International Visitor Program. Unlike their sister organizations in larger cities, the programs and services provided by the Fellowship groups included more homestays and home hospitality, more contact with farmers and small business owners, and fewer formal meetings with experts, government officials, or local leaders. As one Washington-based administrator of the IV Program said, visitors returned from visits to these four Illinois communities with “glowing reports on the few days living with the extraordinarily friendly families in the ‘real America.’ Now, whatever it is you have or whatever it is you do in the Rock River Valley it would be wonderful if we could package it and send it abroad. We would have friends throughout the world.” An international visitor, upon concluding a stay in Geneseo, wrote in an evaluation report that “Americans really

believe in freedom, opportunity, and social progress. It's not just something you're trying to feed us for your own ends."¹¹

It was not only in small-town America that concern for the well-being of foreign students served as an impetus for the creation of local councils. For instance, in Buffalo in 1949 Eleanor Underwood and Ethel Cohan organized the World Hospitality Committee and developed a list of fifty local families willing to provide hospitality for visitors. Then, in 1953 the University of Buffalo, concerned about cultural adjustment and hospitality for a group of French visitors under the sponsorship of the International Cooperation Agency (the predecessor of the U.S. Agency for International Development), sought assistance from local groups to help orient and integrate the visitors into the community. These two separate strands united in 1957 in a formal merger into one group, the World Hospitality Association, the precursor to the Buffalo-Niagara Region Council for International Visitors. Similar events led to the formation of the Rochester International Friendship Council.

Whether the volunteers were motivated solely by providing hospitality or by the interest in countering communist propaganda, it became clear that the reliance on them was extremely effective in giving the program power and credibility. As the San Francisco IHC said in its promotional material:

When we open our homes to foreign visitors, we employ the most effective means of presenting a true picture of the United States and help to correct the unrealistic and often unfavorable views of Americans held by those abroad. The visitors that the Center serves are for the most part men and women of great influence. Giving them an understanding of our sense of values by providing them with an opportunity to observe our day-to-day living, and establishing bonds of friendship is the best way to contribute to our own national security.¹²

Local businesses quickly appreciated the value of having and supporting local organiza-

“Americans really believe in

tions capable of arranging meetings and supporting logistics for foreign delegations visiting through international exchange programs. The advantages were clear: First and foremost such organizations brought international visitors to the community, where they stayed in hotels, ate in restaurants, used taxis and buses, and bought souvenirs and larger consumer items not available in their home countries. Second, since visitors were selected by the U.S. Embassies overseas for their potential as leaders in their own countries, local business leaders understood the value of these contacts in creating future opportunities for trade. Businesses also relied on local international visitor councils to arrange for speakers to educate the people in their community on important foreign policy issues. In communities such as Dallas, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh, local business leaders became strong supporters of international exchange programs. An examination of Pittsburgh’s relationship with the program provides a clear case in point.

In the early years of the 20th century, Pittsburgh was renowned as a major manufacturing center, home to hundreds of steel mills. As the global economy changed, Pittsburgh entered a period of economic and civic decline, along with other “rust belt” cities in the upper Midwest. By the late 1950s, however, business, civic, and government leaders had come together to create the “Pittsburgh Renaissance” to redevelop urban areas and revitalize the economy. Innovative and experimental approaches to urban renewal, transportation, and support for economic development were tried. The city became a magnet for international visitors who wanted to visit both businesses and government officials to better understand the theory and implementation of different community development models.

Four factors came together to lead Pittsburgh to advocate for the creation of a coordinat-

freedom, opportunity,

and social progress.”

ing body to handle the deluge of visitors to the city:

- Large corporations were being inundated with requests for appointments from foreign visitors, and they wanted a clearinghouse to coordinate all the requests;
- Foreign scholars on exchange programs to local universities needed support to get settled and to integrate themselves into the community;
- The “Pittsburgh Renaissance” phenomenon was attracting thousands of foreign visitors and tourists who wanted to know more about economic development and the city’s activities in this area; and
- There was a growth in community interest in foreign affairs and in the desire to meet foreign visitors.

Business leaders in Pittsburgh had a long history of reaching out in partnership with government and the community to support a public good. From Andrew Carnegie to the Mellon family, as well as through lesser known individuals, business leaders had always been active. Thus, when the need for a coordinating body to support foreign visitors became apparent, business in Pittsburgh took a leading role in providing financial support, in serving on the organization’s board of directors, and in opening their corporations to international visitors. As stated in an early planning document:

To fill this vital area of international exchange, Pittsburgh citizens are initiating the Pittsburgh Council for International Visitors. This Council will serve and be supported by the organizations and institutions which represent the broad interests and activities of the City. It is a cooperative endeavor in the finest Pittsburgh tradition. The Organizing Committee of the Pittsburgh Council for International Visitors itself represents industry and business, unions, and community organizations.¹³

Changes in Exchanges

With President Kennedy's election in 1960, U.S. foreign policy began to evolve in new directions. The Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress, and the establishment of the U.S. Agency for International Development, a new agency addressing the economic and developmental needs of emerging nations, all reflected a more engaged and activist foreign policy. Under President Kennedy's leadership, the foreign policy emphasis shifted from reactive anticommunism to a proactive effort to improve living conditions around the world. There was a growing desire to educate people about the true differences between the United States and the Soviet Union by encouraging them to see the reality of America with their own eyes.

The "Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961," also known as the Fulbright-Hays Act, codified previous legislation and reaffirmed the objective of arranging exchanges in order to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other nations. It also reiterated the organizational structure within which international exchange and information programs were administered. The statement of purpose clearly states the high ideals embodied in the legislation:

The purpose of this Act is to enable the Government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries by means of educational and cultural exchange; to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the education and cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States and other nations, and the contributions being made toward a peaceful and more fruitful life for people throughout the world; to promote international cooperation for educational and cultural advancement; and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic, and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world.¹⁴

In 1953 President Eisenhower had created the United States Information Agency (USIA), separate from the State Department, to administer all international information programs. Cultural and exchange programs remained a part of the State Department, within the Bureau of International Cultural Affairs, until 1978, when it was merged with the information pro-

**“Establishing bonds of friendship is the best way to
contribute to our own national security.”**

grams to become a separate agency called the United States International Communication Agency (USICA). The name was changed back to USIA in 1982, and it remained a separate agency until October 1, 1999, when all information and exchange functions were reincorporated into the State Department.

To demonstrate the importance he placed on international information programs, President Kennedy appointed nationally renowned journalist Edward R. Murrow as director of USIA in 1961. Murrow, who had become famous as a war correspondent, described the challenge of USIA's work as follows: “It has always seemed to me the real art in this business is not so much moving information or guidance or policy five or ten thousand miles. That is an electronic problem. The real art is to move it the last three feet in face-to-face conversation.” Thus, the U.S. government recognized that the personal contacts and connections that are the stock in trade of the IV Program represent the true art of international communication. Chester Bowles, U.S. Ambassador to India in the early 1960s, acknowledged the critical role of citizen diplomats when he addressed a COSERV conference in 1963: “As hosts to foreign leaders, exchanges, and participants in training programs in this country, you are a vital link in the international relations of the United States. No Ambassador from this country to another nation is more important than you.”

In response to changing circumstances, both the type of visitors recruited and the structure of the program changed. Visitors were no longer exclusively senior government officials and political leaders, but were also “second and third echelon officials who . . . were usually anxious to have serious and substantive discussions with their U.S. counterparts.”¹⁵ More visitors represented business, education, and the media rather than simply government, and the focus shifted to a greater concern for social issues such as race relations and economic growth issues. Not surprisingly, the number of visitors from the developing world increased dramatically.

“You are a vital link in the international relations of the United States.”

Community Groups Come Together

Changes in the objectives of the IV Program were paralleled by changes in the network of community groups that supported it. In part, changes were driven by the program’s growth and success. Three of the major challenges faced by the IV Program and its supporters were:

- Coordination among national program agencies and between program agencies in Washington and local councils;
- Communication among local councils to develop best practices, share lessons learned, and coordinate activities; and
- Generation of sufficient locally based financial support to sustain the organizations and keep the program successful.¹⁶

The need for greater coordination among community groups had become apparent in the late 1950s and had spurred action among community leaders who supported visitor exchange

programs. The earliest efforts to address coordination issues occurred in February 1957, when representatives of local international visitor councils held a three-day conference in Washington to discuss the future of the exchange program. One important outcome of the meeting was the establishment of a committee to study the question of forming a national association of community groups that would provide services to international visitors. The committee was chaired by Dr. Harry Wann, director of the Washington International Center, and

Box 2. ICCSIV Founding Members

<u>Executive Committee of the Interim Council</u>	
Chairman	Marnie Schauffler, Philadelphia
Vice Chairman	James M. Davis, Ann Arbor
Secretary-Treasurer	Florence G. Cassidy, Detroit
Members-at-Large	Katherine C. Bang, Cleveland Hugh Jenkins, Washington Gordon J. Kloph, Buffalo Mrs. Chase Going Woodhouse, Hartford
<u>Full Membership of the Interim Council</u>	
Mrs. Rex Baker	Houston
Dorothy Bauman	New York
Elizabeth Blanc	Denver
Gladys Brooks	Minneapolis
Walter Coombs	Los Angeles
Lorinne Emery	Dallas
Paul McMullen	Seattle
Margaret O'Donoghue	Washington
Mrs. Allyn Smith	San Francisco

included Marnie Schauffler of Philadelphia, Allyn Smith of San Francisco, Florence Cassidy of Detroit, Willard Daetsch of Buffalo, and Dr. James Davis of the University of Michigan. In the course of the year's study, regional conferences were held in Denver, Hartford, Minneapolis, and Philadelphia to gather various perspectives on the matter.¹⁷

When the groups reconvened in February 1958, they agreed that establishing a coordinating council or clearinghouse would better meet the needs of the program. Thus the Interim Council for Community Services to International Visitors (ICCSIV) was established. (See Box 2 for a complete list of founding members.)

The ICCSIV met intermittently throughout 1959 and 1960. By late 1960 ICCSIV members had reached a consensus that a national body was necessary; in November of that

year the Interim Council established the National Council for Community Services to International Visitors (NCCSIV). In April 1961 the NCCSIV met for the first time, elected an

Box 3. COSERV, NCIV Executive Directors

Helen Ringe	1961-1966
Arthur Richards	1966-1968
Robert Aylward	1968-1981
Alan Warne	1981-1985
Richard Deasy	1985-1995
Sherry Mueller	1996-present

executive committee, and adopted the acronym COSERV. Katherine Bang of Cleveland chaired the executive committee. Other officers included Dr. William Baker of Buffalo as vice-chair, Gladys Brooks of Minneapolis as secretary, and Dr. James Davis of Michigan as treasurer. At this time COSERV received its first core funding from the State Department,

which enabled the organization to hire professional staff.

COSERV, the umbrella organization for the national program agencies and the local councils for international visitors (CIVs), undertook major organizational initiatives in the 1960s. COSERV's small professional staff consisted of Helen Ringe as Executive Secretary and Ruth Frank as Publications Director. It established an office in Washington and held major national conferences in 1965 and again in 1969, along with a series of regional conferences throughout the United States. Simultaneously, a growing number of U.S. government-funded programs began relying on the COSERV network for specialized services. The International Cooperation Agency (later USAID) sought out COSERV members to help support some of the thousands of people it brought to the United States for training each year. By 1971 COSERV's membership roster had grown to 88 community organizations and 33 national program agencies. (See Box 3 for the names of COSERV executive directors.) In 1979 COSERV changed its name to the National Council for International Visitors (NCIV).

Seeing Ourselves through Others' Eyes

As discussed earlier, membership in COSERV continued to expand in the 1960s as communities were exposed to the IV Program and became excited about providing hospitality to foreigners living in their community. In Huntsville, Alabama, for instance, the 1960s saw the growth of a community of foreign military personnel. Similar to Clyde Emery and his concern regarding the integration of German law students into the Dallas community in the late 1940s, Col. William Macpherson, the Commandant of the Ordnance School, was concerned about the need to integrate military personnel and their families into local life. Col. Macpherson asked the city government to explore the formation of a local group to help bridge the gap between the two populations, and in March 1965 the Huntsville-Madison County Council for International Visitors was established. T. Pickens Gates, the first president

“We do not have to agree with another man’s creed or religion to love him. We can love him without trying to convince him of our way of life. One of our many purposes is to see that these visitors go back home as friends.”

of the council, characterized the mission of the council as follows: “We do not have to agree with another man’s creed or religion to love him. We can love him without trying to convince him of our way of life. One of our many purposes is to see that these visitors go back home as friends.”¹⁸

In 1961, as one of its earliest acts, COSERV expressed interest in establishing a group in the southeastern part of the United States to arrange meetings for international visitors eager to learn about the civil rights movement. A COSERV board member from Cleveland contacted Betty Haas, a relative in Atlanta, and tried to interest her in starting a group there.

Betty was interested and asked COSERV for help. Lorinne Emery, the founder of the Dallas CIV, agreed to visit Atlanta to speak to a group of 25 potential volunteers. As the story goes, Lorinne was such a powerful and impassioned speaker that in the time it took Betty Haas to go outside of the church meeting room to help someone with parking, the rest of the group agreed to establish a CIV and elected Betty president.¹⁹

Betty Haas and the members of the Atlanta Committee for International Visitors made

Cooperation between the African American and white communities who supported the CIV was one of the first moves towards integration in Atlanta.

special efforts to reach out to Atlanta's African American community, a courageous move given the tense state of race relations at the time. It was one of the first CIVs to include African Americans as host family volunteers and board members. The Atlanta Committee relied extensively on faculty from the network of historically black colleges in the city, including Clark Atlanta, Morris Brown, and Spelman. Cooperation between the African American and white communities who supported the CIV was one of the first moves towards integration in the city.

That the Atlanta Committee was able and willing to work with the African American community in Atlanta was a reflection of a unique confluence of forces in Atlanta. As in much of the South, Blacks and whites did not live or work together. At the same time, Atlanta's political and business elites — both white and black — understood that economic health was inextricably tied to the perception that the city enjoyed good race relations. In spite of decades of separation, throughout the early part of the twentieth century Atlanta's elites had struggled to develop ways of working together to promote at least the appearance, if not the

reality, of good race relations. The 1949 election of William Hartsfield as mayor marked the beginning of an “alliance between Atlanta’s civic-business leadership and the African American community that would last until the mid-1960s. In exchange for the black community’s political support for the business-civic leadership, the latter promised a more congenial racial climate....”²⁰

By the 1950s white Atlantans saw themselves as residents of a global community and aspired to make Atlanta an important international city. Business and political leaders were concerned that the growing civil rights movement and demands for jobs, better housing, and better schooling would be seen as disruptive to business and thus would threatened their vision. Because they already had a working relationship with the African American community, it was a natural outgrowth to attempt to include African Americans in their vision of a global Atlanta. Thus the Atlanta Committee’s efforts to reach out to the African American community were an organic evolution of prior practices.

The Atlanta Committee rapidly took stands that promoted integration. For instance, the Committee played a significant role in integrating the Atlanta Biltmore Hotel, the city’s premier hotel at the time. Colette Senghor, the wife of Senegal’s president, was a visitor to the city in the early 1960s, and it was appropriate for her to stay at the Biltmore, though at the time the hotel did not admit Blacks as guests. Betty Haas was able to persuade Biltmore’s management that the reputation of the entire city would be hurt if they would not allow her to stay. Mrs. Senghor was the first person of color to stay at the Biltmore, and her stay was directly attributable to the intervention of the Atlanta Committee.

The International Visitor Program affected Atlantans as deeply as it affected the international visitors. Volunteers learned a great deal about other countries and the similarities that linked people. They recognized the hypocrisy of treating African and Asian visitors with respect and courtesy and not doing the same for African Americans in Atlanta. Ultimately,

the Georgia Council for International Visitors brought the world to Atlanta and enriched Atlantans' understanding of it.

Atlanta was not the only city where a CIV was formed to improve perceptions of its community. Fred Darragh, a successful Little Rock, Arkansas, businessman, decided in the early 1960s that he personally had to take some action to combat the image of Little Rock as a backwards community in the aftermath of the Central High desegregation crisis of 1957. Fred had traveled widely for his business, and he was frustrated by the need to defend Little Rock to his overseas business partners. He knew the way the international media portrayed Little Rock was not accurate, so he garnered community support to establish an organization to provide southern hospitality to foreign visitors as a means to combat the city's negative image.

Other CIVs established during the 1960s also were honest in showing both the positive and negative aspects of their communities to international visitors. For instance, the Memphis, Tennessee, Council for International Visitors has been fortunate to have a core group of volunteers who have supported the program for many years and who have offered visitors an honest portrayal of life in their community. Mattie Sengstacke, a member of the prominent Sengstacke publishing family of Chicago (*Chicago Defender*) and Memphis (*Tri-State Defender*), helped insure the cultural and racial diversity of the Council from the very outset. Sengstacke recruited and supported African American members of the community in developing programs, hosting social events, and becoming active Council members. Two other prominent Memphis volunteers, Judge Russell and Gina Sugarmon, have continuously provided visitors with access to and direct, firsthand knowledge of the history of the civil rights movement. Judge Sugarmon has shared his expertise and insights with over 200 groups and individuals in the years that he has been involved in the program.

It was not only in the South where involvement with international visitors helped Ameri-

cans see themselves more clearly and learn from what they saw. Sue Ohrenschall, a volunteer and Board member of the International Diplomacy Council in San Francisco, recalls the event that crystallized her understanding of the power and importance of the IV Program to all parties:

I remember in the 1960s Bob [her husband] and I hosted a visitor from Uganda. He was actually the Ambassador to the U.N. from his country and he appeared very distinguished. We were surprised when we found out that he had changed hotels from the Westin St. Francis to the Booker T. Washington. The Booker T. Washington Hotel was a dingy little place in the Fillmore [district] and when Bob and I picked him up he was sipping coffee in a smoke-filled room amidst predominantly black men drinking and playing pool. We asked him why he had switched hotels and he replied, "I wanted to see how my people live in your country."²¹

The International Visitor Program showed the visitor America, warts and all. At the same time, it forced Americans to see their country through others' eyes, and certainly motivated some of them to seek to improve it.

While the International Visitor Program had unanticipated effects within the United States, it also created connections between Americans and citizens on the other side of the Iron Curtain. At the height of the Cold War, with increasing tension between the United States and the Soviet Union, the IV Program offered a neutral space for people from opposing sides to sit around a table, share a meal, and make personal connections. For instance, in 1978 a group of ten high-ranking officials from the Soviet Union were invited to participate in a visitors program. Midway through their program they decided that they wanted to visit Detroit because, as one said, "We wanted to see where the workers are." The Detroit International Visitors Council (IVC) was able to quickly arrange a program that allowed the Soviet visitors opportunities to meet with autoworkers, as well as with local officials and

**“I wanted to see how my people
live in your country.”**

businesspeople. At dinner one night during their visit, one of the Soviet visitors announced loudly that he was in charge of all atomic weaponry for the Soviet Union. After the delegation left Detroit, Gretchen Hitch, executive director of the IVC, was visited by CIA agents who

The importance of the International Visitor Program is that it operates on a community-to-community, person-to-person level. It has impact through face-to-face-meetings; and because the persons involved on both sides are apt to be leaders, you get a big multiplier in terms of influence.

—John Richardson, Undersecretary of State
for Cultural Affairs, 1969-1977

were curious to know what she and the Soviets had talked about during the dinner. According to Hitch, they had spent most of their time discussing the comparative strengths and weaknesses of Russian classical composers.

The International Visitor Program Comes of Age

In the early 1980s, U.S. business leaders were beginning to understand the need to be involved in the growing global economy. New markets in Latin America and Asia, and the integration of Europe into a single marketplace, were important contributing factors. Local businesses sought community-based groups that were able to help them develop international business contacts and handle the protocol and hospitality aspects of those visits appropriately. The Councils for International Visitors, already established, had the experience, contacts, and systems to provide those services. In many of the new growth areas, such as in California and the South, local groups arose where none had been before to meet the need.

The establishment of the Charlotte, North Carolina, Council for International Visitors (CCIV) is an example of how local businesses saw the program as a means to establish commercial relationships. In the 1980s Charlotte was growing economically, and the city leaders saw great opportunities for additional business development. However, one limitation was the lack of exposure to potential international partners. In addition, the local social service agency, International House, which was to be the home to the CIV, wanted to demonstrate it had services of interest to the business community. Establishing a CIV meant that the Charlotte business community had a mechanism to reach out to international contacts, to make Charlotte better known globally, and to attract investment.

The San Jose-Silicon Valley International Visitor Program is another example of a local group with an economic development focus. The impetus for the formation of this group came in 1993 when Kit Wallace, executive director of the San Francisco-based International

**The IV Program showed the visitor
America, warts and all.**

Diplomacy Council, contacted businesses in the San Jose area to explore ways they could participate in the International Visitor Program in order to meet the demand of visitors who wanted to visit high-tech and computer firms. The concept was intriguing to city and busi-

The proposal to cut IVP funding created a huge uproar among the hundreds of thousands of volunteers who supported the IV and other exchange programs.

ness leaders. The Office of Economic Development took the lead in contacting the U.S. Information Agency to explore how to become involved in the program. Local business leaders and community groups agreed to support the program and to house it at the World Forum, which itself was a global affairs and education organization. Not surprisingly, the focus of many visitor programs is the technology field.

Craig Sullivan, chairman of the board of The Clorox Company in Oakland, California, believes that corporate support for the IV Program “provides Clorox with access to distinguished visitors from all over the world and opportunities to create ties for future business.”²² Ed Rendell, mayor of Philadelphia, said:

The International Visitor Program is a sound investment that has meant as much to the Philadelphia and American communities as it has to our distinguished guests from abroad... In addition to creating jobs through the federal and foreign dollars that are spent each year in our hotels, restaurants and stores, it has stretched our marketing dollars and brought valuable contacts directly into our offices and factories.²³

The decade also witnessed important developments in the IV Program in response to changing foreign policy priorities. Significant events of the late 1970s and early 1980s that led to a heightening of Cold War tensions included the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan; the

seizing of U.S. diplomats as hostages in Iran; the destabilizing effect of multiple warhead missiles; the Sandinista success in Nicaragua and civil war in neighboring Central American countries; and concerns about ties between the Soviet Union and the growth of Muslim fundamentalism.

With the election of Ronald Reagan as president in 1980, U.S. foreign policy entered a new phase. In its first budget, the Reagan administration proposed significant cuts in both foreign aid and support for exchange programs as part of its overall effort to reduce the role of the federal government while increasing defense expenditures. Included in this package was a proposal to significantly cut the International Visitor Program. This proposal, however, created a huge uproar among the hundreds of thousands of volunteers who supported the IV and other exchange programs. Congress and the Administration, inundated with calls and letters from those who supported the program, and buffeted by media protests such as the New York Times editorial "America Surrenders," quickly backed down. Instead, the Administration and USIA, under the leadership of Charles Wick, prompted by Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, doubled the size of exchange program budgets. In addition, new flexible programs were created to respond to specific needs, such as the voluntary visitor program, the Young African Leaders program, and special programs for Russians and East Europeans.

In addition to USIA, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) also became involved in international training programs. In 1982 USAID instituted a global training program that ultimately brought tens of thousands of young leaders from the developing world to the United States for long-term academic and short-term technical training and observational study tours. In 1984 the Kissinger Commission urged USAID's adoption of a special program targeting Central American community leaders, called the Central and Latin America Scholarship Program (CLASP). The Kissinger Commission felt that by bringing thousands of these young community leaders to the United States for short-term training, the

U.S. could teach them the skills they needed to help develop their country. An important part of the program was the “Experience America” component, in which these young leaders learned about American culture and values through visits with American families and communities around the country. The local councils for international visitors were natural coordina-

The success of the IV program demonstrates the importance of citizen-to-citizen exchanges and their ability to create linkages that often are not possible through more traditional diplomatic channels.

tors for this program, and many of them became heavily engaged in providing that support. Other special activities such as “Mid-Winter Seminars,” which were available during the Christmas holiday break for those in U.S.-based academic programs, also became part of the CIV repertoire during this period.

The Visitor Program Matures

The late 1980s and 1990s witnessed major foreign policy changes that have had a significant impact on the nature and direction of the IV Program. Most important, between 1989 and 1991 the world witnessed the collapse of the Soviet Union and its Eastern European empire. U.S. foreign policy, which for so many years had focused on combating the Soviet Union, required, and is still waiting for, a thorough rethinking that would establish key U.S. foreign policy interests. Even now the foreign policy establishment continues to wrestle with defining its mission.

The early 1990s also saw important changes in the U.S. government’s support for publicly

funded exchange programs. Congress began to question the purpose and value of these programs as part of an overall evaluation of the entire foreign affairs portfolio. After a decade of strong government support in the 1980s, the 1990s witnessed a significant change in the emphasis of the program. While support for exchanges between the United States and the developing countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America remained static or declined, there was a dramatic increase in support for exchanges between the United States, the states of the former Soviet Union, and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Specialized programs were introduced, such as the Freedom Support Act, known as the Bradley Bill, which supported exchanges among high-school age students in former Soviet countries and the United States, and Community Connections, which created linkages between business and local government leaders of the United States and countries of the former Soviet Union.

Not surprisingly, these events have had a major impact on the local Councils for International Visitors. Some have seen their federal financial support shrink dramatically; in many cases it now represents only ten percent or less of their budgets. The demand for new types of programs, such as USIA's Community Connections, has required councils to create new services and expand their portfolio of programs to focus even more on business linkages. At the same time, many innovative councils have developed strategic plans, improved their internal management, and have begun to provide additional services to their business constituencies. For instance, a handful of CIVs offers fee-for-service programming directly to businesses. Others offer assistance with translation and interpretation, or provide consulting services for businesses wishing to work internationally. While no single approach is a panacea, it is clear to local councils that diversification of funding sources is a key element to long-term financial sustainability.

baseball games and concerts,

The International Visitor Program Today

Today the International Visitor Program brings more than 4,500 visitors from around the world to the United States. During the typical three-week program, visitors participate in a customized study tour. Either individually or in small groups, visitors travel to up to five cities and towns scattered throughout the United States. In communities large and small, visitors meet with their professional counterparts to talk about relevant issues and to share experiences and perspectives while learning about American customs and culture. They attend baseball games and concerts, banquets and barbecues. They may share meals with “typical” American families in their homes, and may even stay for the night or a long weekend. Visits are scheduled to ensure that participants experience all aspects of America, from big cities to small rural communities, from rodeos to symphonies, along with business meetings with U.S. professional counterparts. The exchange of information is not one-way, however. Through visits to schools, informal presentations, and media interviews, visitors share their cultures with Americans.

The IV Program is remarkable as an example of a public-private partnership. Some of the costs for the program are paid for by the U.S. government; a significant percentage of the costs, however, is paid through donations to the community groups that handle the programs in 98 communities throughout the United States. Some of the staff that arrange programs are paid professionals; more than 80,000 others volunteer their time to support their local councils. It is estimated that U.S. community groups donate nearly \$12 for every one dollar that the U.S. government spends on the International Visitor Program.

The success of the IV Program demonstrates the importance of citizen-to-citizen exchanges and their ability to create linkages that often are not possible through more traditional diplomatic channels. The IV Program's success highlights the critical role played by the network of volunteer community groups that, together with program agencies, comprise the

National Council for International Visitors.

Clearly, the nature and scope of the IV Program has evolved over the years, and it is still evolving as the world moves into the 21st century. New technology, new issues, and new funding sources all present challenges and opportunities that will shape the nature of the IV Program and of the local groups that support it. Regardless of what the future brings, the key to successful exchanges and communications is, as Edward Murrow said, for ideas to traverse the three feet from one person's mouth to another's ear. Communication over such short distances is fraught with challenges and problems that demonstrate just how difficult good, clear communication really is. The files of all CIVs are filled with stories about crossed wires and miscommunication over the years. These gaffes represent the challenge of intercultural communication, and they demonstrate how important it is that all participants in a conversation understand each other. A few examples follow.

A visitor once complained to IVC Detroit staff that after being shown an American home's wonderful electrical appliances, he was taken into the backyard by his host to help him cook his dinner outdoors over a charcoal fire. The pleasure of an American barbecue was lost on him.

Another guest was driven around a fancy Detroit neighborhood. Though he oohed and aahed about the size and obvious luxury of the large and beautiful homes, he was more than a little disturbed that so many of the residents seemed to be in the process of being evicted. He didn't realize at first that he was witnessing weekend garage sales.

A visitor from Britain, a handsome young member of Parliament, recently visited North Carolina. He was met in the office by a young woman, a volunteer for the IVC, who had arranged his program. It was one of her first programs, and she was very excited by the opportunity to meet her visitor. During the briefing she described all the professional appointments, then explained to him that she had planned for them to go to dinner after the meeting,

banquets and barbecues

exchanges and visits?

and then engage in a little shagging. At this the British visitor turned bright red, apologized, and said that though he found her attractive he didn't think it would be appropriate for them to shag so soon after meeting. She was confounded by his response, since in North Carolina a shag is a popular folk dance; in Britain it is a euphemism for making love. Once they sorted that out, they went out and had a pleasant time shagging the North Carolina way.

Reverberations of the IV Program

In the final analysis, what is the impact of all these exchanges and visits? What is the long-term impact of the IV Program on the visitors who come, the Americans who host them, and the communities where they live? Does involvement in the IV Program improve international relations? Does it help people from other countries to better understand the United States? Does it help Americans better understand themselves? For those who supported the program with some expectation of business developing from it, were they pleased or disappointed in the long run?

Americans who work with or volunteer for the International Visitor Program acknowledge that it brings them into contact with potentially valuable international contacts and that it expands their contacts within their own community. Some U.S. volunteers have consummated business deals that developed from the International Visitor Program. For instance, in 1993 the mayor of a large southern Polish city came to America on an IV Program. As part of his program he visited the Research Triangle Institute in North Carolina, where he tasted peanut butter for the first time. The mayor believed that peanut butter had the potential to be a large and important commodity in Poland. As a result of his visit, he signed a joint venture agreement to develop a peanut butter manufacturing capacity in Poland for the domestic market. North Carolina firms now export peanuts to Poland, where local firms make peanut butter. Thousands of Polish children are now able to experience the satisfaction of a peanut

butter sandwich.

Likewise, a volunteer from Minneapolis developed a long-term business relationship with a visitor from Sweden whom he hosted. The visitor was a journalist and producer of children's

A visitor once complained to IVC Detroit staff that after being shown an American home's wonderful electrical appliances, he was taken into the backyard to cook his dinner outdoors over a charcoal fire.

television programming; the host was the owner of a video production business. As a result of their home hospitality, the two collaborated on producing five hours of children's programming; the Swedish visitor became an agent for the American in Europe, and they later established a successful business newsletter on Swedish-American business opportunities.²⁴

More often the impact of the International Visitor Program occurs on a smaller scale. For instance, one city manager from Russia noticed that in rural areas in the United States people raised a little red flag on their mailboxes to indicate that there was mail to be picked up. By adopting this innovation, he was able to increase mail-delivery productivity significantly, reducing costs and providing better service to his constituents. This is not an earth-shattering result, but it does make a difference in people's lives.

Visitors to Nashville, Tennessee, are often as interested in visiting the Grand Ole Opry and hearing country music as they are in their meetings with local government officials. One visitor, a disc jockey from the former Yugoslavia, bemoaned the difficulty of obtaining a sufficient number of records (in the days before compact disks) for his radio station. Upon hearing this, the American disc jockey at the radio station where the Yugoslav was visiting

The visit to the U.S.

immediately arranged for two large boxes of records from his personal collection, each weighing more than 75 pounds, to be shipped to the Yugoslav visitor's radio station, at the American's expense.

The small changes that grow from an International Visitor grant make a difference in visitors' lives. Their understanding of and perspectives on the United States shift and deepen, often dramatically. The files of each CIV, of national program agencies, and of USIA and USIS posts abroad are filled with memos that recount the often life-changing nature of the visitors' experiences:

- "The modest goal of better mutual knowledge and friendship was surpassed into downright love for America, and our [Italian] doctors not only will stay in touch, but also promise to return."²⁵
 - "Ms. Callejas [Honduras] was quick to comment on what a great country she found the United States to be. Many of her experiences with Americans helped to dispel the myths that we are a distant, aloof people."²⁶
 - "As the two [Chinese] writers approached the front gate [of the White House], they noticed a number of protesters maintaining their vigil even on this bitterly cold day. One woman was demanding an end to nuclear testing, while a man protested U.S. support of the government of South Korea. This scene amazed Ms. Wang, who knew little of American-style democracy. She was fascinated that Americans actually know where their president lives, that a person can stand on the president's doorstep, so to speak, and say what he wants."²⁷
 - "At the time of his visit, a leader of an Islamist group in Tunisia was very anti-American. The visit to the U.S. transformed him completely. Upon his return, he wrote a series of six articles entitled 'What I Saw' in which he reversed his positions on America and our people by 180 degrees."²⁸
-

transformed him completely.

While the major component of the IV Program is for foreign visitors to learn how Americans live and work, Americans also learn much from their foreign guests. Long-term professional relationships may develop through which professionals share new approaches, research results, exchange industry literature, and in other ways collaborate on common issues.

Increased comfort levels with other cultures also help people to be more comfortable with the growing diversity within the United States. People involved with the IV Program at the local level are often more comfortable working with a multicultural workforce, and are more knowledgeable of the customs and mores of different peoples. Local businesses gain additional sophistication in dealing in an international environment, which translates into increased ability to do business globally.

Recent studies have tried to measure the impact of the program on American volunteers. In 1999 students at Alverno College in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, conducted two studies that attempted to capture, anecdotally, the influence of the IV Program in the United States.²⁹ Influence manifests in a number of ways. Two of the more important ones are increased personal networking opportunities and greater understanding of global interconnectedness.

Networking Opportunities

American volunteers frequently comment that their participation in the IV Program has offered them friendship and contacts around the globe, and provided them with opportunities for learning about other cultures that they would not have otherwise had. One volunteer related that she planned a family vacation to Turkey and contacted a former visitor, the governor of a province. The Turkish official drove with his family to where she was staying, a distance of some ninety miles, simply to take the volunteer and her family to dinner.³⁰ Genvieve Fridland, a long-term volunteer in Memphis, recounts the story of how she and her daughter visited China and linked up with a former participant from that country, who had

become a “man of influence.” He arranged special side trips and other amenities in order to provide hospitality similar to what Mrs. Fridland and her family had offered him years before.

Increased Global Understanding

The most powerful outcome of the International Visitor Program is the perspective it provides to its visitors and American participants about the rest of the world. The program brings the world to the American volunteers, offering them the opportunity to learn about other countries and ways of life without leaving home.

Americans who volunteer for the IV Program have also said that as a result of their participation they feel an increased appreciation for American democracy and freedoms, in large degree because those freedoms are absent in many other places in the world. Rights that are taken for granted in this country are highly valued elsewhere; as the American volunteers see the United States through others' eyes, their perceptions of their own country change.

A volunteer from Albuquerque, New Mexico, had hosted and maintained correspondence with a visitor from Malawi. After not hearing from the visitor for some time, she learned that he “had been put in prison as a political prisoner, was denied medical treatment, and died there.”³¹ Her experience is not uncommon. As a result of their experiences with international visitors, American hosts often gain a deeper understanding of and appreciation for democratic values.

Others have commented on the impact the program has had on their interest in foreign affairs. Whereas previously foreign policy was something that happened “out there,” the American participants suddenly are able to attach a name, a face, or a person to what they read about in the newspaper or view on CNN. Increased understanding of other cultures and knowledge of other countries are important benefits, both for the volunteers and for their families. Quite a number of volunteers have mentioned that their children travel more inter-

1940

Nelson Rockefeller named Coordinator, Commercial and Cultural Affairs for the American Republics.

1946

Fulbright Act establishes funding for exchange programs.

1948

Smith-Mundt Act establishes International Educational Exchange Program.

1952

International Information Administration (IIA) takes over exchange and information programs.

1953

United States Information Agency (USIA) established under Eisenhower's Reorganization Plan No. 8.

1957

Councils for International Visitors meet in Washington, DC.

1959

The Bureau of International Cultural Relations assumes exchange role from Bureau of Public Affairs.

nationally than other children because they have been exposed to and are interested in other countries. Presumably this will help those children in their professional careers.

A WorldBoston member recently hosted a barbecue for an AIDS/HIV control group from Botswana. She was left with a vivid impression of one of the guests. He was sitting on the couch with her two young children. "He had such wonderful stories to tell them about his country and the animals in the village. I've never seen them so quiet and attentive in all my life! I am one of the few mothers who has children that keep asking, 'When are we going to Botswana?'" And as a volunteer from Freeport, Illinois said, "My daughter can intelligently discuss countries her classmates cannot locate on a map—you can't buy that."³²

Closing Thoughts

In conclusion, the International Visitor Program has been a powerful tool for bringing people from different countries together to talk with each other. It has not created many multimillion dollar deals—that was never its intention—but it has resulted in valuable connections for smaller businesses. It has not solved the world's problems, but it has helped people better understand what those problems are.

The IV Program has succeeded in bringing people together to help them better appreciate the fact that we all share similar hopes, fears, and concerns. We all want to live productive, useful lives. We all want to make a contribution to our communities. We all bring some spiritual dimension to the way we live. By talking together, sharing food, sharing professional concerns, and sharing lives, we begin to understand these common human aspirations. We build bridges across cultures.

To close, I think back to a visitor program I worked on a number of years ago. This was a multi-regional project that brought together twenty people from different countries to look at how foreign policy is made in the United States. During the opening icebreaker sessions, the

1961	1978	1979	1982	1997	1999
Fulbright-Hays Act passed.	U.S. public diplomacy moves to U.S. International Communication Agency (USICA); program renamed International Visitor Program (IVP).	COSERV changes name to National Council for International Visitors (NCIV).	USICA is renamed United States Information Agency (USIA).	To date, of more than 100,000 International Visitors hosted, 177 achieved positions of chief of state or head of government.	International Visitor Program moves to State Department as part of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

visitors stood up and introduced themselves to their colleagues. The visitor from Israel, a radio journalist, stood up and made his introduction. As he sat down the Egyptian visitor immediately stood up, out of order. We didn't know what to expect. "If I can beg my colleagues' indulgence," he said, "I, too, am a journalist. An Egyptian journalist. In Egypt of course we do not have the best relationship with our Israeli neighbors, even though we are so close to each other. You all know the historical reasons why." He paused. "But I have to tell you that we can receive Israeli radio. For many years I have listened to Israeli radio. In particular, I have listened to the commentaries and reporting of a certain Israeli journalist. I have always thought his reporting was honest and true. I have always respected him as a journalist and colleague, and regretted that I would never be able to meet him. But here, in America, I have just heard the voice of my esteemed Israeli colleague, and have just met my esteemed Israeli colleague. This is a wonderful program, that can bring together neighbors who can't talk with each other because of political reasons." He walked over to the Israeli, who by this time was also standing. They embraced, to the applause of their colleagues from around the world.

As the State Department's International Visitor Program and the community groups that have contributed to, implemented, and supported the program since its inception look ahead, they should celebrate the accomplishments, both tangible and intangible, that have been achieved so far. They are a strong foundation for the future.

Endnotes

¹ Brooks Emeny, *A History of the Founding of the Cleveland Council on World Affairs, 1935-1948*, (Cleveland: The Cleveland Council on World Affairs, 1975) 100-101.

² Emeny 101.

³ University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, "The Fulbright Program, 1946-1996: An Online Exhibit," available September 1999: <http://cavern.uark.edu/depts/speccoll/fulbrightexhibit>.

⁴ Dean Mahin, "The Department of State's International Visitor Program 1948-1968," *International Educational and Cultural Exchange*, Fall 1968: 1.

⁵ Mahin 4.

⁶ Mahin 2.

⁷ Katherine F. Rozei, "At the Intersection of Business and Race Relations in Atlanta: The Georgia Council for International Visitors," *atlantahistory: A Journal of Georgia and the South* XLII Winter 1999: 39.

⁸ Jennifer M. Trask, *A Retrospective on Citizen Diplomacy in the San Francisco Bay Area*, (San Francisco: International Diplomacy Council, August 1999) 3.

⁹ Trask 4.

¹⁰ Mahin 4.

¹¹ Marcia Helke, *Geneseo International Fellowship Program Report*, (Geneseo: Geneseo International Thanksgiving Fellowship Program, 1999).

¹² Trask 5-6.

¹³ Gail Shrott, communication with author, September 1999.

¹⁴ U.S. Government Printing Office, "Committee on Foreign Relations, Committee on International Relations, Legislation on Foreign Relations Through 1994," Vol. II, (U.S. GPO, 1995) 997-998.

¹⁵ Mahin 8.

¹⁶ For a good synopsis of the creation of NCIV, see John Gibson, *The International Visitor Program: The United States Government and the National Council for International Visitors*, October 1997: 22ff; and John Gibson, "Public Diplomacy: Public-Private Cooperation to Represent the United States to the World," *International Educator*, Spring 1998: 51-56.

¹⁷ Gibson, *Public Diplomacy*, 25. See also Miriam Murtha, "COSERV Then and Now 4," *Exchange*, Spring 1972.

¹⁸ International Services Council of Huntsville–Madison County, Inc., *NCIV History Project*, (Huntsville: International Services Council of Huntsville–Madison County, Inc., 1998) 1.

¹⁹ For additional details on the founding and early years of the organization see Anne Hansen, *History of the Georgia Council for International Visitors, 1962-1998*, (Atlanta: The Georgia Council for International Visitors, 1998).

²⁰ Rozei 44.

²¹ Trask 7.

²² U.S. Information Agency, *Building International Bridges*, (Washington: USIA, 1995) 43.

²³ *Building International Bridges* 39.

²⁴ Cerbins, J., S. Meier, and R. Miller, *Domestic Social and Economic Impact of the International Visitor Program*, paper prepared for Applied Research, SSC 353, Alverno College, May 1999: 59-60.

²⁵ Sherry Mueller, 1995. "Impact of the USIA International Visitor Program: 'Success Stories,'" paper prepared for a workshop at the NCIV Biregional Conference, San Diego, Ca., April 1995: 36.

²⁶ Mueller 37.

²⁷ Mueller 38.

²⁸ Mueller 41-42.

²⁹ Kochs Adams and Wolf Mason, *Domestic Social and Economic Impact of the International Visitor Program*, paper prepared for Applied Research, SSC 353, Alverno College, March 1999; Cerbins et al.

³⁰ Cerbins et al. 13.

³¹ Cerbins et al. 16.

³² Sherry Mueller and Jennifer Hawkins, "Why Volunteer," *International Educator*, Vol. V, Number 3, Spring 1996: 29.

Bibliography

- Adams, Cherie M., Jessica Koehs, Sara Mason, and Stephanie Murre Wolf. 1999. "Domestic Social and Economic Impacts of the International Visitor Program." Paper prepared for Applied Research SSC 353.
- Cerbins, Jennifer; Sarah Meier; and Ruth Miller. 1999. "Domestic Social and Economic Impact of the International Visitors Program." Paper prepared for Applied Research, SSC 353, Alverno College.
- "COSERV—The First Ten Years of the National Council for Community Services for International Visitors." 1972. *Exchange* (Spring).
- Delaney, Robert F., and John S. Gibson, eds. 1967. "American Public Diplomacy: The Perspective of Fifty Years." Medford: Tufts University.
- Emeny, Brooks. 1975. "A History of the Founding of the Cleveland Council on World Affairs 1935-1948." The Council on World Affairs, (November).
- Johnson, Walter and Francis J. Colligan. 1965. *The Fulbright Program: A History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mahin, Dean B. 1968. "The Department of State's International Visitors Program 1948-1968." *Exchange* IV (Autumn).
- Mueller, Sherry. 1971. "Exploring America With a Group of Asian and Pacific Student Leaders." *Exchange* VI (Spring).
- . 1995. "Impact of the USIA International Visitor Program: 'Success Stories'" Paper prepared for a workshop held at the NCIV Biregional Conference, San Diego, CA (April).
- Mueller, Sherry and Nicole Cavallerano. 1997. "Impact of the USIA International Visitor Program: Success Stories Volume II.
- Ninkovich, Frank. 1981. *The Diplomacy of Ideas; U.S. Foreign Policy and Cultural Relations, 1938-1950*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Norton, Sherry Lee Mueller. 1977. "The United States Department of State International Visitor Program: A Conceptual Framework for Evaluation." Dissertation, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.
- Rozei, Katherine Friedman. 1999. "At the Intersection of Business and Race Relations in Atlanta: The Georgia Council for International Visitors," *atlantahistory: A Journal of Georgia and the South* XLII (Winter): 36-48.
-