Format & Editing: David Passarelli
Transcription: Masami Kimura

**10:00 /Opening Address**
**/Professor** Kazuo KURODA
**/Waseda University**

Good morning. Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to introduce myself. I'm Kazuo Kuroda, organizer of this international research meeting on East Asian higher education.

First of all, I'd like to thank all of you for being here as speakers, but also as participants. I'm really grateful that you have wisely chosen to be a part of this historical endeavor: to establish the study of East Asian integration of higher education. Thank you very much. Opening this event, I'd like to invite Professor Katsuichi Uchida, Vice President of International Affairs at Waseda University to say a few words.

**/Opening Address**
**/Professor** Katsuichi UCHIDA
**/Vice President International Affairs,** Waseda University

Good morning. Thank you Mr. Kuroda. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

I'm very pleased to have an opportunity to offer a few words on the occasion of this opening address for the International Symposium on Asian Higher Education. First, on behalf of Waseda University, I'd like to extend a very warm welcome to you all. Since the first East Asian summit in 2005, we have noticed an increase in the discussions amongst academics and researchers, on the establishment of regional cooperation and integration in Asian countries. Many people compare the successes that have been evidenced in Europe to emerging regionalism in Asia, and express the desire to see the same kind of political and economic cooperation and organization in Asia. We, those who are working in the field of higher education, also understand the importance of collaboration in the field of higher education in Europe. I understand that cooperation in higher education in the European countries started just after the end of the Second World War. And since 1987, the Erasmus program encouraged mobility amongst students and faculty, which has now evolved into the bologna process. Today, nearly 50 countries participate in the Bologna process. We recognize that the

experiences of European countries are very good examples for Asian countries, though regional differences in the political, economical and educational situations are wider than in Europe. However, we have to enhance our effort to formulate an international higher education framework for regional cooperation and integration in Asia.

Historically speaking, Waseda University has paid serious attention to Asian countries. The founder of Waseda University, Manukisu Okuma, inspired the harmonization of cultures: of the East and the West. And, Waseda University established the special division for Chinese students in 1894, more than 110 years ago. Also, just after its establishment, Waseda University began receiving international students from Asian countries. Those graduates contributed to the modernization and industrialization of China, Korea and other countries; we are very proud of them.

Today, Waseda University identifies the internationalization or globalization of education as a top priority. A main objective of our internationalization strategy is to encourage the development of Waseda University; to become a major institution of higher education in the Asian pacific region and become a world-class university, as well. In today's world, people, commodities, money and information, travel around the world quite freely. The world economy is steadily being globalized. In the age of globalization, our charge is to create a society where different cultures are respected and differing ideas can exist together. This way, the idea of a fair and equal society can be accomplished; the role of higher education in achieving this goal is very important.

Waseda University is engaged in academic collaborations with many institutions of higher education in Asia. Consequently, the number of international students received from Asian countries has increased. Participation of Waseda University students in study abroad programs has increased, as well. Waseda University has started double degree programs with Peking, Fudan, Taiwan National and the National University of Singapore. Also, we have a joint MBA program with Nanyang Technological University in Singapore. Last year, we started a new program called 'Global College'. The objective of this program is to encourage student and faculty mobility, to establish joint programs and to engage in joint research projects with several universities in many parts of the world. Therefore, this international symposium on Asian higher education sponsored by Waseda University's Global Institute of Integration, focusing on the topic of formulating an international higher education framework and regional cooperation and integration in Asia is a very important step for all researchers cooperating in this field, especially those that are working to globalize the Waseda University campus. We are very pleased to see the participation of world-class researchers from both within Japan and

abroad. I sincerely hope that your visit to Waseda University will enhance your awareness and knowledge about Japan and will further contribute to develop and strengthen friendly collaborations between your institutions and Waseda University. I would also like to thank Professor Kuroda and Professor Onoda and the other staff members who contributed to the success of this symposium. Thank you very much for the effort you put forth to create this program. I am quite sure today's symposium will give way to an instructive platform upon which we can launch our discussions on the collaboration, cooperation and integration of higher education in Asia. Thank you for your participation.

Thank you very much.

**/Agenda-Setting**
**/Professor** Kazuo KURODA
**/Waseda University**

Thank you very much Professor Uchida.

Before starting, I'd like to make 3 technical announcements. The first is with regards to timekeeping. I'm very sorry, but I will have to limit the presentations to 20 minutes. 10 years ago, when I was working for the World Bank, I attended a seminar that included a panelist session. They invited the Minister of Education from India and he began his presentation saying: "Thank you very much to the World Bank for inviting me here. I flew from New Delhi to Washington D.C. and then I was told that I only have five minutes to talk. But I'm so used to the conditionality of the World Bank, that I will keep to the five minutes." But, we're not at the World Bank and I can't really impose any conditionality on you, but I hope you understand and thank you in advance for your cooperation.

The second announcement pertains to the lecture style. We would ask the presenters to move to the front when you speak and would you please make your presentation sitting, not standing, because it will be easier for the audience to view the screen. Also, please make sure to speak directly into the microphone because we are recording these sessions and also because we have made simultaneous interpretation available.

Thank you and I truly hope you enjoy the symposium.

/**Professor** Kazuo KURODA
/**Waseda University**
/**Presentation:** Agenda-setting for the Study of Asian Regional Integration in Higher Education

As the organizer of this symposium, I'd like to take the next 20 minutes to set the agenda for today's discussion. Professor Uchida has already explained much of the background of this symposium.

The first East Asian Summit was held in 2005 in Kuala Lumpur, including the 'plus three' countries. As well, Australia and India are becoming very important these days for the future of Asia. What we seen then, is that the creation of Asian integration or the move to create an East Asian community has started to be discussed a little more seriously in Academia, and even at the intergovernmental level. In this context, Waseda University formulated this Global Institute for Asian Regional Integration with significant support from the Minister of Education and the COE program. Waseda University represents an academic institution with leading researchers in this field. I would like to start the agenda setting process with a question: What are the ongoing international studies - according to my insufficient overview of the academic papers - on regional integration?

I identify the following features of regional integration studies, which I am going to explore in this section. I believe we can conduct comprehensive studies in regional integration in higher education within the Asian context and we can make a significant contribution to academia, constructing new theories as well as future policy discussions on an East Asian community. This is the motive for convening this symposium. The first approach to this regional study is the empirical analysis of *de facto* integration. From the perspective of international economy, it is said that behind the concept of Asian integration lies a vision of an expanding economy; wherein, a growing interdependence within the region, combined with increased investment flows and independent economic systems that are not reliant upon the Western economy, are characteristic. The East Asianization of East Asia is witnessed based on the analysis of international trade flows and cross-border direct investment within the region. Can this trend in economics here, also be confirmed in the sphere of transnational education? This should be the basic question for our empirical studies of higher education integration in Asia.

By the way, when we talk about transnational education, it does not mean only international student mobility. Just as it is defined in the service trade parlance of the WTO, it can be international satellite campuses; internationally mobile professors, like yourselves; as well as

study abroad programs. International agreements and double degree programs and other various international joint ventures in higher education should also be included. In this part of my presentation I analyze the historical trends of international student mobility and inter-university agreements. However, due to time constraints I will skip this section and jump to my conclusion for this section. Please refer to slide 19, which shows the growing presence of East Asia on the global scene, and the growing interdependence of countries in this region. The East Asianization of East Asia is also true in the field of transnational education, as well as in regional economics. This empirical evidence highlights the significant need for a discussion of an East Asian community, from the perspective of transnational education.

The second approach to the study of regional integration is the historical policy analysis approach. We do this in order to examine the purpose or fundamental principle guiding regional integration. This will allow us to set down the conceptual framework for future pathways of understanding. First, we look at the changing university model from a historical perspective. The original idea behind transnational education is rooted in the ideal of the university based on universalism and internationalism; where "university" was interpreted in its literary sense, to mean communities of universal knowledge, not dependent upon states. Representative of this view are the universities of Glasgow, Bologna, Paris, Oxford and perhaps even Salamanca, I'm not sure. In the Middle Ages in Europe, students of various nationalities spoke a common language: Latin. In these universities, which were born before the advent of the modern state, the international nature of the faculty members and the student body was quite evident.

However, as time went by, the features of the nation-state strengthened and universities were no longer given the independence they once enjoyed. They were gradually expected, and then forced, to play the role of promoting integration of population and international policy goals within state borders. Under the nation-state university model, the dispatch of students abroad and the invitation of foreign professors was considered useful for the process of modernization and state-building. On the other hand, the need to receive foreign students for the purposes of cultivating an international outlook within the institution itself was not really considered in this model. However, as the modern state matured - even as part of the nation-state - there was an increasing recognition of the contribution an internationalized student body made for development of research in the sciences and in raising a nation's political and cultural influence over foreign countries. This led to the pursuit of a third model of internationalization: the cosmopolitan nation-state university model, with a strong sense to internationalize. I believe that this is the most relevant university model for the East Asian context.

During the process of regional economic and political integration in post-war Europe, the proper role of the university was sought after and was being defined. In 1987, as you know, the European Commission decided to establish the Erasmus program, as Professor Uchida mentioned, to promote higher education exchanges in the region. This led to the rapid expansion of international student mobility in the region as well as exchanges amongst the universities. This is, I think, the beginning of the regional integration university model. We can treat this model both in Europe, as well as in other parts of the world, as an important point of reference for our future policy discussions on Asian regional integration in higher education.

Now we turn to the discussion of transnational education policy objectives, in order to search for a future direction for Asian regional cooperation in higher education integration. I point out four objectives from political perspectives, while the other two stem from economic perspectives. The most representative ideal for transnational education is the international understanding/international peace model. The notion of linking international student mobility or transnational education to international understanding and peace began to spread after World War I and became more widespread after World War II. For example, the spirit of UNESCO reflects this very notion; embodied in the sentence "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defense peace must be constructed." I love this phrase, actually. This philosophy has been the basis of UNESCO's international education endeavors. This international education principal appears in many international education policies and programs throughout the world, including Japanese policies. This approach should be given due consideration when thinking about the creation of an East Asian community based on peace. The East Asian region, one could argue, has even more diversity than that which is found in Europe. I believe transnational education will be able to play a major role in the promotion of mutual understanding in the region.

The second policy objective is nurturing global and regional identities. This comes from the recent definition of higher education as an international commodity: we speak of global commodities now, in a globalizing world. In the context of European integration, the creation of a 'People of Europe,' the promotion of a European identity and European citizenship have been recognized as main objectives of transnational education within Europe. This approach is also very meaningful to Asian integration.

The third policy objective is transnational education for economic development cooperation. Based on human capital modernization theory, sending students abroad was regarded as an important part of development modernization policies for developing countries; including for

example, in Meiji Period Japan and in other Asian countries. Also, for developed countries hosting international students from developing countries has been a major form of development cooperation. Recently, there has been an increased recognition of the positive effect of not only sending students abroad, but hosting them as well. This is meaningful for the regional integration model. Under the Erasmus program, the purpose of transnational education was building the sense of a 'People of Europe,' but it is also considered as a human resource strategy for securing European economic competitiveness in the world markets – specifically in opposition to the Soviet Union and North America. In order to achieve regional integration in Asia, transnational education should also be considered from the perspective of strengthening Asian economic competitiveness against other regions.

The fourth policy objective is creating a healthy market environment for transnational education. The most recent trend in international higher education throughout the world is the rapid process of marketization. International students are now considered good customers in certain contexts. The WTO has begun discussing transnational education as international trade. Particularly in Asia, this marketization is becoming evident. The creation of an Asian regional higher education market also calls for a sound regional quality assurance system and an efficient credit transfer system. It is only in so doing, that we can create a healthy environment for transnational education in Asia.

Therefore, in the process of searching for a conceptual framework for regional integration of higher education in Asia, we should recognize both the historical development of the cosmopolitan university model, nation-state university model, cosmopolitan nation-state university model and regional integration university model, as well as various policy perspectives. We need to integrate the diversity of the different models and perspectives in our study.

The third area of research for Asian regional integration of higher education is the study of existing regional frameworks. Since the formulation of an East Asian Community is already being discussed, such as in the ASEAN forum, regional integration of higher education should be discussed in similar forums and within existing frameworks for cooperation; such as in the ASEAN University Network, Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization, within the UMAP, ASEAN University proposals, and so on. Because we have two distinguished representatives from the most important organizations in the region, Professor Supachai and Professor Piniti; as well as Professor Ninomiya - founding father of UMAP - I'm very much looking forward to the discussion in the afternoon on these topics. The fourth area of study for Asian integration and regionalization of higher education is the study of important actors in

Asian regional cooperation. In this context, nations and universities are the most important actors in the regionalization process. We need to analyze their international education policies, internationalization strategies, international educational curriculum collaborations, professorial and student exchange policies and so on. From the perspective of Asian cooperation, I'm looking forward to the discussion in the third part of today's session. The fifth and last area of study is the comparison with regional integration trends in other regions. By analyzing the developments of regional integration in Europe, and the role of higher education in this integration, we stand to draw some implications for the integration of East Asian higher education systems. I'm particularly looking forward to the first session, namely Professor Prado and Professor Morshidi's presentations.

So, concluding this agenda-setting, I would like to re-emphasize the importance of discussing Asian regional cooperation and integration in higher education from a variety of policy approaches. Regional transnational education can contribute to building relationships of mutual understanding and trust in East Asia; promote the concept of a "People of Asia;" strengthen East Asian economic competitiveness through collaborative human resource development in East Asia; and promote a healthy regional cross-border higher education market while assuring quality in education. If we look at the Kuala Lumpur Declaration adopted by the first East Asian summit, namely Articles 6, 7 and 8 which relate to transnational education and we find they are very encouraging; even though they all emphasize the role of higher education integration as only serving the purposes of international peace and understanding. That is fine, of course, however future policies for the integration of higher education should strike a balance between various ideas surrounding transnational delivery of education, including economic perspectives as well as the political, cultural and historical perspectives.

Today, we are launching a long journey in the establishment of a field of study: that of Asian regional integration in higher education. I'm really looking forward to today's discussions.

Thank you.

**/Moderator's Address**
**/Professor** Akira NINOMIYA
**/Vice President,** Hiroshima University

Good morning. My name is Akira Ninomiya. I will be moderating the first session on 'trends of international higher education regionalism.'

Professor Kuroda has outlined, quite nicely, the five agenda items that we are to discuss throughout today's three sessions. The first session is going to deal with and focus on a more general framework of international higher education and regional international higher education systems, organizations and endeavors. Accompanying us, we have four guest speakers for this round, and a hundred and twenty minutes. So each speaker must be very careful about keeping to the time allotment, kindly finishing their presentations within 20 minutes so that the participants from Japan and from other countries can have some time to discuss and exchange ideas at the end.

During the question period, I may speak in Japanese so that people on the floor can jump in and discuss with the panelists at ease. I don't like introducing such outstanding speakers; instead of introducing them, please look at their CVs, which have been provided in this booklet, from pages 22 to 26. So, we have Professor de Prado from Spain, Professor Sirat from Malaysia, Professor Welch from Australia and Associate Professor Sugimura from Sophia University. You will also find PowerPoint slides printed in this brochure, so that you may follow along with the presentations.

Let me invite the first speaker, Professor Cesar de Prado Yepes, from Spain. He will talk about European and Asian experiences in regional higher education systems.

**/Professor** César de Prado Yepes
**/Universidad de Salamanca**
**/Presentation:** European and Asian Experiences

Thank you very much Professor Ninomiya. Thank you very much Professor Kuroda and to all of you for giving me this very kind opportunity to present my research which has taken place over a number of years in several European and East Asian countries.

Even though you kindly presented me as a professor from Spain, I have to say that I'm now a visiting professor at the University of Salamanca. However, I was a researcher at the University of Tokyo for 2 years, prior to going to Salamanca, and there I wrote a book and some publications on higher education - mostly related to human resource issues. Also, I have been in several European higher education institutions, as well as learning and researching in other Asian institutions: giving lectures and also learning a lot. I hope to keep learning from all of you, today.

Since I only have 19 minutes left, I will very quickly talk about Europe and Asia. The first minute will be a quick overview of the global perspectives, such as those overviewed by Professor Kuroda, with perhaps more detail on the Asian side. This is the first slide with information from the American Institute of International Education of global trends on consumption abroad: the fourth mode of service delivery as defined by the GATS agreement. The trend is clear, growth in European higher education is substantial and you can see that it has even surpassed America. Although more foreign students go to the United States to study, and the numbers remain quite high, the trends now being evidenced in East Asia, especially Northeast Asia, are even higher. It is possible that East Asia will become a model for other parts of the world. If this growth is sustained, Europe will pay stronger attention to the Asian model and surely the United States will pay more attention to it, as well. I would stress, however, that this is still incipient. The trend is good but from a low base. Much more will need to be done before an East Asian Community is realized, as Professor Kuroda mentioned before. Let me now elaborate on some European trends.

I will spend only half a minute on the global projections. These are some maps downloaded from the Internet. They're not excellent, but quite good. The first one, at the top, gives a continental overview of regionalisms: political, government-driven regionalisms. You can see the Council of Europe there, and at the bottom you will see a sub-continental regionalism schematic: the European Union. We will see that there are different levels of regionalisms that are complementary – between nation states and the world.

Several layers of regionalisms can exist at the same time. Both in Europe and East Asia, as you know, there are platforms for interregional dialog: such as the ASEAN and ASEAN+3 frameworks. There are also larger regional linkages, like the Asian Cooperation dialog. Most of these macro-continental and sub-continental processes now have some interesting considerations for higher education; working to consolidate, in the long term, their political economic, and especially social objectives, all the while trying to achieve balance between the states and the market, as well. I don't have time to go over them, but let me say after the

European processes and Asian/East Asian-based processes; there are in fact quite a few other interesting models that should be studied. I hope you all have a chance to study the details from other parts of the world, such as South Asia, South America and Africa. Without further to do, I think I should begin to focus more on the European project, as I was requested to do by Professor Kuroda. I recognize there are many experts on Asia, and so I will provide more details about Europe in this section.

I will quickly go through European developments, as well as my own perspective and synthesis. Finally, I will compare and link both European and East Asian projects. I have a map of Europe in which you can see, surrounded by the blue line, the 27 members of the European Union. There are some members of Europe that are not members of the European Union; they're sometimes associated with it, and referred to as the European Economic Area: such as Norway, Switzerland, Lichtenstein and Iceland. Actually, Switzerland is a special case as it's not fully a member of the European Economic Area - but it's almost a member. Somehow they manage to be wherever they want, and where the business is, they tend to be there. There are three candidate countries. Turkey may become a member of the European Union in the medium term - this is still not clear. Perhaps more importantly, at the continental level is the Council of Europe, an organization that was created before the European Union. These institutions complement each other and bring together European countries that are outside of the European Union. Also an interesting fact, to become a member of the European Union, one must first be a good member of the Council of Europe for several years. Similarly, at the higher education level, in order to advance broad goals for discussion at the level of the European Union, they must first pass through the Council of Europe.

The Erasmus program Professor Kuroda has been mentioning has some limits and much more structural work needs to take place. Progress is taking place, not only, at the level of the Council of Europe. At the European level, a process known as the Bologna process has been advancing for about a decade. Please allow me to explain it in more detail. This process is complimentary to the European Union, which is federal and to a great extent advanced by the European Commission and other European federalizing actors. The Bologna process is intergovernmental in nature, with 46 participating countries, while the EU is just one special actor on the margins. Moreover, I would like to mention that within Europe there are a number of sub-regional processes, like the Nordic Council and Benelux; they are older than the European Union and they also tend to have an interest in human resources that deal with higher education, and tend to advance important issues that then spillover to broader regional projects. There is much interaction amongst all these levels, with policies being advanced through cooperative measures.

This is a historical summary of what I've been saying. The Council of Europe emerged from a conference in 1949 in the Netherlands, in which Winston Churchill, after World War II, managed to bring together all the actors interested in European cooperation. The Council of Europe was to be the driver of European integration. The problem is that it was too ambitious and they wanted to advance too many difficult issues – issues that that had been taking decades to advance. It has become a special organization, as I said before, to discuss difficult issues before moving them into the smaller sphere of the European Union. The European Communities were created by the Treaty of Rome in 1957, and encouraged vocational education as a functional education sector in order to promote economic cooperation.

Before that, the College of Europe was created in 1949. It was at the same conference in the Netherlands that a Spanish diplomat proposed the creation of pan-regional institutions. This European institution was created outside of the Erasmus Program, which came much later - and it is still running in Bruges. So the College of Europe is a mainly intergovernmental organization in which the European Union has become an important actor, but just one actor. Various countries constitute the main driving force for the College of Europe at the Masters level. Instruction is in English and French, so it's a bit difficult for some Asians to attend, but more and more Asians are coming and learning there.

So, in essence we have the Council of Europe and the College of Europe emerging in the late 40s and the Treaty of Rome creating the European Communities in the 50s. Then, in 1968, we saw the global opening of universities, which had an important effect on European universities as they were forced to restructure and to open up to more foreign students. The European University Institute, similar to the College of Europe in Bruges, was then finally created in Florence after more then 20 years of negotiations and discussions. The College of Europe was easily established, and only at the Masters level: aimed at forming practitioners. The European University Institute, on the other hand, focuses on post-graduate studies and research. I am, myself, a PhD graduate of the European Institute. The intellectual debates are very strong here and there are still some people who feel tremendous pressure because you have all the intellectual paradigms fighting each other – this occurs with North America to some extent, but even Asian intellectual paradigms become part of this clash. It's a special institution, like the College of Europe in that it is very intergovernmental and still quite small, but it has been quite influential in creating a network of intellectuals who have made some significant contributions. A British diplomat addressing the European University Institute apparently proposed the Euro in the late 70s, even though the British eventually decided not to join!

Now we move into the 1980s and the establishment of the Erasmus Program. The Erasmus Program came about because the European Court of Justice, a federal institution, advanced a ruling on education, decreeing that education was important for the mobility of workers. Vocational education was already allowed in other countries to train workers, but there was a need to provide further education to the workers' families, as well. So, because of this link, the Court of Justice ruled that education could be 'European', and the Commission decided to test the ruling with the Erasmus program. In the beginning it did not advance very rapidly, but it gained momentum throughout the 90s, and now it is in full swing with millions of students moving for periods ranging from half a year to one year. But that was not yet enough to fully restructure Europe's universities. So, in the late 1990s, particularly French intellectuals and government decided to advance a complementary intergovernmental project: the Bologna Process. At the University of Paris 500th anniversary celebrations, four Ministers of Education, the French, German, Italian and British came together and decided to advance a vision, which the following year became known as the Bologna Process. The goal was to aggrandize the project to encompass the full mobility of students, faculty and content, especially because all the institutions in the European Union have similar structures and policies, able to promote these mobility schemes. You can see in the slide that 46 countries have joined the Bologna process while the Erasmus Program only brings together the European Union countries and others around it – 32 countries in total.

Please let me briefly mention that Europe is now also testing a broader model. This year the European Institute of Innovation and Technology is planning to advance networks called 'Knowledge and Innovation Communities', which will be made up from a number of universities, research centers, and a mix of firms, bringing together all kinds of public, private actors. Everyone is, in principal, welcome without any real hierarchy; meaning, firms could take the lead to promote very innovative communities. So, it will complement the College of Europe in the social sciences at the Masters level and the European University Institute at the graduate level: it will be a small group of leading thinkers focused on innovation, technology, and business. The political decision on the exact location of this institution has not yet been decided but it will come soon, I believe.

The most recent goal of the Erasmus program is to have, in a few years, about 3 million students moving within Europe. Professors are also moving now, advancing all kinds of networks that promote the Europeanisation of content. By the way, the multidimensional Erasmus process is actually embedded in a broader lifelong learning scheme called Grundtvig that reaches to high school and below, and all the way to adult education. And it increasingly has a global projection although with some important differences. Erasmus Mundus is a

program at the Masters level while Erasmus is a programme at the undergraduate level. Erasmus Mundus is open to the whole world. Exchanges with developed and developing countries are often encouraged, and are usually done on a regional basis.

The Bologna Process is summarized here: this is a list of Ministerials, which have been taking place every two years, more or less, after the 1999 Bologna meeting. The Benelux countries (Belgium, Netherlands and Luxemburg) will organize the next Bologna meeting. The discussions have turned to focus on quality. The structure of the program has been maturing quite well, and this must continue to advance on the basis of maintaining quality. The ten main goals can be summarized in the promotion of mobility of all kinds of actors: students, professors, faculty, institutions, policy makers, etc, to produce a quality education. Degrees have to be easily comparable regionally, as well, as globally. The structural setup is somewhat similar to the US system and the Japanese system: the first 4 years are spent at the undergraduate level; one or two years for the Masters; and then PhD studies begin. So, the structure now being proposed in Europe will not serve to seclude or divide Europe, it's actually more connected globally.

The Bologna process is nowadays also developing a global strategy. Europe seems willing to link with other parts of the world as long as the other partners and regions allow and share European values. This global approach must allow dynamic stakeholders; meaning not only state universities promoting state ideologies, but also open universities sharing valuable intellectual ideas within a context of European values, human rights, democracy, the rule of law, cultural and religious dialogue, institutional autonomy, academic freedom and tolerance.

I would now like to quickly go over higher education cooperation processes in Asia. In this slide you may see another timeline. It all basically started in Southeast Asia during the Cold War and then broadened into the Asia-Pacific at the end of the Cold War. This has a very large scope so I don't believe that it can ever advance that well. But more recently there have been study groups promoting ASEAN+3 or an East Asian community with similarities to European projects. There was in 2003 an ASEAN+3 group discussing a facilitation program dealing with the exchange people and human resources for development. This study group was mainly promoted by Japan. Its ideas are very similar to those of the Bologna process, that is, the promotion of mobility of students, faculty, institutions, content etc. Advances are still slow and somewhat hesitant. There is also a Network of East Asian Studies (NEAT) promoted mainly by the Institute of Oriental Culture in Tokyo that has been negotiating for three years already, creating links amongst the major national universities. This would, of course, be a

complimentary strategy to autonomous networks being advanced by Waseda, Hiroshima, and many other universities in Japan.

Meanwhile, Northeast Asian countries are also discussing tripartite cooperation and it's possible that a Northeast Asian Ministerial soon takes place. I presume this may even happen this year because the first ASEM (Asia-Europe Meeting) Education Ministerial is taking place in Berlin this May. In order to prepare for this, it would be normal behavior for the ASEAN and East Asian Ministers of Education to meet in the lead up to the ASEM. ASEAN Ministers of Education have already met in the past years, and the Northeast Asian Ministers will probably have their first meeting before the ASEM meeting in Berlin.

The East Asian Summit is an even broader platform for potential cooperation in higher education, including the project to revive the famous ancient Nalanda University in Bihar. Moreover, it's possible that the SAARC (South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation), which has been trying to advance its own education cooperation initiatives, may also get involved in the East Asian Summit. This may be difficult in the short term because of Pakistan's situation, but it will likely be possible in the medium term.
This last slide provides a comparison of European and East Asian regional processes in higher education. The bottom line is that the European process is relatively quite advanced and the East Asian processes are still incipient, even though the market and autonomous linkages are contributing a great deal to the regionalizing project. At the public level, there is a lot of talk that still has to be concretized. It is my hope that the people present here will advance and advocate a vision that is compatible with Europe's. And perhaps the ASEAN process is a good catalyst to bring about a common interest and a coalescing of global interests; perhaps Europe and East Asia could link with other regions and effect some change global arenas as well, such as within the WTO-GATS education debate.

I will like to finish here. Thank you very much.

**/Moderation**
**/Professor** Akira NINOMIYA
**/Vice President,** Hiroshima University

Thank you very much Dr. de Prado.

Our next speaker is Professor Sirat. He will discuss the challenges and issues faced by Malaysia in the field of globalization and international higher education.

/**Professor** Morshidi Sirat
/**Director,** National Higher Education Research Institute
/**Presentation:** Trends in International Higher Education and Regionalism: Issues and Challenges for Malaysia

Thank you very much. A very good morning to all participants and fellow presenters. Thank you very much to Professor Kuroda for inviting me and giving me this opportunity.

My presentation is divided into two parts. I am going to skip the first part and go directly to the second part of my presentation in order to save time and give more focus to what I'm going to say. The second part of my presentation is specific to Malaysia. The first part is a very broad discussion about where we are going in terms of international higher education (IHE).

Now, let's look at IHE. The latest report from the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education's website (OBHE) has identified Malaysia as an emerging player in the IHE market. We have major players in the USA, UK and Australia; middle players consist of Germany and France; and evolving destinations include Japan, Canada and New Zealand. And then we find the emerging contenders: Malaysia, Singapore and China. I'm going to skip this section and just present you with the context of my discussion. We have heard discussions about the old and the new regionalisms, namely in the case of the European Union. I would like to concentrate on the uses of regionalism in higher education. Now in the case of IHE in Malaysia, we look at three areas. One is from the perspective of student mobility; Malaysia as a source country. The second perspective considers Malaysia as a receiving country: playing host to international students. The third, considers the higher education framework in Malaysia: to what extent is Malaysia educating its students for the global market; that is, the relationship to the global workforce initiative and global workforce development. I am going to focus my talk on these three areas.

With respect to IHE from Malaysia's perspective, I was asked to write on where Malaysia is heading. Now, in terms of student mobility – Malaysia as a source country - Malaysia is in the top 10 source countries for the USA. From the data we have, we see that there have been ups and downs in the periods before 9/11 and post-9/11. And at the same time, we have witnessed a decline in the number of students going to the UK since 1998. This decrease is less dramatic than in the USA, even though the post-9/11 fallout has affected the UK, too. There are some constraints however, despite the slight decrease over the years. The UK remains in the top 10

host countries, despite the high cost of a UK education. The Asian financial crisis will have to be factored into the picture, as it did stem the outflow of students and funds. So we see, in the post-9/11 period, capacity development in Malaysia has consistently been shifting to the private sector.

If we consider student flows to Australia, it appears that Malaysia is the third source country in terms of student numbers; China being the major source country in terms of student numbers. So we are an important source country for Australia, in a sense. This is because the cost opportunities are greater, being less expensive than the UK and closer than the US. But more importantly, there are employment opportunities. Malaysian students in Australia are given opportunities to stay on and work.

Now, let's turn to Malaysia as a receiving country. The recent phenomenon would have Malaysia becoming an important destination for mobile Asian students. The latest data we have indicates we command 2% of the market in IHE students. The majority of students are from ASEAN, and a bigger majority is from China: 35% each year. But it has been declining slightly, and that has to be taken into consideration as China expands its own capacity. Now, the question is why are we not bringing Chinese students to Malaysia? Instead, we are sending our institutions to China, recruiting Chinese students in China itself. Increasingly, we have students from the Middle East, a post-9/11 phenomenon. But interestingly, it's a government-to-government kind of arrangement, rather than a free flow of Middle Eastern students to Malaysia. The interesting thing is in the case of the Middle East, compared to the other countries, we have a free flow of students who enter the Japanese and Chinese systems on their own. However, in the case of Malaysia the inflow of students from the Middle East is the result of governmental negotiations. The Malaysian government has had to agree to provide all the facilities for accommodations, for example. So it has become very tricky in a sense. And now, we have students from Africa who come in on their own.

In this context, looking at Malaysia as a receiving country, we must differentiate between private sector and public sector provision of higher education. There are a lot of international students in the private sector. This is because in the public sector we have capped the intake of international students at 5%. We cannot take more than that. The 5% cap was put in place for 'national interest' considerations. However, there are no such quotas in the public postgraduate and doctoral programs; you can take as many students as you like, so long as institutional capacity permits. The government has stated that it wants to attract 100,000 foreign students by 2010. The fact remains, now we have only about 48,000 international students in Malaysia. Two years down the road, the target is 100,000. Can we achieve that? At

the time of the projection, the figures for international students had been rising rapidly, and suddenly somewhere down the road figures have come down a bit. With the increasing capacity in China itself, we expect that the number of students from China is going to decrease.

The possibility of achieving the 100,000 goal by 2010, is slim. Interestingly, the recent Malaysian Higher Education Plan has targeted 100,000 PhD students. At the end of the day, these are a lot of big numbers. I don't know where these numbers will come from. I don't mind if the big numbers are expressed in terms of investment for teacher salaries and for lecturers; but this is a big number for students.

Now today, let's put the discussion in the context of what I have referred to as the National Higher Education Plan 2020. At present, there is a general restructuring of the education system as a whole: from a very centralized system of government control, to greater autonomy for the institution. This is a question of new liberal tendencies versus state-centric tendencies. The European Union, for example, is quite used to giving autonomy to its universities. But in the case of Southeast Asia and Asia, it's a difficult proposition still; you want to give autonomy but you still want to hold on to the public universities, because public universities are important investments for the government and often they cite concerns over national interest. So, right now we are still discussing and debating university autonomy. Even right now, at this very moment, we haven't yet agreed on how much autonomy universities in Malaysia will receive. In Malaysia, employment as a lecturer is a civil servant function. And as civil servants, we are tied to the national bureaucracy and subscribe to national guidelines.

I was also asked to discuss the role of English as a language of instruction in Malaysia. When I was growing up, I studied in English. When Dr. Zainal was growing up, he used a little English and Bahasa Malaysia. Then, we went back to using primarily Bahasa Malaysia, and now we are back with strong English usage. Quite frankly, I don't know where we are going. Probably, one day we will end up using Japanese, I suppose. It is very unclear, the reason can be found in Malaysian regionalism; even now, Malaysians have to learn at least three languages: English, Malaysian and Mandarin because of the importance of the Chinese market. I send only my daughter, of my 4 children, to Chinese school to learn Mandarin. The other three boys are going through the normal Malay streams. That is how important the Chinese factor is.

But in terms of the importance of the international educational experience, even though we acknowledge international higher education as being important, in the Malaysian curriculum

as a whole, its influence is very minimal. We don't expose them to what's going on in the world and in Asia. It still has a local focus. In relation to the regional educational framework, Malaysian higher education curriculum is still localized, in a sense, not looking at the international market. This is the very reason why it's very difficult for Malaysian graduates in the public higher education system to find employment outside of Malaysia or in Asia. It is because of this local orientation. But, for those Malaysians who are studying overseas in Australia, Canada and the UK, they are getting opportunities to work in those countries. I was told during my last visit to Sydney, that a large proportion of students are staying on in Australia, because of greater work opportunities. Our higher education framework, ideally, should prepare graduates for the highly interconnected world and globalized economy. If we are aspiring to be a node in a global network, we need to be more aware of these things. We should have a graduate workforce prepared for the global economy with multicultural competencies. Having a global workforce development initiative that focuses both on Asia and the rest of the world is very important. In the case of Malaysia, even though we are thinking in terms of international higher education, we are still worried about quality issues. For example sending students overseas to universities of questionable quality, and with no way of verifying the quality of the education they will receive. Similarly, we are concerned about receiving students from institutions that we are equally unsure about.

There was a case recently with a group of Malaysian students who went to Russia and experienced some complications there. Because of a seemingly different grading system, Russia ended up taking in Malaysian students with lower grades for their medical programs.

So, we see that standardization is a problem. Malaysia is concerned about standardization, and recognizes its importance in bringing about an international higher education framework that ensures quality across borders. We have introduced a Malaysian qualifications framework, which has been created to deal with this kind of international higher education qualification discrepancy. Malaysia tends to approach international higher education with an air of caution, believing that doing otherwise may lead to an erosion of quality.

In terms of professional qualifications we subscribe to agreements such as the Washington Accord, to ensure that there is a quality engineering education being delivered, for example. Apart from engineering and professional education, the education system is still in a state of flux. So, what is our vision of the future and our way forward? Lessons from Bologna? Yes, this is in fact an important area. Regionalism in higher education? Malaysia is now playing an important role in this context. Something that we look forward to, is promoting the cross-border mobility of students, as well as academic and research personnel. UMAP has

been there throughout, although Malaysia has not fully taken advantage of the UMAP facilities.

We are not talking about things that are new. Mechanisms are already in place and we are not out to re-invent the wheel once again. There are many mechanisms already in place; it is just a matter of trying to put things to work rather than introducing new things. The important thing here is many countries in Asia, especially in Southeast Asia, consider themselves regional education hubs: Singapore, Malaysia. We are competing with countries in the region itself and for the same source countries: students in China, for example. This is the reality now. We need a new synergy, rather than competing for these resources. I know globalization means competition: survival of the fittest. But if we look at the global resources, we cannot compete all the time and there are areas in which we can synergize and collaborate. So, the challenge for Asia is dealing with our great diversity - unlike in Europe. Our level development and political systems are all very different. This is the reality we've got to deal with. We've got to develop regional structures that enhance present structures and work towards new ones if the need arises. The third challenge that Malaysia recognizes as important is the harmonization of academic degree structures; an area where considerable progress is being made in Europe, but where Asia is still struggling. I have been asked by the Malaysian government to work on the Mutual Recognition Agreement between Malaysia and China, to try and bring some progress in this area. This is still a work in progress, however.

I will need to end here, thank you very much.

**/Moderation**
**/Professor** Akira NINOMIYA
**/Vice President,** Hiroshima University

Thank you very much Dr. Sirat.

I was impressed with the notion that there already exist a lot of ideas, procedures, tools and even toolboxes which can be used as solutions to the challenges being faced in transnational higher education schemes and programs. The question really seems to be, who is willing to use these tools to bring about that change. Maybe during our discussion period, we can exchange ideas on how better to promote such ideas and tools, which are already at our disposal.

Thank you very much again, Dr. Sirat. May I invite Professor Welch to speak next.

/**Professor** Anthony R. Welch
/**University of Sydney**
/**Presentation:** The Dragon and the Tiger Cubs: Competitive and Cooperative China-ASEAN Relations in the Higher Education Sector

Let me echo my fellow presenters. Thanks to Kuroda-san, and to my colleagues here at Waseda for the opportunity to return here. I've been here several times, including once as a visiting professor some years ago and it is always a pleasure to return to Waseda.

Kuroda-san did ask that I try and look at things from an Australian perspective. That really is, probably, a bit beyond the scope of the paper that I'm going to give. Instead, I will make one or two very brief introductory remarks about internationalization in Australia, following on from some other comments made by the preceding presenter, Dr. Morshidi.

Many people think that the process and progress of internationalization of higher education in Australia has been very successful. In many ways that is true. There has been a systematic attempt to internationalize the Australian higher education system, which goes well beyond simply recruiting international students. That has been, I think, a remarkable transformation of the Australian system over the last 20 years or so. Many of us welcome that transformation, as teachers and as scholars. It is a wonderful diversification of the system and we enjoy working with students, mainly from the region, but from many parts of the world, as well. It is now the case that one student in four in the Australian higher education system is international. So, 250,000 international students are, approximately, studying in the Australian system, out of one million total. So, it is a very high proportion and many of us think that is wonderful.

Where we don't succeed, anything like as well, is in our commitment and resources in sending our own students abroad. And that is a long-standing failure of the Australian system. We need to encourage our students more; many of them would like to, but it's expensive of course, and we need to provide more support for them and more scholarships. And the other question, of course, has been raised by a couple other presentations - and which is always an issue for Australia - is our role in Asia. This is because Australia has a history that is, in some ways, more British and European; although our recent history and our cultural and economic policy now focuses and has for some time focused much more on the Asian region. So, there is an interesting tension there. Australia's role within Asia and contributions to Asia is expanding, including in the area of higher education.

So with those brief remarks I'll just talk mainly about this paper. My apology for the Japanese error: I'm told, instead of it reading 'the dragon of the tiger cubs', it actually reads 'the dragon and the lion cubs.'

So, what I'm trying to do is talk about competitive and collaborative relations between China and three ASEAN countries: Singapore, Malaysia and China. I think we can skip over the first part fairly quickly; suffice it to say that higher education is increasingly recognized internationally as a pillar of the so-called 'knowledge economy'; whatever people understand that term to mean, higher education is recognized as an important component. But, there is this tension between spiraling demand, spiraling enrolments and government capacity to sustain this increase. So, public universities are pushed to diversify their income including by taking in more international students, and we see a simultaneous increase in the private sector.

This is occurring in a number of ways. Private delivery of education has been recognized within the GATS framework, and I will not need to go into that too much since it's already been mentioned once or twice. The OECD estimates that international trade in higher education was worth, at the beginning of the century, something like 30 billion dollars – it is significantly more now.

One of the things that the GATS agreement and framework reminds us of is the increasing move towards service sector economies, and how much of a role higher education plays within that. But the important point to make, of course, is that like with any other kind of trade, countries are not equal and systems are not equal. On a whole, it is the richer countries, that is, the wealthier countries - and as I will show in a minute, English-speaking countries – that have tended to dominate international trade in higher education. I would like to consider the implications this has for China and ASEAN.

I would like to offer just a brief introduction on regional integration, to see what a China-ASEAN FTA, CAFTA as it is sometimes called, would mean. It translates to a population of 1.7 billion and a regional GDP of two trillion dollars (US) plus - of course if Japan were to join, it would make it significantly larger. China-ASEAN trade has been growing by 20% to 30% every year since about 1990. For 2008, it is estimated that it will reach something in the order of 200 billion dollars (US). And of course China is now a member of the WTO, and has been for some years, which is leading to some liberalization in the services sector – although not as much as some of its ASEAN peers would like. [Photo]

This is a picture of the fourth China-ASEAN Expo, which was held in October 2007, in China.

We've talked a bit about GATS, so I don't think we need to talk too much more about it, except to say that education is a significant component; by no means the largest, but a significant component of services sector trade worldwide.

Here we have some indications of earnings from cross-border education, from some of the major players that Professor Morshidi was talking about. You can see how from 1998 to 2000 – there is newer data available - the changes that have occurred amongst four countries: Australia, Canada, UK and the USA. What's so striking is last column; you can see in the last column, whereas for Canada, the UK and the US service sector exports from education are about 3%, for Australia it's nearly 12%. That makes Australia, in some ways, quite vulnerable to changes, by things like SARS or tsunamis, or any of the other major regional events - none of which we paid much attention to a few years ago - but which have affected higher education among other things.

Although I won't go into the GATS discussion, as it has already been covered in some of the other papers, it is just to make the point that consumption abroad has been, traditionally, the largest component of GATS, but the others are growing rapidly. This really is making a difference.

Here we get to some of the inequalities that I was talking about before. If you look at these statistics taken from OECD data, you will notice that the US is responsible for a little bit less than one third of total cross-border trade and the UK about half that. Again, some of the data that Professor Morshidi presented in the previous presentation shows that the situation has changed significantly. What the data also shows is the dominance of this area, on a whole, by English-language countries. Including countries like Malaysia and Singapore who are expanding their English language provision. What you see is that 70% of enrolments from Asia and Oceania go to English language providers. We also see a significant fall in the overall size of the American system: 49% in 1995, now probably about 30%. For the reasons Professor Morshidi already explained, the wider competitiveness and the increasing competition, particularly from the Asia Pacific region: Japan, China, Malaysia, Singapore, Australia and so on. And you can now see a rise in some of the other kinds of providers.

It's important to point out that speakers of Mandarin in the Asia Pacific region are about as numerous as speakers of English. And given, again as Professor Morshidi pointed out, given

China's rise in cultural, economic and political terms, I think we are going to see, over the next few decades, a significant expansion in the demand for educational services in Mandarin - mainly in China, but not only in China. Countries like Singapore and others will be relatively well positioned to take advantage of that increase. We see it in the rise of the Confucius Institutes, for example - now scheduled to number 500 in a matter of years.

This is some of the regional data. You can see that Asia Oceania students still largely tend to go to the Americas, particularly to the US, comparatively less than they did so only a decade or so ago. What is interesting is the rise in Asia-Oceania; that is, there are more Asia-Oceania students going abroad, but choosing to study within the region, than was the case a decade or so ago.

All right, the dragon. Explained very briefly, because I think everyone is aware of China's rise, this chart gives some indication of a GDP growth rate: around 10% per annum since around 1990 - which is quite spectacular. This is a massive rise in foreign direct investment into China. Now, in 2006, we are talking about 72 billion US dollars. And this is having a dual impact on the ASEAN region. On the one hand, it is stimulating ASEAN because there is huge demand being sucked into China. ASEAN can respond to some of the demand, including in the service sector. But, it is also true – and this is the other side of the coin - that there is more competition from China for ASEAN countries, including in the service sector. China, as we know, has tried to sign the treaty of amity and cooperation, as well as the ASEAN-China FTA, and so on. Its rise is very significant internationally.
So the three countries that I'm looking at, as I said, Malaysia, Singapore and Vietnam are very different. Malaysia is a middle-income country, with a population that is a little larger than Taiwan or Australia. A significant proportion of its GDP is now in the services sector. As well, there is a significant proportion of high-tech goods as a proportion of the manufactured exports and substantial investment for higher education. Singapore is a wealthy country by any measure: GDP per capita is about the same as in Japan or Australia, for example. Singapore spends less on higher education as a percentage of GDP, but as Professor Morshidi was explaining, it has been aggressively positioning itself as an edu-hub in the region and has a solid record of expanding service sector trade, including into China. Vietnam is by far the poorest of the three; with a much larger population of around 80 million, low GDP, low per capita GNI, the lowest in terms of services as a percentage of GDP, and so on.

So we've got a high-income, a middle-income and low-income country with different profiles. But there are some similarities between the three, and one of them is quite relevant for this analysis: that is the role of the Chinese ethnic minority in all three countries. It is quite

significant in Malaysia: around 25-30 %. But, as you can see, they play a substantial role in the economy. The substantial role within the economy is there within all three: in Singapore, as well as in Vietnam.

Malaysia's 'Vision 2020' gives a substantial role to higher education and to high tech industry. Singapore does even more, with a very high concentration on these high value sector areas. Vietnam, as I said, is still a very poor country. Modeling itself, though not entirely, to some extent on China's success. It now boasts a vigorously growing economy, rising by about 8% per annum and with a very ambitious plan for higher education. It has also joined the WTO, just recently.

I won't talk too much about the Chinese higher education system, except to say that there are some real challenges here, too. If you look at the last column, here, you can see the massive rise in enrolments in China over the last few years of the last century and in the beginning of this century. And what that has meant, if you look at the last column, is an explosion in student-staff ratios over the past few years, as deliberate policies by the government to get more students into universities take root. Levels of efficiency in Chinese universities are not always as high as the government would wish. There is a push - and we see it in many countries - to encourage universities to diversify their income, so that they are less and less dependent on the central government. Brain drain is an issue in terms of internationalization, while at the same time, as professor Morshidi indicated, China is taking in more and more international students and has ambitious plans on that front, also.
Here we see a role for ASEAN in Chinese universities. You see about 8% of international students in China come from the ASEAN region, largely from places like Indonesia and Vietnam. China offers a number of scholarships to Asian students; it has mandated teaching English in 10% of subjects; it has a green card system and it is encouraging its own highly skilled diaspora to come back to China and contribute, or even to contribute from abroad. I won't talk about some of the ASEAN-China framework agreements because these have been covered in one or two of the previous presentations.

We can see that Singapore's higher education system is probably the most developed of the three. Singapore has a strong record of investment in China and its FDI goes, in large part, to China and there are many Singaporeans living in Shanghai. So, it is well positioned to expand its existing profile. There are a number of planks that can be used as a base for expansion from Singapore to China. I trace some specific examples of links between Singapore and China in the paper.

Malaysia also wants to become a regional edu-hub. It has some issues in terms of its own Chinese minority, and these are gradually being solved. Private universities have been pursuing connections with China, as Professor Morshidi explained, as has the public sector, particularly at the graduate level. There are already signs of substantial success attracting students to Malaysia.

Vietnam is the least developed of all - as one would expect. The trade between Vietnam and China, is largely towards China – though this was the most difficult to trace, despite help from both China and Vietnam.

So this final slide is a broad summary of relations, including specific agreements that operate within Malaysia, within Singapore and within Vietnam in terms of relations with China. And lastly, just to conclude, it's clear that Singapore is wealthier, has better infrastructure and its investment in ICT in higher education leaves it best positioned of the ASEAN three countries. Professor Morshidi has explained that Malaysia is in sort of a middle position, with substantial ambitions to expand and boasts a substantial success in doing so. China's growth is important too, including in the educational services sector. Vietnam, the weakest by these measures, comes in the least strong of all three. There are significant problems of regulation of the private sector across the region, including in China. That's being complicated by the growth of transnational programs, which some systems are finding difficult to regulate. There are issues of transparency, and finally, there is this overall problem of inequities: that the trade is still dominated, largely, by the wealthiest countries and by the English language providers. I'll leave it at that, thank you.

**/Moderation**
**/Professor** Akira NINOMIYA
**/Vice President,** Hiroshima University

Thank you very much Professor Welch.

I apologize for the limited time given for your presentation. Lastly, I would like to invite Professor Sugimura from Sophia University. She will be talking about international student flows in Asia.

/**Associate Professor** Miki SUGIMURA
/**Sophia University**
/**Presentation:** Higher Education Strategies and International Student Flows in Asian Countries

Thank you very much for your kind introduction Professor Ninomiya.

Let me begin by expressing how honored I am to be here today. I appreciate Waseda University's kind invitation and I would like to especially thank Kuroda-sensei, organizer of this session. My topic is higher education strategies and international student flows in Asian countries. My presentation has two parts. First, I would like to examine factors and structures of international student exchange. And, the second part consists of clarifying the nature of international student flows in Asian countries. This is the outline of my presentation.

Nowadays, as Professor Kuroda already mentioned, the relationship between higher education and economic development in Asian countries is more emphasized. In these circumstances, Asian higher education has developed in various ways. Among them, the expansion of transnational programs is a very unique trend spurred on by globalization. As you know, several types of transnational programs exist. For example, credit transfer programs, external degree programs, split degree programs, distance learning programs, and so on. What these transnational programs have in common is that they are designed with cooperation in mind, between local higher education institutions and foreign-linked higher education institutions.

Transnational programs are also closely linked to economic considerations. The cost of a transnational program is relatively cheaper than a normal program. One common form of transnational program is international student exchange. On the other hand, accepting international students is also very beneficial to the host country. First, international students bring foreign currency with them. Secondly, the international students are a potential source of manpower for the host country. After they graduate, if there is a possibility to stay in the host country to work, the students may join the host country's work force. This is a very important and attractive consideration for countries where the workforce is running short, like in Japan.

For these reasons, many colleges and universities in Asia have linked-up with transnational programs in Western countries. This is closely related with each country's political strategy. For example, in the case of Malaysia - Professor Sirat already mentioned a lot, so I shouldn't repeat it - private higher education institutions have an appeal abroad: boasting lower costs,

programs in English and good access to Western countries' transnational programs. Malaysia has been actively involved in promoting its education abroad and they have established promotional offices overseas to support these efforts. This has been carried out not only in Asian countries, but also in Africa and the Middle East, as Professor Sirat already mentioned.

This slide shows the increase of international students from Asian countries to Malaysia. The next slide shows the increase in international students from African countries to Malaysia. This final slide shows the number of international students from Middle Eastern countries to Malaysia. These slides support the idea that political strategies are spurring the increase in international student flows. Actually, the number of international students going to Malaysia to pursue their studies has been on the rise; and, it is said that the Malaysian government aims to accept 100,000 international students. This is a very ambitious goal, as Professor Sirat already mentioned. This is a drastic increase compared with the only 12,000 students in Malaysia, in 2001.

As for Singapore and Thailand, they share the same aim: to become an educational hub among Asian countries. Education is now an important industry in addition to tourism. These countries have been trying to attract international students by promoting their English education system and a general climate of social peace and order, in their respective countries. An important characteristic of Singapore's educational strategy is that it is focusing not only on higher education, but on primary and secondary education, as well. Presently, 66,000 international students are studying in Singapore and they are mostly from South Korea, China, Vietnam, Thailand and Indonesia. They represent an increasing pool of international human resources for development in Singapore.

Singapore also aims to attract 150,000 international students by 2012. The trend of accepting international students to domestic education systems is becoming harder and harder, especially with the intensification of international competition amongst Asian countries, as Dr. Welch already mentioned.

When we look at factors relating to international student flows, it should be pointed out that international student exchange cannot be explained entirely by the traditional context of cultural mutual understanding, but it should be understood as part and parcel of political and economic strategies. For each country, these strategies translate into a means of human resource development or national development. Transnational education programs are very effective for enlarging higher education systems at a low cost. They are also countermeasures for brain drain problems, from which each country has suffered.

This trend in international student exchange is closely related with a way of thinking that regards education as a kind of industry or business, in which efficiency is taken very seriously. At the same time, transnational programs have an impact on the standardization of degrees, because many international students from various countries or areas can study in a similar program, simultaneously. In this sense, transnational programs are as attractive to the officials, as they are to the people. For example, China has developed short-term transnational programs, while sending more Chinese students abroad. In the case of China, there are signs of drastic change with regards to international student flows to its private sector. And the number of Chinese students remaining within their own country to study has also been increasing.

Transnational programs also shape the method of interaction between countries; that is, fostering multilateral international student exchange. International student exchanges were traditionally an educational matter between two countries: sending and accepting countries. However, the present transnational programs are sometimes developed between more than two countries. In the case of Monash University-Malaysia, for example, not only Malaysian students, but also a host of other international students have been studying there to obtain degrees from Monash University-Malaysia. At least three countries are concerned in the case of Monash University-Malaysia, and this has led to a new multilateral relationship between those countries by way of international student mobility.

Students also seem to conceive of study abroad differently. Traditionally, studying at a foreign institution, simply meant going abroad and entering a host country as foreign visitors, learning not only academic matters but also the country's history and culture. But, on the other hand, with transnational programs those international students don't necessary think of their studies in this traditional way.

Considering these shifts in transnational higher education, specifically the mobility patterns of students in higher education, we become aware of some distinct political and economic strategies, which I will try to illustrate in the following slides. This will be the main part of my presentation.

This flow chart was made by Morikawa Yuji Sensei of Waseda University, and displays part of his 2006 COE research results. As you can see, this is the flow of international students from Asia in the 1980s. What we notice is that they move mostly from Asian countries to the

USA. You can see the red line from China, Korea and Japan going to the right side of the USA.

This next chart displays mobility in 1985, still a very strong line from Asian countries to the USA is there, but there was not much mobility between Asian countries. However, in 1995, while the flow to the USA was still increasing, we also notice that other flows began to appear: from China to Japan, from Korea to China, from China to Malaysia, from China to Australia, from Malaysia to Australia, and so on.

Finally, in 2002, the flow among Asian countries, as well as to Australia, became increasingly active, while the flow to the USA has maintained. This trend follows the rapid expansion of transnational programs in Asian countries.

Next, I would like to focus on East Asian countries. The next slide shows the destination of international students from China, Korea and Japan. China, Korea and Japan have sent their students to Western countries, including Australia. The most popular country is the USA. As of 2004, the number of international students that went from China to the USA was about 87,000; from Korea about 52,000; and from Japan to the USA, about 40,000. These numbers represent 33%, 59%, 73% of the total students abroad for each country at the tertiary level, respectively; so we are talking about large numbers. But on the other hand, China and Korea have sent many students to Japan, as well. The student numbers from China to Japan sits at roughly 76,000. This represents 28% of total Chinese students abroad. And the number students going from Korea to Japan is 23,000, which represents 26% of total Korean students.

As you can see from the next slide, this trend can be explained in different terms. Chinese students represent 62% of international students in Japan, and Korean students represent 16%. At the tertiary educational level, between China and Korea, 43% of international students in China are Korean, and 62% in Korea are Chinese. These are big ratios.

These trends lead us to three observations. First, we notice that the number of international students from Asia to Western countries, for example to the USA or Australia, has continued to increase. These countries still attract international students from all over the world and are especially popular among Asian students. But additionally, these countries are counterparts in transnational programs to Asian countries, which is another reason why they are attractive for so many international students. Secondly, we recognize the new flows from China to Japan, Korea to China, Korea to Japan, China to Malaysia and Singapore, which indicates student flows among ASEAN countries and East Asian countries are more active than ever before.

The present international student flows stemming from transnational programs, has come to be a politically and economically efficient strategy. This strategy has been developed through multilateral relationships and the structure will be further emphasized under the pressures of globalization, as efficiency and standardization become more privileged.

However, as Professor Sirat and Professor Welch already mentioned, it should be noted that there are some issues with international student exchange. The first is probably quality assurance in transnational programs. While transnational programs can be very helpful in political and economic strategies, some of them are managed as an education business. As a result, the problem of quality assurance in transnational programs is of growing concern and is one of the issues to be examined. This issue includes the problem of certification or certification of standardization. To deal with this problem, the importance of an information network for transnational higher education programs was already recognized by the WTO and UNESCO.

The second issue raised by the present trends in international student exchange, is that it sometimes affects the internal administration of the countries involved. Furthermore, international student exchange inevitably involves cultural contact within these human flows, and sometimes this leads to other social problems. For example, the restoration of English as a medium of instruction is an example of a possible source of cultural conflict. English is an invaluable language to develop for transnational programs with foreign-linked institutions. However, each country has a different language policy for national identity and political considerations, and if the primacy of English is over-emphasized, this might affect sensitive policy matters in some countries.

Another side effect of transnational human flows is the increase in multicultural interactions. It should be noted that the rise in such interactions could make the ideal of “co-existence” difficult to achieve. When considering these points, we should strive to balance internal policies and international trends. That is my opinion. In other words, transnational programs promoting international student exchange should be reconsidered as a matter of localization, as well as globalization.

To conclude, I would like to highlight some of the points I made earlier. The present flow of international students amongst Asian countries is spurred on by economic considerations, as students greatly prefer partaking in more economical and efficient programs. The host government also views these students as a potential source of manpower in the process of economic development. Another consideration of international student flows is political; that

is, there is a clear link between the education being imparted and students being received with a nation's relative standing in international society. When we consider these economic and political factors, we see that transnational programs are promulgated, not only within the traditional contexts of peace and mutual understanding, but also as economic and political strategies. New transnational programs are made in a new style of exchange: with multilateral relationships involving at least three countries - different from traditional bilateral exchanges.

What this makes clear is that transnational programs are products of globalization: seeking efficiency and standardization beyond national boundaries. However, while the introduction of a transnational program is an efficient means to expand higher education provision, quality assurance remains a very critical issue. Another situation arises from multicultural human contact, the product of which is increased human flows. This can go so far as affecting the internal administration of the countries concerned. In spite of these observations, I would like to emphasize the new trend of international student flows in Asia, particularly those that have emerged between ASEAN countries and East Asian countries. Student exchanges within the Asian region have been more active and will continue to be active, even while the number of Asian students studying in Western countries increases. This could lay the potential groundwork for a regional community. International student exchanges are basically national-oriented matters, and each Asian country is in competition to try and attract the most international students. However, the present trend of international student flows shows us that a transnational human network has appeared within the Asian region, and indeed, it can serve as a good foundation for regional cooperation and integration in Asia.

Thank you very much for your kind attention. I do look forward to your comments.

**/Session I: Discussion**
**/Professor** Akira NINOMIYA (Moderator)
**/Vice President,** Hiroshima University

Thank you very much, Professor Sugimura.

Professor Kuroda has indicated that we only have 30 minutes for this discussion period.

We just heard the proposals from our four panelists. I don't think it is meaningful for me to summarize what they've said, so I'd like to go into some specific issues: Why do we need to

establish a framework? Why do we want to establish the framework? In connection with an 'East Asian Community,' how are we going to go about it?

Today's theme was higher education. How do we position the higher education system in a regional framework? We are witnessing some specific trends in the internationalization of higher education.

I would like to open the floor now for comments on these questions, or questions of your own. Please use a microphone if you would like to say something, and please identify yourselves when you speak.

**/Comment # 1**
**/Professor** Tereso S. Tullao, Jr.
**/De La Salle University**

Hello, I'm Professor Tullao from the Philippines.

I would like to begin by congratulating the panelists for excellent presentations. But, the issues that were raised in the presentations affirmed that the internationalization of higher education in the region is really exploiting the commercial gains, instead of promoting the public goods character of higher education. And, it is this that has created the brain drain problem.

Secondly, relating to flows of human resources or students in the region and the relationship established with regional integration, I think the internationalization of higher education in this region is a very effective tool for mutual understanding, at the expense of bridging the higher education and human capital gaps among the countries in the region.

And so this problem of brain drain, as well as the expanding or widening human capital educational gap in the region, is not contributing to regional integration. I argue that narrowing the gap and minimizing that cause of brain drain will promote greater and faster regional integration.

At this juncture, I would like to propose that we can still use higher education systems - because of the asymmetries that exist between higher education systems from the developed countries and those leading universities - to help the development of higher education in developing countries.

So now we move from just mutual understanding - which is very noble tradition of internationalization of higher education - to really narrowing the human capital gap. So, the future movement of people and the movement of intellectuals in this region will mimic the Bologna or European movement of people, which is really an exchange of intellectuals. Right now, because of the diversity we have to help the poor ones.

Thank you very much.

**/Moderator**
**/Professor** Akira NINOMIYA

Thank you very much.

We would like to entertain just one more question before the panelists for their views. So we would like to ask another person to speak up, please.

**/Comment # 2**
**/Mrs. Yamada,** Nagoya University

I'm from Nagoya University. My name is Yamada. That was really very insightful and all were excellent presentations.

This is connected with the statement from the gentleman from the Philippines. In terms of investment in higher education and the creation of an educational gap, I believe that there are people who are left behind, which creates a need for investment. But there is also a need to invest in the receiving countries. Of course, in the short-term they stand to reap economic benefits by receiving foreign students. But mutual understanding can also be encouraged through such exchanges. But in the long-term, if you receive students from abroad and you have no means of offering them employment, then how can you rationalize the decision. That is, if you want to rationalize investment in national higher education, how do you do so when taking into consideration student mobility? What kind of strategies can you establish?

Thank you.

**/Moderator**
**/Professor** Akira NINOMIYA

Did the panelists understand Mrs. Yamada's question?

So, we have two questions; would anyone like to respond to these issues?

**/Respondent**
**/Professor** Anthony R. Welch

I would like to just make one or two brief points in response, particularly to the first comment.

I think you are absolutely right. It is, in my view, the responsibility of the most developed systems to offer more assistance to developing countries in various ways: through scholarships, through support for the systems at home, and so on.

The Australian Government, I think, has a reasonable record of doing that within the region, and I don't want to exaggerate here. But it is focused and there are some good things, let me say, about Australian support. One is, for example, that it offers more scholarships to universities in the least developed countries; for example, we offer I think, something like five times as many scholarships to Vietnam as we do to China. Why? Because we believe China is now more able to support its own efforts, than is Vietnam.

Secondly, we insist on gender parity for scholarships. So, in the old days it was much more common for men to dominate scholarships. Now, we insist it must be 50/50; so the committees that meet – that are both Australian and part of local government - must settle on 50/50. Could we do more? Undoubtedly.

I should add that each university offers its own scholarships and its own international scholarships, as well. In my case, the University of Sydney offers a number of scholarships. Of course, I would like to see our own university offer many more.

Sometimes, governments also respond to international crises. The most well known example, I suppose, is the Australian Government's offer - something in the order of a billion dollars - in development support after the tsunami, to Indonesia. Much of that, a significant proportion

- I can't tell you exactly how much, but a significant proportion – was in the form of support for higher education through scholarships, and so on.

But, the other point that I suppose is worth making is that we do offer the opportunity, for our own international students, both to work part-time and study while they are in Australia, and in many cases, to stay on. Now you may argue that this is reinforcing brain drain and perhaps it does, but it also fosters - I think there is an increasing amount of research about this – better relations between Australia and the region. What we are finding is that many of our international students who do stay in Australia, are in fact going back and forth; they are promoting relations between our countries; they are investing in their home countries; they are going back and doing lectures sometimes at their own universities. Again, I don't want to exaggerate the importance of that, because obviously there is a benefit to Australia too, in having a more international work force. But, I do think there are some benefits to regional countries, also.

In general, I accept your point that developed countries must do more, and that certainly includes mine.

**/Moderator**
**/Professor** Akira NINOMIYA

Thank you very much Professor Welch.

Professor de Prado, could you make comment on the situation in Europe? Are there any issues or problems of divide and disparity?

**/Respondent**
**/Professor** César de Prado Yepes

In Europe, in the late 60s, university systems became open, basically, to everybody who wanted to study. This came about with the support of public governments.

So, the European project, from a higher education point of view, has always been in favor of social higher education. This has become a problem actually, because the quality of some universities has been decreasing; European universities are no longer – in general – at the

forefront. American universities tend to be, overall, at the forefront - even though their community colleges have a relatively lower level than European ones.

But now, there needs to be some leading universities in Europe. Erasmus – and especially the Bologna process – has had in mind to create some leading universities in Europe, but they are not forgetting the social dimension of higher education. Actually, there was a debate early in the Bologna process negotiation about this: it was made very clear that the social dimension will always be present and all actors (students, faculties, administrators, etc.) are part of the Bologna process negotiations. And, even though there is some homogenization, the Bologna process is not forcing European universities to liberalize. Most of the European universities will remain public. Yet, it is supposed with the homogenization, more mobility will come and the public universities will become more nimble - in a sense, competing with some private providers. That does not mean that European universities are becoming private enterprises - even though some private universities are emerging.

Actually, the problem is a bit reversed because there are not enough students in some countries. So, there are many openings for anyone who wants to study in Europe; and they can study very cheaply. In some countries, it is almost free: in Germany, for example, fees are minimal. Students who go to northern countries even get paid to do their PhD – they receive a salary to study!

So money is not the problem. The opposite becomes the problem and some universities will have to fail. How do we not create an imaginary gap between a few leading universities and the bulk, the many hundreds, if not thousands of universities that have a relatively okay level, but need to increase the level and create synergies? That is one aspect.

I think in Asia, there is no great risk - besides, perhaps, the Philippines. Most universities in East Asia are still public. Japan's universities are only privatized to a small degree; I think anyone who wants to study in a university in Japan, can do so. In China, universities remain public to a great extent. So, I think there are possibilities to maintain some sort of public-led higher education system in East Asia, but open to competition.

Once you achieve that, then creating mechanisms for narrowing the developing gap should be in place. But, I don't think this is going to happen very soon because it is extremely costly to narrow a development gap – higher education being just one way. You have to have good investments at other levels, in social issues like health, for example. Transportation has to be

addressed and this is extremely costly. These issues are part of global, political and economic systems.

In summary, the European case has made sure that social needs remain on the table. I believe East Asian countries have enough tools – political tools - to not fully fall victim to a liberalized system. I think the case of the Philippines has been erroneous to some extent because of American linkages. Now you have to, perhaps, find a way to ensure that students who leave, come back. And there could be some strings attached if they go abroad. One could implement a system that would uphold mandatory service for some years after studying in a university. Those that decide to opt out of this service may have to face an additional tax. Such mechanisms could be proposed on a regional and interregional basis.

Thank you very much.

**/Follow-up Comment**
**/Professor** Kazuo KURODA

Within one country, when we think of investment priorities in the context of education, of course, rate of return analysis and other frameworks exist. And much research has already been conducted.

So, with regards to the views and observations about transnational education or student exchange programs, some formulas and mechanisms have already been advanced, but I don't think we have much more to go. Instead, an international economics approach must be integrated to make a further in-depth analysis, so that we can measure the impact and influence on the region by way of transnational education.

**/Moderator**
**/Professor** Akira NINOMIYA

That is not an easy topic to bridge and since I'm moderating, I may not speak too much.

I feel that different countries are not making investments for students wishing to study abroad. They have made investments in higher education systems but there are ceilings; for example, the government's policy was to receive international students to a capacity of 100,000. This was not simply policy for policy's sake; it was not such a straightforward cost-benefit oriented analysis. Investment models don't quite fit in transnational education paradigms,

from an ODA perspective. I think a very good issue was raised, indeed. Any further questions from the floor?

**/Comment # 3**
**/Mr. Akiyoshi YONEZAWA**, Tohoku University

Hello, my name is Akiyoshi Yonezawa from Tohoku University.

I really enjoyed the very productive discussions today. My impression is that there is a very tricky aspect to the idea of an emerging regional framework. That is, there seem to be very different conceptions of the 'regional framework' between different types of stakeholders in higher education. If we go back to a famous framework, I mean the triangle between the state, the university and the student market; we easily arrive at a different understanding of the region or of the incentives for integration in higher education.

I mean the state, or the regional government - like the EU – can have quite a complicated idea of regionalism; this is not limited to education, but also, from the diplomatic point of view, for example. At the same time, the university also has their own role in autonomous decision-making, with regards to what kind of partnership they want to have. This is not limited to the region either, but spreads to interregional initiatives, as well. Of course, top universities and bottom universities have very different means and objectives. With regards to the student market, they too have their own incentives and agendas. Sometimes, I am sure, they do not think about the 'region' at all, but are more concerned with private or personal circumstances.

My point is that I found - especially from Dr de Prado's discussion – these same differences amongst stakeholders in Europe. I also found that there is a big gap between the Asian or East Asian condition, and the European condition. I mean within the European framework, the state or the regulatory framework, is stronger than in Asia. If we look at the Asian reality, the market is really strong and the institutional initiative is also very strong. So I would like to know if you agree with my observation: that there is a big difference in the make-up of these two regions. The second question is: in what way can the dialogue or consensus-building process between different stakeholders take place in the Asian region. Thank you.

**/Moderator**
**/Professor** Akira NINOMIYA

Thank you for that question. Professor de Prado, you showed us the world map earlier in your presentation and spoke a fair bit about your idea of regionalisms. So, would you like to respond?

**/Respondent**
**/Professor** César de Prado Yepes

Thank you again for raising these points and questions, but I don't know whether I can answer them properly.

Let me link the previous question and answer to one of your points. In Europe, the state is still important but there has been a lot of devolution towards intrastate regions; like in the German Länder, the Spanish autonomous communities, etc. The original system matters and has many prerogatives – but sometimes intrastate regions have more prerogatives than the central state. This is also a way to protect the social character of universities. A state could liberalize within Europe or in the GATS at some point, but then the regions within states would say "Hey, we want to keep our autonomy." That is, perhaps, a system those Asian countries may want to develop.

Then I link this point to Asian models. Asian countries have become extremely diverse throughout history, manifested in the wonderful panorama that everybody can see, but there is still a lot of talk. Progress in the region is not extremely efficient yet, from the public point of view. But the process has been going on for several decades and is picking up speed. There are good chances that this tremendous historical diversity will be sustained. Actually, Europe thrives on diversity. We are relatively good at learning languages and solving problems, while the Americans sometimes get into problems. It is because they are not longer used to harmonious diversity. In America one sees the melting pot model in which everybody is supposed to conform. They have many problems at present, because the melting pot is not fully working and many ethnicities remain ethnically different in the US and at some point they may need to explore new models, such as the Canadian mosaic or Australian models, for example.

The point is that in Asia the extreme diversity is not becoming a melting pot, rather, it is more like a mosaic making all kinds of linkages with the rest of the world. This could be a very good model, which the world could learn from if it is complimented by sub-regional devolution. In Japan, there is some talk about this: regional universities are appearing, local universities may pick up new strength. In China, some cities are showing signs of this devolution and these institutions are becoming hubs for regional development. I don't know about the Philippines – I feel they may be extremely centralized - but perhaps, there will be some decentralization in the Philippines and in other countries, which are still very centralized.

**/Moderator**
**/Professor** Akira NINOMIYA

Thank you very much.

Before the panelists leave the stage, I'd like to give you 30 seconds for summing up your presentations.

**/Closing Remarks**
**/Associate Professor** Miki SUGIMURA

Thank you very much for your questions and comments from the floor, but there's just one more point that I would like to emphasize before concluding the session.

That is, as we have pointed out, national government and the universities have taken great initiatives in the region. Some of the biggest changes that are taking place in Asia include the decisions being made by more and more students to leave their country and study abroad. I think that is the major driver of mobility: people's awareness and the people's initiative. So I think that, of course, political economic issues might be involved and also government initiatives might be at work, but considerations of nationalism and ethnic divide are also playing roles in shaping this mobility. These issues may remain for some time yet.

That's an issue that might be taken up in the afternoon session, but I think it is the very first step toward understanding each other, and might be the very first step toward integration. Of

course, other private initiatives will contribute a great deal. All the actors are indeed very active.

## /Closing Remarks
## /**Professor** Anthony R. Welch

Let me just make one point that, in a sense, underpins much of my analysis, even though it is not so obvious in my paper. That is the question of the relationship between the public and the private sector in Asia in general, but in Southeast Asia and East Asia in particular. And, how is that changing? What does it mean for access and equity?

If we look at Southeast Asia for example, in the Philippines, more than 80% of all enrollments are in the private sector. In Vietnam, it's about 12%: so huge differences. But even Vietnam has ambitious plans to expand their private sector to about 30% - 40% of enrolments by the year 2010. I don't really see how that would be achieved, but it's indicative of the changing balance between the public and the private sector in Southeast Asia and in East Asia.

What does it mean from the student's point of view? From the families' point of view, who want to send their children on to higher education? On the one hand, the public sector universities in many of these countries have been largely peopled by the middle class - it's true. But there have always been opportunities for students from poorer families who have high ability to go to public universities. There have always been some places there because they are structured relatively lower than the private sector. Now what we see, are private sector universities expanding - some of high quality, some of lower quality, some of them with very high fees and some of them with relatively low fees. While in the public sector universities, we see many of them offering high demand courses for much higher fees because they are under pressure to diversify their income.

So the question I would like to leave you with at the end is: What does that mean for the poorer students of high ability? Are they been squeezed out of the picture, more and more?

Thank you very much.

## /Closing Remarks
## /Professor Morshidi Sirat

I have only some very simple words to offer.

I would like to quote the gentleman from the Philippines: 'international higher education has been developing according to business models.' We should move away from purely following a business model, to original cooperation models.

Second, there are already structures in place, in terms of regional cooperation in higher education. We should work on developing these. If there are additional structures that need to be put in place, they should compliment or strengthen whatever structures we already have. We have had a lot of debate on this issue, now is the time for working towards regional cooperation.

Thank you very much.

## /Moderator's Closing Remarks
## /Professor Akira NINOMIYA

Thank you very much.

According to Hiroshima time, I think we have gone over our time limit by one minute, but according to Tokyo time, we are already 3 or 4 minutes late. In closing today's discussion I'm sure we have had to focus on some very difficult issues. I think there were lots of fundamental issues covered in this morning's session. There is a framework to be spoken of, or a community initiative within the region: conceptually and ideologically. Whether we are taking an international peace or mutual understanding approach; and whether we are talking about European citizenship or Asian citizenship; whether they really firmly exist or not, we are attempting to define an ideal philosophy. As participants in the networks and regional activities, we need to discuss our strategic approach – whether it is based on ideological or technical cooperation.

Depending on which path to this debate will take, our discussions would be quite different. As Professor Sirat said, there are already many tools and many structures that exist, but nobody tries to use them. ESD concepts and tools are developing together and in the same framework

we discuss ICTs, but we should place more emphasis on institutions or systems, not tools and technology.

I look forward to the fruitful outcome from this afternoon's sessions, as well. Please join me in giving a big hand of applause to the panelists.

Thank you.