DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 610 HE 032 840

AUTHOR	Cornwell, Grant H.; Stoddard, Eve W.
TITLE	Globalizing Knowledge: Connecting International & Intercultural Studies. The Academy in Transition.
INSTITUTION	Association of American Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC. Program on the Status and Education of Women.
ISBN	ISBN-0-911696-77-6
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	54p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1818 R Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009. Web site: http://www.accu-edu.org.
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Differences; Cultural Interrelationships; *Cultural Pluralism; *Educational Change; *Global Education; Higher Education; Intercultural Programs; *Multicultural Education; *Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS	*Globalization

ABSTRACT

This is the fourth in a series of occasional papers that analyze the changes taking place in U.S. undergraduate education. This essay examines two streams of reform on the campus and in the curriculum--internationalization and diversification--and suggests that these separate movements must come together in a new paradigm of higher education in which diversity would be taught as the historical result of multiple overlapping diasporas created by the evolving process of globalization. Concomitantly, an understanding of deeply different cultural and political perspectives from outside the United States would develop the intercultural skills students will need in an increasingly diverse and globally interdependent nation. Part 1 of the paper, "Separate Streams: The Legacy of American Exceptionalism," focuses on the internationalization of U.S. higher education, diversity, reconceptualizing identities and locations, globalization, diasporas, interculturalism, and positionality (identity politics). Part 2, "Educational Goals for U.S. Students in the Twenty-first Century," offers four interrelated goals that follow from the changes identified in part 1: understanding diverse cultures; developing intercultural skills; understanding global processes; and preparing for local and global citizenship. (Contains 56 references and 6 endnotes.) (CH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Complimentary AACU Publication

the Academy in Transition

ED 440 610

GLOBALIZING KNOWLEDGE

Connecting International & Intercultural Studies

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

GRANT H. CORNWELL AND EVE W. STODDARD

Association of American Colleges and Universities

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FOURTH IN A SERIES OF DISCUSSION PAPERS FOR FACULTY MEMBERS AND ACADEMIC LEADERS

GLOBALIZING KNOWLEDGE

Connecting International & Intercultural Studies

GRANT H. CORNWELL AND EVE W. STODDARD

ERIC

Published by the
Association of American Colleges and Universities
1818 R Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009
www.aacu-edu.org

copyright © 1999

ISBN 0-911696-77-6

ERIC

Contents

About this Series v

Acknowledgments vii

Introduction viii

Part I: Separate Streams: The Legacy of American Exceptionalism 1

Part II: Educational Goals for U.S. Students in the Twenty-First Century 21

Notes 37

References 38

the Academy in Transition

JERRY G. GAFF
Series Editor

OTHER TITLES IN THE SERIES

Contemporary Understandings of Liberal Education
by Carol Geary Schneider and Robert Shoenberg

Mapping Interdisciplinary Studies
by Julie Thompson Klein

General Education: The Changing Agenda
by Jerry G. Gaff

About this Series

THIS SERIES OF OCCASIONAL PAPERS REFLECTS THE CONVICTION of AAC&U that, as the name states, we are witnessing The Academy in Transition. Change presents difficulties and opportunities for both individuals and institutions. For some, confusion, frustration, and fear cloud efforts to understand and gain control over events. For others, change is energizing, presenting opportunities, and calling forth creative responses. Still others find competing calls for change—conflicting agendas advocated by different individuals and organizations and uncertainty about the results of alternative courses of action—reason for continuing with practices that have worked in the past. The purposes of this series are to analyze changes taking place in key areas of undergraduate education and to provide "road maps" about the directions and destinations of the changing academy. Although we may still be on an uncertain journey, having a map increases the chances that we get to where we want to go, and it reduces the ambiguity.

During transitions, it is important to retain central values even as forms and structures that have supported those values may have to be adapted to new circumstances. For instance, we are convinced that a contemporary understanding of liberal education is a sound vision for a high quality baccalaureate education, even as some of its meanings and practices may be altered. As the titles in this series suggest, we envision that a high quality education emphasizes connections between academic disciplines, prizes general education as central to an educated person, and includes global and cross-cultural knowledge and perspectives. Collectively, these present and future essays point to a more purposeful, robust, and efficient academy that is now in the process of being created.

AAC&U encourages faculty members, academic leaders, and all those who care about the future of our colleges and universities to use these papers as a point of departure for their own analyses of the directions of educational change. We hope these essays will encourage academics to think broadly and creatively about the educational communities we inherit, and, by our contributions, the educational communities we want to create.

These essays can be useful in a number of ways.

- They can provide the basis for important conversations among campus groups interested in enhancing international education, exploring connections between domestic diversity and intercultural perspectives, and encouraging interdisciplinary studies, for example.

- Members of particular committees, for example, those reviewing general education, can quickly get an overview of national trends and issues to guide their own work.

- The essays can be helpful in starting conversations with members of the Board of Trustees or with community leaders about important educational issues and programs.

- Campus leaders can find useful language to frame issues and guidance from theory and practice that are contained in each issue.

I would be interested in hearing from readers about how these essays have been used, the value they provided, and suggestions for improving future issues. Thoughts about topics that should be addressed in the future and suggestions for possible authors are particularly welcome.

Jerry G. Gaff, Series Editor

Acknowledgments

Acknowledgments

A NUMBER OF FACULTY AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT GRANTS have given us the resources, field study, and interdisciplinary conversations that inform the writing of this essay. We are grateful to the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, the Andrew Mellon Foundation, and the Christian Johnson Endeavor Foundation for grants to St. Lawrence University. In addition, our ideas have developed in dialogue with AAC&U's initiatives, such as Engaging Cultural Legacies and American Commitments. We would especially like to thank June Noronha, of the College of Saint Catherine, and members of the AAC&U staff for their insightful readings of earlier versions of this manuscript, including Jerry Gaff, Joseph Johnston, Caryn McTighe Musil, and Bridget Puzon.

Eve W. Stoddard, Director of International and Intercultural Education, St. Lawrence University
Grant H. Cornwell, Chair and Associate Professor of Philosophy, St. Lawrence University

Introduction

Introduction

> The Stoics stress that to be a citizen of the world one does not need to give up local identifications, which can be a source of great richness in life. They suggest that we think of ourselves not as devoid of local affiliations, but as surrounded by a series of concentric circles. . . .Outside all these circles is the largest one, humanity as a whole. Our task as citizens of the world will be to "draw the circles somehow toward the center."
>
> (Martha Nussbaum 1997)

> Our elaboration of the term *cosmopolitics* represents one effort to describe, from within multiculturalism, a name for genuine striving toward common norms and mutual translatability that is also part of multiculturalism.
>
> (Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins 1998)

FUTURE HISTORIANS OF THE ACADEMY WILL LOOK UPON THIS as an era of opening in American higher education. One would be hard pressed to find a college or university that has not been engaged in reforms to make the campus and curriculum more inclusive. The task of this essay is to chart the courses of two such streams, one often talked about as "internationalizing" higher education and the other as "diversifying" it, and to suggest that reconfigurations of the global landscape are moving the separate streams toward a promising confluence (Bennett 1994, Noronha 1992).

We will argue that the nature of the world today is such that U.S. and global realities, whether economic, cultural, political, environmental, or social, interpenetrate and mutually define each other to the degree that isolating U.S. studies from international studies is increasingly impracticable. While each movement has developed separate goals, practices, and theories, we will examine what happens to both if reconceptualized to take account of new knowledge being produced within post-colonial cultural, and global studies. In this new paradigm U.S. diversity would be understood and taught as the historical result of multiple overlapping diasporas created by the evolving processes of globalization. And, concomitantly, understanding deeply different cultural

Separate Streams: The Legacy of American Exceptionalism

Separate Streams

BEFORE MAKING A CASE for the confluence of internationalizing and diversifying higher education, we suggest how and why the movements have developed along parallel streams. This separation between domestic and international concerns does not originate in the academy, but reflects pervasive attitudes in the conceptualization of "America" itself and of American history, attitudes signified by the terms "isolationalism" and "exceptionalism." In what follows, we will try to show how American exceptionalism has helped to frame agendas for internationalizing and diversifying American higher education and, consequently, helped keep them from productive engagement with each other. While isolationism *per se* no longer dominates the nation's orientation toward international affairs, it has been replaced by an almost uncontested global power which allows U.S. citizens to conduct their lives relatively unchallenged by the realities of alternative perspectives. As inhabitants of one of the world's wealthiest and most influential countries, Americans have the luxury of expecting others to learn their language. While children in most countries begin studying a second language in primary school, many Americans never do.

The scholarship produced in and about the United States both reflects and fosters the popular attitudes of exceptionalism, of the belief that the nation was created out of a unique set of events and took on a unique destiny. Hence scholars who study the United States often do not make comparisons or examine issues from other perspectives, because from this point of view there are no commensurate societies or histories (Desmond 1996). Thus, in the lead article of the 1992 *Journal of American History* devoted to internationalizing the *JAH,* Joyce Appleby (1992) writes,

> Exceptionalism, in this analysis, is America's peculiar form of Eurocentrism. In the nation's critical first decades, it provided a way to explain the connection of the United States to Europe within a story about its geographical and political disconnection. But today, exceptionalism raises formidable obstacles to appreciating America's authentic and original diversity. (420)

Universities in the United States originated as specifically American institutions, dedicated to producing good citizens and knowledge relevant to the creation of the nation (Boyer 1987, Jeavons 1991). But Appleby argues that the originary story of America foreclosed other ways of understanding our national identity, especially those now called multicultural.

INTERNATIONALIZING U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION

Because Americans tend to be exceptionalist and to lag behind those of other nations in knowledge of geography and foreign languages (Johnston and Edelstein 1993), those educators who become internationalists can be zealous against U.S. parochialism, encouraging an outward focus. The recent drive to internationalize the curriculum dates from the end of World War II, motivated by apparently contrary desires to promote international peace and understanding on the one hand and to bolster U.S. strategic interests on the other. A number of colleges developed general education courses aimed at understanding and preventing the kinds of forces which resulted in the Holocaust, World War II, and the explosion of the atom bomb (Boyer 65). The Fulbright Programs were created in an effort to promote international exchange and understanding (National Humanities Center 1997). Strategies for internationalizing higher education have typically included foreign language study, area studies, international studies, study abroad programs, and exchanges of international students and scholars (Pickert 1992).

As Joyce Appleby notes, Eurocentrism plays an important role in America's national identity. This is reflected in the continuing preeminence of Europe in international education. Most language study, study abroad, and international courses have focused on Europe as part of a Eurocentric worldview. For example, in the parlance of American language instruction, "the Less Commonly Taught Languages" are "all of the world's languages except English, French, German, and Spanish" (*website,* Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition). While the number of U.S. students studying abroad has been rising quite rapidly, it is still only 1 percent of total enrollment. Of those nearly 100,000 students, 64 percent go to Europe, followed by 15 percent to Latin America. The continents of Africa and Asia receive only 3 percent and 6 percent respectively. In contrast nine out of the top ten countries sending students to the United States to study are Asian, amounting to 58 percent of the total influx of 481,280 foreign students in the U.S. (Dessruisseaux 1998, A70, 71, and A67).

The Cold War provided a recent impetus for U.S. scholars and students to learn about regions outside North America and Western Europe (Desmond 1996). The strategic interests which prevailed during the Cold War made seemingly remote parts of the world part of a system

and political perspectives from outside the United States would help develop the intercultural skills students will need as citizens within an increasingly diverse and globally interdependent nation.

Today's graduates need to be prepared for the complexities of the global economy and be equipped to live and work productively with persons from other nations and different cultural backgrounds. Insofar as college education is meant to prepare students for citizenship, we believe, with Martha Nussbaum, that belonging to a particular state, in our case the United States, should not be at odds with global citizenship, or "cosmopolitanism." As our epigraph suggests, all of us are citizens of our towns, provinces, nations, and the world. Air pollution and television broadcasts do not observe state boundaries. Transportation and electronic networks have brought much of the world's population into regular contact, with decreasing regard for national boundaries. Thus we believe that students should be educated to read back and forth between the local and the global, between multiple forms of identity and difference.

of allies and potential targets of communism. Area studies were created to increase U.S. knowledge of Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe, and Latin America. They were multidisciplinary—but mostly social science—programs predicated on language study, lengthy field experience, and detailed regional knowledge. The Ford Foundation, U.S. Department of Education Title VI grants, and the Social Science Research Council have been major supporters of research and curriculum development in foreign languages and cultures, especially non-European ones.

Whether it was the changes brought about in the American curriculum as a result of World War II and the Cold War, or the most recent push resulting from the globalization of the economy, each period has spawned efforts to equip the next generation of leaders to respond effectively to changing global dynamics. The degree to which the curriculum responds to global changes is shown by the rise and fall of Russian studies from the 1980s to the 1990s. In the 1980s, as relations warmed between the two superpowers, exchanges of students and scholars were occurring and Russian language courses were growing. By the late 1990s, less than a decade after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russian classrooms sit practically empty. In the 1990s the strongest motivation behind internationalization has been to "ensure the nation's economic competitiveness" (Johnston and Edelstein 1993, 4), and students willing to work hard at languages therefore look toward Japan and China.

But it would be too easy to interpret all efforts at internationalizing higher education as responses to U.S. interests. Since the nineteenth century, U.S. higher education has negotiated tensions between goals which are practical, ethical, or civic, and purely intellectual (Boyer 1987). The same is true of area studies and other efforts at internationalizing U.S. universities. As Toby Volkman (1999, viii–ix) notes,

> While geopolitical concerns figured prominently in early efforts to create an academic infrastructure for area studies, there was also a general sense, concisely expressed in a 1943 report by the Committee on World Regions of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) that "our citizens must know other lands and appreciate their people, cultures, and institutions."

Moreover, the motives of funding agencies, parents, faculty, and students do not necessarily coincide. The government could fund the creation of Latin American Studies to protect U.S. interests, but the professor observing elections in Nicaragua might be sympathetic to the Sandinistas, and the student taking her class might simply be curious about a country bandied about on the evening news. Another student might decide to study Spanish because he likes salsa dancing, but his parents might be happy because Spanish will help him get a job in California.

Whatever the motives, efforts to internationalize higher education have sought to address a pervasive American provincialism. This may bolster U.S. strategic interests or prepare future leaders to participate in international business, but it is also central to producing liberally educated citizens. Efforts to encourage study abroad for U.S. college students have increased dramatically in the 1980s and 90s (Dessruisseaux 1998). The older model of study abroad was aimed at language majors who spent their junior year usually in France, Spain, or Germany with the goal of becoming fluent in a second language. The locus of study abroad is still predominantly Europe, but it is now more often for a semester, often conducted in English, and designed to suit general liberal arts goals or business majors. There are many programs that emphasize internships or community service projects, the majority in developing countries. In most programs cultural immersion remains the goal, but not just for language majors. Some programs are geared toward providing experiential learning in a particular field, such as art in Florence, tropical ecology in Costa Rica, or Buddhism in Nepal. Others are aimed at providing intercultural skills for students in preparation for the globalized marketplace they will enter upon graduation. However, while many colleges have embraced study abroad as a means of "internationalizing" their students' educations, often the semester abroad remains detached from the rest of students' course work.

Although the focus of this paper is on U.S. higher education, and its efforts to deal with internationalizing and diversifying the learning of American students, it is important to recognize that efforts to "internationalize" higher education are occurring throughout the world. What this means varies greatly depending on the position of the nation in the global order. The United States educates more students from other countries than any other nation. This is significant both as a factor in internationalizing U.S. campuses and in showing how many students other countries are sending abroad for their educations, in some cases because they cannot serve all those desiring a university education.

It is mostly wealthier nations who are promoting internationalism for its own sake. A European project, ERASMUS, fosters educational exchanges among European states. Canada commissioned a report on internationalization in 1991, and in 1994, Jane Knight produced a comprehensive survey of internationalization in Canadian higher education. The new *Journal of Studies in International Education* publishes articles on the way countries around the world are trying to internationalize. A good example is Rhondda Brill's 1998 essay on Australian efforts, in which she brings together intercultural diversity and globalization as we do in this paper. She includes dealing with "world issues such as environmental pollution, AIDS, drugs and religious fundamentalism" as well as "encountering cultural diversity at all levels: at home, in the local

workplace and overseas" (82). The Japanese government began a generous scholarship program in the early 1990s to encourage more international students to study in Japan. South African universities are eager to gain connections with the rest of the world after being isolated by embargoes against apartheid.

On the other hand, many newly independent nations are struggling to provide spaces for their own citizens at underfunded universities, and many see the missions of their universities as nation-building, creating knowledge about their own histories, literatures, environments, and freeing themselves from Eurocentric forms of knowledge. One of the things colonial regimes carried with them and left behind was universities whose curricula and institutional structures remain essentially European. In India, Africa, and the Caribbean, the recent era has been one of decolonizing the university, most typically by focusing on the curriculum. For example, while generations of Caribbean students memorized Wordsworth's daffodil poem, they now study the rich literature of the Caribbean. Nonetheless, by virtue of having been colonies—and thus already enmeshed in a global network—the curricular reforms are in many ways models of internationalized courses of study. The mission of postcolonial universities in developing nations is both to enable their students to understand their complex histories and current problems and to equip them for contributing to nation building and competing globally as producers of knowledge.

How is "transnational competence" best acquired in the context of higher education?

In the United States, although the need for internationalizing is widely agreed upon, what that means is not. Johnston and Edelstein (1993) point out that internationalizing often comes down to four elements: language study, study abroad, international students on U.S. campuses, and internationalizing the curriculum. Other writers would add internationalizing the ethos or culture of an institution such that international perspectives are suffused across all aspects of campus life, including cultural events, student life, research, faculty, and the curriculum. Jane Knight (1997, 5) gives a comprehensive account of various approaches to internationalization, arguing especially that both academic and organizational factors must be taken into account. Using an updated model for "internationalizing" which they call "Transnational Competence," an Institute for International Exchange task force (Institute of International Education 1997) argues that all individuals and organizations need the ability to integrate technical and cultural skills in a variety of new settings (19). But the question remains: How is "transnational competence" best acquired in the context of higher education? While professional organizations and colleges are expanding study abroad opportunities and recruiting international students, the concept of internationalizing the curriculum remains murky, including the expansion of foreign languages in ways relevant to the twenty-first century.

Tensions between different motivations for "internationalizing" education sometimes emerge within a university. At some universities, the recruitment of international students is seen as a way of increasing enrollments and revenues. In many cases, administrations, boards of trustees, offices of admissions and career planning are primarily concerned that higher education prepare students to compete well in the global marketplace. The rhetoric of "education for the twenty-first century" often refers to preparing students to participate in transnational business. In contrast, many liberal arts colleges see internationalization as a strategy for the traditional goal of expanding students' horizons, liberating them from parochialism, and creating cosmopolitan perspectives. These goals are usually met through general education components, including foreign language study, civilization courses, and in some cases, study abroad. The Engaging Cultural Legacies initiative of The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) fueled the development of a number of core-curriculum courses in world civilizations beyond what was typically covered in a Western Civilization course (Schmitz 1992).

U.S. DIVERSITY AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Whereas today's interest in internationalizing higher education grew out of the global crisis of World War II and the subsequent strategic interests of the Cold War, the movement for multicultural reform of education, including women's studies and feminist scholarship, arose as an extension of the domestic civil rights, student power, and women's movements of the 1960s and 1970s. While the impetus for international studies came from the top down, the push for multiculturalism came from the bottom up, that is, from those who perceived themselves to be on the margins of the academy and of U.S. society (Bennett 1994, 149). Typically, student demands led to the creation of Black Studies courses and programs, followed quickly by Women's Studies, and then other ethnic studies.

Multicultural reform, motivated by a desire for social justice, included the desire to present a more accurate picture of history, politics, and culture than the standard one; its focus was set on correcting American history and addressing inequalities in American society. The process began with a quest for fair representation both in the curriculum and in an inclusive campus community of students, faculty, and administrators. Fair representation meant admitting diverse students to predominantly white institutions and women to all-male colleges. It meant noticing who made up the faculties of colleges and working toward a more representative faculty. The story of "America" had to be re-researched and retold from the multiple perspectives of its constituent populations. This meant adding in the stories, contributions, and cultural forms of those who had previously been invisible. In the newly created areas of knowledge and teaching, whether

Women's Studies, African-American Studies, Asian-American Studies, Chicano/a Studies, or Native American Studies, serious new questions arose about the entire academic enterprise.

At first, people thought representativeness was possible simply by adding new students, faculty, and texts without changing the nature of teaching and scholarship. But the predominant ethos of the academy valued objectivity, detachment, and skepticism, separated the author from the ideas or the writing, and held knowledge to be universal and disinterested. As the scholarship on women and diverse cultures evolved, it became clear that this ethos was itself the product of a particular culture and gender and that it functioned to maintain the status of those who had long held the leadership of universities. Questions arose about whether the identity of the teacher mattered in a class on Women's Studies or Black Studies (Mayberry 1996). As new kinds of literature entered the curriculum, questions arose about aesthetic values. Questions arose about pedagogy and authority in the classroom. And, finally, the entire map of history and culture began to change as new persons and events emerged from obscurity into the light of scholarly inquiry. It is hard to imagine now that authors such as W. E. B. Du Bois, Olaudah Equiano, or Kate Chopin were not commonly taught thirty years ago.

Thus, a number of unresolved foundational crises were created in the academy, including questions about what constitutes quality, what the role of the author's or teacher's identity is in the transmission of cultural texts, and whether teaching should be in the service of social justice or be value-neutral.[1]

In the 1980s, the challenge presented by multiculturalism to the status quo was evinced in the public "Culture Wars" which raged around such relatively innocuous changes as Stanford's inclusion of one "diverse" text in its core curriculum. Books like Allan Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind* argued to the general public that higher education in America was destroying the achievements of Western culture. In these arguments against multiculturalism, what was being protected was Eurocentrism. There was an underlying belief that "American" culture was a direct offshoot of "Western" culture. Thus "our" heritage began with Plato and Aristotle, moved through the European Middle Ages to the Renaissance and Reformation, to the Scientific Revolution, Enlightenment, and founding of the United States. Adding African-American texts was as disruptive to this narrative as adding African or Latin American texts. The controversy inspired by the teaching of such texts served to expose the degree to which "American" culture was imagined as Anglo-American culture, "American" citizens as white.

Both within the academy and in the popular media, there was considerable emphasis on criticizing Enlightenment universalism as a projection of the perspective of white, European, middle-

class men, their perspective having been taken as the norm for all humanity. In the late 1980s the media popularized multiculturalism as the celebration of "difference," and to some degree the continuing existence of separate ethnic and women's studies programs suggests that "difference" governs curricular approaches to learning about culture and identity. In reaction, books like Arthur Schlesinger's *The Disuniting of America* decried the tendency of multicultural efforts to fragment American society. As the world watched Bosnia and Rwanda go up in flames over ethnic differences, even those active in ethnic studies and feminist studies began to consider ways to reconcile commonality and community with full respect for diversity. Both AAC&U's American Commitments Project and NEH's National Conversation attempted to address how a democratic nation could recognize the different identities of its citizens while also establishing a shared sense of community and responsibility.

Thus, one of the major cruxes of debate within movements for diversity concerns difference or separatism versus commonality and engagement. Despite the desire for establishing common ground in the United States, the report on American Commitments titled *American Pluralism and the College Curriculum* (1995) notes that unequal power and wealth impede our ability as a country to come together around civic aspirations and values, and that colleges perhaps offer the best laboratory for finding ways to achieve greater equity, recognition of differences, and common civic causes. In the report's proposals, two out of four recommended kinds of curricular experience are explicitly about social justice (xxi). The report "frames diversity questions as a searching exploration of U.S. justice, histories, equity, mutual recognition across racial and ethnic boundaries, economic empowerment, democratic aspiration, and moral engagement"(8).

The second, and growing, debate is over the civic goals of liberal education and whether students should be educated to be American patriots or cosmopolitan, global citizens. Discussing higher education in *For Love of Country*, Martha Nussbaum (1996, 6) poses the following question:

> Most important, should they [students] be taught that they are, above all, citizens of the United States, or should they instead be taught that they are, above all, citizens of a world of human beings, and that, while they happen to be situated in the United States, they have to share this world with the citizens of other countries?

In fact the terms "multiculturalism" and "diversity" seem broadly inclusive in their scope, so that the issues of justice they invoke would not recognize a domestic/global distinction. But that has not been the case up to this point. Many of the most committed advocates for diversity are explicit about locating their concerns "domestically." Thus, the American Commitments report cited above takes a clear position on this point:

> Education for United States democratic and cultural pluralism is not the same task . . . as the education for global knowledge and interconnection. . . . Colleges and universities shortchange their students when they view courses on world cultures and United States diversity as interchangeable, or leave attention to United States diversity optional and elective. Education for participation in United States cultural and democratic pluralism is preparation for citizenship and leadership. (xx)

Citizenship and leadership are here understood as local or national in scope. Many Americanists interested in diversity issues argue that social obligations begin at home and that a focus on global problems or social injustice in other nations is an escape from pressing issues at home, that students and faculty enjoy the appeal of the exotic other, but shrink from confronting racism and cultural differences next door.

Nussbaum takes the opposite position, arguing for "cosmopolitan education." In the remainder of *For Love of Country,* a host of scholars debate the relative merits of patriotism and cosmopolitanism, loyalty to one's own country versus responsibility to all humankind, justice as local commitment versus justice as equity for all the world's inhabitants. Benjamin Barber (1995) is perhaps most typically Americanist in his defense of exceptionalism; he criticizes Martha Nussbaum for being "unduly alarmed about what has been a remarkably successful and undogmatic constitutional exercise in American exceptionalism and unduly frightened of efforts to refocus American patriotism and community in an era of individualism and privatizing markets" (30–31). Barber goes on to quote himself (32) in a way that is deeply revealing of the official self-representation of the American success story:

> From the outset, then, to be an American was also to be enmeshed in a unique story of freedom, to be free (or to be enslaved) in a novel sense, more existential than political or legal. Even in colonial times, the new world meant starting over again, meant freedom from rigid and heavily freighted traditional cultures.

The story of U.S. origins and history that Barber alludes to is a familiar one. The story's narrator and its protagonists can only be white, Euro-American, male. These words make sense only for those who came voluntarily to the United States and found "freedom" when they arrived. That would rule out Native Americans, indentured laborers, African Americans, illegal aliens, and many refugees and reinforce the image of "Americans" as white, descendants of European immigrants. Thus Barber's statement takes us back to Joyce Appleby's equation of American exceptionalism with Eurocentrism. Yet the very dependence of American exceptionalism on Eurocentrism unravels the integrity of American exceptionalism. It immediately calls into question the separa-

bility of the entity called the United States from regions beyond its borders. The term "American" also contains within itself the ambiguity of its referents. While used both domestically within the United States and around the world to refer to behaviors, persons, and institutions belonging to the United States, it, in fact, belongs to all the other countries of the Western hemisphere.

NEW PARADIGMS: RECONCEPTUALIZING IDENTITIES AND LOCATIONS

Thus far we have sketched the separate origins and goals of international and multicultural initiatives within U.S. higher education. In the remainder of the paper, we will suggest that recent scholarship in both areas has revealed new ways of charting the relationships between geographical territories and human belongings. Some of the most valuable new methods of inquiry which apply both to U.S. and to international studies have come from cultural studies and postcolonial studies[2], along with related cross-disciplinary developments in anthropology and geography. A fuller and richer recognition of the multiplicity of personal identities and of the impact of colonization and migrations on national identities has rendered it difficult to frame the study of human cultures and societies within a simple paradigm of clearly-bounded nation states. These newer paradigms of multiple belongings use concepts such as globalization, diaspora, interculturalism, and hybrid identities to map new relations of politics and place, history and identity, economies and states. On these new multi-layered maps, it becomes difficult to separate the United States, or any other state, from complex embeddedness in historical and contemporary movements of people, capital, ideas, cultural forms, and even elements of the natural environment. Before addressing specific curricular implications, we will define some of the most important constructs for reconfiguring the way social issues are identified and studied.

Globalization

"Globalization" is a term that is much used and little agreed upon. Its most specific meaning belongs to the domain of economics, referring to the transnationality of corporate headquarters, ownership, factories, production, labor, and sales. Some examples would be the way many commodities, such as automobiles and clothes, are produced from natural resources and components scattered around the globe, though the corporate owners of the company might be located in the United States. What especially differentiates this global form of production from earlier incarnations of international trade is the dispersal and multiplicity of components and the fact that it is cheap labor that plays a key role in the location of factories. There is no necessary connection between the nation where the raw materials come from, the nation where they are assembled into

commodities, or the nation where they are sold. And, any of these can change with little notice. Hence an apple juice label lists a host of possible countries as the origin of its fruit, allowing the manufacturer to substitute whatever apples are cheap and readily available—without reprinting the label. Electronic communications have played a major role in making globalized business possible on such a scale. In popular parlance, globalization is often understood as the rapid and unprecedented global circulation of cultural forms and commodities, detached from their original context. Thus, village children in Nigeria might know who Michael Jordan is, but not what basketball is. CNN shows refugees from Kosovo stumbling across the Albanian border with Nike logos on their shirts. A blond Danish youth sports dreadlocks without any idea about Rastafarianism. American patients receive acupuncture with no knowledge of the metaphysics behind it.

The pace and intensity of change and communications has produced a qualitatively different awareness of interconnection than the one experienced by earlier generations.

Globalization is often thought of as a contemporary phenomenon, but there are a number of competing accounts of its origins. Some scholars argue that it has always characterized human trade and cultural development. Others argue for the European voyages of exploration as a starting point, in particular 1492, because of the large scale movements of people and capital and the resulting immense cultural changes in most of the areas affected. Others, perhaps the majority, locate globalization as a phenomenon of the late twentieth century, characterized by rapid electronic communication and travel. It has to be acknowledged that the pace and intensity of change and communications has produced a qualitatively different awareness of interconnection than the one experienced by earlier generations. Nonetheless, for the purposes of conceptualizing the relations of U.S. and global diversity, one might think of globalization as beginning with the European conquest of the New World, especially with the rationalization of the triangular trade between Europe, the Americas, and Africa during the centuries of plantation slavery. The scale of cross-cultural influence and of transnational economics and politics can be seen in the distribution of foods and plants around the world. For example, mangoes, which originated in India, are now popular fruits in practically every tropical country in the world, and they appear to be naturalized in the forests of places like Jamaica. Asian and European cuisines would be unthinkable without New World vegetables such as chili peppers, tomatoes, maize, and potatoes. It is not that these foods are simply enjoyed around the world, but rather that they are now identified with the cultures which consume them. The same is true of tea in the British Isles and coffee in Italy, France, or Turkey.

Some theorists equate globalization with the homogenizing export of Western, or even American, economic and political institutions, science and technology, and the norms, practices and values that come with them (Barber 1995). In this version, market capitalism is the engine of

globalization. Attitudes on globalization tend to be polarized. Both in the West and in the developing world, the adoption of free markets, industrialization, and technology are viewed by some as progress and welcomed. Others decry the destruction of indigenous lifeways and environments, fearing neocolonialism and deepening inequalities. From the point of view of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and those in developing countries who advocate for their interventions, the global spread of structural adjustment and liberal market economies will bring with them the other benefits of developed Western societies, especially liberal democratic governments. These include, on the one hand, perceived improvements in material well-being, ranging from improved infrastructure, medicine, technology, and education, to access to the global marketplace of commodities. Others will cite as progress the globalization of liberal democratic social and political ideas; in this view, human rights, feminism, religious tolerance, and other ideological hallmarks of contemporary liberal democracies are seen as part of an emerging global consensus. Others, describing essentially the same phenomena, see something very different. They notice the globalization of labor markets which improve the profitability of production for multinational corporations, but they point out that it is the Western stockholders who receive the benefits, thus widening the gap between the rich and the poor on a global scale (Wallerstein 1991). They see industrial practices harmful to workers and the environment—and thus not allowed in the West—subjecting those in developing countries to declines in well-being.

Arjun Appadurai (1990, 328) has given one of the best accounts of what he calls "the global cultural economy," although, he points out, "we have only begun to theorize" this "complex, overlapping, disjunctive order, which cannot any longer be understood in terms of existing center-periphery models." He proposes a model for studying global cultural flow based on five "scapes": ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, finanscapes, and ideoscapes. He justifies his metaphor with the idea that landscapes are not objective, but perspectival and fluid. The five scapes are not isomorphic; they occupy different shapes and relations in different locations, shifting constantly. Along with more traditionally worded theories of globalization, Appadurai's formulation highlights the critical need for multidisciplinary approaches to globalization and interculturalization. In this world "both points of departure and points of arrival are in cultural flux, and thus the search for steady points of reference, as critical life choices are made, can be very difficult" (335).

Insofar as globalization is actually shaping the world we live in, it is clear that every area of the world is affected by it, though not equally or with equal benefits. But it means that the objects of knowledge which organize our curricula and the methods used to study those objects

need to change. Rapidly increasing interaction and interdependence characterize the United States as well as the rest of the world.

Diasporas

Processes of globalization, including colonization and slavery, as well as local crises of drought, famine, and civil war, have led to the dispersal of peoples around the globe, creating what Appadurai calls "ethnoscapes." The Jewish diaspora, the African diaspora, the Chinese diaspora are some of them (Palmer 1998, Skinner 1993). The paradigm of diaspora as a way of recognizing and identifying identity-based groups is one of a number of new transnational ways of conceptualizing the relationships between identity, history, and place.[3] To map the world with diasporas is to highlight the connections among people who are spread around the globe and to make visible what connects them. It also makes visible the historical processes which led to dispersal and can lead the scholar to ask different sorts of questions than would be asked of people within a single state. For example, Keith Nurse (1998) points out that more money comes to the Caribbean through diasporic relations, "emigrant remittances," as they are called, than through international aid. These pipelines, through which people and money travel in both directions, are a basic household survival strategy, not just in the Caribbean but in many developing countries.

Insofar as globalization is actually shaping the world we live in, it is clear that every area of the world is affected by it, though not equally or with equal benefits.

Using diasporas to study cultural identity highlights the complexity and multiplicity of identities people have, and it fosters the comparative study of diversity in different states. Diasporic peoples always have at least two places of belonging: their homeland and their present home. The relationship between these multiple belongings is constantly in flux, negotiated both at the level of the individual and the community; this is as true for Irish-Americans as it is for Chinese-Americans. In addition, the complexity of more contemporary global movements has resulted in persons and communities who are doubly diasporic. Persons of West Indian-African descent who have migrated to London or New York or Toronto are members of both the African diaspora and the Caribbean diaspora. They might identify three locations as "where they are from," or they could choose one as the locus of their "imagined community"; but which one cannot be taken for granted. These identifications can have an impact on what might otherwise be perceived as domestic political and economic issues. For example, Irish Americans have played a powerful role in funding both the IRA and other domestic projects within the Republic of Ireland.

Of course, there are rich scholarly controversies about how we understand diasporas and their significance. For example, scholars disagree on a number of criteria used to define diasporic identity, especially the degree of conscious identification required by members of the diaspora and the

desire to return to the homeland, if such a return were possible. One question is whether the diasporic population must serve as the primary imagined community of the persons within it or whether the objective fact of their existing in dispersal is sufficient for calling a group a diaspora. The existence and availability of a homeland can make a big difference in the identities and well-being of persons within the diaspora, as was the case with the establishment of the state of Israel for the Jews. As is the case with any ethnic group, members of a diasporic population may over time shift from latent or superficial commitment to their diasporic identity into deep identification or nationalist movements for sovereignty. For the purposes of this essay, the point is that these and related controversies could be productively engaged by embracing Gerald Graff's (1992) pedagogy of "teaching the conflicts."

Graff's "teaching the conflicts" seems especially relevant to conceptualizing the United States for purposes of analysis, teaching, and learning. We submit that the more closely one examines the boundaries of the United States and its constituent peoples, the more ambiguous and transnational they appear. Thus one conflict that can shape the study of American diversity is between conceptualizing it as a bounded state with a multicultural population or as a nexus of transnational cultural groups who are connected to histories and ancestors and identities which are diasporic and global.

To make the case for studying the diverse peoples and cultures of the United States—and all states—in a global context, one would do well to begin with Eric Wolfe's *Europe and the People without History* (1982), a ground-breaking study calling for a global history based on the premise that an accurate history could not be based on one nation or culture studied in isolation because "human populations construct their cultures in interaction with one another." Furthermore, world history since 1492 has been a "conjoint participation of Western and non-Western peoples in this worldwide process" (ix). The conventional narrative of U.S. history often begins with Columbus and voyages of "discovery," i.e. the conquest and extermination of the indigenous peoples of the Western hemisphere starting in the fifteenth century CE. This history already includes Italy, Spain, the "Americas," and the desire for Asia. The current political boundaries of the United States, though not all that clear even today, did not exist at all until the late eighteenth century and have been in flux since then. For instance, in this century the United States bought the Virgin Islands and made Alaska and Hawaii states. Right now the U.S. is letting go of Panama and facing the possibility that Puerto Rico might either separate or become a state. Guam's official website boasts that Guam is "America's Westernmost border." In studying the cultures and histories of "Native Americans," it becomes increasingly difficult to isolate some groups as truly U.S.

populations and rule out others as "international," precisely because the native peoples living within the United States are separate nations who do not necessarily accept the sovereignty of the federal government. Some, like the Akwesasne people, part of the Iroquois Alliance, span the border between New York and Canada. Their shrunken reservation, located partly on an island in the St. Lawrence River, now crosses the boundaries of New York, Ontario, and Quebec. If Quebec were to secede from Canada, Akwesasne would be in three countries.

More contested is the southern border of the United States. Its relation to the identities of indigenous, Mexican/mestizo/a, Chicano/a, and other U.S. citizens is a prime example of how unclear the division between domestic diversity and international diversity is. Gloria Anzaldua's *Borderlands/La Frontera* (1987) exemplifies this undecidability. Writing about the Tex-Mex Borderlands, she says (3):

> This land was Mexican once,
> was Indian always
> and is.
> And will be again.

Following the Spanish conquest of the indigenous people, who themselves had migrated and conquered others, the United States took the land from Mexico and now erects barbed wire fences to keep out the aliens from Mexico, aliens who carry in their ancestry layers of indigeneity and conquest:

> Our Spanish, Indian, and *mestizo* ancestors explored and settled parts of the U.S. Southwest as early as the sixteenth century. . . . For the Indians, this constituted a return to the place of origin, Aztlan, thus making Chicanos originally and secondarily indigenous to the Southwest. (Anzaldua 5)

To read Anzaldua is to shift one's perspective 180 degrees, reversing who are the owners of the borderlands, who are the "natural" inhabitants, and who the aliens. But most of all, it is to see that none of us, with the possible exception of the indigenous peoples, is unhyphenated. None of us is a pure identity, though some of us have the wealth and power to define all others as hyphenated and ourselves as the natural and rightful heirs to a place.

Similarly, Ronald Takaki's histories, especially *A Different Mirror* (1993), illustrate the interconnectedness of U.S. ethnic and racial groups with each other and their historical links with international diversity. Thus for example, Takaki points out that the British were fomenting the Opium Wars in China, leading Chinese people to emigrate, at the same time they were allowing Irish peasants to starve while they provided food for the British elite. Thus two populations emigrated to the United States from different directions, driven by the same global power. If we want

to understand the cultures and experiences of other "diverse" groups of Americans, we have to know something about their lands and cultures of origin, as do they. While Chinese-Americans, of course, are American, some of their distinctiveness arises from the cultures of their ancestors. To understand their history within the United States is to understand why they left as indentured servants or emigrants, why they stayed here, and, further, how they have been treated here.

While both the Chinese and the Irish were driven from their homelands by the same imperial power, they experienced differential treatment in the United States, where the phenotypical similarity between the Irish and the English gave the Irish a strong advantage over other ethnic groups. The Irish also spoke English, having had their own language previously drummed out of them by hundreds of years of British domination in their own land. It is a contingent fact of history that "America" formed itself around whiteness, giving the Irish an advantage their religion would have prevented if skin color were not so central to U.S. national identity (Ignatiev 1995). On the other hand, in 500 years of relations between Britain and Ireland, white skin was completely irrelevant to the British image of the Irish as an inferior lifeform. As Takaki narrates from his own experience, it is instructive that Americans of Asian descent are frequently considered to be foreign after several generations. Ten years ago it was not uncommon to hear speeches or read articles about how Asian students were monopolizing academic prizes in science and this was threatening American domination of the field. But, for the most part, these were not students from Asia but American students of Asian descent.

In yet another way of seeing the fluidity of U.S. identities, cultures, and borders today, Orlando Patterson (1994) argues that the United States can best be understood as a series of overlapping, transnational, regional cosmoses. These are comprised of people, communications, cultural forms, and capital in movement around certain hubs. One is the Western Atlantic, encompassing the Caribbean, Miami, New York, and (we would add), Toronto. Another is the Tex-Mex cosmos of the Southwest, and another, the Pacific Rim cosmos of the Northwest, probably from Vancouver to San Francisco. For many purposes of analysis, these cosmoses have more reality, economically and culturally, than the national boundaries that are transgressed in their composition.

Our point here is not to advocate for one way of globally situating the United States, so much as to point out that Appadurai, Anzaldua, Takaki, Patterson, Wolf and others are articulating a paradigm shift with dramatic implications for how this nation understands itself. Seeing persons or groups as members of diasporas is a way of seeing history, of understanding connections, and of recognizing complexity.

Interculturalism

While "globalization" refers to the realities of the world we live in and prepare students for, "interculturalism" refers both to the increased mixing of peoples in that world and the skills needed to interact with people from varying cultural backgrounds and social locations. Interculturation is the existential manifestation of globalization. In many respects "interculturalism" is the application of approaches developed within U.S. multiculturalism to international contexts. It reminds us that other countries are no more homogeneous than the United States is. It describes the social and cultural lifeworlds of those working out their day-to-day relations in a context of diversity. Differences of nationality are but one in a multidimensional matrix of differences that define most intercultural encounters. Increasingly, one is working, playing, negotiating, and communicating with others who enter these relations with different first languages, religious beliefs, gender assumptions, and ethnic identities. The field of intercultural communication developed primarily in an international context, but it is now clearly applicable within many national contexts. It pioneered the view that there are some "culture general" principles of interaction and adaptation that can be taught to people to increase their success at participating in a different culture. We ourselves began using the term in the early 1990s to signify the merger of "multicultural" and "international" which we are advocating here (Cornwell and Stoddard 1994). In addition, the term emphasizes the interactions between and mutual influences of cultural forms and practices on each other. While what we call "interculturalism" is much broader than and more influenced by cultural studies and U.S. multiculturalism, there is a confluence between the two.

"Interculturalism" is the application of approaches developed within U.S. multiculturalism to international contexts.

Interculturation can apply on a number of levels to the phenomena created by globalization and migration. It can apply to interactions between peoples of different groups or within one person whose identity is hyphenated, such as African-American or Indo-Caribbean or Chinese-Australian. It can also apply to cultural forms, practices, and beliefs. In cultural studies such phenomena and identities are often referred to as hybrid or creolized.[4] The concept of "creolization" originated in the Caribbean region to refer to the languages and cultures of the displaced populations who created new mixed cultures in the region (Brathwaite 1971). Creole languages are West African in syntax and primarily European in lexicon, carrying with them the history of slavery and colonization on the one hand, and survival and creative adaptation on the other. The recognition of West African structure in Creole culture and language is also a mark of decolonization, of reversing the colonizers' views of Creole as a debased form of European language and culture. Hybridity and creolization are models of culture which recognize that diasporic, or immigrant, or colonized peoples do not maintain a static identity and belief system. Rather, they

RECALLING THE AFRICAN IN AFRICAN-AMERICAN

The American Negro is neither totally African nor totally Western.
He is Afro-American, a true hybrid, a combination of two cultures.
—Martin Luther King, Jr.

IT IS FAIR TO ASK, WHAT MAY GET LOST by seeing the United States as a nexus of multiple diasporas, a layered montage of transnational movements and zones, and as one of many such centers in the world? In particular, what are the implications of this shift for how we understand African-American identity and the pressing but seemingly intractable social issues of this community? Given the economic and political stakes today, many feel strongly that both academia and the public need to keep focused on the exceptional plight of African-Americans in order to bring about much-needed redress of injustice and inequality. There is a very reasonable tendency to fear that new conceptualizations of racial categories or transnational definitions of identity will dilute a growing political presence in local and national politics (DuCille 1994).

We would point out that scholarship from and about the African diaspora is one of the original areas of scholarship reflective of globalization and transnationalism. From Equiano and Du Bois to King and Malcolm X, the most influential African-American thinkers have sought to locate the struggle for liberation within frameworks which keep the duality of diasporic identity in the fore. What is more, pan-African movements of resistance and liberation, like Negritude and Black Power, have been transnational calls to link Africans and persons of African descent across time and space. For many, an investigation into the Africanness of African-American culture leads to the conclusion that the ancestors across the Middle Passage are a source of spiritual strength, and it is only through studying the cultures of West Africa and the African diaspora can one begin to understand what is African about African-Americanness.

While we contend that African-American experience is most accurately and productively understood in a global and comparative perspective, this perspective should not detract from the quest for justice and equality within the U. S. state. A transnational paradigm does not remove local responsibility; it does not remove the debt owed by U.S. society to those who have built the wealth of the country and fought in its military with little opportunity to benefit from its prosperity. In fact we would hope that a comparative and global approach might liberate us from the blinders of the Black-White dichotomy in America.

Thus we recommend situating in a comparative and global paradigm conceptions of African-American identity and analysis of social issues pertaining to African-American communities, both because comparison brings into view things that might not otherwise be seen, and because this fuller vision provides compelling grounds for dramatic redress of persistent inequalities.

incorporate and mix both in themselves, creating, as Homi Bhabha (1996) says, a third space which is something new. Similarly, whole societies maintain creolized cultures and languages born of adapting old ways to new environments and to mixing their languages and practices with those of other cultures. Just as with globalization theory, there are many competing views on diaspora, hybridity, and creolization, especially relating to unequal power relations and identifying through origins (Stoddard and Cornwell 1999).

Positionality

One of the most important features of U.S. multiculturalism was that the chief agents in developing it as a body of knowledge were members of the cultures being brought into academic discourse: women, African Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, Latino/a Americans, gay and lesbian Americans. In contrast, area studies has until very recently been primarily the study of "others" by white Americans. Postcolonial studies was a parallel movement in newly independent countries, to replace the Eurocentric discourse and knowledge regimes of the colonizers with local knowledge. This is no easy feat when the educated have been educated in European languages and the newly independent country conducts its government in the European language, and when the local knowledge of medicine and agriculture has been suppressed or replaced with European practices. Yet here is one of the clearest convergences between U.S. diversity studies and new forms of international studies. Both postcolonial and diversity studies are movements to decolonize knowledge and identity, to decenter Europe from discourse, culture, knowledge, and values—though not to discard it entirely. This is where the concepts of creolization and hybridity are of central importance, for the overly reductive move would be to reject all things European, to seek to return to some imagined purely indigenous reality and culture. One reason the Caribbean was the place to embrace *"créolité"* is that almost no one there can claim indigenous status. Almost all are transplants, members of diasporas, and they have chosen, for the most part, to embrace their created, mixed culture, but to decenter the European elements of it.

Where does this leave European and European-American students and scholars? While the identity politics that shaped much of the development of U.S. diversity movements has been tempered by the arrival of the new fields of knowledge as respected bodies of scholarship, so long as people of color are underrepresented on faculties and in student bodies, there will be tension over who can teach and write about what. Within the U.S. context, it has become commonplace to discuss whether and how a man can teach women's studies and whether and how a white person can teach African-American Studies (Mayberry 1996). A key move in women's studies was to

turn attention to constructions of gender and sexuality, to masculinity as well as femininity, based on the premise that these are interdependently constructed identities. Similarly, in diversity studies, there has been a recognition that addressing inequalities requires turning some light on the construction and processes of whiteness. Thus critical white studies has developed as a field for analyzing and resisting white power.[5] Beyond the United States, there are similar critiques of European hegemony undertaken in postcolonial studies, looking for example at how the British used constructions of femininity to bolster their superiority over their imperial subjects.

Most generally, across both U.S. diversity studies and newer forms of international studies, there is a recognition that the social location of the knower, whether scholar or student abroad, is an important element of the process of scholarship. The power relations of the knower and the object of knowledge have to be taken into account and the knower must reflect consciously on how his or her location shapes what is seen. Thus, part of the Ford Foundation's project to revitalize area studies is to create a more collaborative and mutual community of international scholars. In the end this is an extension of the goals of intercultural respect and reciprocity to the work of scholarship. But, as long as wealth and other forms of power are so unequally distributed both within countries and across them, the recognition of positionality is especially important in the effort to avoid neocolonialism.

Educational Goals for U.S. Students in the Twenty-first Century

Educational Goals

HAVING SKETCHED SOME OF THE NEW SCHOLARLY APPROACHES to international studies and diversity, we now turn to the implications for teaching and learning. We suggest four interrelated goals for undergraduate students, goals that follow from the transformations in knowledge we have charted. They are

1. understanding diverse cultures and understanding cultures as diverse,
2. developing intercultural skills,
3. understanding global processes, and
4. preparing for citizenship, both local and global.

We believe that acquiring these capacities will be valuable for students who will live and work in the twenty-first century. Rather than giving examples of specific courses and curricula, we will discuss the topics, strategies, and organization that might address these goals within general education courses, in majors and minors, infused throughout the curriculum, and applied in cocurricular programming, experiential learning, and residential life.

UNDERSTANDING DIVERSE CULTURES: UNDERSTANDING CULTURES AS DIVERSE

Both internationalization and multiculturalism, though with radically different motives and strategies, take as a major premise the importance of learning about cultures different from one's own. The phrase "beyond our borders" has often been used by international educators to epito-

mize the direction of their message and the location of their mission. "No, we need to focus on our differences right here," has been the rejoinder of diversity advocates. Our major point is that such learning can no longer be divided into domestic and international, inside and outside. To understand something about African American experience one needs to know about the African diaspora and something about West African culture. A course on West African society which includes both culture and development issues can be used to turn attention on African-American history and culture. To understand Chicano/a culture, one needs to understand something about Mexico, about the history of indigenous peoples in North and Meso-America, about the Spanish conquest, and about contemporary politics and labor movements. U.S. students might think very differently about so-called immigration problems if they learned something about the history of Mexico from a Mexican—rather than from a U.S.—perspective. Visually, bringing together U.S. diversity with its transnational connections is to create a map of the world crisscrossed by interconnections, migrations, trade relations, and transnational class relations.

As we suggested in the beginning of this paper, one thing that unites both U.S. diversity education and post-colonial studies is the project Shohat and Stam (1994) call "unthinking Eurocentrism." The U.S. diversity movement has been as much about decentering Europe from U.S. norms as it has been about the positive recognition and building of alternative cultural traditions within society and academia. But critiquing European values and norms and traditions from a post-colonial perspective does not mean erasing Europe or Euro-America from history or the arts or the curriculum, as some seem to fear. It means seeing the European roots of American culture as limited or partial knowledge (Minnich 1990). And this is true on the macro level of world regions as well as the domestic arena of hyphenated U.S. populations. European Studies, for example, becomes an area study like African Studies, whereas up until now it has been everything in the curriculum that is not area studies or American studies. It has been the invisible norm.

But if globalizing U.S. diversity is one half of this goal, recognizing that virtually all societies in the world are diverse is the other. The approaches and insights gleaned from U.S. diversity efforts shed new light on societies and politics outside the United States. The diasporic cultural groups and ethnic minorities created by migrations and conquest inhabit most states. Thus "comparative multiculturalism" simultaneously expands students' and scholars' horizons beyond ethnocentricity while also shedding new light on U.S. ethnic, racial, and gender relations and constructions. One of our students recently returned from a study abroad program in Spain and announced at a large meeting that, unlike the United States, Spain has a homogeneous population. This is an intelligent student, so clearly there has been some failure in our Spain program.

Fortunately, another student responded that Spain has a long history of interaction among Moors, Christians, and Jews, and contemporary ethnic movements by Basques and Catalans.

Many U.S. citizens are under the mistaken impression that the United States is exceptionally multicultural, that it has nothing to learn from other multicultural societies. In fact, comparing India's reservation system to U.S. Affirmative Action or indigenous peoples in India, Brazil, and New Zealand can be extremely enlightening (Musil 1999). Unfortunately, many world civilization courses, because of time constraints, give the impression that other cultures are unified. The whole presentation of cultural relativism, as usually discussed, is based on the premise that "other" cultures have certain sets of values and beliefs which may or may not be "right for them." The question becomes much more complex once one realizes that each society has women, various classes or castes, and minority religious or ethnic groups that do not necessarily share the dominant group's beliefs and values. What then is the unit on which cultural relativism is based? It could be subnational ethnic groups or nation-states or world religions like Buddhism or Catholicism. Within every national context, rights, wealth, and beliefs are contested in different ways.

In particular, comparatively examining the constructions of racial and gender categories in other countries to those in the United States can help to liberate us from the naturalized dominance of the black-white opposition. The United States needs fresh ways to bring home the fact that these are not essential, genetically determined categories but socio-historically created and maintained. For example the ethnic differences and different social statuses of Martinicans, Algerians, and Senegalese people in French society highlights the role culture, religion, and education play in racism as opposed to phenotype or putative descent. Studying ethnic conflict among black Africans within Kenya or Rwanda or Zimbabwe brings out the differences between phenotype, ethnicity, and nationality. The same is true of constructions of masculinity and femininity and gender roles in various national and cultural contexts. U.S. students debating what is "natural" for men and women need to see how different the natural is construed in other locations. And western assumptions about their superior treatment of women need to be studied from the perspectives of Muslim women in various countries, or Chinese women, or those in many other places. Just as many people say they learned more about English grammar from studying a second language than they did in English grammar classes, so students can learn a great deal about their own society by studying race, class, caste, and gender in other societies. This is true also of politics and economics. Studying the trade-offs between "freedom" and welfare in the form of housing, work, health care, and education in places like Cuba or China can be instructive as well.

When we talk about "understanding diverse cultures," we have to take account of the position of the knower as well as the viewpoint of the known. Students need the opportunity to reflect critically on their own social locations in the global matrices of power, privilege, and material well-being. That is, education in and for globalization should engage students in critical reflection on normative questions about power and equity. In the process of becoming more self-aware, students need to develop the capacity to discern their social locations in every relation, transaction, and encounter. Just as race studies in the United States have led to critical white studies and the realization that the dominant group needs scrutiny, so in the global context, U.S. students need to learn about their power and privilege in relation to most of the world's population. This is not to reflect on their cultural superiority, but to see how their patterns of consumption affect those elsewhere and how the political prowess of the United States is seen from outside.

While courses and programs in diversity have taught us to be aware of the privileged position of middle class, white, heterosexual males, they have done less to illuminate the comparative benefits and privileges of being a U.S. citizen. Extending the important work begun in diversity efforts, the analysis of how power and privilege function needs to be globalized. This means that we cannot just educate students to be successful consumers and managers and professionals; we have to educate them about the impact of their choices and their successes on the rest of the world. Furthermore, we have to do that employing the critiques and perspectives of others—of Iraqi and Irani and Cuban citizens suffering under trade embargoes, of Caribbean and African societies struggling under structural adjustment mandates imposed by the World Bank, of Latin American societies pushed and pulled by the shifting winds of U.S. foreign policy.

DEVELOPING INTERCULTURAL SKILLS

In discussions of goals, it is common for colleges and universities to make distinctions between the knowledge and the skills which liberally educated persons ought to possess. The latter goals typically address skills of writing, speaking, research, and critical thinking, and sometimes, ethical judgment. If we think about the skills needed by students as they enter public life in the twenty-first century, the traditional set needs to be expanded to include those skills that enable one to function effectively and responsibly in an intercultural world. What we suggest here are ways for students to *experience* the kinds of realities we described in the first goal, so they can live the kind of understanding the curriculum will give them. Most of these components have until now been developed to serve *either* internationalizing *or* diversifying students' educations. Language study and study abroad have served the former, while service learning generally has served the latter.

The presence of international students, scholars, and cultural events on campuses has served the former goal, while the presence of U.S. students, faculty, and staff of color and multicultural programming have served the latter. We will suggest how they might be transformed to cross-fertilize each other.

Second Language Study

Studying a second language has been the hallmark of international education. Nonetheless, many Americans believe they do not need to know other languages because "everyone else speaks English." Part of what this shows is a failure to perceive ourselves through the eyes of others. While it is true that the contemporary wave of globalization has carried English with it, this actually redoubles the need of U.S. citizens to learn about societies they expect to trade with and invest in. These are well-rehearsed arguments from international educators.

We would suggest that studying a second language is fundamental to the effort of understanding diversity, from the inside out, from the subjectivity of another way of viewing the world. Even if a student finds no practical use for a particular language, the process and effort of learning the language is a valuable part of liberal education for interculturalism. Struggling to express oneself or to communicate in a language other than one's own is a primary way of developing both insight into and empathy for diversity. As David Maxwell, director of AAC&U's Language Mission Project, pointed out at a recent conference, we must focus not on proficiency but on teaching students how to learn languages so they can be adaptable to a globalized world. In college they do not know whether they will end up working in Brussels or Bangkok, but knowing they can master a new language when needed will be of great use.

To bring home the merger of international and domestic realities, we must note that Spanish is now the most popular language studied in colleges, and it is primarily studied for its usefulness within the U.S. (Lambert 1999). It is another illustration of the transnational nature of cultures and populations. Many Spanish speakers in the U.S., from Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, and Mexico, maintain a sense of "multiple belongings." They support relatives in their countries of origin or ancestry, and they may have homes in both places. They are not necessarily going to follow the path of European immigrants who assimilated into mainstream society after a generation, giving up the sense of their origins as home. Thus, despite the efforts of some segments of the United States to pass English-only laws, the nation is becoming more bilingual. In many areas of the United States, students who want to pursue health careers or teaching would do well to speak Spanish. Imagine if the United States as a nation were to concede the impor-

tance of bilingualism by encouraging the teaching of Spanish in all primary schools. That would be a radical move away from monoculturalism. From that start students might move on to study other languages, both those spoken by significant U.S. populations, such as Japanese, Chinese, or Navajo, and others of purely academic interest.

Intercultural Experiential Learning

We would contend that experiential learning, contextualized by critical reflection and analysis, is essential to the development of intercultural sensitivity and skills. This is reflected in anthropology's traditional emphasis on participant-observation and in the traditional junior year abroad for language majors. Skills *per se* need to be learned by doing, by practice. But the nature of specifically intercultural skills is that they also require understanding and context. There needs to be a dialectical relationship between learning about diverse cultures and learning to interact with diverse peoples. Victorian social reformer James Mill believed that one could learn everything there was to know about India through books. We would venture that any book learning one did could be eclipsed by the multiplicity of experience that comprises "India." No one could ever "know" India, whether he or she lived there for ninety years, or studied it for a career's length, or both. But to inhabit a perspective very different from one's own requires fairly extensive experience because there are layers and layers of perceived understanding and frustration involved in the process. This is as true within the United States as outside it. So, a college education should provide students opportunities for sustained, critically reflected-upon practice in intercultural relations. This may be achieved by using the campus as a laboratory for diversity (Cornwell and Stoddard 1997), study abroad, or service learning, but in all three there should be conscious strategies for connecting the global and the local.

College Campuses as Intercultural Laboratories

As noted above, both international students, faculty, and staff, and U.S. students, faculty, and staff of color have been invoked as ways to internationalize or to diversify campuses. Often, unfortunately, these two initiatives have been not only separate but at odds with each other. There is often resentment on the domestic side when colleges include international students in their statistics on "minorities" or diversity. Sometimes those in the dominant group have stereotypes which make them associate U.S. persons of color with affirmative action and international students with achievements higher than the norm in the United States. To further exacerbate this problem, often these two groups hold negative stereotypes about each other or within their own

ranks. Thus the work of intercultural relations is needed not just by the white or Euro-American students and faculty, but by everyone. Too often institutions recruit diverse people, domestically or internationally, and think they have achieved their goals. Achieving a campus climate truly welcoming of diversity where all interact respectfully is a rare feat, especially rare when the population is heavily dominated by white American students.[6]

The best way to create effective learning experiences on such a campus is through sustained, structured living/learning communities or laboratory components for courses on diversity, such as the Intergroup Relations Program at the University of Michigan (Schoem). Short of these integrated collaborations between academic affairs and student development, there is much that can be done on campuses to employ their diversity in the service of developing intercultural skills, not just for students, but for all members of campus communities.

Study Abroad

Study abroad is a highly desirable form of intercultural experiential learning, but it too must be contextualized and reflected upon if it is to develop intercultural skills. Study abroad can be conceptualized as part of general education or as part of a major or minor, usually in modern languages or area studies. For some students it is academic tourism which never penetrates beneath their surface impressions of exotic sights and other American students they meet in youth hostels. For others who take learning seriously, too often study abroad tends to stand in isolation from the rest of their curriculum and personal development of intercultural skills at home. Study-abroad professionals have tried to address the need for preparation and re-entry adjustment with co-curricular workshops. It has been established that one of the most important ways to prepare students for study abroad or for cross-cultural experiences is to help them to define their own national and cultural identities. They need to be prepared for the fact that they will be taken as representatives of "America." In times of international strife such as the Gulf War or subsequent attacks on Iraq, host families and students in other countries expect our students to be able to account for and have intelligent positions on U.S. military actions. They want to know why racism is such a problem in the United States or why we impeached our President. Many American students know very little about our political system or international affairs. Consequently, knowing more about the United States and about how they themselves fit into U.S. demographics is actually good preparation for study abroad, as is knowledge of the country they will visit.

While preparation for study abroad is helpful, it is crucial that courses be developed especially for students returning from off-campus experiences, to help them reflect on and integrate their

experiences into their overall curriculum and intellectual and personal development Without such structured opportunities for critical reflection, students are likely either to romanticize their experiences or to rest content with the judgment that the United States is a superior place to live. While study abroad is supposed to provide knowledge about the host country, its people, and its values, it is also one of the prime occasions for students to learn about their country from an outside perspective, to see how various other countries regard the United States and American culture, and further how the United States directly affects other nations through sanctions, foreign aid, media, McDonalds and Pepsi, and so forth. That outside perspective can be illuminating in preparing students to take their places in U.S. and global society; it is completely unavailable without getting outside what seems natural and absolute from within the U.S. While information is readily available if one knows how to search for it, most of us need the shock of experience to see the familiar from a dramatically different perspective.

Students abroad also encounter many people who revere the high standard of living and the political system of "America." Within one country they will meet people with differing views on the United States, and they will be sure to learn that the United States is both a powerful symbol and a powerful force in the local economies and politics of many nations. Students should get some sense that human values differ significantly across cultures, and this recognition should liberate them to take a critical stance toward what is perceived as natural at home. However, they need a course or courses which will help them to process and analyze these reflections. Ideally, they might take a course with students who have studied in a variety of countries, enabling them to compare and contrast what they have learned. A central focus of such a course should be reflection on how the experience abroad affects the students' identities as U.S. citizens.

Often American students who identify as "minorities" or hyphenated Americans find when they go abroad that they are seen only as "American." This is true regardless of race: A Dominican-American student is perceived as a Yank in Trinidad, and an African American may be simply an American in Kenya. In both cases the primary connotation of "being American" is wealthy. Subjectively, these students have to wrestle with the terms of their own self-identities, but some will return home more identified with the nation than when they left. For good or ill, they may feel that their standard of living as a working class American far surpasses that of most working and even middle-class Kenyans.

Another important intercultural dynamic is what happens within groups of U.S. students abroad where ethnic, gender, or racial differences may mean that they experience differential treatment. As much interculturalism may take place among the group of American students as

between them and the host people. A program director attuned to both U.S. diversity issues and cross-cultural experiences abroad can do a great deal to facilitate this kind of learning. Needless to say, all kinds of intercultural experiences have the potential to be disastrous as well as beneficial; they require tremendous sensitivity and wisdom on the part of the facilitator or instructor.

A further point on how "study abroad" can be used to cross the boundaries between domestic and international diversity is by reconceptualizing it as "intercultural" off-campus study. Exchange programs between Historically Black Colleges and Universities and traditionally white institutions or between either of these and Native American tribal colleges are examples of domestic intercultural study. Again the students who participate in domestic off-campus study should, upon their return, be part of a course that allows them to process and share what they have learned. Native-American or African-American students who attend predominantly white colleges can have their minds turned around by a semester at an institution that totally reflects their histories, cultures, and traditions. Above all, they may learn to see themselves as more hybrid when they get away from a situation in which their difference is so prominent. They will probably learn more about the diversity within their own identity group by attending such an institution than they would by being at a predominantly white place. White students who spend a semester at colleges, domestic or abroad, where they are in a small minority, will in all likelihood gain significant intercultural skills.

Service Learning

A number of colleges have service learning programs, both in the United States and abroad, that can provide similar occasions for reflection on U.S. ways of life, politics, and civic responsibilities and on the international role the United States plays in the world (Guarasci 1997). Students doing service learning in the United States might take a seminar with students who have done service projects abroad. It is instructive for all of them to learn about such things as the role of the World Bank in other countries, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and the extraordinary work of grassroots organizations at home and abroad, like the women's cooperative credit societies in India where very poor women learn business principles and raise each others' consciousness about abuse and family planning. For students doing service learning in the United States, it would be good to have a comparative perspective on issues like health care and infant mortality rates in both developing countries and industrialized socialist states. As with reactions to study abroad, students doing service learning are at risk of making easy judgments both about class values and about U.S. policies.

Exposure to radically different social formations, standards of living, and approaches to addressing poverty and literacy can help students form more sophisticated and responsible positions on domestic politics. Moreover, in urban environments many of the populations that students will encounter will be immigrants or Spanish-speaking people. Here the transnational and intercultural realities of globalization are obvious. Thus, domestic service learning programs can prepare students to work with people from different countries and different cultures.

UNDERSTANDING GLOBAL PROCESSES

One of the corollaries of a world shaped by globalization is that students need to learn about that world and the processes we have been discussing, processes of change and interaction that cannot be neatly carved up into area-based courses or single disciplines. This kind of learning goal is not as common as others we have mentioned, like diversity or language study, and few faculty are currently trained to think or teach this way. Educational reformers have been pushing for faculty to move out of the narrow areas of specialization that Ph.D.s typically require, but even so, understanding global processes goes beyond most visions of interdisciplinarity. Ideally, those teaching and learning about these processes would integrate instruction in basic geographical and environmental knowledge with an introduction to the vocabularies of globalization. Students need to have a working knowledge of competing theories about geo-historical, economic, and political processes that have shaped the world we have today. To understand world affairs and the forces that drive them, students need a working knowledge of the history and principles of capitalism, socialism, and the tensions between them, of the histories of the major eras of colonization and the subsequent creation of independent nation-states, of the causes and consequences of the major global diasporas, of development, world systems, and liberalization theories, and of the origins and impacts of transnational corporations, international financial institutions (e.g. World Bank, International Monetary Fund), and NGOs. Moreover they need to grasp the multidirectional intersections among these vectors of globalization.

Global warming, the financial crisis in Indonesia, the democratization movement in China are but a few of the kinds of complex global issues that students need to be equipped to understand. Critical literacy about global processes amounts to being able to discern the interrelations between natural, political, and economic systems. We suggest that higher education needs to take on the task of preparing students to be both critical consumers of the representation of these issues they meet in the media and responsible producers of well-grounded judgment about how they, the institutions they work for, and the nations they belong to should respond to them.

What is more, students need to be able to discern, not how distant these world events are from their immediate concerns, but how their immediate concerns have threads which link them—their actions, their votes, their choices as consumers—to these world events.

Meeting this goal would call for large-scale faculty development. Capitalism and socialism are economic systems based upon competing philosophies, and it is difficult to understand what is at stake without understanding their underlying ideals. Demographics about the transnational movements of people and environmental histories of drought and famine are made meaningful when the human lives so affected are portrayed through literature and the arts. In short, understanding the dynamics and impacts of global processes is an educational endeavor that has to be infused throughout the curriculum.

Critical literacy about global processes amounts to being able to discern the interrelations between natural, political, and economic systems.

DEVELOPING CITIZENSHIP: THE OBLIGATIONS OF MULTIPLE BELONGINGS

One of the distinguishing features of U.S. higher education has been its commitment to preparing students to be civic leaders and citizens. This can be interpreted in many ways, such as educating students for social justice, or leadership, or community service. Usually, it is implicitly based on the notion that citizens in a democracy need to have not only information but also both critical and deliberative reasoning skills in order to make good decisions. In many nations, tertiary education is solely concerned with producing highly-trained scholars or professionals; in newly independent nations, there is often a sense that universities play a role in nurturing the creation and transmission of the national heritage and place in the world order. Until recently, the civic mission of U.S. colleges has been clearly understood to be national rather than international, with the exception of a few institutions that have committed themselves to international training. But recently, with increasing awareness of globalization, the ideal of cosmopolitanism as a goal of education has come to the fore, exemplified by Nussbaum's book, *Cultivating Humanity.* Her earlier volume *For Love of Country,* discussed above, generated tremendous opposition from those who believe students should be invested in patriotism or U.S. citizenship. Illustrated by case studies of various colleges and universities, *Cultivating Humanity* is an extended argument for the responsibility of liberal education to create citizens of the world who can entertain—while rationally reflecting on—different perspectives. Nussbaum's primary concern is an ethical one, perhaps best illustrated by current events.

As we write this in early May of 1999, the U.S. news media is full of debate over whether our country should be engaged in military action against Serbia, and in particular, whether American lives should be risked by sending in ground troops. The terms of the discourse are instructive.

Since Desert Storm, the public seems to expect that the military actions which destroy targets in another country, sometimes including civilians, can be carried out without loss of U.S. lives. As ordinary citizens are asked whether they favor sending in ground troops to Kosovo, the debate primarily revolves around whether this war is "in the national interest" or whether it is based on humanitarian concerns. In the discussions there is little sense of equivalence between the lives of civilian Serbs being bombed and the lives of American soldiers who might die in a ground action. Robbins (Cheah and Robbins 1998) argues that because U.S. nationalism sees itself as civic rather than ethnic, "it misses the way the national imagination even of progressives remains in thrall to those borders, routinely unwilling or unable to register the moral and political weight of noncitizens" (13). This is where higher education might help by cultivating a cosmopolitan allegiance to humanity, as Nussbaum argues. In this view political decisions should emulate Kant's regulative ideal of a Kingdom of Ends in which all humans are treated as ends in themselves and never merely as means. Indeed, "Kant's vision of cosmopolitical right asserted in the name of a common humanity attempts to provide an ideal institutional framework for regulating the anarchic behavior of states" (Cheah and Robbins, 24). In the Kosovo situation, such a model could justify warfare to save hundreds of thousands of ethnic Albanians, or it could be used to justify avoiding war. But it probably could not justify a war strategy that is careless of the lives of civilian Serbs while holding the lives of American soldiers sacrosanct.

Attractive and oft-invoked though it is, the notion of universal human rights or the equal value of all lives does not animate many state decisions about either economics or war. In public debate the most often invoked criterion regarding military engagement in Kosovo is the U.S. "national interest." This is what most people understand to be the justification for war. Following this logic, it seems clear that the public would need good education on international relations and global economics in order to judge whether ethnic conflict in Eastern Europe has any direct bearing on U.S. interests. Some people argue that war, particularly in Europe, will be harmful to the global economy and hence to American students looking for jobs. The fact that this is a pressing issue for American citizens, like that of bombing Iraq and the Vietnam War before that, is one indication that citizens of the United States must also understand themselves as citizens of the world.

A cosmopolitan, or citizen of the world, is sufficiently experienced in the ways of diverse cultures that she can bracket her own frames of identity and belief enough to be comfortable with multiple perspectives, to suspend disbelief in the presence of new cultures and new ways of seeing. A cosmopolite's own local or national identities are not held with blind commitment, but subject to evaluation and comparison with those of others. Nonetheless, citizens of the world

may have special obligations closer to home. Yi-Fu Tuan argues that "a sense of positive if complex and multiple belonging . . . is already shot through with unavoidable distances and indifferences, with comparison and critique; yet it does not thereby cease to be a mode of belonging" (Cheah and Robbins, 3). Local relations matter. Most of our students will live, work, vote and shop in economic and political localities that, while linked and situated globally, are instantiated and governed locally. The environmental movement's slogan, "think globally, act locally," is applicable for all citizens.

While citizens of a particular state, in our case the United States, may have their strongest obligations close to home where they vote, pay taxes, and live in communities, this does not mean that their ethical obligations toward U.S. soldiers are stronger than their ethical obligations toward Somali children or Serbian civilians. However, at the highest level of moral and intercultural understanding, a global citizen would not necessarily simply apply Enlightenment universalism to all situations. Rather a cosmopolitan ethical disposition would first undertake an empathic understanding of the views held within vastly differing societies, and then negotiate between that relativist empathy and an ethical disposition toward universal human rights.

An American citizen needs to be cosmopolitan in relation to world issues, but also in domestic ones.

An interculturally educated citizen of the United States and the world would not make a judgment about foreign policy without seeking the perspectives, histories, and beliefs of those involved. He or she would not be satisfied with sound-bite slogans about freedom or evil but would research the situation in order to make a balanced analysis, taking into account the interdependence of the world's economies, ecologies, and societies. To be cosmopolitan is to achieve "the non-totalitarian consciousness of a preserved diversity" (Bernabé 1992, 892).

Thus, an American citizen needs to be cosmopolitan in relation to world issues, but also in domestic ones. When domestic issues like welfare reform, gun control, taxation, or school vouchers arise, U.S. citizens will have a better grasp of alternatives if they understand the range of ways these issues are handled in other societies; they will be less fettered by the polemic of either/or thinking that dominates political debate. If they also know U.S. history and the particular dynamics of U.S. society, they will be able to situate domestic issues within both the domestic and the global context.

Many domestic issues raise issues of cultural or gender diversity as well as having global implications. The same kind of understanding subjective perspectives of others synthesized with equally applied ethical standards will further deliberative reasoning within the United States. Many political decisions about international issues have ramifications for domestic diversity as well. For example, when the United States goes to war, the odds are that populations of color will

be disproportionately affected. In the Vietnam War a disproportionate number of U.S. casualties were persons of color. Thus, in 1971, while Chicanos were 6 percent of the U.S. population, they comprised 20 percent of the dead in Viet Nam (Oboler 1995, 67). As discussions occur over settlement of refugees from Kosovo, the specter of U.S. immigration policies emerges. The whole question of immigration, of the unequal desirability of different national groups as immigrants, is tied both to diversity and to U.S. involvement in world events, again showing the confluence of domestic and global citizenship.

Also blurring the boundaries between U.S. diversity and global issues is the fact that the major military actions mentioned above all involved attacks on societies with ethnic identities, religious beliefs, and histories unfamiliar to most of the U.S. population. The information from commercial news media tends to slant the portrayal of leaders and values rather than presenting detailed histories or information about multiple perspectives. The portrayal of international affairs often follows the plot structure of epic adventures with a hero and an evil enemy that is reified and two-dimensional, whether it is communism or Saddam Hussein. This kind of binary opposition between good and evil is dangerous given that many historians and political scientists agree that ethnic conflict is the dominant threat to world peace and stability today. Studying ethnic identity and conflict is relevant equally to U.S. pluralism and to global studies. While each case has its own history and its unique beliefs, there are some common threads to the processes by which ethnic differences go from features of personal or familial identity to political movements for sovereignty.

Conclusion

Conclusion

Assuming that higher education in the United States aims to prepare students cognitively and normatively for the world they will live in, we believe that it is both inaccurate and insufficient to teach students about the international arena independently of their positionality as U.S. citizens or about domestic diversity and citizenship without reference to transnational responsibilities and identities. Attention should be paid to inequalities both within and between states, whether in the United States or other countries. However, even when issues of domestic importance are under consideration, issues like health care or taxes or racism, the United States should be understood in global context and comparatively. Similarly, other countries need to be appreciated as multicultural and contested, not as homogeneous units. A citizen of any state is at the same time always a global citizen and a member of various subnational and/or transnational groups, whether religious, ethnic, or occupational. No national language or culture exists in purity and isolation from others'.

Just as U.S. multicultural education was designed to promote respect for the different subcultures of the United States in order to recognize the positive values of difference, so we need knowledge of the histories and beliefs of the global societies with whom we interact, in war or peace. Without such knowledge, it is difficult to empathize with the societies we are acting with or upon, and it makes it difficult for citizens of the United States to have informed opinions about the justice or injustice of our nation's actions. Bruce Robbins notes that as the world becomes more interdependent, "Politics must be forced to include the variable power of the sympathetic imagination to define collectivities of belonging and responsibility in the absence of that long history of face-to-face interaction that Dewey thought was necessary to community" (Cheah and Robbins, 8–9).

The work of liberal education is, on the one hand, to create citizens who have the ability to move easily among different cultures, who give the benefit of the doubt to diverse ways of thinking, who go beyond applying their own labels and categories to practices which seem strange, and who seek out the common humanity in those whose beliefs and practices are different. It is, on the other hand, to create citizens who will be critical consumers of commodities, media reports,

and economic policies, who will ask questions beyond those of individual or national self-interest when they assess the equity of economic and political choices. Because globalization is so rapid and so dispersed, providing these skills will be a major challenge for the academy of the next century, requiring faculty flexibility and ongoing development for transcending their own specializations.

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

Notes

Notes

1. Simultaneously, but through a completely different chain of reasoning, French post- structuralism and related movements in the humanities were attacking foundational metaphysical concepts which had served as the basis of scholarship in the West. The two movements intersect in cultural studies and post-colonial studies, but not until the 1990s. And many of the people active in U.S. diversity movements are opposed to post-modern and post-structuralist attacks on the subject. Supporters of "identity politics" need a foundation in the identity of the subject that is rejected by post-modernism.

2. Both cultural studies and postcolonial studies are large new international areas of inquiry. Both are influenced by the methods of post-structuralism, but both have strong political antecedents of their own. Cultural Studies began in the U.K. as an offshoot of Marxist studies of culture, whereas in the U.S. it is perhaps more closely related to studies of American popular culture. Postcolonial Studies grew out of the decolonizing classics of such writers as Frantz Fanon, Asish Nandy, and Ngugi wa Thiongo. Gayatri Spivak has been one of its foremost theorists in the West.

3. Another would be the use of ocean or sea perimeters, such as Paul Gilroy's *The Black Atlantic* or the Pacific Rim.

4. For helpful analyses of creolization, see Bernabé (1990), et al. and Brathwaite (1971). On hybridity, see Bhabha (1994 and 1996). For a comparison of the two discourses, see Stoddard and Cornwell (1994).

5. See for example Delgado (1997), Frankenberg (1997), and Ignatieff (1995).

6. A number of foundation initiatives have fostered exciting attempts to create an intercultural campus climate. They include the Ford Diversity Initiatives, AAC&U's American Commitments, the Hewlett Diversity initiatives, and some of the Ford Foundation's Crossing Borders projects.

References

Anzaldua, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands/LaFrontera: The new mestiza.* San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1990. Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Public Culture* 2 :2, 1–11, 15–24.

Appleby, Joyce. 1992. Recovering America's historic diversity: Beyond exceptionalism. *Journal of American History* 79: 2, 419–31.

Association of American Colleges and Universities. 1995. *American pluralism and the college curriculum: Higher education in a diverse democracy.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Barber, Benjamin R. 1996. Constitutional faith. In Nussbaum. *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism.* Boston: Beacon Press, 30–37.

———. 1995. *Jihad vs. McWorld.* New York: Random House.

Bennett, Janet Marie and Milton James Bennett. 1994. Multiculturalism and international education: Domestic and international differences. In Gary Althen, ed. *Learning across cultures.* 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: NAFSA, 145–172.

Bernabé, Jean, et al. 1990. In praise of Creoleness. *Callaloo* 13, 886–909.

Bhabha, Homi. 1996. Culture's in-between. In Stuart Hall, ed. *Questions of Cultural Identity.* London: Sage Publishers, 53–60.

———. 1994. *The location of culture.* London: Routledge.

Bloom, Alan. 1987. *The closing of the American mind.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Boyer, Ernest L. 1987. *College: The undergraduate experience in America.* New York: Harper and Row.

Brathwaite, Edward K. 1971. *The development of Creole society in Jamaica 1770–1820.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brill, Rhondda. 1998. Internationalisation of undergraduate education: The UTS initiative. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 2: 2, 81–98.

Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition website: Http://carla.acad.umn.edu.

Cheah, Pheng and Bruce Robbins, eds. 1998. *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and feeling beyond the nation.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Cornwell, Grant H. and Eve W. Stoddard. 1997. Residential colleges: Laboratories for teaching through difference. In Richard Guarasci and Grant H. Cornwell, eds. *Democratic education in an age of difference: Redefining citizenship in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 73–106.

Cornwell, Grant H. and Eve W. Stoddard. 1994. Things fall together: A critique of multicultural curricular reform. *Liberal Education* 80: 4, 40–51.

Delgado, Richard and Jean Stefancic. 1997. *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Desmond, Jane C. and Virginia R. Dominguez. 1996. Resituating American studies in a critical internationalism. *American Quarterly* 48: 3, 475–90.

Desruisseaux, Paul. 1998. More American students than ever before are going overseas for credit. *Chronicle of Higher Education, December* 11, A70–72.

DuCille, Ann. 1994. Postcolonialism and Afrocentricity: Discourse and dat course. In Werner Sollors, ed. *The Black Columbiad: Defining moments in African American literature and culture.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 28–41.

Frankenberg, Ruth, ed. 1997. *Displacing whiteness: Essays in social and cultural criticism.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Graff, Gerald. 1992. *Beyond the culture wars: How teaching the conflicts can revitalize American education.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Guarasci, Richard. 1997. Community-based learning and intercultural citizenship. In Richard Guarasci and Grant H. Cornwell, eds. *Democratic education in an age of difference: Redefining citizenship in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 17–50.

Ignatiev, Noel. 1995. *How the Irish became white.* London and New York: Routledge.

Institute of International Education. 1997. Towards transnational competence. *Rethinking international education: A U.S.–Japan case study.* New York: Institute of International Education.

Jeavons, Thomas. 1991. *Learning for the common good: Liberal education, civic education, and teaching about philanthropy.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Johnston, Joseph S., Jr. and Richard J. Edelstein. 1993. *Beyond borders: Profiles in international education.* Washington, D.C.: The Association of American Colleges and American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business.

King, Martin Luther, Jr. 1995. Black Power. In *I am because we are: Readings in Black philosophy.* Ed. Fred Lee Hord and Jonathan Scott Lee. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 285–295.

Knight, Jane. 1997. A shared vision? Stakeholders' perspectives on the internationalization of higher education in Canada. *Journal of Studies in International Education,* 1:1, 27–44.

Lambert, Richard D. 1999. The winds of change in foreign language instruction. *International Educator* 8: 2, 31–35.

Mayberry, Katherine J. 1996. *Teaching what you're not: Identity politics in higher education.* New York: NYU Press.

Minnich, Elizabeth. 1990. *Transforming knowledge.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Musil, Caryn McTighe. 1999. Educating for global citizenship. *Liberal Education,* 85: 1, 22–27.

National Humanities Center. 1997. *Fulbright at fifty.* Research Triangle Park, N.C.: The National Humanities Center Steering Committee on the Future of the Fulbright Educational Exchange Program.

Noronha, June. 1992. International and multicultural education: Unrelated adversaries or successful partners? In Maurianne Adams, ed. *Promoting diversity in college classrooms: Innovative responses for curriculum, faculty, and institutions.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 52. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nurse, Keith. 1998. Diasporas, globalization, and carnival. Unpublished Lecture at St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 1997. *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum, Martha. 1996. In *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism.* Joshua Cohen, ed. Boston: Beacon Press.

Oboler, Suzanne. 1995. *Ethnic labels, Latino lives: Identity and the politics of (re)presentation in the United States.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Palmer, Colin. 1998. Defining and studying the modern African diaspora. *Perspectives* 36: 6, 21–25.

Patterson, Orlando. 1994. Ecumenical America: Global culture and the American cosmos. *World Policy Journal* 11: 2, 103–17.

Pickert, Sarah and Barbara Turlington. 1992. *Internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum: A handbook for campus leaders.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Schlesinger, Arthur, Jr. 1992. *The dis-uniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Schmitz, Betty. 1992. *Core curriculum and cultural pluralism: A guide for campus planners.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Schoem, David, ed. 1991. *Inside separate worlds: Life stories of young Blacks, Jews, and Latinos.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Shohat, Ella and Robert Stam. 1994. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the media.* London and New York: Routledge.

Skinner, Elliott P. 1993. The dialectic between diasporas and homelands. In Joseph E. Harris, ed.. *Global dimensions of the African diaspora.* 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press. 11–40.

Stoddard, Eve W. and Grant H. Cornwell. Forthcoming. Cosmopolitan or mongrel? Reading *Créolité* and hybridity via "Douglarisation" in Trinidad. *European Journal of Cultural Studies,* 2:3.

Takaki, Ronald. 1993. *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America.* Boston: Back Bay Books.

Taylor, Charles. 1992. *Multiculturalism and "The politics of recognition."* Ed. Amy Gutmann. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Volkman, Toby. 1999. Introduction. *Crossing borders: Revitalizing area studies.* Unpublished Report. New York: The Ford Foundation.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1991. *Geopolitics and geoculture: Essays in the changing world system.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wolf, Eric R. 1982. *Europe and the people without history.* Los Angeles and Berkeley: University of California Press.

AAC&U STATEMENT ON LIBERAL LEARNING

A truly liberal education is one that prepares us to live responsible, productive, and creative lives in a dramatically changing world. It is an education that fosters a well grounded intellectual resilience, a disposition toward lifelong learning, and an acceptance of responsibility for the ethical consequences of our ideas and actions. Liberal education requires that we understand the foundations of knowledge and inquiry about nature, culture and society; that we master core skills of perception, analysis, and expression; that we cultivate a respect for truth; that we recognize the importance of historical and cultural context; and that we explore connections among formal learning, citizenship, and service to our communities.

We experience the benefits of liberal learning by pursuing intellectual work that is honest, challenging, and significant, and by preparing ourselves to use knowledge and power in responsible ways. Liberal learning is not confined to particular fields of study. What matters in liberal education is substantial content, rigorous methodology and an active engagement with the societal, ethical, and practical implications of our learning. The spirit and value of liberal learning are equally relevant to all forms of higher education and to all students.

Because liberal learning aims to free us from the constraints of ignorance, sectarianism, and short sightedness, it prizes curiosity and seeks to expand the boundaries of human knowledge. By its nature, therefore, liberal learning is global and pluralistic. It embraces the diversity of ideas and experiences that characterize the social, natural, and intellectual world. To acknowledge such diversity in all its forms is both an intellectual commitment and a social responsibility, for nothing less will equip us to understand our world and to pursue fruitful lives.

The ability to think, to learn, and to express oneself both rigorously and creatively, the capacity to understand ideas and issues in context, the commitment to live in society, and the yearning for truth are fundamental features of our humanity. In centering education upon these qualities, liberal learning is society's best investment in our shared future.

ABOUT AAC&U

AAC&U is the leading national association devoted to providing contemporary liberal education for all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Since its founding in 1915, AAC&U's membership has grown to nearly 700 accredited public and private colleges and universities of every type and size.

AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning. Its mission is to reinforce the collective commitment to liberal education at both the national and local level and to help individual institutions keep student learning at the core of their educational programs as they evolve to meet new economic and social challenges.

AAC&U's current priorities are:

Mobilizing collaborative leadership—for educational and institutional effectiveness

Building faculty capacity—in the context of institutional renewal

Strengthening curricula—to serve student and societal needs

Establishing diversity—as an educational and civic priority

Fostering global engagement—in a diverse but connected world

Association
of American
Colleges and
Universities

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

EFF-089 (9/97)