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Thank you for the opportunity to comment on an issue of such importance to the United States. Many international education organizations have spoken to the value of international students and scholars in our classrooms and research facilities, to the successes we enjoy as a nation because of their contributions, and to the increasing roadblocks and delays that threaten that continued exchange and success. I am including links to organization documents in the appendix to this testimony.

This testimony will summarize the chief difficulties that international students and scholars face in applying for visas, and will suggest policy and procedural changes that can enhance security while helping to make the visa application process more positive and welcoming. Let us remember that before these students and scholars reach the point of visa application, they have already been vetted by the schools and programs as to their academic credentials and their qualifications for the study or research in which they will engage. The visa application process examines their individual circumstances relative to security concerns and to their intent to engage in the activities described on the visa documents provided by the school or program. The visa stamp is only permission to apply to enter the U.S. It is the SEVIS document, provided by the school or program, that specifies the activities and intended length of stay. The visa stamp may expire shortly after arrival in the U.S., but that stamp expiration does not affect lawful status inside the U.S. The visa stamp is only required for travel, not for remaining legally in the U.S.

I come to you representing three different, but related groups: Duke University, whose student population is about 10% international and whose research facilities host hundreds of scholars every year; Duke University as one of the 21 pilot schools that helped design, test, and launch CIPRIS, the precursor of SEVIS, and that continues to offer information as needed; and as an American citizen who has traveled abroad and has seen how others in the world may see us.

The United States is still the destination of choice for thousands of students and scholars, but it has also become a destination of academic and personal risk. Consider these representative experiences.
Imagine that your son has been admitted to four of the best schools in the world, all in different countries. He has one special favorite in the United States on which he has placed his hopes – all the others are his second choice. He has read the catalogue until he can quote it. He has told all of his friends that he has been admitted. It is only March and he is already packing for school in September. All things being equal, most parents would want him to go to the school of his choice. Now suppose that four of those countries will give him travel documents and visa stamps in 15 days. He could get those visa stamps now, but he has not done so. He is set on attending his favorite school. Surely the U.S. will give him a visa. He worked so hard to be good enough to get admitted. His future depends on it. Then he learns that it may take three months to apply for a visa and even then he might be refused or might be delayed past the first semester. He is still hopeful. He holds out for the visa, does all that is required of him, but time is getting short and still no visa. You are a parent, worried about your child and his dreams, with limited funds for his education, and concerned that such a delay could postpone his education for a year or more. Finally one of those second choices becomes the only choice because the risk of “waiting it out” is just too high. He goes to one of the other schools, but his dream is unrealized and he forever harbors a certain bitterness toward the country that admitted him to school and allowed him to dream and then bureaucratized that dream out of existence. In the future it would not be surprising if none of his siblings or cousins or acquaintances apply to schools in the U.S. “Why should I?” They might argue. “Even if they admit me they won’t let me in. I can’t afford to take the risk.”

Imagine your daughter was admitted to a school in the U.S. and was granted a visa. She has finished her freshman year and you are looking forward to having her home for the summer. She calls you in March and says, “Maybe I won’t come home this summer. Some of my friends went home for the winter break and still haven’t been able to get back because of visa delays. My SEVIS documents cover four years, but my initial visa stamp was for only a year and expires in early May (note that expiration of the visa stamp is common and is not expiration of lawful status). I would have to apply for a new visa to come back in the fall. Mom and Dad, I just don’t think I can take the risk of not being able to come back.” Two years later, at the end of her junior year, she has still not been home because she is still afraid that she cannot get a visa to come back. She loves her studies in the U.S., but the inefficient visa system and the long separation might make you wonder if you would send another child to the U.S. And her loneliness might make her wonder if she would encourage her little brother to make the same educational choice she did.

Imagine you are a scholar whose work in a particular field has been recognized internationally. A prestigious U.S. university invited you to join one of its research teams for a three-year project. You applied for your J exchange visitor visa, and though it took three months to get it, you finally arrived and joined the team. The team members are among the best in the world from the U.S. and from other nations. One of your discoveries leads to a paper published in a very selective journal. You are invited to present your findings at the annual international conference in your field. The conference, four days long, is outside the U.S. The original visa stamp in your passport has expired, and you will need a new stamp to return. It will take at least a month, or perhaps longer, to get the visa stamp to return to the U.S. It is your work, your paper, your chance to meet and compare notes with colleagues from around the world. You have an opportunity that would make you competitive for top positions in your home country when your return, but you cannot attend the meeting. You cannot take the chance that you will be away from your time-sensitive research for a month.
or two or more. Or alternately, you decide to take the chance and you are stuck in a foreign
country (not the U.S. and not your home) for months with your savings and your career
slipping away. In research, as in politics, time can make all the difference.

Remember that these are common experiences repeated hundreds of times each year at
colleges and universities across the U.S. We see their effects in the drops in the number of
college applications and the thousands of U.S. tax dollars wasted as research projects limp along
because a key team member cannot get a visa.

WHY DOES IT TAKE SO LONG AND WHAT CAN WE DO?

Two primary functions of visa application and consular processing contribute to the
delays and denials, one new, one old.

The Technology Alert List (TAL), “sensitive areas” list, and general security concerns.
The TAL is not new, but the combined effect of the TAL with understandable post 9/11
concerns about sensitive knowledge areas and the resulting need to look closer at the background
and affiliations of visa applicants has created a visa review process that can take months.

We need to apply the rules efficiently, transparently, and logically. We need to eliminate
repetitive visa reviews that serve no security purpose and that take resources from other security
work. The Department of State has worked diligently to streamline the VISAS MANTIS
clearances and to encourage and empower consular officers to expedite visa interviews for
international students and scholars. Some processes that used to take three months have now
been reduced to 30 days in many cases, but some cases still seem to get stuck in the system for
many months with no apparent reason. In addition, many students and scholars who have
undergone the reviews and obtained visas are repeatedly subjected to the same review process.
This repeat review generally occurs not because of any new or additional concerns about the
applicants, but simply because their initial visa stamps were of short duration, merely as an
operation of visa reciprocity. Under current visa reciprocity rules, a student or scholar from
country X gets an “F” student or “J” scholar visa stamp for the full duration of his/her program
and with multiple entries, while a student from country Y gets an “F” or “J” stamp valid for only
six months and for only two entries. This inequities result from agreements with other countries
that have no particular relationship to security. They make some sense in the old and long-
standing visa reciprocity agreements, but do not withstand logical scrutiny in the post-9/11 visa
environment. We are engaged in repetitive visa reviews on people that represent very minimal
security risks because we are not willing to review our own visa policies, decide if they really
serves our interests, and change them if necessary. U.S. government resources are being wasted
on second or third administrative reviews that are only tangential to security, if they are related at
all.

Senator Coleman, in S. 2715, the International Student and Scholar Access Act, has
sought to address these issues of waste, repetition, and delay.

Nonimmigrant intent, INA 214(b).

This law, now over 50 years old, requires that all F and J visa applicants (and others such
as B visitors) show that they have a residence abroad that they have no intention of abandoning.
DOS needs to rethink INA 214(b), the “nonimmigrant intent” rule, and accept documentation in SEVIS that the visa applicant is a student or scholar as evidence of temporary intent (i.e. to be a student or exchange visitor) absent demonstrable evidence to the contrary. Such evidence might include the filing of a labor certification or immigrant petition or application on behalf of the alien, or very close family ties in the U.S. that have an immediate potential for immigration. The nonimmigrant intent rule should apply only to maintaining legal status during this activity and for this purpose identified on the visa application, not to the possibility that the student might legally acquire another status in the distant future.

DOS has considered and addressed similar intent issues related to B visitor visas in its policy on cohabitating partners, and has implemented a more open policy. While that policy states that the individual must meet the nonimmigrant intent rule of INA 214(b), it also says that long-term stays in the U.S. with partners in extended status is expected and acceptable. It goes on to say that consular officers should make appropriate annotations on the visa, “as that will increase the likelihood that the inspector grants the maximum possible admission period on initial entry and will facilitate subsequent extensions.” The substance of the cable tells consular officers that it is OK to give long term “B” tourist visas to cohabitating partners, and that it is OK not to worry too much if they might stay in the U.S. for a long time. It authorizes the consular office to give the cohabitating partner the “benefit of the doubt” when issuing the visa.

If nonimmigrant intent can be viewed as related to a particular visit that has a variable and unspecified end date for the purpose of admitting cohabiting partners for extended stays, why can’t a similar interpretation and visa issuance practice apply to students and scholars? Indeed, unlike the B-2 cohabitating partner, who may have no definite completion date, the F or J student or scholar carries documents that specify a precise end date. Shouldn’t a student or scholar be given the same “benefit of the doubt” as a cohabitating partner?

When the law was written in 1952 most transoceanic travel was done by ship, and no transatlantic commercial passenger jet flight had yet occurred. It would be another six years before the first such jet flight, and well into the 1960s before jet travel became common. When travel was so difficult, so burdensome, and so infrequent, it was important for a consular officer to see exceedingly strong evidence that the student or scholar to whom he was giving a visa had very strong ties to the home country, and did not intend to use that visa to enter the U.S. fraudulently and remain here illegally. People travel much more easily and frequently now, but the validity of the 1952 interpretation of the law in the student and scholar context has had only minimal review.

Because people can travel more frequently, our application of the law to make that travel very high risk has the opposite effect of that intended. The student or scholar who wishes to travel frequently, and is permitted to do so by a reasonable visa process, maintains ties to home and establishes and develops business relationships that will draw him back to his home country. The student or scholar who is threatened with visa delays and denial if he leaves will remain in the U.S. for three, or five, or eight years getting a degree or doing research. He will not take the risk of going home, and so finds it nearly impossible to maintain those close ties. His choice not to travel has protected him from visa review, but has also isolated him from the family and business relationships that would have drawn him back home. It is easy to guess which one of these people is likely to become a positive voice for America at home and in other countries. Our current visa policies, in stifling travel, also stifles those voices.

Secretary Powell has begun the much-needed conversation on this nonimmigrant intent issue in his guidance to consular officers in a 30 March 2004 cable to the field. Nevertheless, the
underlying assumption still remains that nonimmigrant intent applies in a kind of perpetuity. Not only must the student or scholar show that he has ties in the home country now that will likely cause him to return, but also that he will not, at some future time years from now, change his mind and remain in the U.S. legally. The burden on consular officers to read the mind and “crystal ball” the future of a student or scholar who is primarily focused on the next few months, not the next 10 years, is completely unreasonable.

WHAT CAN SEVIS DO AND HOW CAN WE USE IT BETTER?

Although SEVIS is under the purview of DHS, the SEVIS database can assist and inform consular officers in their visa deliberations and can help relieve the consular burden if we choose to use it to do so.

The Original Vision

As one of the 21 pilot schools Duke University helped design the database management system that is today known as SEVIS. When work on what was then called the CIPRIS project began in the mid 1990s, Mr. Maurice Berez, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) officer in charge of the project, shared with participant schools a vision of an integrated system. SEVIS would be the work horse database that would organize and streamline student and scholar processing from school admission, through visa application, entry at the port, participation in the program, travel during the program, and final completion. It would provide a range of data on each individual to different government agencies. It would identify those students and scholars who were maintaining status and pursing the studies, teaching, and research for which they came to the U.S., and it would also identify those few who failed to do so. SEVIS would:

• Collect data from the “source” for each data element. For example, schools should enter educational data, consular posts and ports of entry should enter visa and port data respectively, and INS (now DHS) should enter stateside immigration actions related to the student or exchange visitor.

• Provide information to all relevant administrative and law enforcement agencies as appropriate for the need of that agency.

• Serve as and be recognized as evidence of status and lawful activity for the students and exchange visitors listed in it.

• Contribute significantly to national security by providing a broad range of data on individual students and exchange visitors and their host schools and institutions that could be subjected to algorithms and statistical analysis. Such data review could reveal fact patterns or anomalies on individuals or groups that might need additional scrutiny or investigation. This data, combined with information from other databases, could help identify the few who might pose a threat to our national security.

• Facilitate the admission to the U.S. and lawful activities in the U.S. of the many bona fide international students and exchange visitors. Treat them as welcomed guests, and make their visa application, admission to the U.S., and subsequent travel easy and efficient.

INS and the schools worked together toward a system that would use practical and logical means to manage data and to use that data not only to solve problems, but also to add value for all users. The practical applications included:
• Issue a student and exchange visitor ID card, something like the Border Crossing Card, that could be used by consular posts, ports, and DHS offices to identify the individual and access SEVIS data. This card would serve in place of the paper Form I-20 and Form DS-2019, both of which would be eliminated.

• Give consular posts full access to SEVIS so that officers would have all the information available on a visa applicant. That information would, in some cases, not only include current F or J student or scholar data, but also information on prior stays in the U.S.

• Establish SEVIS intake facilities at the major ports. Allow students and exchange visitors to go to a special line or area at the port to have their admissions processed by officers who were familiar with SEVIS and with student and exchange visitor issues. Make that process friendly and welcoming. Establish automated processes that would allow the students or exchange visitors to swipe their SEVIS ID cards and have their biometrics and identification verified electronically. In this way they would be treated more like frequent business travelers who have similar services. This special recognition would reinforce the fact that we value their contributions to the U.S. In addition we would gain security by subjecting each entry to biometrics verification and to verification that the student or exchange visitor is currently considered by his/her school or program to be in status and pursuing appropriate activities. The airport in Atlanta tested and used some of these components of admission as part of CIPRIS/SEVIS development.

• Connect employment authorization to the SEVIS ID card so that the degree and research related employment already provided for in the law and regulations could be authorized and tracked via the card. It would document whether a student is working on campus on an assistantship or working with an outside employer in required degree related work (example: field work for the Masters in Social Work). Employers would have a secure document upon which to rely for employment verification. The Social Security Administration would have access to SEVIS for their purposes as well.

The SEVIS of Today

By the year 2001 most of the initial development was completed, and the 21 schools were fully converted to the prototype CIPRIS system, INS was well into writing and testing the final, and more robust SEVIS software based on the CIPRIS model. INS was planning the transition to the new, full SEVIS system and was mapping out a structured, measured roll-out across the country.

The attacks on 9/11 and the discovery that at least some, though by no means all of the perpetrators had, at some time, had student status, precipitated the urgent and immediate full implementation of SEVIS. Unfortunately, SEVIS was not ready for full implementation as it had been envisioned. What the schools and the nation got was essentially a scaled down beta test version. Both the schools and INS had to struggle to make it meet the demands placed on it. School international offices were literally in lock down mode for weeks as all staff members sat at computers putting in 20-hour days to manually enter massive amounts of data on hundreds of thousands of students and scholars. SEVIS, itself was full of yet to be discovered programming errors and unanticipated collateral “features.” INS employees were also “sleeping in their offices” to deal with cascading problems.

Since that first launch SEVIS has been through many upgrades. Schools and DHS (legacy INS) have suffered and continue to suffer through arcane work arounds and jury rigged “data deceptions” to try to give the system accurate information in circumstances where the
programming was not in place to take the data. DHS has worked cooperatively with schools and higher education organizations to identify and deal with problems. As with nurturing a premature baby, there was a lot of catching up to even approach the level performance from SEVIS that we would have expected had INS it been allowed to develop it properly before launch.

During 2003-2004 academic year, schools were fully integrated into SEVIS and other groups such as consular posts and the Social Security Administration have now come on-line, though some to only a limited degree. Consular posts are beginning to see data that is useful in their visa deliberations and ports of entry are beginning to trust the database more than the I-20 and DS-2019 forms presented by the student or scholar, which is exactly what should happen. A paper form is static, but the schools update the SEVIS database constantly as circumstances change for their students or scholars. Ports can now consult SEVIS regarding the admission. For example a port officer reviewing a student’s SEVIS file can learn that the I-20 document that the student carries and the visa stamp in the passport, both of which appear to be valid, relate, in fact, to a SEVIS record that has been invalidated by the school because the student withdrew from school last semester. He is no longer a student and is no longer admissible to the U.S. in that status.

Government agencies that have access to SEVIS need to use it to provide information on students and scholars. At the same time, they need to be informed about how to interpret what they see, and to contact schools and programs with questions before taking negative action based solely on SEVIS data. For example, a “completed” notation on a bachelor’s program should not necessarily be interpreted as completion of SEVIS student or scholar status. It may mean only that the bachelor’s has been completed and that the student is moving on to a higher degree.

SEVIS as a Tool to Serve International Education and the Nation

SEVIS holds many data elements on students and scholars from many sources. The schools and other users provide ongoing updates. As mandated by Congress, SEVIS is or soon will be interoperable with many other agency and law enforcement databases. We need to continue to develop it and make it the tool it was envisioned to be, and we need to use that tool.

Based on the current and future capabilities of SEVIS and related databases, and on the policy and procedure changes discussed elsewhere in this testimony, we can identify ways that SEVIS could serve to welcome students and scholars to the U.S. It could expedite their travel and return and inform the higher education community on trends in international education, while at the same time providing important security information to law enforcement.

• Issue a SEVIS student and exchange visitor ID card, something like the Border Crossing Card, that can be used by consular posts, ports, and DHS offices to identify the individual and access SEVIS data. Allow this card to serve in place of the paper I-20 and DS-2019.

• Use the SEVIS database and its ID card to manage the travel of students and exchange visitors to the U.S., to monitor their academic and related immigration activities while in the U.S., and to allow them to leave and reenter the U.S. in an efficient and timely manner.

• Once the student obtains the initial visa stamp, have the ID card serve as ongoing automatic revalidation of the visa stamp while the student or exchange visitor is carried as active in SEVIS. This would eliminate the need to apply for visa extensions at consular posts without compromising security. Remember that SEVIS holds various kinds of ID data that law enforcement can use to run algorithms to search for fact patterns or data clusters that might
indicate security concerns. If this information is available 24/7 to law enforcement, what purpose is served by filing a new visa application at a consular post? Further, appropriate government agencies would be immediately informed through the SEVIS system when degrees have been completed or employment has ended, signaling that the visa validation had also ended.

- Use SEVIS and connected databases to record and examine other immigration actions that an individual might take that would indicate immigrant intent. Those actions could then be the basis for review of “intent to return” rather than requiring consular officers to examine the same unchanged circumstances time after time in repeated visa applications. DOS and DHS could deal directly with students and scholars thus identified to determine if the visa should remain valid.

- Allow schools, if they wish, to establish 24/7 contact numbers for consular and port officers so that questions can be addressed quickly and easily. Maintain these contact numbers in the SEVIS database, making them easily accessible to government users. During the mass transition to SEVIS, DHS-ICE asked schools to establish such contacts, and, in our experience, it worked beautifully.

- Give schools and other organizations access to national SEVIS data (numbers, not individuals). This was part of the original SEVIS planning, but has been forgotten in the aftermath of 9/11 and the subsequent focus on security concerns. SEVIS should be used to enhance our security, but we should also use it to inform the discussion on international higher education. Consider the wealth of data available on fields of study, countries of origin, levels of study, areas of teaching and research, and so on that could be useful as individual data elements, and a treasure for statistical analysis of trends in international education and research. Imagine the collaborative efforts that could emerge among U.S. schools as they learn where certain concentrations of field specific knowledge or relevant research lie.

- Use SEVIS to populate the annual Open Doors census. Again, this was part of the original SEVIS planning. Currently Open Doors has only the data from schools that are willing to respond to its survey. SEVIS could provide data on every student or exchange visitor who holds “F,” “M,” or “J” (students and exchange visitors) visa status.

- Give students and scholars limited access to their own files to see what their records show and to facilitate correction of errors, if any, through their schools or through DHS. Control access through the SEVIS number as an identifier. As with all SEVIS users, the information to which they would have access should be filtered to include only those elements appropriate for their review.

The SEVIS Fee

The fact of the SEVIS fee and its amount are, at this time, of much less concern than the way it will be collected and the way refunds and overpayments will be managed. Making the payment of the SEVIS fee a separate action creates one more procedural and time hurdle for the small “summer months” window in which a new student must apply for a visa. It also says, in a very identifiable way, “We intend to charge you more and we want to make it difficult for you.” Beyond the payment process are concerns regarding credits to proper accounts, refunds, and corrections for overpayment.

- Incorporate the SEVIS fee into the visa application payment so that the student or exchange visitor does not have to coordinate payment of two separate fees. While the total cost will be
the same, making the process easier shows that we want to make coming to the U.S. possible and reasonably achievable.

- Refund the fee if no student or exchange visitor visa is issued. While the visa application fee may be nonrefundable, the SEVIS fee should only be charged for a true benefit. The SEVIS fee benefit only occurs if the student or exchange visitor is permitted to come to the U.S.
- Refund duplicate fees to the party or parties that paid them. Anyone can pay the fee for a student or scholar, which means that the school or a friend in the U.S. could pay it. This creates the very real potential for more than one person or organization to attempt to pay the fee for the same student or scholar. The fee should be paid by the first payment received and refunds should be provided to all other payers.

WHAT IS REALLY AT STAKE?

Any American citizen who has traveled internationally, even in short trips to Canada, Mexico, or the Caribbean, can tell you that people outside the U.S. see us differently than we see ourselves. We cannot control all of the press and propaganda machines of the world. Others will always speak for us and about us. Our only successful response will be a strong voice speaking up for ourselves, and we must speak to individuals.

Most people here and abroad do not doubt that the U.S. media and entertainment industry has permeated most of the world with images of America that can make us proud or make us shudder with disgust. Those images go unmediated and unexplained into homes around the world. We cannot control how people receive and interpret those images.

But international education is the “real thing.” It is an experience of America of the highest quality among friends, colleagues, and faculty that can challenge assumptions, obliterate stereotypes, embrace diversity, and empower minds to grow beyond the lessons of image and propaganda to the lessons and experiences of an open society. On our campuses and in our laboratories social argument meets community cooperation, political “enemies” find workable compromise, and the pure passion for knowledge fuels the relentless logic of science. The Center for Jewish Life provides meeting space for a discussion on religion and ethics in Islam, Christianity, and Judaism. A student from a country with a repressive government participates in her first political demonstration in support of a women’s shelter and the shelter is saved. A young scientist is proud and amazed to be asked to “take charge” of a particular component of a research project even though he is a “foreigner” and not yet even 35 years old!

People around the world want what we have to offer for a thousand different personal reasons, some of which they can’t even identify themselves until after they arrive. Allow me to share a few human moments.

- Duke sponsored a young man to do research in the J-1 exchange visitor status. His work went very well and he published a paper as “first author” (an academic indication that the research and the discoveries were primarily his). He was asked to present the paper at a conference. He came into my office to check his documents for travel, and in that conversation said, “At home I would never have been allowed to do this. I would never be first author or present.” I asked why, assuming his answer would be no money or space for research. Instead he explained, “They maybe might have let me do the research, but they never would have given me credit as first author. In America you recognize people for what they do, for their own work.” Turns out in his own country he was the wrong family, wrong social class, wrong color. By the time he left the U.S. he had a publication record that would
open doors around the world. This happened before 9/11, and he was able to do that presentation and return to the U.S. to complete his project. Today he would probably be afraid to leave because he couldn’t get back.

- In March of 2004 I spent three weeks in Egypt and Jordan as a visitor. In that short time I met three very different people for whom America was a distant but real place of learning and opportunity.
- A young middle school student showed me medals she had won in international competitions in gymnastics and school competitions in English language, literature, and poetry. She was looking forward to applying to U.S. colleges in a few years.
- A man in his late forties spoke with pride about his son who had gone to America to college and had come home to build a very good life for himself and his family. His grandchildren will see America as a place of generosity and opportunity for a better life for those who are willing to work hard and learn. They may apply to school here.
- A young man of 16 or 17 talked about studying in America someday. He had learned English and he kept up with the global news and current events. Politics seemed to be his passion. He said to me, “Tell your president, Mr. Bush, that Egyptians want peace but it must be fair. You tell him, we want peace, but it must be fair.”

This last comment is perhaps one of the most instructive, not for the political content, the discussion of which belongs in another venue, but because it tells us how very much we can gain if we support international education and solve these visa issues, and how much we can lose if we allow that support to languish. This young man’s core assumption, not subject to doubt, was that any American could go back and talk to her government, could convey a message to her president. And he was right. Even more importantly, he spoke of fairness, of this very American characteristic of equal recognition, of doing the right thing, of rewarding merit. When we open the door through admitting students and inviting scholars, and then build a barricade across that open door with unreasonable and illogical visa processes, we are being profoundly unfair in a way that shouts “Unwelcome!” to each individual.

The few with evil intent will always try to practice evil against us. No level of security can keep them out and keep us 100% safe. Our real security, our future, our success as a part of the global community, depends on the understanding and good will of our neighbors. It depends on that researcher of the “wrong color” making a difference in his part of the world in the way people think about him and about others. It depends on that young gymnast whose bilingual poetry may someday bring Arabic and English speakers to common understanding. It depends on that eager young man who, if he is allowed to realize his dreams in a U.S. college, may influence hundreds or thousands by sharing his experiences. It depends on all those who, if allowed to enter our universities and research facilities and to travel freely, will spread the message of democracy, not in speeches and political tracts, but in being what America lets them be, in showing others the confidence and success that comes from the American experience, in contributing their knowledge, their skills, and their understanding of America to the world.
APPENDIX

Department of State Cable on International Students and Scholars and INA 214(b).
http://travel.state.gov/visa/state118790.html

Department of State Cable on Cohabitating Partners.
http://travel.state.gov/visa/state118790.html

Department of State Cable on Payment of SEVIS Fee
http://travel.state.gov/visa/state187635.html

Department of State Cable on Visa Processing for International Students and Scholars
Via the NAFSA web site
http://www.nafsa.org/content/ProfessionalandEducationalResources/ImmigrationAdvisingResources/doscable172365.html

“Promoting Secure Borders and Open Doors”
http://www.nafsa.org/content/PublicPolicy/NAFSAontheIssues/VisaRecsCover.htm