One of the least known of Andrew Carnegie’s many endeavors—and one of his few real failures—was his involvement in a crusade to simplify the spelling of English-language words. The idea was originally the brainchild of Melvil Dewey, the New York State librarian who developed the Dewey Decimal library classification system, and Carnegie—who was fond of composing his own correspondence in an abbreviated style that often omitted articles and prepositions while making use of his own phonetic spelling—involved himself in this campaign until the end of his life. This wasn’t an eccentricity; it was a manifestation of his lifelong commitment to the importance of communication: anything that could be done to get the word out should be done.

It is in that spirit that we launch this new magazine, the Carnegie Reporter. In the age of the Internet, one always hears predictions that the web will replace most written communication. We’ve heard them, too, so we embark on this new venture with great respect for the new world of technology that is revolutionizing and democratizing communications, but also with the knowledge that the power of reading has not been diminished by technology but, in fact, revitalized by it.

I first discovered and fell in love with reading during my schoolboy years in Tabriz, Iran. It stimulated my thinking, my imagination, my aspirations; it placed me on the road toward discovering my future as an historian, and it enriched my understanding of the human soul in all its complexity. Certainly, we all have our own story about the time we discovered literature, the texture of the book’s cover, the smell of the pages, the way each word spun into the next until they were more than mere words on the page but an intricate web of words, creating a world beyond our own—the world of our imagination—and began to create our character, our thought process. Like the spider’s web, every piece we read adds a new layer to our understanding. Every book or magazine article we read enhances the last one and pushes us toward the next one. We move from the center out and are infinitely able to build and rebuild ourselves through reading.

We also depend on reading and writing—the essence of communication—in our role as the staff and stewards of philanthropic foundations like Carnegie Corporation; we think, we talk, we write, we read, we listen, and then try to use these tools of communication to express the goals we’ve set for our organizations and to share the results of our efforts. That is the intent of the Carnegie Reporter, to help us share what we learn from our work, and it is how we hope you will use it, too. We hope it will help you understand Carnegie Corporation and its philosophies on education, democracy, international peace and security and international development, the areas in which we currently concentrate our grantmaking. We also want this publication to be a hub for the work of other foundations, an avenue for important ideas.

Initially, this magazine will be published twice a year, and it will also be made available as an online publication. Andrew Carnegie probably would have liked that, would have liked reading about the Corporation’s work in yet another communications medium, because the Internet’s power is that it offers the word, the potency of reading and learning, to a larger and larger circle of the world’s people. In time, when everyone can log on, the Internet promises that no one will be cut off from groundbreaking scientific discoveries, literary achievements or the understanding of history—the greatest library that the world has ever known will be open to everyone, every adult, every child. In time, the world’s most wonderful ideas will be accessible to anyone who wants to learn, who wants to be thrilled and challenged and provoked. On the web, the written word is still “the written word,” and thus maintains the ability to flex its extraordinarily powerful muscle. We are both awed and humbled by that thought, and hope that our best efforts to add to what the world knows about itself will always be reflected in these pages.

Welcome to the Carnegie Reporter

VARTAN GREGORIAN
President
A Bright Future for Russian Higher Education

Students who demand post-Soviet honesty from their teachers, a more open society inching towards all-out capitalism, a new economy struggling to compete in global markets: surrounded by so much change, how will the new Russia’s institutions of higher education reinvent themselves? In many cases, the process has already begun.

Between the Lions Rates a Roar of Approval

Can a children’s television show set in a library and starring a family of literate lions help kids learn to read? Researchers think so, as does the TV Critics Association, but more importantly, so do the young children who have made Between the Lions one of the most popular new programs on public TV.

Liberal Arts for a New Millennium

There was a time when having a liberal arts degree meant you were probably headed for a career in academia or maybe the sciences. But today, could studying the liberal arts be the best preparation for becoming a techno warrior?

Overturning Buckley

The late Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., helped author a landmark 1976 Supreme Court decision that struck down all limits on spending for political campaigns. In an ironic twist, the law center that bears his name is spearheading the effort to have the ruling overturned.

Narciso Matos: An Interview

He was born into Mozambique’s segregated society and helped shepherd its universities through both his country’s independence and its struggle to move from Marxism to democracy. Now the former secretary general of the Association of African Universities has joined Carnegie Corporation as a senior program officer with a mandate to shape the foundation’s new program in African higher education.

Foundation Roundup

From a study of racial disparity in the juvenile justice system to an innovative program for funding the arts, foundations around the United States continue to support social change in the community, the country and the world.

Lessons of the Cold War: William J. Perry’s Perspective

William J. Perry, former U.S. Secretary of Defense, is often thought of as the chief architect of this country’s stealth technology and smart weapons. What does he think about recent proposals to develop a national missile defense system? Maybe not what you’d expect.
For nearly thirty years, Midkhat Faroukshin taught “scientific communism” at Kazan State University (KGU). He was tapped for the job in 1963 as a young law graduate and loyal Communist Party member. In 1989, he was one of the first to introduce the study of political science in Russia. Today, the owlish Faroukshin, still lawyerly in a suit and tie, teaches comparative politics to political science majors planning careers in business, civil service and public relations. Communism is just one of the systems they study. Students decide for themselves which one they like best.

KGU, in American terms the Russian equivalent of an Ivy League school, has its share of famous alumni. Leo Tolstoy enrolled in 1844. Vladimir Lenin attended for one semester; he was expelled in December 1887 for his involvement in revolutionary activities. When Tolstoy and Lenin attended KGU, two courses not yet on the curriculum were “Scientific Communism” and “The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union,” later to become mandatory for every single student in the USSR.

If scientific communism was meant to indoctrinate students into quoting Marx and Lenin as the answer to any dispute, new subjects like political science aim, at least in part, to instill an understanding of the open discourse encouraged in a democratic society. Faroukshin frets about a recent government decree making political science an elective.

“Who will tell students about today’s life?” he asks. “I don’t understand how chemists or biologists will understand what is happening in Russian society.”

Faroukshin teaches in Tatarstan, a perfect case study for a fledgling political scientist. The largely Muslim republic on the Volga River has avoided Islamic fundamentalism and negotiated much of the autonomy that regions like Chechnya are still demanding. Tatarstan is also one of the most authoritarian
republics of the new Russian Federation, with a president who often acts like a feudal lord.

But these days, says Faroukshin, no one can tell him—or instructors at any other Russian university—what to teach. In Faroukshin’s class, for example, Lenin’s State and Revolution has made way for Arend Lijphart’s* Democracies. Students have to learn English (soon a second language will also be required), navigate the Internet, and would read publications like the American Journal of Political Science, Faroukshin says, if the university library could afford a subscription. KGU is federally financed, so local authorities cannot tighten the screws, but money is always short. Faroukshin recently paid his own way to a national congress of political scientists in Moscow. The top-heavy federal education ministry, for all of its bureaucratic heavy-handedness, does not micromanage individual course content or faculty development.

“We are free in our teaching,” Faroukshin explains. “No one keeps track like in Soviet times of what we are teaching, how we are lecturing. This does not exist now. Now there is freedom. Even in a republic where an authoritarian situation flourishes, where in essence a regime of dictatorial power has been established, we speak openly about those things that are happening in the republic as well.”

Three time zones away, at Tomsk State University (TGU) in a region known as the Siberian taiga, political science majors are clamoring for practical applications for their newfound political knowledge. All of the university’s political science majors have worked in hotly contested political races full of mudslinging. The head of the department, Vladimir Scherbinin, was chief strategist for the parliamentary campaign of Yegor Ligachev, the former number two bureaucrat in the Soviet Politburo. Scherbinin, never a Communist, prides himself on having taken on a challenge and run the region’s only clean campaign as an example to his students. Ligachev won.

Condemned by Soviet officials as a bourgeois pseudo-science, political science is now one of the most popular new subjects at universities across Russia. Young Russians are also flocking to classes offering other subjects that used to be banned or nonexistent, from gender studies to Jewish studies. Business schools have also become popular.

Other avenues of educational exploration are also opening up to Russian students and teachers. Grants from foundations like Carnegie Corporation, Ford, MacArthur and the Open Society Institute sponsor Internet communication, fund research projects and make it possible for students and teachers to travel abroad and return to Russia to apply their knowledge. A $50 million World Bank loan is earmarked for improving social science education at several universities, including TGU, which will receive $1.5 million.
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Other avenues of educational exploration are also opening up to Russian students and teachers. Grants from foundations like Carnegie Corporation, Ford, MacArthur and the Open Society Institute sponsor Internet communication, fund research projects and make it possible for students and teachers to travel abroad and return to Russia to apply their knowledge. A $50 million World Bank loan is earmarked for improving social science education at several universities, including TGU, which will receive $1.5 million.

Russian Universities: Reaching Out to the World

Universities themselves are beginning to benefit from the confluence of a more open society and the availability of new communications tools. In Russia, as in many other places, educational institutions have begun to embrace whatever technology they can gain access to. From Vladivostok to Kaliningrad, a computer network links universities to each other and to the rest of the world. With support from the Open Society Institute, 33 Internet centers have been established at various higher education institutions. One Moscow-based institute, which is pioneering distance learning, has increased its student body from 5,000 to 32,000 and sends out over three tons of course materials monthly.
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Osip Mandelstam, the poet who died in the Gulag. But holdovers from the Soviet era still do have an effect on the lives of most students, subjecting them, for example, to grueling entrance exams, rote learning, lottery-like oral exams at the end of each semester, and only minimal student participation allowed in classes led by dictatorial professors.

Even at universities that tout freedom of choice, the number of mandatory courses is so great that students have little room to maneuver. Dormitories are cheap, but also dirty and dangerous. Corruption is rife. Education is becoming more regionally stratified. Fewer students are travelling to Moscow to study because of prohibitive travel costs and substandard living conditions. Russian universities now have closer ties with their Western counterparts than with their immediate neighbors. An example: in 1992 there teaching Tolstoy but talking about communism all the time.

Another student, Liza Lopatkina, 19, who is studying English and Swedish, wonders when her teachers were showing their true face. “They taught in Soviet times. I don’t understand this transformation,” she says. “When were they sincere? In Soviet times or now?”

Galina Belaya, dean of the department of history and philology at the Russian State Humanities University (RGGU) in Moscow, worries that students do not know about the horrors of the past and suffer from what she calls “historical deafness.” She assigns reading that includes the shattering memoirs of Nadezhda Mandelstam, wife of Osip Mandelstam, the poet who died in the Gulag.

But holdovers from the Soviet era still do have an effect on the lives of most students, subjecting them, for example, to grueling entrance exams, rote learning, lottery-like oral exams at the end of each semester, and only minimal student participation allowed in classes led by dictatorial professors.

Even at universities that tout freedom of choice, the number of mandatory courses is so great that students have little room to maneuver. Dormitories are cheap, but also dirty and dangerous. Corruption is rife. Education is becoming more regionally stratified. Fewer students are travelling to Moscow to study because of prohibitive travel costs and substandard living conditions. Russian universities now have closer ties with their Western counterparts than with their immediate neighbors. An example: in 1992 there
were nearly 30,000 students from Ukraine studying at Russian schools, but by 1999, the number was 4,703.

Another major unresolved issue is how closely intertwined higher education is with military service. Young men at state institutions and some “commercial” or nonstate schools enjoy a deferment from the mandatory draft of 18-year-old males, many of whom are sent to fight in the ongoing war in Chechnya. Top universities lure young men with “military departments,” similar to the U.S. military’s ROTC program found on many American campuses. In exchange for one day per week of military training they graduate as officers and avoid basic training if they end up having to serve. Graduate students can defer even further. Those with the Russian equivalent of a Ph.D. are completely exempt.

Still, it is not hard to find ways in which Russian student life is similar to that of their American counterparts. On a Saturday night in Tomsk, young men and women converge at a nightclub called Millennium where admission costs nearly $4 or about half a student’s monthly stipend. The nightclub, with its Siberian Corona beer on tap, yards-long bar and mural of the New York City skyline, looks like it could be in Moscow, London or Manhattan, and the nightclubbers display the expected Generation X ennui, only in typical new Russian style, they are better dressed, sporting designer clothes and trendy sunglasses.

**Education: Still Russian by Nature**

Russian students may like to unwind in the same kinds of places their American cousins frequent, but...
back in school, their education is delivered by a decidedly Russian system—and that’s a source of national pride. Both Russians who support change and those disheartened by reform have not forgotten that their institutions of higher education gave birth to pioneers of the atomic and space ages. Like Russian music, literature and dance, education is a reminder of both past and potential glory.

Russian children, who usually start school at age 7 and spend 11 years in the school system, are taught the basics so well early on (elementary school students study algebra, high schoolers take calculus), that some bright college students in the sciences tell of attending lectures only a couple of times each semester and doing just fine on exams. Proof that this may be more than an idle boast comes from a recent international computer programming competition where a student from St. Petersburg University took first place, beating out teams from Harvard, Stanford and the California Institute of Technology.

“In Russia, education was always very important,” says Belaya of RGGU. “We are an illiterate country of peasants who still have a complex about being poorly educated. This is one of Russia’s big problems.”

Another looming problem—at least from the Russian point of view—is the prospect of American-style education gradually taking over. It’s a scenario with possibilities, because American schools are beginning to open branches in Russia. Bard College of Annandale-on-Hudson, together with St. Petersburg University, recently created the first college in Russia to offer an American liberal arts program. Graduates earn a B.A. awarded jointly by Bard College and St. Petersburg University. Though Belaya is a great champion of educational reform—RGGU is one of the most liberal schools in Moscow, popular with the children of Moscow’s intelligentsia—even she is wary of outside pressure. “I’m concerned that we often turn to educational models that are alien to us,” she says, adding that her department chose to follow a pre-revolutionary model of combined comparative literature and area studies.

As befits a psychologist and professional educator, Alexander Asmolov—a reformer who spent the years 1988-98 as a Deputy Minister of Education—believes the roots of the problems with Russia’s educational system and their solutions are in childhood. Asmolov—who was constantly attacked by Communist critics during his tenure in educational administration—sees conservative bureaucrats and university rectors as enemies of change. He compares them to the “red directors”—the heads of factories who feared reform and wouldn’t let decrepit post-Soviet industry out of their iron grip. Only in this case, he intimates, they are, as Stalin called them, like “engineers of human souls” who do not want to let young minds out of their grasp.

Asmolov states that, “We have to create a school of uncertainty that will teach a person to make decisions in unforeseen, nonstandard, atypical, indefinite situations. That would be different than in the Soviet Union,” he continues, “where at eight-thirty in the morning all children sat down to the same textbook, at the same hour, and learned the same exact thing, and a misstep was treated like an escape attempt, like in a concentration camp. In essence, in the Soviet education system the shaping of consciousness was much more powerful than that of the Party or of the KGB. If Freud saw this he would be upset because it doesn’t confirm his theory. Children didn’t love their father—they didn’t have an Oedipus or Elektra complex—they loved Lenin, the Great Father. We had a powerful system of totalitarian consciousness.”

**Books and Money: Looking to Capitalism to Provide Both**

At the Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences, a postgraduate school opened in 1995 and offering a joint degree with the University of...
Manchester in Great Britain, rector Teodor Shanin answers a question about the shortcomings of modern Russian education with a tour of the library.

Orderly, easily accessible shelves line a hall full of students typing away at individual computer work stations. It looks like a small, high-tech American public library. This is not the norm in Russia, where getting a library book is perhaps the best reenactment of the Soviet shopping experience. First you stand in line to place your order, then you wait for your book. Russian university libraries do not have open stacks. There is no looking, no touching, no wandering around for inspiration.

“This is the only library in Moscow with open shelves categorized by subject,” says Shanin. “I feel terrible when some of the best scholars in Moscow come and beg for one hour in my library.”

That’s not to say that Shanin hasn’t found some very good traditions to build on in the Russian educational system. He has, for instance, adopted cross-disciplinary “philosophical readings” from pre-revolutionary Russian universities, at which students engage in no-holds-barred intellectual debate.

“This is a very modern idea, but Russians came up with it first,” he explains. “It’s like teach-ins in the 1960s. They are a part of Russian academic culture.”

Shanin’s school has 200 students from across the former Soviet Union. His educational goal, he says, is to help “create a flame” that spreads innovative approaches to teaching and learning. Students from the outlying regions are sponsored by the Open Society Institute’s Higher Education Support Program. The school has five faculties ranging from social work to law. For all faculties but the faculty of law, the tuition for Muscovites is about $2,000 per year. At the faculty of law, it’s $3,500.

For a time in the first half of the 1990s, the period of economic shock therapy and hyperinflation, making money was more popular than making the grade at top universities. The idea of shelling out for a school like Shanin’s would have been dismissed as highly impractical. Even at Moscow State University, the Harvard, Yale and Princeton of Russia all rolled into one and topped with a Stalin-era spire visible from across town, the number of applicants in some departments dropped by two-thirds from the early 1990s.

The low point was probably the desperate time following the crash of the ruble in 1998. When that crisis struck, most students were receiving a stipend of about 83 rubles, which was worth about $13.30. After the ruble collapsed, the value of the stipend shrunk to about $3.90, barely enough for several spartan meals or a couple of Big Macs at Moscow’s McDonald’s.

Today, most students receive a stipend of 200 rubles, or about $7; not much of an improvement, but other numbers indicate an upturn. Russian industry is showing signs of growth and the service sector is continuing to develop. Well-trained managers and technical specialists are in demand. According to the Ministry of Education, in 1999 there were 1.3 mil-
lion high school graduates. In the fall of that year, over 1 million students enrolled in higher education institutions. While some may have been graduates from previous years, that’s still an astonishingly high figure.

Tatiana Klyachko, an economist at Moscow’s Higher School of Economics, founded in 1992, attributes at least part of the boom to young men looking for cover from military service, especially after the first Chechen war began in 1994. But most still find it heartening.

“The situation now is much better than it was a few years ago,” says Ivan Groznov, dean of the department of molecular and biological physics at the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, which has a rigorous six-year program. “Now I am optimistic,” says Groznov. “Students have started to grade of 5 (or A) on entrance exams to top schools. A, B or C can be remedied by a tuition fee. Two or three thousand dollars may seem cheap to American parents facing the prospect of financing an Ivy League education, but it is more than two year’s salary for the average Russian, which makes Harvard look like a bargain.

With education spending budgeted at just 3.2 percent of Russia’s GDP, state schools are always short of money. Many have opened affiliates throughout their home regions and in neighboring regions where students are required to pay fees. And the number of non-state higher education institutions jumped from 78 to 349 between 1993 and the present. Built on the new business-oriented economy, such schools draw students with the promise of good jobs and high pay. At the prestigious Moscow State Institute of Foreign Relations (MGIMO), where a law education costs $7,000 a year, students stride purposefully through the halls wearing suits and ties and carrying briefcases. Political science department dean Andrei Melville says that what used to be known as the “training ground of cadre” for the Foreign Ministry is now “more like the training ground of Russian yuppies” who prefer high paying corporate jobs to the small salaries of diplomats.

There are other signs that the forces of capitalism are beginning to affect Russian higher education. University applicants no longer need to make the effort of degrees in advertising, management, tourism and other specialties not always offered by classical state universities.

Some of these institutions, though, fail to meet state standards or obtain state accreditation. Tuition of hundreds, even thousands of dollars, means that few Russian students can afford such freedom of choice. Well under 10 percent study at “commercial” institutions. Both at state and commercial institutions, the number of students studying subjects related to economics, finance and law has caused a glut of such specialists on the job market. One-third of students this year graduated with degrees in these fields.

By any measure, the flow of students may soon run dry, not because of lack of interest in higher education but because of a lack of student bodies. Russia’s predicted demographic bust may mean that soon there simply will not be enough students to go around. Education Minister Vladimir Filippov sounded the warning at a convocation of education workers held in Moscow last January. According to Filippov—and bearing in mind that recent population growth estimates for the Russian Federation are -0.07 percent—by the year 2009 there will be only 1.3 million high-school graduates to fill 1.7 state-funded spots in higher education institutions.

Teachers are feeling the pinch, too. When the Soviet Union was intact, university professors lived fairly well, with decent salaries and apartments. Academicians were like gods, with vast dachas and chauffeured cars. Today, there is more freedom, but there are fewer perks. Salaries no longer support a satisfactory standard of living and this financial shortfall encourages a system of tutoring that may be even more insidious than SAT prepping in the United States.

In Moscow, some university professors earn up to $50 an hour tutoring high school students for entrance exams; not bad when the average salary is little more than $50 per month. In a country where getting into the right school can depend on having the right tutor, it is not unusual for a well-to-do family to spend several thousand dollars in this manner. A standardized university entrance exam has been written, but has not been greeted enthusiastically since it would eliminate a system from which many have profited. Professors also supplement their income by doing double duty, often at a rival school. At some com-

that will teach a person to make decisions in unforeseen, 
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have a serious attitude about education. They want not just a diploma, but an education.”

That, of course, does not preclude making money. At the prestigious Moscow State Institute of Foreign Relations (MGIMO), where a law education costs $7,000 a year, students stride purposefully through the halls wearing suits and ties and carrying briefcases. Political science department dean Andrei Melville says that what used to be known as the “training ground of cadre” for the Foreign Ministry is now “more like the training ground of Russian yuppies” who prefer high paying corporate jobs to the small salaries of diplomats.

There are other signs that the forces of capitalism are beginning to affect Russian higher education. University applicants no longer need to make the
commerical institutions, most of the faculty is made up of professors moonlighting from low-paying jobs at state schools.

In the outlying regions, money shortages have meant shortages of literature and textbooks. Freud may be de rigueur in Moscow, but a professor in Vladivostok complains that his students cannot obtain his books and in a test, one even identified the founder of psychoanalysis as “Fred.” Sergei Kulikov, a professor of modern history in Novosibirsk State University (NGU) says that he tries to overcome this obstacle by subscribing to over 100 publications with his own money and scouring the Internet for class materials.

A big part of the problem is at the top, says Alexander Tikhonov, another former Minister of Education who is now promoting Internet technology in education. He points to examples such as across-the-board stipends—even rich students with mobile phones get their 200 rubles a month—as a gross waste that costs the state $200 million per year.

**Marketing the Best and Brightest, At Home and Abroad**

Nikolai Dikansky, the rector of Novosibirsk State University, is well aware that he and his colleagues are going to have to make use of some overtly western marketing techniques to keep their institutions afloat. Dikansky, who says he has turned down several Western loans and grants because of the conditions they would impose, still sounds like a ruthless capitalist when he talks about his students. The university was founded in Akademgorodok in 1959 to produce researchers for the adjacent institutes of the Siberian Academy of Sciences. Akademgorodok was one of the birthplaces of reform, producing such Gorbachev-era strategists as economist Abel Aganbegyan and sociologist Tatyana Zaslavskaya.

But now, says Dikansky, “There is a huge demand in the West for our graduates, for programmers. But who pays us for this? They are our product. All of these foreign firms grab our graduates after we’ve educated them for free. So teachers end up teaching for free. Russian oil companies come to me,” he continues. “They say, we want your graduate. I say, pay money for him or we’ll send him to Seattle.” Referring to Microsoft, Dikansky says that there are at least 40 NGU alumni at the company and an equal number in Silicon Valley. The university has an alumni office that solicits funds, still a rarity in Russia and not always feasible because of tax legislation that offers few breaks.

Another financial strategy that Dikansky is mulling over centers on recruiting paying students from China, Pakistan and Turkey. He is opposed to the idea of charging tuition to Russian students.

Down the street, at the Boreskov Institute of Catalysis—where marble floors and shiny turnstiles in the foyer make the institute look more like a bank branch than part of the Siberian branch of the Academy of Sciences—graduates of NGU are working on projects such as one venture with Solutia, which used to be part of the Monsanto Company. The institute patented a one-step process for turning benzene into phenol, less harmful to the environment than the traditional method. Solutia is building a plant in the United States that will use the technique.

Business students at Novosibirsk State Technical University help organize trade shows and promote technological and biomedical products developed at the university. Some are also studying Turkish, thanks to a corporate sponsor from Turkey. The department is using a World Bank loan of $500,000 to develop the teaching of economic theory with help from visiting professors from the University of Washington.

At the Belozersky Institute, affiliated with Moscow State University, Dr. Alexey Agranovskiy, head of a team studying plant viruses, has held onto his young researchers with help from two consecutive grants of 150,000 DM from Germany’s Volkswagen AG and ruble support from the Russian Foundation for Basic Research. Agranovskiy moonlights as a blues singer and has given the name “rattlesnake” to one of his discoveries—the structure of a particular virus—in honor of Rattlesnake Annie, a favorite American country-blues singer with whom his band played in Moscow in the summer of 1997.

Marketing is also on the mind of Igor Fyodorov, rector of the venerable 170-year-old Moscow State Technical University (MGTU), which produced many of the founders of today’s space and nuclear science. He says that universities need to teach students how to market themselves. During the Soviet
era, he explains, students were assigned jobs as required by the state. By upgrading its status from institute to university, which a lot of schools have done in recent years (though sometimes only as self-promotion), MGTU was able to broaden its offerings. Students are now spending more time on the humanities—about fifteen percent—and learning foreign languages. They may be trained as engineers, but they have learned to be flexible.

“Specialists need to know how to quickly shift from one direction of work to another” says Fyodorov in his imposing Stalin-era office, surrounded by huge bouquets of flowers from his 60th birthday celebration. “For this they need a much broader, humanitar-ian, general education than they received in the past.”

Like institutions in many other regions of the country that are seeking greater independence from the rest of Russia, Tomsk State University has adapted not just to Russia’s new realities, but to the needs of the regional economy. The international relations program is focused not on training future diplomats for the Russian foreign ministry, but on educating graduates to work in the regional government and develop international ties that will draw investment to the timber-rich region. Another unique program, in ecological management, is training young environmentalists who work with local officials to combat violations such as poaching.

Recognizing and adapting to these new market forces, along with the many other practical considerations
imposed by living in a country with a new, global outlook, may finally be transforming the face of something that heretofore seemed immutable: the Russian intelligentsia. “I think our old understanding of the intelligentsia is fading away,” says Andrei Levandovsky, a history professor at Moscow State University who specializes in the study of the 19th century intelligentsia. Levandovsky is pleased with his students, who he says are much more lively and inquisitive than Soviet-era students. But he also points out that they are already a new breed.

“There is a difference between the intelligentsia and intellectuals,” he explains. “The intelligentsia is involved in solving eternal problems, it is tormented, and reflective. Intellectuals have a much more pragmatic approach. They go into politics, business, places where they can use their knowledge.”

He may be right, although the truth may be even more complicated. Konstantin Kozlov, the son of a miner, a senior at Tomsk State University and leader of its environmental activists, states almost matter-of-factly that he is not an “intelligent,” but gives a speech worthy of a Dostoyevsky character about the role of the intelligentsia and what must be done in Russia. He is categorically opposed to the war in Chechnya, but voted for the country’s new president, Vladimir Putin, who is committed to continuing the war, because “there was no alternative.”

“This is a period of transition with an old intelligentsia that does not understand the new system and no new intelligentsia that can say how better to do things,” he says. “I know that we are capable of changing this situation for the better,” he continues. “In my opinion, the situation in Russia will be changed by those in my generation who are going from one system to another, through this great change, and didn’t become pessimists, those who are not saying that everything is falling apart, but who are doing something. The future is ours.”
How will the Russian intelligentsia survive during the transition to democracy? That rather casual question, put on the table during an intense period of introspection about the work of Carnegie Corporation of New York by its then new president Vartan Gregorian, has challenged the Corporation’s international peace and security division to create opportunities that will echo in the former Soviet Union for decades to come.

**The Challenge:**

**Academic Freedom in the Former Soviet Union**

If revolutions are led by intellectuals, the work of building a country is not. The spotlight often moves from the university campus to the corridors of power; the work of history and philosophy, literature and political science can be left in the dust as enthusiasm focuses on creating bureaucracies and institutions. Gregorian, a scholar who had been leading institutions of higher learning for many years when he accepted the presidency of the Corporation in mid-1997, brought his personal perspective to the needs of the former Soviet Union. As Gregorian, along with his colleagues in the Corporation’s international peace and security and education divisions, considered the work the foundation should pursue in the new century, he knew there would be a role to play in Russia and the post-Soviet successor states. As a historian, Gregorian understood that in major political transformations intellectuals are often unprepared and unprotected. He wondered if Carnegie, with its long-standing tradition of working to improve U.S.-Soviet understanding and its reputation in Russia—who passed her early school years in Moscow, has spent the last two years shaping this program, which will create regional centers of excellence. She has engaged a team of senior management of the Corporation and a wide circle of outside advisers from within and outside of Russia. The program will develop a network of scholars beyond the main academic hubs of St. Petersburg and Moscow who will be able to continue to advance in their disciplines, conduct research and also teach a new generation of scholars. The centers will be more than lifelines for intellectuals caught without access to scholarly journals and to other scholars: They will be magnets for entire regions to build new learning centers that can invigorate professors, students and communities.

“If I ever had a doubt that our centers could contribute to scholarship in this vast land of the former Soviet Union, my travels to distant points and communities have erased those doubts,” says Arsenian. “After difficult years of neglect and change, Russian regional universities are starting to rebuild and are competing for students and resources. A certain resiliency and ingenuity are alive. When I meet with rectors in every corner of the country,” she continues, “I find them anxious and eager to compete for these centers, which will offer access to resources and connections for their professors. The universities want their scholars and students connected to the ideas, changes and discoveries of today. The CASEs will help do that.”

**CASEs: An Idea Takes Shape**

That was the genesis of the idea of CASEs, Centers for Advanced Study and Education, which will be established in Russia and other former Soviet Union states over the next decade. Deana Arsenian, a Carnegie Corporation senior program officer and director of HEFSU (Higher Education in the former Soviet Union) who passed her early school years in Moscow, has spent the last two years shaping this program, which will create regional centers of excellence. She has engaged a team of senior management of the Corporation and a wide circle of outside advisers from within and outside of Russia. The program will develop a network of scholars beyond the main academic hubs of St. Petersburg and Moscow who will be able to continue to advance in their disciplines, conduct research and also teach a new generation of scholars. The centers will be more than lifelines for intellectuals caught without access to scholarly journals and to other scholars: They will be magnets for entire regions to build new learning centers that can invigorate professors, students and communities.

“If I ever had a doubt that our centers could contribute to scholarship in this vast land of the former Soviet Union, my travels to distant points and communities have erased those doubts,” says Arsenian. “After difficult years of neglect and change, Russian regional universities are starting to rebuild and are competing for students and resources. A certain resiliency and ingenuity are alive. When I meet with rectors in every corner of the country,” she continues, “I find them anxious and eager to compete for these centers, which will offer access to resources and connections for their professors. The universities want their scholars and students connected to the ideas, changes and discoveries of today. The CASEs will help do that.”

**The Beginning**

As a starting point, the Corporation and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation commissioned a major study on higher education in
the former Soviet Union by the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, DC. The report, written by Blair Ruble and Nancy Popson of the Kennan Institute and Susan Bronson, an independent scholar on Russia, offered a baseline appraisal of the issues facing higher education. It was a springboard for Arsenian who engaged a team of educators and foundation officers through an analysis of opportunities. Andrei Kortunov, director of the Moscow Public Science Foundation, became the Russian partner in the program analysis that sketched out a thesis for the CASEs and then put that thesis to the test in meetings throughout the vast and varied regions of the former Soviet Union. Changes were made, strategies refined and a program launched in the spring of 2000 with a $2.4 million grant to the Woodrow Wilson International Center, which will administer the project with the Moscow Public Science Foundation.

One major decision by Arsenian and her team of advisors, arrived at after site visits to a number of Russian universities, was to make the CASEs selection process a competitive one. The strength of spirit and ingenuity, so apparent on the ground in many university communities, meant that choosing one institution over another was not a simple task. The Russian Ministry of Education, which was extensively consulted during the process of exploration, also believed that the competition would be a way for the individual communities to rally their resources and help prepare them for the regional leadership role they would inherit with the centers. The competition will begin during the summer of 2000 with three institutions expected to be chosen as the first CASEs sometime in the fall.

“For Carnegie Corporation, the CASEs are a long-term commitment underlining our belief that the intelligentsia have a unique and important role to play in this march toward a new society that is underway in the former Soviet Union,” says Gregorian. “For centuries, the tradition of learning and scholarship has been a mark of Russia’s greatness and that tradition must be nurtured as the society goes through the transition from a Soviet state. Scholarship knows no political boundaries; it must be free to question, explore, analyze and percolate. Historically, we at Carnegie Corporation have worked to deepen the understanding between Russia and the United States. We think now, more than ever, when knowledge is often the comparative advantage in many business and personal situations, that higher education deserves the commitment of the world.”

**Sustainability is the Long-Term Goal**

The Centers for Advanced Study and Education will be located on existing university campuses but will be independent organizations with advisory boards that guide their work. The Corporation will offer financial support, assistance in strengthening the institutions, support in domestic and international outreach and support in building regional and national networks of scholars. Among the activities expected to be part of the CASEs are:

- fellowship grants for scholars in the social sciences and the humanities
- travel, conference and information support to individual scholars
- institutional support for CASEs
- support for workshops, conferences, public lectures and roundtables
- library support and publication programs
- dissemination of Russian scholarship abroad

The CASEs will have thematic profiles that build on the strongest departments or academic traditions in the home university, but the intent of the program is to avoid thematic rigidity. “We think the thematic profile can give the centers national and even international name recognition that will attract scholars,” says Arsenian. “But we also want to allow for academic flexibility and cross-disciplinary fertilization.”

“For the past decade, we’ve been deeply involved in the Russian question,” says David Speedie who has chaired the Corporation’s international peace and security program since 1993. “Carnegie has been in the forefront of bringing leaders in the Russian military, political and scientific fields together with their counterparts in the United States. Together, they’ve grappled with the security and peace questions faced by these two pivotal world nations and created new and important relationships.” He adds, “We think this work in the humanities and social sciences is an important investment in the intellectual life of Russia.”

“The primary objective of these Centers for Advanced Study and Education is to develop a dynamic and sustainable network of Russian scholars, educators and researchers capable of conducting independent research and analyses of crucial social, political, philosophical and economic issues,” says Arsenian. “With Carnegie’s investment, the Russian intelligentsia will be offered the financial, professional and managerial support required for their efficient performance—not only during the duration of the program but for decades to come.”

“If we succeed,” says Gregorian, “Russian scholars will be integrated into the international intellectual community and that will be a major contribution, not only for Russia and the former states, but for the world.”
As soon as a child laughed through one half hour of *Between the Lions*, no conscientious parent or teacher could ask, “Does the show work for kids?” Clearly, the most ambitious children’s television program in a decade, aimed at teaching young children the fundamentals of reading, is good entertainment. But the question haunting the creative team behind *Between the Lions* was, “Can the show make a difference in how kids learn to read?” The first report cards are in and the show wins an E for excellence in TV and education.

Deborah Linebarger of the University of Kansas completed a study involving almost 200 children from three different areas of Kansas City—half of whom watched 17 episodes of the program from February to April 2000. Children in both the control and television-watching groups were evaluated prior to viewing the show as well as after 8 episodes and upon completion of watching 17 of them. Linebarger’s study was part of an evaluation carried out by the educational foundation of WGBH-TV in Boston, which co-produces the program along with Sirius Thinking, Ltd. *Between the Lions*, which has received both corporate and governmental funding, is also supported by Carnegie Corporation, the Park Foundation, the Arthur Vining Davis Foundation and the Institute for Civil Society.

Kindergarteners who watched *Between the Lions* outperformed their peers who didn’t watch on three important measures: phonemic awareness, letter-sound correspondences and concepts of print. The same children also had significantly higher raw scores on a normative measure of reading abilities than those who didn’t view the show. Teachers reported that the program, which is set in a library and stars a family of literate lions, conveyed a love of reading and writing and that children who watched the show spent more time writing letters, notes and stories.

“Taken as a whole, these results are promising, suggesting that this program does lead to positive changes or growth in essential early literacy skills predictive of later, fluent reading,” said Linebarger in her conclusion. She noted that because *Between the Lions* is available free on public television it could “reinforce, motivate and extend early literacy instruction, both in the classroom and within the children’s home.”

Christopher Cerf and the creative staff of Sirius Thinking, most veterans of *Sesame Street*, spent four years collaborating with reading experts and literacy professors to create a program that would both engage children’s imagination and teach them the sound, meaning and placement of words. The Sirius team merged the lessons they learned from the reading experts with a craft they love—puppetry—and created characters and vignettes that could convey critical reading concepts.

This summer, *Between the Lions* beat out serious competition like WGBH’s other highly acclaimed children’s show *Arthur*, as well as the veteran *Sesame Street*, to win the TV Critics Association Award for Best Children’s Program. Clearly WGBH and Sirius Thinking have a hit on their hands, but the challenge for all involved is to extend the early gains revealed in the University of Kansas study, which also seems to confirm one of the founding principles of *Between the Lions*: that reading tenets can be transmitted by television. First graders showed mixed but less convincing results and the researchers concluded that further, more focused study was necessary to gauge the impact of the show on those with basic reading skills. With second year planning underway this research gives *Between the Lions* supporters and producers evidence that innovative teaching techniques can make a difference.
In 1947 Americans were relishing the peace of the postwar years, enjoying *All My Sons* on Broadway, listening to the radio show *Lassie* and humming the hit song “Almost Like Being in Love.” That same year is also remembered as a time when over one million veterans took advantage of the G.I. Bill of Rights to seek a college education, swelling the enrollment to record-high levels of more than two million students.

Prior to passage of the G.I. Bill in 1944, higher education was the province of the elite, the privilege of those with the financial resources to spend four or more years in college, savoring the luxury of time to read the classics and to ponder history, philosophy and the sciences. But the G.I. Bill made a college degree much more accessible, prompting broad changes in the nature of higher education in the United States. During the latter decades of the 20th century, many other factors also helped reshape colleges and universities, remodeling curricula to be more responsive to a changing society and economy.

**A Shift**

Today, at the dawn of a new millennium, 65 percent of high school graduates go to college. Yet even as college enrollment figures have reached record-high levels, the SAT and ACT scores indicate that the average level of academic achievement of college applicants has declined. In the 1940s, only 20 percent of high school graduates went to college, and most of them sought advanced learning at a liberal arts institution. But an analysis of the demographics of the college population indicates that a shift has occurred in the type of education students seek. Thirty years ago, half of all baccalaureate degrees were granted in a liberal arts discipline including science. By contrast, a profile of today’s college students reveals that nearly 60 percent of the degrees granted are in a pre-professional or technical field, and the largest number of baccalaureate degrees granted in the 1990s were in business, with business majors alone representing 15 percent of the total. The number of students attending community colleges and similar institutions increased greatly from 1970 to the mid-1990s, so that now two-year associate-degree-granting schools account for more than 40 percent of the college population.

These changes have prompted Carnegie Corporation of New York to focus on the questions and challenges that we are confronted with at the start of the 21st century. In *New Directions for Carnegie Corporation of New York: A Report to the*
What's On Students' Minds?

Valuing a Liberal Arts Education

Jeremy Bratt, 21, developed an interest in political science from his mother, who was active in local politics in Minnesota, and from a high school teacher who was also an elected state representative. But it was a liberal arts college—Augustana College in Rock Island, Illinois—that really solidified his goals.

“My career decision was shaped by my college experience,” says Jeremy, explaining that Augustana helped him narrow his interests in politics to international relations and then focus on nonproliferation efforts. Jeremy’s senior thesis and senior project is on Indian and Pakistani nuclear proliferation, and he has been a summer intern at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, DC.

Jeremy believes his four years at Augustana have given him many advantages. “One of the hallmarks of a liberal arts college like this is the diversified general education curriculum,” he offers. “To students that may seem extraneous, but part of the purpose is to expose us to a wide variety of classes. Our president says that the school’s mission is to educate students who can intelligently watch the 6 o’clock news and learn how to question and how to analyze the messages they hear and be active citizens.”

A sense of community also appealed to Jeremy. “You get students who really live their lives on campus, and that means they’re participating in student groups such as campus political organizations, a fraternity or a Habitat for Humanity chapter,” he says. “That exposes you to a lot of different belief systems and different backgrounds of experience. I think the nature of the small residential liberal arts college is that there really is an effort to try to build community and try to draw people in, and I think that effort is a lot more conscious than it is at a large state university.”

Pressures on Students

In answering these questions, we must take into consideration other changes in the college population that have been occurring concomitantly with a sharp rise in tuition and living costs. The demands on students go beyond those of their studies, with many students juggling work, family and school responsibilities. As data from a 1999 survey show, by and large students today view their undergraduate education as a means of developing skills that will enable them to land lucrative jobs in a technologically oriented marketplace. These students—and their parents—are increasingly concerned about the costs associated with attending institutions of higher learning and what the “payoff” will be in good jobs after graduation. Educational costs and the pressures to get a good job give meaning to the phrase that students today might be “more interested in learning to earn than in learning to learn.”

“With the increase in the price of higher education, many families are worried about the relationship between that price and the graduate’s capacity to enter the job market successfully, and consequently professional education of one sort or another—business, engineering and sometimes education—has become much more prominent,” says Neil Grabois, vice president and director for strategic planning and program coordination of Carnegie Corporation. He continues, “A number of institutions have also become much more wide-ranging in an effort
to capture the market and in particular to capture the market by inculcating skills that would be immediately bought by the society. I think it very important that we not focus exclusively on those skills and needs for remunera-
tion after graduation.”

Grabois further notes the impor-
tance of all members of our society hav-
ing a sense of ethical perspective as well as an understanding of history, the economy, the world of imagination and
the esthetic experience. This is impor-
tant, he says, not only for people to ful-
fill themselves professionally, but because they are not merely profession-
als, but human beings who raise fami-
lies, participate in society and learn from and enjoy music, art and theater,
all the province of liberal learning.

**Signs of Dissatisfaction**

There have been instances in which students themselves have vented their feelings about the need to integrate lib-
eral learning into the curriculum, and there are signs that they are beginning to protest against an educational system that might be evolving in a way that does not emphasize a general education.

In Massachusetts, high school stu-
dents balked at having to take a series of standardized tests that stretched over 11 days. To vent his frustrations, one boy wrote an essay about how a standard-
ized exam “could never measure the breadth of his abilities.” The Mass-
achusetts effort followed similar boy-
cotts in other states by parents, teachers and students against standardized tests, indicating a growing discontent with

Parent tests, which have or soon will be

mandated in 26 states.

Parents have also rebelled against

innovations that they believe are under-
mining their children’s education. An

article in *The New York Times* in April of

this year reported on a new math cur-
riculum that relies on children making

estimates and participating in other dis-
covery processes to solve math problems

rather than using textbooks and an

approach to mathematics that hinges

on memorization. Parents argue that

the new math does not teach their chil-
dren basic math skills but rather con-
fuses the youngsters. The parents con-
tend that the new math is a “dumbing
down” of mathematics teaching and

will produce math illiterates.

Fast-moving developments in the

world of computers also impact on

education. In one instance, administra-
tors in a Florida high school

announced the formation of a fresh-
man class in which all teaching and

learning will be done online. The self-
paced learning will be available to 30
freshmen and is offered in part because

of a shortage of classroom space.

Students will have the opportunity to

interact with each other during a lunch
break and by participating in extra-cur-
ricular activities.

In another sign of the times, the

Virginia Foundation for Independent

Colleges and a venture capitalist have

joined forces to offer Tek.Xam, an

online examination for undergraduate

liberal arts students to demonstrate

their technology skills.

The cyberspace school and the

Tek.Xam raise questions about the

Internet explosion and the appropriate

role of computers in education as well as

the need to ensure social interaction

among students who may be spending

an increasing amount of their time face-
to-face with a computer.

On the other hand, it is also a con-

cern that under-resourced youngsters are

falling behind in computer literacy. Steve

Case, chairman and CEO of America

Online, Inc., seeks to erase the “Digital

Divide” with programs such as the AOL

Foundation and PowerUP that are tai-

lored to help disadvantaged people and

to make computer technology available

to underserved students. Case, who co-

founded AOL in 1985, is also an advan-
cate for liberal learning.

“I think a broad-based liberal arts

education provides important ground-

ing, especially since we are entering a phase of unusual change as we kick off

what likely will become known as the

Internet Century,” Case says in a recent

article that appeared in *The Washington Post*. “A shift to a more connected soci-

ty will have profound impacts on busi-

ness, education and government, as

new perspectives and linkages are

brought to bear,” he continues. “So

having a broad understanding of the

past and a broad perspective on the

future will be more important than

ever—and that’s what a liberal arts edu-

cation, which exposes you to a range of

perspectives, can help provide.”

**A New Conversation**

Cognizant of a variety of forces that

are reshaping our educational institu-
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tions and the questions that are being raised about the nature of education in our country, the Corporation has embarked upon an effort to launch a national dialogue about the role of liberal learning in our changing world.

Toward that end, in November 1999, the Corporation convened a panel of 25 leading educators from across the nation along with Corporation staff to discuss the issue. The essay, *Carnegie Challenge 2000: Liberal Arts Education for a Global Society*, arose from that day-long meeting. The paper is intended to serve as a starting point for further exploration of how to integrate liberal learning into the undergraduate experience of all students, regardless of their ethnic background, gender or other individual characteristics.

In the *Challenge* paper, written for the Corporation, Carol M. Barker, former Senior Associate of the Corporation and now Vice President, Programs, Nellie Mae Foundation, states that “the goal of an undergraduate liberal arts education is to provide students with knowledge, values and skills that will prepare them for active and effective participation in society.” Liberal learning, which is generally recognized as embracing the arts and humanities as well as the sciences, enables students to join the ranks of thoughtful citizens who have the capacity to learn, to make judgments and to communicate effectively in a way that enriches the human experience.

The need for a liberal education is also underscored by a fast-paced complicated world that requires the best of its citizens. From a social perspective, our democratic society depends on citizens who share and sustain a commitment to common values within cultural diversity and a dynamic economy. What seems to follow, then, is a societal need to educate citizens in a way that enables them to make sound judgments about issues of great human consequence emerging from scientific discovery and technological developments.

The Corporation's *Challenge* paper also argues for preparing students to function in a multicultural, global society and in a world where national borders may sometimes blur. The capacity to understand and communicate with people from other countries and backgrounds is increasingly important in a world where culture, business, science and politics are developing on many levels in many places all at once.

The goal of the current Carnegie Corporation initiative is to assess the role of liberal learning and how to best integrate it into the undergraduate educational experience. It is the first such large-scale attempt to address the issue since 1945 when a Harvard University faculty committee published *General Education in a Free Society*. The report, which is known colloquially as “The Redbook,” reflected and condensed a ten-year national debate about liberal learning.
At the time “The Redbook” was published, only 20 percent of high school graduates pursued college studies. As we have seen, the picture of the two-year and four-year college enrollment has changed radically, generating a compelling need for a contemporary equivalent of that report.

**Initial Carnegie Corporation Grants**

As part of its overall program strategy in the area of liberal learning, Carnegie Corporation has awarded the first of a series of grants aimed at helping to reframe liberal learning so that it meets the needs of the 21st century. In April of this year the following grants were announced:

- Association of American Colleges and Universities in Washington, DC, $1,000,000 over two years to support the development, dissemination and institutionalization of practices to strengthen liberal arts education. In the 1990s, colleges and universities began to experiment with new approaches to liberal arts education designed to enhance students’ capacity for engaging in rigorous intellectual work. These approaches are not yet part of the practice of most college faculty and so do not reach the majority of undergraduates. With assistance from this grant, the American Association of Colleges and Universities is working with colleges and universities chosen for their progress in institution-wide reform of liberal learning to clarify the goals of liberal education and develop, disseminate and help institutionalize curricular models and pedagogy that further these goals.

- Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation in Princeton, NJ, $988,800 over three years to support a new program, the National Council on Education and the Disciplines. The Council’s aim is to strengthen liberal arts education by making the liberal arts disciplines more integral to the expectations, curricula and achievement standards of the last two years of high school and the first two years of undergraduate education. The Council has identified core literacies gained through the major disciplines—quantitative, scientific, historical and artis-

Jaimee Cougle, a 17-year-old high school junior from Arlington, Virginia, says that reading and other areas of liberal learning “help provide a better perspective and outlook on life because you have a reference to the past. History and literature might not necessarily help in your career field, but they enrich your style of living and help you to be a lot more educated and a lot more open-minded.”

Even with those insights about literature and learning, Jaimee still feels that she might not be ready to pursue higher education when she graduates from high school. Right now, it seems that the Air Force is what’s in Jaimee’s future. “My mom and I recently came to the conclusion that I wasn’t going to be ready for college and the whole college scene of being on my own,” she explains. “We decided the military would provide the discipline I would need and would give me a steady paycheck.”

Jaimee is considering a career in medicine, especially forensic pathology, an interest developed in part from watching *The X-Files*. She finds the Air Force especially attractive because it would subsidize her college and medical school education. The fact that both her parents are retired from the Navy also helped sway her decision.

In high school Jaimee is studying algebra, English, chemistry, psychology and Latin and enjoys playing the flute and piccolo in the concert band. She also participates in track activities and is a swimmer. Jaimee credits her teachers with inspiring her to want to learn, especially an English teacher who is her favorite. “He is very laid back, treats us as equals and is not uptight about getting stuff done in class,” she says. “We start laughing and joking, and he gently gets us back on task. He doesn’t give us busy work.”

Recently Jaimee read *A Farewell to Arms*, and together with other students developed a skit incorporating what they had learned as well as a can-can dance. She much prefers this style of teaching to that of her mathematics teacher who lectures and then passes out worksheets of problems for the students to complete in class. Jaimee is a Stephen King fan and says that when she was younger she used to read two books at a time but homework demands in high school have limited her recreational reading.

“I do sometimes miss reading just what I’d like to,” she says, “but that’s part of what going to school is about. You just have to try to keep up with all the work and hope you have some time left over to do the other things you want.”
What’s On Students’ Minds?

An Epiphany and New Horizons

When he was younger, 17-year-old Jewel Love had low self-esteem. “There wasn’t anything telling me that by working hard I was going to be successful because there are not all that many successful people around me,” he explains.

In middle school, Jewel’s grades dropped and stayed low until his sophomore year when he was selected to attend a 7-week wilderness expedition. Jewel went to Maine for his wilderness experience, and it was an epiphany for him. During the trip, he decided he wanted to change his life. And he did.

Jewel is now president of the 1,300-member student body of his high school and involved in political activism, planning to major in political science in college and hoping to “save the world.”

“I don’t want to see other people suffer; I want to see everyone have at least an equal opportunity,” he says. Jewel offers that some poorer schools need to “pay teachers more, buy better books, make the schools look nicer and hopefully keep them safer, provide for tutoring programs, mentoring programs, after-school programs, literacy programs, and more school supplies.”

“Computers are resources,” Jewel says, “but there are other resources out there as well.”

Jewel, who lives in California, recently visited a private college on the East coast and really liked what he saw. The college liked Jewel, too, and offered him a substantial financial package. But the very high tuition is still out of reach, so Jewel plans to go to a state university.

Jewel plans to take a close look at the ways in which college can broaden his horizons. “I’m not really sure what I’m going to cover in college,” he says. “I want to get into a little bit of everything possible, just to see what I like because there are not too many resources at my own high school, so I want to experiment with a lot of different courses.”

The world today requires more thinking people,” he adds. “There’s been a great deal of early specialization, and we would hope to dilute some of that. Too often, parents early on are encouraging kids to determine the career for which they are preparing rather than taking good solid academic courses—solid pre-college courses in sciences and humanities—so that they are ready to go into a general education in college rather than specializing. Too many students are career-oriented too soon.”

Crisis in Teacher Education

Before there can be effective liberal learning, there must be creative, edcu-
requires more thinking people.

the state. A survey of Texas teachers indicated that, compared to twenty years ago, teachers have less experience, with only 30 percent earning master's degrees (compared to 41 percent in 1980). The study also reported that 43 percent of the teacher respondents are “seriously considering leaving the profession.”

Because teachers are so crucially involved in transmitting knowledge from one generation to another, Carnegie Corporation is committed to helping to improve teacher quality. The Corporation also seeks to educate the public to recognize that well-qualified teachers can be national treasures, people who can touch our lives, and inspire us to learn, to think and to expand our horizons. As Henry Adams observed, “A teacher affects eternity.”

Providing intellectual stimulation for teachers-in-training is key to encouraging them to infuse their lessons with stimulating concepts and to teach a culturally and racially diverse student population. Yet cross-pollination between schools of education and other schools within colleges and universities is virtually nonexistent, and many teachers do not hold degrees in the subjects they teach. Not only are more teachers needed, but the students could then resemble doctors and lawyers, whose professional standards are set by medical societies or state bars.” The AFT proposal would mandate that new teachers have a major in the subject they plan to teach; the proposal also backed a two-tier national test schedule that would require prospective teachers to demonstrate a college-level knowledge of several subjects.

Exposing administrators as well as teachers to liberal learning hopefully will benefit all members of the education community. With this in mind, New York City’s schools chancellor, Harold O. Levy, has begun to provide liberal learning for administrators. Levy organized lectures, sent poetry to board members, and arranged for Isaac Stern to give group violin lessons to superintendents. These liberal learning experiences were an effort to bring board members, school officials and students into what Levy described as “the secret society that is New York City’s intellectual culture.” Although most board members looked favorably on Levy’s attempts to provide them with enriching experiences, one member expressed negative views, saying that she had not received the poems. “Probably if I had gotten them I would have thrown them out,” she is reported to have said. “I’m not a poetry kind of person. I like serial killer novels.”

A New Paradigm

Educators who attended the November meeting convened by Carnegie Corporation discussed ways to rejuvenate liberal learning and make it accessible to a diverse student population. In addition to exposing undergraduate students to fields of study that rely on interdisciplinary approaches, the group

planning to teach need to be better prepared for their profession.

Recognizing this need, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) has reversed its long-standing position against standardized tests for teachers. In May, the Internet edition of The Dallas Morning News reported that, “The union suggests that a private organization like the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards administer a national test for teachers. Teachers

In late 1974, then-U.S. Senator John A. Buckley faced a tough 1976 reelection campaign. He had been elected as the Conservative Party candidate with only 39 percent of New York’s voters in a fractious 1970 election, defeating both the Democratic and Republican nominees. Sensing his political weakness, opponents were lining up to unseat him in 1976.

To make matters more difficult, Buckley faced a strict new federal campaign finance law just passed in the wake of President Nixon’s Watergate scandal. The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 created tough restrictions on campaign contributions and spending, as well as disclosure and public financing measures.

He and others promptly sued, asserting in the case, Buckley et al. v. Valeo, that the new law was an unconstitutional restriction of political speech.

On January 30, 1976, a divided U.S. Supreme Court issued a landmark decision that struck down all spending limits, reasoning that spending was essential to political speech. It also struck down all limits on a candidate’s personal contributions to his or her campaign. At the same time, though, it upheld limits on the contributions that individuals can make to a candidate’s campaign. This bifurcation has contributed to confusion about the Buckley decision and, in some cases, about how to respond to it.

In the years that followed, Buckley v. Valeo thwarted attempts at all levels of government to stem the rising torrent of campaign spending. Contending with this decision has been a central goal for reformers.

Two public-interest law centers are leading the legal challenge to the Buckley decision, determined to remove this obstacle to effective campaign finance reforms by Congress, state legislatures and local governments. The William J. Brennan, Jr., Center for Justice of the New York University School of Law and the National Voting Rights Institute in Boston, MA, have different styles and approaches, but both are aggressive and persistent and both are part of the Corporation’s approach to supporting campaign finance reform.

By joining in the defense of campaign finance reforms that are being challenged by opponents of reform throughout the country, they are probing for weak aspects of the Buckley decision, aiming to...
expand the constitutionality of reforms and ultimately overturn its most burdensome elements.

Attorneys at both centers agree that the effort will take many years, because of the slow pace of such complex court proceedings.

They also agree that history is on their side. They point out that poor Southerners first challenged the Supreme Court rule against them in 1937. The Court again upheld the constitutionality of the poll tax in 1951. Not until 1966 did the Supreme Court finally strike down the poll tax as an unconstitutional infringement of the right to vote. Challengers to Buckley expect to win similarly.

The Brennan Center for Justice

“Buckley is a rotting tree that’s ready to fall,” says Joshua Rosenkranz, executive director of the Brennan Center. Until recently, it could have fallen either way, he reasons, with the Supreme Court either overturning its ban on spending limits or extending its ban to contributions and not just spending. “The distinction between contributions and spending is untenable,” Rosenkranz states.

But a Supreme Court decision in early 2000, Shrink Missouri Government PAC v. Adams, upheld Missouri’s law limiting contributions to statewide candidates to $1,075, encouraging reformers. This marked the first time since the 1976 Buckley decision that the Court affirmed that limiting contributions did not infringe on the First Amendment and encouraged Rosenkranz to believe that future decisions would go their way. “The rotting tree isn’t going to fall on us, and that’s good,” he says.

The center was established in 1995 by former law clerks of the late Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., to work toward four goals, one of which is strengthening democracy. Its Democracy Project focuses on enabling effective campaign finance reform to become constitutional—litigating cases, drafting model legislation, counseling reform groups and educating the public and legal community about this issue. With a staff of 32, the center resembles a medium-size trial firm of lawyers, experts and support persons, but unlike most small law firms, this group shares the passion for reforms embodied by the late Justice Brennan.

Ironically, the late Justice Brennan wrote much of the opinion, including key rulings that his namesake center now seeks to overturn.

Ironically, it was Justice Brennan who wrote much of the Buckley opinion, including key rulings that his namesake center now seeks to overturn. Rosenkranz, his law clerk in the 1980s, explained that Brennan later made him promise that the center’s lawyers would never feel bound by any of his judicial opinions.

By mid-2000 the center was involved in a dozen lawsuits around the nation, most of them defending new state or local laws that limit campaign spending and contributions, which is the focus of the Corporation’s work, believing, as it does, that change may be more achievable in statehouses than at the federal level. Some of these involve laws recently passed in Arkansas, California and Missouri that limit contribution amounts; North Carolina’s regulation of “issue advocacy” campaigns; and Maine’s Clean Election Law that established public financing for statewide and legislative candidates.

Also, the center has filed an amicus brief in defense of the Federal Elections Commission’s regulation of “soft money”—funds raised by parties or advocacy groups not expressly supporting a candidate—spent for negative ads attacking an opposing candidate.

The center describes in detail the arguments against the Buckley decision in the 1998 report, Buckley Stops Here: Loosening the Judicial Stranglehold on Campaign Finance Reform, published by the Twentieth Century Fund, and written principally by Rosenkranz. A more recent book, If Buckley Fell: A First Amendment Blueprint for Regulating Money in Politics, edited by Rosencranz (Brookings Institute, 2000), describes the elections system that would result from campaign finance reforms.

In the Buckley decision, the court recognized the compelling interest of governments to prevent corruption involving campaign financing and to promote effective electoral participation, regardless of wealth. However, the court distinguished between contributions and spending.

It held that it is not unconstitutional for governments to regulate contributions by others because these are acts of political association, not direct expressions of political speech. Contributions
can involve the danger of political corruption, and limiting that danger is a compelling interest of government.

However, the Court ruled, it is unconstitutional to regulate campaign spending. Money is the fuel of political debate, it reasoned, and limiting what a candidate can spend affects the quantity of political speech in the same way limiting the amount of fuel limits how far an automobile can travel. Further, because no corrupt deals are involved in the act of spending campaign money, the government has no compelling interest in limiting it.

The Buckley decision also found that limiting amounts that candidates can contribute to their own campaigns is unconstitutional because these are acts of political speech and there is no other person involved with whom to make a corrupt deal. It also rejected limits on “independent” expenditures because the spender presumably has no contact with the candidate and thus cannot make an expressly corrupt deal.

In criticizing the ruling, the Brennan Center and other critics note that the distinction between contributions and spending is artificial. Contributions are acts of political expression, they reason, and much spending—on, say, opinion polling and office rent—has little to do with expression directly.

The center argues that a truly independent expenditure does not involve prior communication but that it can involve such communication—and corrupt deals—afterwards. Also, the ruling ignored the impact of huge levels of campaign spending that can, in effect, drown out—and thus limit—competing political speech by less-wealthy campaigns.

A central flaw of the Buckley ruling, the center argues, was its haste. Oral arguments were heard only 13 months after the law’s passage, and there was little factual record for the Court to consider. Basing their ruling on speculation about what could happen, the justices ignored the real-world impact of soaring campaign spending on our democracy, Rosenkranz says.

Because other cases dealing with campaign finance issues will undoubtedly come before the Court in the next few years, the center and other critics have been carefully documenting the harmful effects of inadequate regulation of campaign finances to strengthen their argument. No rights are absolute, Rosenkranz says, and the Supreme Court would have no problem in banning the right of someone to say, “I’ll give you $1,000 to vote for this bill.”

Campaign spending that leads to quid pro quo corruption or the appearance of corruption is probably the most compelling state interest for the justices to point to in declaring limits constitutional, and there is ample and growing evidence of this, the center contends.

Another compelling state interest, never raised during Buckley arguments, is the need to attract candidates with great potential for public service who decline to run because they are repelled by the campaign finance system and how much money they must raise. Incumbents can easily scare off talented opponents by raising huge amounts of special-interest campaign money. The Brennan Center contends that limits on campaign spending could promote more competitive elections.

The center works closely with such research organizations as the Center for Public Integrity and Center for Responsive Politics, both based in Washington, DC. It also works with national organizations like Public Campaign in Washington, DC, and such regional organizations as Northeast Action in Hartford, CT, Western States Center in Portland, OR, and Democracy South in Chapel Hill, NC.

The center also has an extensive public education program that includes reports on and critiques of the Buckley decision. It published Writing Reform: A Guide to Drafting State and Local Campaign Finance Laws in 1999 to help reformers from lay activists to legislative technicians. To inform the legal community, especially prominent lawyers and jurists, the center has held mock Supreme Court hearings of the case, rehearsing and honing its arguments, as well as raising the issues’ general visibility.

The possibility that it may take a decade to overturn Buckley does not discourage Rosenkranz. “It may be a blessing because it gives us a luxury few have in litigation,” he says. “It lets us take every step possible to reshape the landscape and improve our chances of winning.” And while it pursues a national strategy for federal reform, the center also supports state-by-state grassroots reform efforts.

National Voting Rights Institute

Located in Boston’s financial district, the National Voting Rights Institute’s staff of eight is smaller than the Brennan Center for Justice but has a unique emphasis on campaign finance reform issues. “Our special focus is on litigation and public education to complement the growing reform movement,” says John Bonifaz, the institute’s executive director and lead attorney.

Like the Brennan Center, the institute is involved in numerous cases defending campaign finance reform laws around the country and is co-counsel with the center in several of those cases. One was their successful defense against the Maine Civil Liberties Union’s challenge to that state’s Clean Elections Act, and a defense still underway against a similar challenge to Vermont’s new campaign finance reform law. (The American Civil Liberties Union and its state affiliates have consistently opposed cam-
Campaign finance reforms as unconstitutional restraints of free speech.)

The institute has also made a special effort to reach out to state attorneys general and secretaries of state to enlist their help in overturning the 

Buckley decision. However, the institute’s greatest distinction is its legal offensive against 

Buckley on the grounds that lack of controls on campaign spending is a civil rights issue: It unconstitutionally bars poor and minority candidates from winning, or even running, and deprives poor and minority voters of a choice. This approach puts reformers on the offensive against inadequate campaign finance laws, rather than merely defending reform gains.

“We’re trying to redefine the campaign finance question—move it beyond the narrow focus of constitutional rights of wealthy contributors and candidates—to the rights of the nonwealthy to have a vote that counts,” Bonifaz says.

In a challenge on behalf of the Georgia NAACP filed in 1998, the institute asserted that the state tolerates an unconstitutional system of state legislative elections that denies equal and meaningful participation in voting. The high cost of running for those offices is just as serious a barrier to voting by the poor and minorities as the “white primary” and poll tax of earlier times—and more recently by high filing fees for candidates. In fact, it is part of a discriminatory tradition that dates back two centuries when only white male property owners could vote.

In their report, 

The Wealth Primary: Campaign Fundraising and the Constitution, Bonifaz and co-author Jamin Raskin, an American University professor of law, detail their arguments. The report marshals campaign finance data that show soaring costs and a correlation between winning and money raised. The Center for Responsive Politics, Washington, DC, published the report in 1994 and provided much of the financial and voting research.

Bonifaz honed this argument in a 1999 conference at Howard University, “Campaign Finance as a Civil Rights Issue,” that brought legal scholars together with other experts, activists and elected officials.

In its Georgia lawsuit, the institute showed that higher-spending legislative candidates won 83 percent of the time and that incumbents who outspent their rivals in the previous three elections won 95 percent of the time. And it’s getting worse. In 1992 Georgia Senate elections, winners had a 55 percent funding edge over their rivals. In 1996, winners enjoyed a 324 percent edge.

“We say you cannot have a political system in which the ability to have your voice heard depends on wealth,” Bonifaz states. “Elections have become a wealth primary in which only the richest and most powerful interests have a say. They simply drown out nonwealthy candidates, and that’s an unconstitutional limit of the free speech of the nonwealthy.”

The remedy, according to Bonifaz, is public financing of candidates who can demonstrate public support combined with limits on spending—as well as overturning 

Buckley, which he, like the Brennan Center, is optimistic the Supreme Court will do. In 1949, the Court upheld a Trenton, NJ, ordinance that regulated the use of political sound trucks, recognizing that the right of some to speak (loudly, in this case) has to be balanced against the rights of others.

Despite losing the Georgia lawsuit in 1999 which focused on a civil rights-related angle of campaign finance reform, and earlier, a similar lawsuit in California, the institute joined in another suit filed in North Carolina in late 1999, challenging that state’s inadequate campaign finance laws. Heading the legal team there is former North Carolina Supreme Court Chief Justice James Exum, Jr.

Bonifaz is confident that a future Supreme Court will ultimately agree with the institute. It may not be soon, he says, “But we’re in it for the long haul. The wealth primary will not stand the test of time.”

CONTACT: E. Joshua Rosenkranz, Executive Director, William J. Brennan, Jr., Center for Justice, New York University School of Law, 161 Avenue of the Americas, 5th Floor, New York, NY 10013. web site: www.brennancenter.org

CONTACT: John Bonifaz, Executive Director, National Voting Rights Institute, 294 Washington Street, Suite 713, Boston, MA, 02108. web site: www.nvri.org

“We’re trying to redefine the campaign finance question—
the nonwealthy must have a vote that counts.”

— John Bonifaz
Besides supporting high-level research and public debate on the problems and challenges of campaign finance reform, Carnegie Corporation of New York supports nearly 20 nonprofit organizations that help ordinary citizens participate more fully in national, state and local political decisionmaking. They all provide invaluable information to the public about campaign finance and political abuses and, in some cases, help communities organize themselves. Following is a list of seven of them, what they do and how to reach them:

**National Institute on Money in State Politics.** A nonpartisan, nonprofit program, its database on state government campaign finances is searchable by industry and occupation of contributors, as well as across state lines to determine multistate and national trends. The Institute grew from a collaboration between the Western States Center, Northeast Action and Democracy South.

**Center for Responsive Politics.** It is a widely used source of reliable, nonprofit information on campaign finance issues, maintaining a searchable database of congressional and presidential campaign contributions, lobbyist activities and spending, political action committees and parties’ “soft money” accounts. It also publishes a newsletter, weekly alerts and biennial and special reports.

**Center for Public Integrity.** Its staff of researchers and writers publishes investigations and analyses of the influence of money in politics, most notably *The Buying of the President 2000* and *Our Private Legislatures,* a study of interest by legislators in the 50 states. It publishes many reports in its newsletter, *The Public i,* and supports the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists.

**Democracy South.** This nonpartisan, nonprofit network of state-based organizations in the campaign finance on state and build progressive multi-issue coalitions to address social, environmental and economic justice problems, including adoption by states of “Clean Money” campaign finance reforms.

**Center for Governmental Studies.** It provides state and local governments and public interest groups with research and technical support for a wide array of issues, including campaign finance and ethics reforms. Its National Resource Center for State and Local Campaign Finance Reform provides model legislation, case studies, current research and expert testimony. It developed the Democracy Network, now operated by Grassroots.com, Inc., a web site for nonpartisan political information and citizen-to-citizen networking.

**Northeast Action.** Its Money in Politics Project combines research, coalition-building, policy development and public education campaigns to reform campaign finance laws in New England and New York. It has helped achieve adoption of major “Clean Money” reforms in Maine, Vermont and Massachusetts, and is helping reformers in numerous other states to develop similar campaigns. Northeast Action has also received Corporation support for a project it is working on in conjunction with Democracy Works and Public Campaign to provide technical assistance to nonprofits monitoring the implementation of comprehensive statewide campaign financing reforms.

**Western States Center.** Besides helping progressive community-based organizations become more effective participants in state and local politics, it operates the Money in Western Politics Project. This project analyzes the impact of campaign contributions in western state governments, maintains accessible campaign finance databases, and builds support for “Clean Money” reforms.
In January 2000, Narciso Matos joined Carnegie Corporation of New York as a senior program officer with a mandate to help shape the foundation’s new program in African higher education. A native of Mozambique, Professor Matos previously served as secretary general of the Association of African Universities (AAU) and was a member of the Advisory Group on Higher Education to the Secretary General of UNESCO. He is a chemist by training and a graduate of Eduardo Mondlane University in Maputo, Mozambique, where he also served as dean of the faculty of science and later, as vice chancellor. He is interviewed here by Susan Robinson King, vice president of public affairs for the Corporation.

SK: Tell me where you grew up. How many were in your family?

NM: Well, I was the fourth of a family of nine children, so it was a very large family. I grew up in the suburbs of Maputo, the capital city of Mozambique. During the colonial time, cities like Maputo were clearly divided even if there were no laws legalizing separation. But you knew where you should go and where you should not. It had to do with living space and the schools you could visit, even the church you could go to. Everything was segregated.

SK: You didn’t play with white kids?

NM: No, we played at school, but that was the end of it. I mean we belonged to different worlds, their families were separate from our families. But going to public school did give me access to education. Interestingly, I don’t remember this kind of segregation in public school, which is strange. I mean, black kids and white kids, we were friends while at school. But at the same time, during all my education I don’t remember visiting a white colleague, or the other way around.

SK: White and black.

NM: Strictly white and black. And it’s interesting because South Africa is known for having institutionalized the separation of blacks and whites. But it was also there in Mozambique and it was also there in Rhodesia and other colonies at that time. So I grew up in the suburbs of a major city in southern Africa. And at a time when black kids could only go to missionary schools. In a sense I belonged to the first generation, even in my family, that had the opportunity to go to a public school, which was unheard of. But my parents, they understood the difference. In a public school you could have opportunities. The missionary school was helpful but it would not bring you beyond a certain level of education, that was the politics of the time. I should say it was also a time of change. For example
I've heard even my older brothers saying, “Well, we could not go to the movies because that was in the city and it was not for blacks.” I could go. In my time, that was already allowed. So separation in some sectors of social life was starting to disappear. I grew up going to movies, I grew up studying in a public school. And we used to study in cafes. In Portugal and in other parts of Europe, and also in Portuguese colonies, the cafe is the place where you socialize. But we also went there to study. For black kids like us it was also the only possibility of having light—electricity—and being able to study after six o’clock when it became dark. So we had this small world of ours which also provided opportunities.

**SK:** Tell me a little bit about the public school that you went to.

**NM:** I started in the first grade. At the time there were four years of primary education and then there was a secondary education which was the lycée, like in the French system, for a duration of seven years and after that, university. When I think of it today it’s really incredible because I think that from grade one to what here in U.S. would be grade twelve, I was always one of only two or three black kids in my class. One of very few black kids in the whole school.

**SK:** How did you get into the public school if there were so few blacks?

**NM:** I think that my parents understood that to get us, the kids, into that school would open doors that otherwise would always be closed. My older brothers and sisters, except for one, started in missionary schools. Eventually they also moved to public school. But I was the first child in the family who went straight to a public school.

In society, there was a system that separated people; you had a school with white teachers only. But they didn’t treat you differently. They treated you like any other kid. And your classmates, also, they didn’t treat you differently. So it was kind of interesting. I mean, underneath the established system, there were the individual human beings and they dealt with us, at least at school, like with any other kids.

**SK:** That’s worth a memoir. Your mom was at home; what was your dad’s field of work?

**NM:** He was a telegraph operator. At that time there was the Morse code system of communication.

**SK:** Andrew Carnegie was involved in the same thing, you know. He was a master of Morse code in a telegraph office.

**NM:** My father worked in the Navy and so his role was in communications. That was his profession. But he was really interested in just about everything. So in his free time, which was never free time, not for him and not for us, he was doing all sorts of things. He was building his house, he was fixing his car, he was doing things that, when I think of it today, I say, my goodness, what a great person. I strongly admire my parents.

**SK:** When was it that you decided, “I’m a scientist”? What was it that helped you to decide to make chemistry your world?

**NM:** I think it was not until I got to the university. I knew, during primary school and secondary school, that I didn’t feel strongly about the humanities and social sciences and languages. I preferred science, I preferred math, I preferred physics and chemistry. I think I decided at the end of my secondary school that, why not chemistry? I found it interesting.

**SK:** That was my worst subject. I was scared of chemistry.

**NM:** It’s interesting, very interesting. It’s a science that I would say combines everything else, and that’s the beauty of it. You need math, you need physics, you need biochemistry—or you move to biochemistry from chemistry. So, to me, it’s kind of a pivotal science.

**SK:** If you would have taught me I probably would have enjoyed it more. In high school or the secondary schools in Mozambique, were you in the same kind of school, mostly dominated by whites?

**NM:** Yes. In all schools at that time, up until twenty years ago, black kids were a minority.

**SK:** What was expected of you? Were you being nurtured as a leader of the new Mozambique? Were you expected to lead?

**NM:** I think some people like my parents had leadership in mind. Actually I’m sure about that because my father mentioned several times that, “Well, I think if you’re educated, maybe the situation might change in the future for our country.” He was not a militant in the sense of directly challenging the system. In his own way, he believed that educated people would eventually play important roles in the country. So I think he expected that myself and other students would someday contribute to the emancipation of the country.

I grew up also in the time of struggle for independence. But you never heard about that from the newspapers or the radio. It was underground information, by word of mouth. But it was late in my educational career when I started to think that maybe my education could contribute to something. I wouldn’t claim to have contributed more just by sticking to my education. It was after independence that I became more involved in politics.

**SK:** Did whites expect much from you? Teachers?

**NM:** I think some of them did, yes. And in retrospect, I understand that some of them even ventured some few sentences, and when I interpret them today, they were saying, “Well, there are things we cannot say but we feel it should be different.”

**SK:** Tell me what your memories are when independence happened. You were in the university then. Was it scary?
Disruptive? Or was it just liberating?

NM: It was liberating. That was 1975. I was at the end of my university studies. I had six months to go to complete my licentiate degree.

It was a time of change. There was fear. Because all along there was this propaganda saying that if blacks came to power they would kill all the white people there, and so forth. So people were scared, including those who had contributed in their way to liberation. But for Mozambicans it was—well, I don’t have a word to describe it. It was just, all of a sudden we thought, now we can start something in this country and we can contribute. Some people even made crazy decisions like, for example, they just dropped out from education. They said, “Well, now I just want to go and do something for the country.”

I was at university then and it was a time of upheaval. To give you an example: in the 1974 academic year, the university had 3,000 students. Most of them were white students and all the faculty were white. And one year after independence, in 1975, the university was down to 700 students. It means that most of them left to go to Portugal. Almost all the lecturers and professors also left, except for a handful who stayed in the country.

At that time, from within the university, there was a feeling of, “Let us try to keep the university functioning,” but there was not even agreement about that. Some people were saying, “Well this was a colonial university, what we have to do is to shut it down and start something new.” And there were those—I belonged to that group—who said, “No, let us try to keep this university and change what needs to be changed.” Eventually good sense prevailed, I would say. The university was never closed.

It was a time when we believed that everything, anything was possible. But there were many constraints and we made many mistakes. But most importantly, we believed in what we were doing. There was a sense of contributing to something bigger than one’s self-interest. That was the mood at the time. I think everyone, or almost everyone, felt that way.

SK: And that’s a very powerful feeling. You feel like you’re building a country and a university, not just your own career.

NM: Yes. Very much so. But things did not go as we thought. That was during the Cold War, and Mozambique, for good or bad, chose to be a Marxist country.

I would say I myself believed at the time that the right thing to do for Mozambique was to embrace this philosophy of providing for everyone, that no one should exploit others. After all, we had had 400 years of exploitation by Portugal. So the socialist ideal was appealing and I bought it myself at that time.

But it brought difficulties to the country. For example, here you have a country that has a Western economy, social system and education—every-
thing designed according to Western standards. And all of a sudden you interrupt this development, you try to develop something totally new, particularly with support from the Soviet Union and East Germany. So the economy went down. A civil war started, which eventually ended in 1992. It was a very hard time.

This is to say that the enthusiasm for building the country, which brought very, very positive results, at the same time crippled the country. And I would say that by 1985, ten years after independence, the country was a disaster. At that time enthusiasm had vanished, the country was very dependent, and it was a depressing time.

I was at university and it was ironic because, for all the intervention by the state in the economy and in the personal lives of citizens, the government did not get involved in the university. So somehow the university managed to maintain some integrity, with many difficulties but with a sense of direction, of building something for the future.

SK: Talk about your work in higher education and your role as a leader at the university.

NM: I started as a lecturer of chemistry but, as I mentioned, that was a time of change and the few of us, the few Mozambicans, were expected also to look beyond our discipline and to be involved in the administration of the department. As a matter of fact, at that time we had no director, no dean—no head of department. Everyone was included in governance and so I started to get involved in management. All during my career at university, I had one leg in the actual business of teaching chemistry, another in administra-
tion. I served one or two terms as dean of the faculty of science, and the faculty included chemistry and most of the other natural sciences. I became the dean of the faculty and combined that function with teaching and research.

By 1990 I had become vice chancellor. And that’s the time when I started to be more interested in getting involved with international issues. I think about, by 1992, I realized that I had to make a choice. At that point I was no longer comfortable teaching chemistry because I didn’t have the time to remain as prepared as I wanted to be. That was the time when I got involved with the Mozambique Parliament, with a special focus on educational matters and international relations. I was a member of the country’s representation in the International Association of Parliamentarians, where you are expected to be fully informed about all sectors of your country, all issues. I became more involved with policy issues, with a special interest in education. That’s how I would define myself today.

**SK:** What made you decide to get involved in issues beyond Mozambique?

**NM:** To be a vice chancellor in Mozambique—and it applies to most African countries, particularly if it’s the major university in the country—you deal at the same level with cabinet secretaries. You interact directly with the president of the country and you are consulted about educational issues. You are expected to play a role beyond the small world of your university. And given my belonging also to Parliament, I was very involved in educational and developmental issues larger than the university. After being vice chancellor there was little left to me except going to government or embarking on an international career.

**SK:** So then, give me a feel for what it was like when you walked into the secretary general job at the Association of African Universities. You’d been working day and night since you were a graduate to build up one university, your university and your country. Now you’ve got the whole continent that you’re representing.

**NM:** Well, I had the experience of learning how to manage a university with very few resources, with a very great demand for education, with a relationship that has to be nurtured with government, and planning how to do better and to involve colleagues at all levels, departments and so on.

So my sense, when I went to the AAU, was that we needed to change the perception that the bad shape of the universities was exclusively the responsibility of our governments. I believed and knew from my own experience that there were things within our institutions that needed to be changed. That we needed to really look at how we could do better with what we had. And other colleagues shared these ideas.

I should mention also that it was a time when there was a coalition of donor agencies who were very concerned about the little attention being paid to universities in Africa. And they were willing to support universities and university leaders who really meant business. So I came to the AAU at a time when there were people willing to experiment with new ways of managing their institutions, donor agencies willing to support this kind of exercise, and willing, therefore, to support the AAU if we were to engage in this kind of development.

**SK:** Now you are in the Association, and it’s the 1990s, the Cold War has died, you’re now working on issues facing the continent, not just Mozambique. How would you describe that mood? Was there a sense of collective opportunity? Was there a sense of fatigue? Was there a sense of historic moment?

**NM:** It’s difficult to generalize. We are talking about 53 countries in Africa. Some of them going down, some of them just coming to shape. But I would say the mood was one of opportunity, most of all; of starting afresh.

The continent was changing. But I found myself depressed at times. There were the setbacks that we all read about—the wars and disasters. So I was saying to myself, we need to reevaluate what’s going on now. To be sure there is support for real development, not just some dreams of ours.

But I must add that, in general, the mood in Africa, in the past five years, has been one of hope. And the end of the Cold War had a very strong impact on Africa in many ways. Part of the positive impact is that we used to have undemocratic governments and they could prevail because someone supported them. Some of them were supported just because they were part of the cold war strategy of a certain country. And since they had outside support, they could afford to do terrible things, things you cannot describe, to their own people. But now they don’t have support. No one is supporting the Mobutus and the like today. They had to change or to go. And there is the South Africa factor which is very important, very powerful.

**SK:** What is that South Africa factor?

**NM:** The liberation of South Africa means a lot to Africa. The economy of South Africa alone is bigger than the economy of the rest of black Africa. And a liberated South Africa has influence not only in the neighboring countries. I mean, you go as far as to West Africa or to Uganda in East Africa, which is really like going from New York to Los Angeles and you find South African television, South African products in the market—the telephone companies are South African run or South African sponsored and so on. So
it’s really an engine for the development of the continent. Today, you find scholars from all over Africa in South Africa; some of them become vice chancellors there and many become lecturers. The liberation of South African means a lot for the whole continent. It’s a window of opportunity opening up.

**SK:** What was it that intrigued you about taking on a more complicated, 53-country organization like the AAU?

**NM:** I could help or promote innovations by working with university leaders with whom I have created academic relationships. And I could help tell the African university story of today. At the last conference of the AAU, for example, we discussed the issue of “cost sharing,” which is a coded phrase for students paying for their education, something unheard of in Africa. Five years ago, almost no one would have agreed with that; they would have said that government should pay for education because education is a public good and after all, we educate students to serve the country, so why should students pay for education? But now, vice chancellors by and large agree that students should contribute.

So, yes, you can influence positive developments, but you don’t have the last word on what happens. It depends entirely on the vice chancellors. And that’s important even now at Carnegie Corporation. We can work with vice chancellors, but it’s up to them to do the right things or not.

**SK:** What made you take a new career turn, to move the family all the way to New York and come to an American institution to work on African higher education?

**NM:** It was the opportunity to have more leverage on positive developments. To help identify and design good programs. And help vice chancellors implement what I believe is right. Because I know about the kind of situ-ation where sometimes you have a good program but you don’t have resources, and that can be frustrating. I’m not saying that you can be sure that you’ll get the best results just because you have the money. But I can recognize a good program that deserves support.

**SK:** And now you can deliver the resources.

**NM:** Yes. I now have the possibility of influencing the program at Carnegie Corporation and to work with colleagues in other foundations.

**SK:** A partnership.

**NM:** A partnership. I maintain the same beliefs and discourse about universities in Africa. It may have sounded different when I was at the AAU because at the AAU I was trying to convince the donors to put their money in the universities, but I was doing so from the receiving end. Now, it’s the same objective, namely, to support capacity and institution building, but it’s different. I’m as much concerned as the partners to make sure that we support really good programs, that we make the best investments. Otherwise, I’m harming my own reputation. I have as much to lose as the partners if something goes wrong. But I am in a position to make a difference.

**SK:** That’s what motivates you.

**NM:** Yes.

**SK:** It’s real power, but it’s also real responsibility.

**NM:** Oh, yes, yes. Absolutely. And it’s a much bigger responsibility I would say. This time round, the frustration won’t be because a good program or university didn’t get financial support. The frustration for me would be that an institution did not deliver, and worse, it would mean I have also not delivered. I have to show results. If I have said that this is a good program and it failed, now I would have to explain why it wasn’t a good cause. So there is more responsibility, for me, clearly, much more responsibility.

**SK:** You won’t be relaxing very much.

**NM:** No.

**SK:** You’ve said the Partnership to Strengthen African Universities (Note: see sidebar) with Ford, Rockefeller, and MacArthur is risky. Why is it worth the risk?

**NM:** Because it puts us among those who can reinforce the conditions for a good outcome. It’s not about determining the future of Africa. Like the future of everything else, that’s something we build day after day. But I think it’s worth the risk. We are talking about investing in education. That’s the business we are in in Africa, be it supporting public libraries or scholarships for women in higher education or universities. Our program is about providing opportunities for education.

And there is a risk. But even partial success sometimes is important in the sense that if we assist universities to improve their managerial capacity, the quality of their training, and, after all, educate more citizens, somehow—I could even say, regardless of what happens, ultimately, to a particular university twenty years from now—the fact that we have contributed to educating several generations of students is still a positive impact.

I have no doubt we will have an impact beyond measurable results. It’s not about counting heads, or about how many study programs have been organized or how many computers we have provided and so on. That’s only part of the equation. What’s equally important is the change of mood, of attitude, of perception about education, about the role of universities, our role in promoting dialogue, improving the relationship between government and institutions in the country.

**SK:** You’ve got me convinced. Thank you.
hope through education, which can help develop and sustain the next generation of African leaders, is one of the goals of a new initiative sponsored by four U.S. foundations.

The Partnership to Strengthen African Universities, which focuses on countries in sub-Saharan Africa, is a collaboration of Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Rockefeller, Ford and MacArthur foundations. The initiative will support projects at African universities and academic associations that are designed to strengthen the quality and availability of higher education. Perhaps no single area of development is more important to efforts aimed at reducing poverty and stimulating economic and social development in Africa, especially in the fields necessary for continued growth in the region.

In announcing the partnership on April 24, 2000, the presidents of the four foundations—Vartan Gregorian of Carnegie Corporation, Susan V. Berresford of the Ford Foundation, Gordon Conway of the Rockefeller Foundation and Jonathan Fanton of the MacArthur Foundation—who were joined by United Nations secretary-general Kofi Annan and Andrew Siwela, president of the Association of African Universities—said that the decision to provide this support was based upon two important trends. First, a significant number of nations are implementing democratic and economic reforms and, despite very difficult circumstances, many higher education institutions in Africa are responding in creative ways to these reforms and to the pressing needs of their countries. It is anticipated that the foundations will provide more than $100 million in support over the next five years through projects related to the initiative.

Under the partnership, each foundation will provide support for higher education institutions in the country or countries in which it has traditionally focused. While the nature of the activities to be supported will vary, an important potential element of the initiative will be establishing regional and inter-country education leadership links. Support may also be provided to foster the growth of continent-wide learning networks and opportunities to collaborate in selected fields.

Planning grants have been made to some institutions where work already underway reflects the spirit of the partnership. Makerere University in Uganda, for example, is undertaking a strategic plan concerning both functioning and financing of the university as well as capacity building for the decentralization process underway in Uganda. At that institution, enrollment has doubled over the past six years and degree programs have been expanded to include business administration, nursing, biomedical lab technology and tourism. The University of Dar es Salaam, in Tanzania, has undertaken a strategic planning process that is completely redefining the university, proposing a new legislative framework and new management structures. In Mozambique’s Eduardo Mondlane University, the quality of the faculty has been greatly improved over the past ten years, and one of Africa’s first Internet service providers was established.

The foundation leaders said this new partnership is only a small part of the platform of support upon which substantial and long-term gains can be made by Africa’s higher education institutions. They pledged to encourage other organizations to make African higher education a priority of their funding strategies.
“Bowling Alone” Author Receives Foundation Funding for Social Capital Study

Harvard University professor Robert Putnam, the author of the book, Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000), has been awarded more than $1 million by the Ford Foundation and dozens of community-based foundations to conduct a national survey and local opinion polls gauged at measuring America’s supply of social capital. “Social capital” refers to the collective value of all “social networks” and the motivation that individuals derive from these networks to do things for each other.

The new survey and polls will be conducted under the direction of the Saguaro Seminar, which is based at Harvard’s John F. Kennedy School of Government.

New Report Finds Racial Disparities Pervasive in Juvenile Justice System

Minority youth experience more severe treatment than their white peers at every stage of the juvenile justice process, finds a comprehensive new report commissioned by the Open Society Institute. A national project to address unfairness in the juvenile justice system. According to the study, entitled And Justice for Some, the harsher treatment of youth of color puts them at a “cumulative disadvantage” that has led to an over-representation of minority youth in confinement across the United States. The report was prepared by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) and funded by the Justice Department and the Ford, MacArthur, Rockefeller, Walter Johnson and Annie E. Casey foundations and the Center on Crime, Communities and Culture of George Soros’s Open Society Institute.

According to the new report’s findings, when white youth and minority youth were charged with the same offenses, African-American youth with no prior admissions were six times more likely to be incarcerated in public facilities than white youth with the same background. Latino youth were three times more likely than white youth to be incarcerated. Minority youth were also much more likely to be waived from juvenile court to adult criminal court than white youth when charged with the same offenses.

Kaiser Family Foundation Poll Reveals Misconceptions about America’s Uninsured

Americans are aware of the problems facing the uninsured, but their perceptions about the 44 million people without health insurance largely miss the mark, a new poll reveals. The results of the survey were released by PBS’s NewsHour with Jim Lehrer and the California-based Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation as part of an ongoing partnership between the two to provide in-depth information about health issues to the public.

According to the survey, 57 percent of respondents incorrectly stated that the majority of the uninsured are unemployed or from families where no one works. In fact, more than 8 in 10 uninsured Americans are employed or are dependents of people who work, according to data compiled by the Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured.

Still, Americans are aware of some of the problems facing the uninsured. More than 6 in 10 know, for example, that the uninsured are less likely to have a physician recently, to have regular access to medical care, and to use preventive health services than people who have health coverage. But less than half (43 percent) of those surveyed knew that the uninsured are more likely to have health problems overall.

While Americans support action on the issue, there is little agreement on what remedies to pursue. Survey respondents were widely divided, for example, when asked about various options for expanding insurance coverage, with only 41 percent saying they would pay $50 a month or more to extend coverage to the uninsured.

New Directions/New Donors — $42.5 million for the Arts

The Ford Foundation has announced a landmark program, New Directions/New Donors for the Arts: A Ford Foundation Cultural Initiative. This initiative will provide $40 million in one-time challenge grants to 28 nonprofit organizations across the country from every artistic discipline. It is designed to capitalize on two concurrent national trends: an expanding economy, which has created a new generation of potential donors, and the fresh energy and vision exemplified by arts organizations working in creative new directions.

The challenge grants will be used to generate donations from individuals over the next 3 to 5 years, raising an additional $73 million in endowed funds for artistic and operating expenses. The initiative also includes a $2.5 million grant to the Nonprofit Finance Fund, which will document the grantees’ lessons in building support among individual donors and use this information to develop publications, web-based resources and training opportunities for the benefit of the larger arts field.
DontBlowIt.org

Group’s Message: “Don’t Blow It”

A new web site created by the Technology Project lets citizens voice their support for nuclear reductions at the click of a mouse. Visitors can send a free, paperless e-postcard to President Bill Clinton in support of strong arms reductions and against a new $60 billion “Star Wars” anti-missile system. The site also enables citizens to invite friends to DontBlowIt.org, become a virtual volunteer and learn more about nuclear disarmament.

To support their cause, DontBlowIt.org leaders cite a study by the Mellman Group that finds about 70 percent of Americans believe reducing or eliminating the more than 36,000 nuclear weapons around the world should be one of the country’s top policy priorities.

A supporting organization to the Rockefeller Family Fund, the Technology Project is a nonprofit organization dedicated to accelerating social and political change by using technology to build community collaboration and citizen engagement.

DontBlowIt.org is funded by the W. Alton Jones Foundation and the Ploughshares Fund and is expected to remain up until the end of the year.

MacArthur Foundation Makes Grants to Twenty-Three Media Centers

The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation has awarded $500,000 in grants to 23 media centers and national media organizations throughout the nation. The awards were made to media centers in 10 states and the District of Columbia for film and video projects in three categories: those that foster community engagement; those that serve and involve children and youth; and those that stimulate community discussion about issues related to welfare, workforce development, and economic inequality. Under the program of support for media centers, the Foundation makes 15 to 25 grants ranging from $10,000 to $30,000 each year.

Media centers provide community-based and independent film and video producers with access to training and other resources needed to produce, exhibit, and distribute film and video. National media organizations provide support for independent producers, services to the field, or exhibition and distribution of independent media to the public. Since 1986, the MacArthur Foundation has provided nearly $15.3 million in support for more than 100 media centers, with an increasing focus on community-based centers that promote social justice and democracy through media and that serve people and communities typically at a disadvantage with respect to the media.

Pew Internet Study Shows Surge of Women Online

More than nine million women have gone online for the first time in the last six months, bringing a measure of gender parity to the Internet population, a study released by the new Pew Internet & American Life Project, a research center created to explore the social impact of the Internet, reports.

According to the report, the rapid increase in Internet use by women is helping to reshape America’s social landscape as women in growing numbers use e-mail to enrich their relationships with family and friends as well as enlarge their social networks. This finding counters the conclusions of earlier studies that reported a correlation between Internet use and social isolation.

The Pew Internet & American Life Project is funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts through a grant to the Tides Center. The Washington, DC-based initiative will explore aspects of the Internet that have not received sustained attention from policymakers and scholars: its effect on children and families, communities, schools, the workplace and civic and political life.

Three-Sector Collaborative to Address Social Change

In order to more proactively address the changes the communications revolution is introducing into business, government and the nonprofit sector, six national infrastructure organizations have joined together to form the Three-Sector Collaborative. The organizations—the Conference Board, the Council on Foundations, Independent Sector, the National Academy of Public Administration, the National Alliance of Business and the National Governors’ Association—will share their organizational knowledge and resources in an effort to help institutions in all three sectors work more effectively to benefit local communities and society in general.

The collaborative has identified and will seek to address several major trends affecting the roles and relationships of organizations and institutions in all three sectors. These include the delivery of social service programs by corporations, the creation of for-profit subsidiaries by nonprofits, and the increasing willingness of government officials to collaborate with members of the for-profit and nonprofit sectors. The group, which plans to sponsor online conversations and will convene regional forums later this year, has already issued an initial discussion paper, Changing Roles, Changing Relationships: The New Challenge for Business, Nonprofit Organizations, and Government.
Lessons of the Cold War: William J. Perry

As we struggle to define a new security strategy for the Post-Cold War era, there is one specific issue that is thrusting itself upon us immediately. How do we deal with the emerging threat of nuclear-armed ICBMs being developed by hostile Third World nations? Dealing with this threat poses difficult technical problems; but it poses even more difficult geopolitical problems. For the actions we take to deal directly with the ballistic missile threat could stimulate another arms race with China or Russia, or possibly both acting together. This arms race, in turn, could be the first stage of another Cold War. And if I have learned anything at all from my own experiences in the Cold War, it is that we do not want to travel again that incredibly dangerous path.

In my talk I will summarize the likely geopolitical consequences of deploying a national missile defense system, with special reference to how it would affect our relations with China.

I start by agreeing with the Rumsfeld Commission that ICBMs being developed by three nations are, in fact, emerging as a potential threat to the United States, but I would qualify this threat in two ways:

These emerging ICBMs are only a significant increment to the military threat we already face if they have nuclear weapons as their warheads.

In responding to this threat, we could inadvertently stimulate responses that could actually increase the danger to us, rather than reduce it.

In dealing with the ICBM threat, we have three lines of defense, which—in order of priority—are: first, try to prevent the threat from emerging; second, if prevention fails, try to deter nations from using these weapons; and third, if both prevention and deterrence fail, be prepared to defend against their use.

Nearly all of the debate has been on this third line of defense, but I think that it is important to take a broader point of view. The first line of defense, and one that receives almost no attention, is to prevent the nuclear threat from emerging, or, failing that, to prevent the ICBM threat from emerging. There are many courses of preventive actions open to us. We could sustain and strengthen the already existing bilateral and multilateral treaties and agreements dealing with nuclear weapons, including the NPT, the CTBT, START 2 and 3, and the Nunn-Lugar program. We could strengthen the non-proliferation programs that make it harder for nations to go nuclear or to get long-range missiles. Considering how many nations have sophisticated nuclear or missile technology, it is clear that non-proliferation programs can be successful only when these programs have international support. Thus if our relations with Russia or China become confrontational over our national missile defense deployment, it is less likely that we will get their cooperation in refusing to sell nuclear or missile technology to other nations. It is also less likely that we will get Russia’s continued cooperation in the Nunn-Lugar program, which plays an important role in preventing the leakage of nuclear technology, materials, or even weapons to other nations.

In addition to pursuing non-proliferation programs, we could practice diplomacy that provides disincentives for proliferation and incentives for non-proliferation. A good example of that are the multilateral diplomatic efforts now underway with North Korea.

In my judgment, prevention should be our first priority in dealing with this emerging threat, but I would concede that we cannot always count on its success. In North Korea, we have started a promising process, but are not yet sure of what its results will be. In Iraq, UNSCOM has curtailed the Iraqi nuclear program for almost a decade, but is losing supporters in the UN. And in Iran, we have hopes that the new reform-minded government will draw that nation back from their programs in nuclear weapons and long-range ballistic missiles, but the jury is still out.

So each of these non-proliferation programs has problems that are significant enough that we should not base our security on the assumption of success. But neither should we base our defense programs on the assumption that they will fail, particularly if the defense pro-
And how much does the policy cost—considering both dollar costs and geopolitical costs? While Russia has had an extremely negative political reaction to a national missile defense deployment, it is clear that their retaliatory capability would not be significantly affected by the national missile defense system proposed by the Administration. The situation with China is far different, in that their ICBMs could be significantly affected by even the first phase of our planned deployment. For many years they have had deployed about 20 ICBMs with single warheads, which gives them a minimal—but real—deterrent capability. It is likely that they would see our first phase deployment reducing this capability, possibly defeating it.

I want to be clear that I do not believe that we owe the People's Republic of China a “free shot” at our country, or that we should be unduly concerned with whether they are “unhappy” with our deployment. My concern is much more pragmatic and it is tied to the steps they are likely to take to restore their deterrence, and whether those steps lead to increased or decreased security for the US. The most obvious response would be for them to build more launchers or to achieve more warheads through MIRVing.

The People's Republic of China already has under development a new generation ICBM, presumably to replace the current system, and to make it less vulnerable by adding mobility. We do not know what plans they have for this new ICBM, but in the face of a national missile defense deployment they would have an incentive to build many more of these than are needed for replacement of the older system. They could also carry out a service life extension program on their older system, including the addition of multiple warheads. They could also embark on an aggressive program on countermeasures—in fact, they have already begun a discussion with the Russians about sharing technology in the field of ABM penetration aids.

I also want to be clear that I understand that the People's Republic of China could take these actions even if we did not deploy our national missile defense system, and that their decisions on strategic weapons will be affected not only by our national missile defense actions but also by the political context in which their decisions were made. The desire for reunification with Taiwan influences China's views on all issues, including missile defense.

Thus, China's concern about the US deployment of theater or national missile defenses is intensified by the prospect of military confrontation over Taiwan, and the possibility that the US could be on the side of Taiwan in such a confrontation. So it is possible that the People's Republic of China will decide to proceed on this expansion of their strategic missile program irrespective of our actions. But our national missile defense deployment, by itself, not only gives them considerable incentive to take actions to limit national missile defense effectiveness, but also undercuts any moves that we might make to limit their missile buildup through arms control agreements.

Of course, if China is making significant additions to its missile forces, these additions can also be seen by India as threatening to them, and could result in an additional buildup in the Indian force of nuclear missiles. That in turn, would be seen by the Pakistanis as threatening to them, and could result in additional buildups to their nuclear missiles, with attendant responses in other Middle East nations, including Iraq, Iran, and Israel.

I have described just some of the unintended consequences of a national missile defense deployment by the US. Thus, a relatively small deployment of defensive systems could have the affect of triggering a regional nuclear arms race of considerable proportions. Such an arms race would create real and obvious dangers for nations in the region, but it could also undermine our own security.

I do not believe that this is a worst-case scenario. Indeed, I believe that it is the likely consequence in the Asia-Pacific region of a national missile defense deployment, and that this consequence is one important component of the high cost of our “insurance policy.”

Therefore, I believe that much greater effort should be put on trying to avoid the need for that insurance policy. That is, we should put a higher priority on the “preventive defense” programs that try to head off the threat from becoming serious, and for success these programs will require international cooperation, especially from the Russians and the Chinese.

I fully understand that this cooperation might not be forthcoming, but in light of the stakes, I believe that the U.S. should go the extra mile before we take actions based on that conclusion. I believe that today we have a window of opportunity to explore these possibilities with the Russians and the Chinese, but this window will close after we make a decision to deploy a national missile defense system. If that full exploration proves to be fruitless, then we should be prepared to take our third line of defense: active defenses. In the meantime, we should continue a robust development program so that we would have highest confidence in the system we are deploying if it comes to that.
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In this cluttered world of communication—e-mail, the Internet, radio, television, magazines and newsletters—it may seem rather brash to be launching a new publication. But we at Carnegie Corporation are not slaves to advertising, or circulation or to the bottom line. Ideas are our master, and the Carnegie Reporter seeks only to challenge you with insights, intellectual questions and tested observations.
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Here’s a sampling of what’s in our inaugural issue:

You know from your favorite newspaper that a new president is leading Russia today, but do you know what students and professors at universities there see in their future? What is the future for the study of liberal arts in the United States?

The 2000 election cycle is putting campaign finance reform on the front pages, but what are the real issues behind the hype?

One international news magazine essay was recently headlined “Hopeless Africa,” yet Carnegie Corporation, with three foundation partners, has launched a multi-year, multi-million dollar initiative aimed at strengthening higher education in Africa. Can the project make a difference?
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