CSHE | Center for Studies in Higher Education

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
http://cshe.berkeley.edu/

BERKELEY'S NEW APPROACH TO GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT:
Early and Current Efforts to Become More International

December 2015

Nicholas B. Dirks
UC Berkeley

Nils Gilman
UC Berkeley

ABSTRACT
This essay discusses past and current thinking about the globalization of higher education (from a U.S. point of view in particular) and a new model we are attempting to develop at the University of California, Berkeley. This essay begins with a brief narrative of the historical evolution of efforts to internationalize education, from the seventeenth century to the present day, before providing a schematic outline of efforts to create new models for the global university. From its earliest beginnings in the U.S. and elsewhere, higher education embodied important global dimensions. Since then, the globalization of higher education has accelerated rapidly over the last quarter century, motivated by a quest for additional revenues (especially in the case of Anglophone universities), a desire for greater international relevance and hence prestige (for all universities, but especially in the case of European and Asian universities), and a desire to provide a foundation for a knowledge economy (especially in the case of Asian universities).[1]

The University of California's original campus at Berkeley has long been internationally engaged. But is now in the midst of developing a new approach: the Berkeley Global Campus, pursuing a relatively new model for how a major research university might seek new and unique global collaborations with other major universities and academic communities. The following provides a brief historical analysis of how American universities have drawn ideas from other parts of the world, the evolution of various models to encourage interacting with international academic communities. It then discusses the conceptual idea of "in-sourcing" that will distinguish Berkeley emerging global engagement effort.

Prehistory: Global Endowments and the Colonial Past
It is well known that many of the early colleges established in colonial America were designed to foster dissenting denominations and to disseminate theological views at odds with what was possible in the mother country.[2] Less well known, however, is the fact that Yale College – one of the new dissenting colleges – was named after an Anglican, who gave his founding endowment in part to satisfy his (general) missionary zeal, and in part to ensure posterity for his surname after the death of his son David in Madras, where Elihu Yale had been Governor.[3] Yale, as was the custom for East India Company Governors during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, earned his vast fortune through the custom of "private trade," engaging in an activity that ultimately led Edmund Burke to push for the regulation of mercantile capitalism in India.[4] The fruit of global trade – unfortunately in this case the same kind of trade that propelled a new class of "Nabobs" to enter gentry status, acquire huge estates, and buy seats in parliament – played an important role in the foundation of one of America's oldest, and most prestigious, institutions of higher education.

We do not mean to draw perverse analogies between the current push for globalization and this particular history, though admittedly global trade has often been part of the mix for the generation of wealth that continues to be so important for the philanthropic support of higher education. We do mean, however, to suggest that even the most local of educational beginnings

were always quintessentially global. Yet this historical anecdote is not just an isolated example, but also the prelude for thinking through the global relationships of American higher education throughout its history. This history is one that began with England and its role in setting the terms for the fundamental values of higher education, shifting in part to Scotland (and the eighteenth century Scottish enlightenment), before migrating across the continent to Germany, which became the most important new influence for U.S. educational institutions in the mid-nineteenth century, especially in the area of research and graduate training. This is also a history that shows how important higher education was for early settlers and then citizens of the new world, while expressing the continued importance of Europe – and its civilizational inheritance – for the emergence of the United States as a new nation. Indeed, education was not just to inculcate religious learning, but also an understanding of and appreciation for the civilizational inheritance that was seen as so critical a base on which the new world was to develop.[5] For much of its early history, American higher education was oriented in relationship to Europe, both as the touchstone, and the point of departure.

Europe was also a point of perpetual return. As Edward Gibbon observed in his autobiography, "According to the law of custom, and perhaps with reason, foreign travel completes the education of an English gentleman."[6] During the 18th century, "travel became fashionable as a means of finishing the education of youths, as a source of social polish, and as a pleasant and desirable way to spend periods of leisure."[7] For English aristocrats in particular, time spent perusing the (mainly ancient) glories of the continent provided just the right touch of gentlemanly polish.[8] This aristocratic tradition was not lost on settlers in the new world. As students in American colleges studied theology, the classics, and—especially after Jefferson created the University of Virginia—a growing array of new subjects, the Hellenic and Roman worlds remained primary referents, though European civilization as the continuous space for enlightenment was always the ultimate referent.

Although sponsoring formal study abroad was beyond the reach of early colleges, the curriculum fed into a desire to replicate the grand tour, if only in theory for most students. Increasingly, however, the new American elite sought to ape the model of the English aristocracy, sending their children not just to college in America, but also to Europe for their own version of the Grand Tour.[9] (Henry James's fiction, from "Turn of the Screw" to *Portrait of a Lady,* offers a portrait account of what upper class Americans hoped to achieve by sending their children for a jaunt around Europe—and how often they left disappointed.)

Soon this was being institutionalized: by the late nineteenth century, some American finishing schools for girls began to market themselves in part around the chaperoned travel that they afforded their students – updating the thematic content of the Grand Tour for a new gender dynamic, while also presaging the role that colleges would soon play in funneling new generations to various packaged versions of the Grand Tour, disseminating a patina of refinement to growing numbers of young Americans who coveted cultural capital and, of course, elite status.[10]

Model I: Travelling
Though collegiate study abroad remained fundamentally a luxury good throughout America's Progressive Era (roughly 1900 thru 1920) which saw the first large scale investment in public higher education. The professionalization of advanced scientific education, particularly in Germany, spurred fundamental change of a different kind--change that would metamorphose the idea of higher education in the United States. In fact, the first pedagogically serious efforts at international education would begin in the late 19th century, with graduate students from around the world (and particularly the United States[11]) coming to study at the new breed of German research universities, whose model of scientific training was soon exported back to the United States (and to other countries too).[12] The desires of students to learn from the best professors in Europe was supported by scholarships designed explicitly to lure top talent from abroad—iconically, the Rhodes Scholarship, which had Oxford hosting foreign students from 1902 on. Up through the Great War, intellectually serious international education remained the province of graduate education.

The idea that American universities would actively encourage their own undergraduate students to study abroad first began to take off after World War I, with American universities (led, curiously enough, by the University of Delaware) for the first time actively encouraging their students to consider spending a semester or a whole year at a European university.

Study abroad suddenly seemed a good idea to US university administrators in the 1920s not only because such an offering promised students a frisson of continental sophistication that echoed the grand tour, but also because the strength of the dollar in the postwar years made educating students in war-ruined Europe a cheap alternative to educating them at home. Study abroad in its modern guise began, in part at least, as a price arbitrage play.

If this original idea made good financial sense, it would soon flower into what until recently was virtually the only (and even today remains the modal) model for international collegiate education, namely the iconic "School Year Abroad." Through the 1920s and

1930s, there was a rapid proliferation of foreign study programs at American universities, both public and private, though the total number of students studying abroad remained relatively small at first.

Figure 1: The first US foreign study group, sponsored by the University of Delaware, en route to Paris in 1923.

The idea of the school year abroad really took off in the post-World War II years, as a result of a number of factors. First, transportation linkages between continents intensified with the rise of the long-distance air travel, democratizing international travel to an unprecedented and ever-increasing degree. Second, the rapid expansion of university systems in the United States, combined with great stratification, led many universities to begin to offer school year abroad programs as a "product differentiator." While these programs were often marketed to the students in terms that would not have been unfamiliar to the grand tourists, travel to Europe began to become a marker not just of elite status but of a new American middle class. Finally, there was also a distinct Cold War imperative behind the push to internationalize postwar higher education in the United States. As Princeton linguist and USIA consultant Albert Marckwardt put it in 1965:

> Certainly we can grant without further argument that the position of the United States in the world today demands, on the part of everyone who has a share in the decision-making processes through which the country is governed and moved to action, a heightened and sympathetic reaction to the ways of life, the values, and the problems currently facing other areas of the world. As a democracy, we can no longer tolerate the unhappy spectacle of a thirty- to fifty-year lag between the public state of mind and those who must assume the responsibility for our relationships with the outer world, Western as well as non-Western. In fact, it is urgently necessary that the gap be closed at once. Even if we were not one of the powerful nations, the technological conquests of time and space which have occurred would still demand this of us. In the world we are approaching, not even a third-rate power will be able to afford the easy, retreat of isolationism, either in its political thinking or in its social and ethical outlook. How is such a general broadening of the horizons to be achieved? Direct foreign contact, which is becoming a far more common experience than it used to be, still cannot begin to take care of the situation adequately. Moreover, it takes more than a vacation trip or even a school year abroad to work the changes in thinking and outlook that are necessary; if anything, this is only a beginning. Operating on the scale which seems almost inevitable, we can only put the new experiences and the extension of the personal environment into the educational system in this country. In short, we shall have to bring the non-Western world to the student, since we can send only a limited number of students to the non-Western world.[13]

It was in this context that the semester in London or Paris began to be a not uncommon component of a college education, at least in many private colleges, and a few of the leading public universities as well. It was also in this context that study abroad began to include not just the standard European destinations, but some in the "Third World" as well. Japan, India, Latin America, and the Middle East all began to be the sites of new interest, propelled not just by the new Fulbright program and the National Defense Education Act (among other federal government initiatives), but sponsored by some of the leading foundations as well, including Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie.[14] Under these programs, students from the Global South now came to study in the North as much as the reverse. (Less studied is the Soviet Union's sponsorship of parallel student exchange programs for socialist bloc nations, which would significantly influence the political imaginaries of many postcolonial cadres in the later years of

the Cold War.[15]) Although post-war "Area Studies" was predominantly directed towards graduate training and advanced research, the growth of Area Studies faculty and programs led inexorably to increased attention to study abroad as a genuinely global phenomenon.

Model II: Exchanging
Study Abroad programs began by being sponsored and organized by colleges and associations in the US, but increasingly relied on "host" institutions in Europe and elsewhere. As programs became more dependent on these institutions (and in turn, host institutions began to rely on the regular revenue models that went along with them), new kinds of partnerships were established, in order to formalize the curricular and financial aspects of student exchange (even if students moved more in one direction than another) and to curate a student experience that required regulation, oversight, and "*in loco parentis*" in multiple global sites. This model commonly involved two universities collaborating to set up a shared pedagogic and/or research program. In some instances, each university would contribute roughly equal numbers of students, faculty, and resources to the venture, with none of the resources flowing off campus, and students simply flowing between the campuses. This model worked well for US liberal arts colleges, but worked less well for the more fixed curricula of most European institutions, which nevertheless valued their role in helping to educate American students. In many instances, US programs would be run through associations or consortia that provided structure, housing, and some set of curricular guarantees through relationships with host institutions.

The partnering model became the basis for the proliferation of cross-institutional agreements: the ubiquitous memoranda of understanding that began to create dense global networks, at least in theory. Over time, partner universities began to generate new programs at the graduate level as well, increasingly in professional degree programs (especially MBAs) where international exposure also attained major significance. In recent years, a variety of universities have offered dual degree programs that offer students the chance to spend time at the two campuses, allowing them to broaden their international experience, which is seen as particularly valuable for those intending a career in international business or in a globalized industry. This model began to be used in Asia throughout the 1990s as a number of privately owned institutions provided outlets for students to study for foreign degrees in their home countries.[16] These programs were in some ways more precursors for new models of institutional collaboration than the standard study abroad programs of earlier decades.

Model III: Branching
Though the first international 'branch campus' opened in the 1920s, when Parsons Fashion School in New York launched a location in Paris, the fashion capital of the world,[17] few universities followed Parsons's suit until the 1990s, when all of a sudden a welter of universities began to consider building extensions of their home campuses overseas.[18] Over the last twenty years, few ideas have been more popular with ambitious university administrators: According to the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT) at SUNY-Albany, as of May 2015, there are a total of 235 international branch campuses in operation worldwide. Universities in 32 different countries have "exported" campuses, including 51 U.S. universities (with a total of 81 branch campuses) and 26 British universities (with a total of 34 branch campuses). Conversely, there are a total of 73 "importing" countries, including United Arab Emirates (with 33 branches), China (28), Singapore (14), Qatar (11), and Malaysia (9).[19]

The motives behind the establishment of international branch campus are multifarious, ranging from a desire to unlock new sources of revenue for the university, to offering faculty and students of the home campus with a more comfortable environment for international engagement.[20] While many different models have been attempted, the common idea is to replicate the academic and other experiences of the home campus, while injecting appropriate local flavor into the mix. Sometimes this entails building a stand-alone campus, with NYU-Abu Dhabi as perhaps the most famous example, whereas sometimes it involves building a bilateral joint venture, e.g. Yale-NUS, Technion-Cornell (which bleed into Models IV and V, see below).[21]

Depending on where these campuses are set up, such international branch campus are often bold (and risky) experiments, introducing various American styles of education (including the liberal arts) where it did not previously exist, creating new levels of investment in and collaboration with partner universities, and opening universities to global forces that are fundamentally new and different. In addition, the number of students, and faculty, engaged in branch campus programs are small and often operationally separate from the home campus.

Yet they also create a thicket of operational complications for the institutions involved, ranging from financing, to convincing the professors of the home institutions to participate, to ethical questions concerning labor practices and academic freedom.[22] To be successful, the managers of higher education institutions who embark on branch campus ventures need to understand the cultures and business practices of the countries they are entering. The greater the cultural distance between the two countries, most importantly including differences in the institutional understandings of the role and function of higher education, the greater the chances something will go awry. So far, the most successful experiments have been those where partner universities already

shared faculty cultures of research and teaching. Exciting though many of these experiments are, however, the downside risks are enormous: even leaving aside losses of prestige or "face" should the venture go awry, financial losses from failed joint ventures have been known to run into the tens of millions of dollars. Despite these risks, for most universities this model remains the state of the art in terms of global institutional ambitions.

Model IV: Satelliting
Some universities, tempted though they have been to build branch campuses, decided to take a different strategy in developing their global "footprint." Columbia University in the early 2000s, for example, decided to build a global network of "consular" offices to provide a limited, yet discrete, physical presence in various global centers. Likewise, the University of California under President Richard Atkinson (1995-2003) expanded its global reach with centers in London and Mexico City.[23] In both cases the thought was that these offices would be free-standing (that is, not linked to any particular university), enabling the development of partnerships and collaborations with multiple institutions, and yet capable as well of developing links to and programs for faculty, students and their parents, and alumni, while also handling local legal, political, and fundraising issues of relevance to the university. We believed that these centers (some very small, some larger, depending on local funding and resources), would significantly advance our global activities, encourage faculty and students without significant global experience or expertise to become more global, while minimizing risk and, for that matter, upfront investment (most of the resources were raised from local alumni pleased to have an opportunity to "give back" to their alma mater while doing so locally).

Columbia began by opening offices in Beijing, Paris, Amman, and Mumbai, soon expanding as well to Istanbul, Nairobi, Rio de Janeiro, and Santiago. So far, these centers have steadily established themselves as important resources and generated new activity, from different forms of study abroad, to new faculty research, to the generation of new grants to support research in areas such as global health and environmental policy.

The Columbia model has been followed by a number of other universities, usually with a focus on key areas of the world. Stanford, for example, has opened an impressive new center in Beijing, and though it has done so on the Peking University campus, it has not restricted the center's activities to specific collaborations with PKU. Like Columbia (and to some extent deliberately following its example), the University of Chicago has opened a number of global international centers, in Beijing, Hong Kong New Delhi, and Paris. The list of universities that have opened some set of consular office is growing almost exponentially, and this is true for universities all over the world. For example, the Freie Universität of Berlin has seven global centers (New York, São Paolo, Paris, Cairo, Moscow, New Delhi, and Beijing), explicitly establishing for itself the model of a global network university. If offering your students the opportunity to study abroad has become table stakes for any major university, the "Consular Office" model remains the most popular for universities with bigger ambitions about "going global."

Model V: Networking
While various global centers, most notably Dubai, Abu-Dhabi, and Qatar in the Gulf, and a myriad of cities in China (e.g. Souzhou), have established new university research parks, inviting global universities to take advantage of land, proximity to other new research and educational ventures, shared use of infrastructure, the promise of growing and talented student populations, and often major infusions of resources, to date only a few of these research parks have been sponsored by highly ranked research universities themselves. Where top ranked universities such as Stanford have built research parks, the goal most often has been not to partner with foreign universities, but rather with industrial partners, with the aim of lubricating the process commercializing technology and other intellectual property. This process has typically been kept quite intentionally distinct from the process of partnering with other universities, if only to lessen potential legal and operational complications.

An important exception in this regard is the National University of Singapore. NUS has made major partnership agreements with a whole slew of foreign universities including Duke, M.I.T., Carnegie-Mellon, Australian National University, University of North Carolina, Cambridge University, King's College London, Waseda University, and perhaps most significantly with Yale. In many of these cases, NUS has provided land and facilities on or near their main campus with the express purpose of developing new kinds of international partnerships to drive innovation and enhanced global collaboration. Each of their educational collaborations has been bilateral, although some research ventures have been multilateral (e.g. CREATE). In both of these areas, NUS has been pioneering a new model for a global university, what might be described in the language of "insourcing."

This is a model we at Berkeley are ourselves developing, especially since we were recently cleared to develop a new campus – 134 acres on the San Francisco Bay formerly known as the Richmond Bay Field Station—less than fifteen kilometers to our north. As we have considered different options for extending our global reach and establishing a real global network for ourselves, we have been mindful of the successes (and failures) of other ventures, as also of our public mission, in particular our obligations to the region of northern California and more generally to the state of California itself.

We have also been mindful of the fact that while we all have seen how global centers can exert powerful incentives for partnership and collaboration, no U.S. university has initiated a similar kind of "insourcing" strategy as begun by NUS, and indeed (viewed in a wider context) developed by a number of countries in the Middle East and Asia. The most direct example of U.S. "insourcing" might be said to be the initiative undertaken by New York City, at the instance of Mayor Michael Bloomberg, when he invited universities from across the world to compete for money and land with direct access to the myriad of resources represented by an institutional presence in one of the greatest global centers. The winner of this much-heralded competition, of course, was a partnered proposal by Cornell and Technion, an Israeli university, and this new experiment in global collaboration is currently under construction.[24]

At Berkeley, we have taken and elaborated these ideas and examples to propose a new model, in effect that our new campus be labeled as the Berkeley Global Campus (BGC) at Richmond Bay, separate from but deeply connected to the home campus. We are in the process of recruiting international and local partners—universities as well as private corporations, government agencies as well as non-governmental organizations—to join us in designing an integrated global network of activities, programs, and enterprises. The goal of this new campus will be to provide our students, faculty, and staff with an unparalleled global experience and education, as well as to generate and to sponsor global research and entrepreneurship that will benefit both our campus and the entire region of northern California.

BGC will create a unique global footprint, involving a multilateral consortium of universities from across the world (along with other public and private institutions), who will partner with UC Berkeley in the establishment of a global center for research, teaching, and practical engagement in the East Bay. BGC will bring global resources to bear on the construction of the campus, while at the same time opening up the entire Berkeley community to global opportunities. Building on our strengths in engineering, computing and technology, climate science, global public health, big data, entrepreneurship, law, social science, humanities, the arts and design (as well as leveraging our developing partnerships with UCSF on the other side of the Bay, for example in the field of personalized medicine, as well as the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, in energy biosicences, computing, etc.), we propose to establish a global campus that will extend out from our Berkeley base while inviting global universities to partner with us in a wide range of activities that align with the university's core academic priorities and take full advantage not just of our resources but of our location in the world's leading center of innovation.

This idea initially emerged as we began to consider and evaluate a wide range of issues and risks associated with a potential UC Berkeley presence in mainland China, either through the establishment of a "consular" office or by setting up joint educational and research ventures. Along with some of the challenges in areas related to academic freedom, there are complicated regulatory and political issues, as well as local concerns about ensuring wide participation across the Berkeley campus for a venture of this kind. While we will proceed on a parallel track with the planning for global centers not just in China but in critical world locations, we will commence the development of a global strategy by establishing a central node in the form of a new global campus close to the home campus.

The proposal inverts the usual model whereby U.S. universities establish themselves in sites all around the world, and instead proposes to invite the world's leading universities to come to join us at Berkeley. BGC represents a model of educational globalization that is sharply distinct from the 'commensalist' models of academic globalizations outlined above. These models of global engagement are all in one way or another premised on the educational analog to a "special economic zone," creating autonomous campuses that purport to be somehow "in" but not "of" the country in question.

What Berkeley envisions in BGC, by contrast, is a 'mutualist' model: a network in which all participants are full partners and actors in creating activities and initiatives. Rather that sallying forth to conquer the world, we wish to invite the world not just to partake of the benefits of our campus and region, but also to establish a genuinely global network of activities. BGC will be host to the research and educational facilities of a small set of elite partner universities from around the globe, as well as P3 research facilities. All of these facilities will be formed in partnership with specific research initiatives (both ongoing and new) that are taking place at Berkeley and in partner universities. As the BGC grows, we believe it will increasingly attract the most resources and talents of people from around the world, thus acting as a sort of tractor beam for drawing in the brightest lights from across the world into California.

The real innovation of BGC will be to create a new hierarchical network structure to transnational academic collaboration. This pushes it one step beyond the admirable work that Singapore has done in making multiple bilateral arrangements with foreign universities in order to turn the city-state into an "Educational Hub." In other words, where Singapore has been building a brilliant hub-and-spoke model, what we hope to do is to create a true *network* – a "Star Alliance" for international higher education. To

put it somewhat technically: whereas the topology of higher education has always been scale-free, our aim is to formalize the clustering among the world's top educational brands by creating an altogether new global structure.

Conclusion: The Global Public and the Public University

The globalization of higher education has accelerated rapidly over the last quarter century, motivated by a quest for additional revenues (especially in the case of Anglophone universities), a desire for greater international relevance and hence prestige (for all universities, but especially in the case of European and Asian universities), and a desire to provide a foundation for a knowledge economy (especially in the case of Asian universities).[25] But this is too limited a vision of global engagement.

As Berkeley embarks on its new venture, we will also provide new opportunities for our extraordinarily diverse student body to become not just citizens of California—the original charter of the land grant university—but of the world. We take this challenge quite literally, as we have decided to place at the core of the global campus a College of Advanced Study that will take on, in collaboration with academic partners from around the world, issues related to global governance, global ethics, global citizenship, and global relationships more broadly. The goal here is two-fold: the first, that universities represent the most successful experiments in global institution building; the second, that if universities work together to build global curricula and global platforms, for research and teaching, they might provide models and ideas that will predicate new ways of engaging—and reimagining—globalization itself. The new global campus with thus reflexively become a site for reflecting critically on the nature of globality, and for training those who aspire to participate in global governance.

This mutualist vision of the globalized university is rooted in a fundamental assessment of the inexorable direction of the global future, which is increasingly knitted together not just around a single global research enterprise, but also around the changing social and economic role of a preeminent research university like UC Berkeley in the 21st century. In contrast to the "high modernist" vision of the state university as a machine whose output would be knowledge workers contributing to the state economy—a major focal point of the 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education.

BGC represents the first-class research university as a focal point for enabling the state and its citizens to engage the world, connecting Berkeley scholars and local industry with researchers and innovators worldwide, and drawing human and financial capital from across the globe into the state. Rather than the cloistered space envisioned by the traditional inward-looking campuses, BGC will be a site for the flow of ideas, information, money, technology, and people—moving not only between Berkeley and foreign universities, but also between the private and public sectors, with increasing velocity as they pass through.

By acknowledging the irreversible force of global trends, the extent to which no local challenge is disconnected from global issues, and the powerful role that our universities—both within the United States and across the world—can play, we seek to establish a new kind of global presence that is fully in concert with our public mission. Berkeley is seeking to enable the renewal of its core ethical and political commitment to remaining an elite institution that enables the best and brightest Californians from all backgrounds to gain access to the highest echelons of research and opportunity. In sum, BGC offers what we hope to be a fundamental reimagining of the role of the state university in the age of globalization.

ENDNOTES

[1] Philip G.Altbach and Jane Knight, "The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities," *Journal of Studies in International Education* 11:3-4 (2007): 290-305; Poh-Kam Wong, Yuen-Ping Ho, and Annette Singh, "Towards an 'Entrepreneurial University' Model to Support Knowledge-Based Economic Development: The Case of the National University of Singapore," *World Development* 35:6 (2007): 941-958; Simon Marginson, "Dynamics of national and global competition in higher education," Higher Education 52:1 (2006): 1-39.

[2] John Seiler Brubacher and Willis Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities* (Transaction Publishers, 1997 [1956]): 14-16; David C. Humphrey, "Colonial Colleges and English Dissenting Academies: A Study in Transatlantic Culture," *History of Education Quarterly* 12:2 (1972): 184-197.

[3] See Gauri Viswanathan, "Yale College and the Culture of British Imperialism," *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 7:1 (1994): 1-30.

[4] Nicholas Dirks, *The Scandal of Empire: India and the Creation of Imperial Britain* (Harvard University Press, 2009).

[5] George M. Marsden, *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (Oxford University Press, 1994).

[6] Edward Gibbon, *Memoirs of the Life of Edward Gibbon* (Aberdeen University Press, 1900): 148.

[7] Jeremy Black, *Italy and the Grand Tour* (Yale, 2003): 11-12. See also: Bruce Radford, *Venice and the Grand Tour* (Yale, 1996). The 19th century also saw the beginning of "reverse Grand Tours," in which colonial elites visited European metropoles, experiencing often withering prejudice; see Jayati Gupta, "Modernity and the Global "Hindoo": The Concept of the Grand Tour in Colonial India," *The Global South* 2:1 (2008): 59–70.

[8] Michele Cohen, "The Grand Tour: Constructing the English Gentleman," *History of Education* 21:3 (1992): 241-257.

[9] Daniel T Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age* (Harvard, 1998).

[10] Earlier, during the Renaissance, Europe had a broad tradition of wandering scholars, with students going to sit at the foot of masters in Paris or Bologna. See Hilde de Ridder-Symoens, *Universities in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 1996).

[11] But not only: intellectual exchanges between Britain and Germany also grew rapidly in this period. See for example, Heather Ellis, "National and Transnational Spaces: Academic Networks and Scholarly Transfer between Britain and Germany in the Nineteenth Century," in Isabella Löhr and Roland Wenzlhuemer, eds., *The Nation State and Beyond: Governing Globalization Processes in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century* (Springer-Verlag, 2013).

[12] Christophe Charle, Jürgen Schriewer and Peter Wagner, eds. *Transnational Intellectual Networks: Forms of Academic Knowledge and the Search for Cultural Identities* (Campus Verlag, 2004).

[13] Albert H. Marckwardt, "The Humanities and Non-Western Studies," *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 356:1 (1964): 46.

[14] Chay Brooks, "The Ignorance of the Uneducated': Ford Foundation Philanthropy, the IIE, and the Geographies of Educational Exchange," *Journal of Historical Geography* 48 (2015); Liping Bu, "Educational Exchange and Cultural Diplomacy in the Cold War," *Journal of American Studies* 33:3 (1999): 393-415.

[15] Constantin Katsakioris, "The Soviet-South Encounter: Tensions in the Friendship with Afro-Asian Partners, 1945-1965," in Patryk Babiracki and Kenyon Zimmer, eds., *Cold War Crossings: International Travel and Exchange Across the Soviet Bloc, 1940s-1960s* (Texas A&M University Press, 2014).

[16] Pi-Yun Chen, "Transnational Education: Trend, Modes of Practices and Development," *International Journal of Information and Education Technology* 5:8 (2015): 634-637.

[17] Jason Lane & Kevin Kinser, "Is today's university the new multinational corporation?" 5 June 2015: https://theconversation.com/is-todays-university-the-new-multinational-corporation-40681.

[18] The term "International Branch Campus" first appeared in 1991 in Alan Wagner and Klaus Schnitzer, "Programmes and Policies for Foreign Students and Study Abroad: The Search for Effective Approaches in a New Global Setting," *Higher Education* 21:3 (1991): 275-288. Despite this early appearance of the phrase, the serious growth in this sector started only in the 2000s.

[19] http://www.globalhighered.org/

[20] Stephen Wilkins and Jeroen Huisman, "The International Branch Campus as Transnational Strategy in Higher Education," *Higher Education* 64:5 (2012): 627-645.

[21] Kris Olds, "Global Assemblage: Singapore, Foreign Universities, and the Construction of a 'Global Education Hub,'" *World Development* 35:6 (2007): 959-975.

[22] Philip G. Altbach, "Is There a Future for Branch Campuses?" *The International Imperative in Higher Education* (SensePublishers, 2013): 101-106.

[23] Patricia A. Pelfrey, "A Brief History of the Atkinson Presidency: 1995–2003," *The Pursuit of Knowledge: Speeches and Papers of Richard C. Atkinson* (2007): 1-8. Retrieved from: http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2nx02710.

[24] Kevin Kiley, "The Lure of the City," *Inside Higher Ed,* 20 December 2011: https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/12/20/cornell-and-technions-win-new-york-competition-reflects-desire-grow-urban-ties.

[25] Philip G.Altbach and Jane Knight, "The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities," *Journal of Studies in International Education* 11:3-4 (2007): 290-305; Poh-Kam Wong, Yuen-Ping Ho, and Annette Singh, "Towards an 'Entrepreneurial University' Model to Support Knowledge-Based Economic Development: The Case of the National University of Singapore," *World Development* 35:6 (2007): 941-958; Simon Marginson, "Dynamics of national and global competition in higher education," Higher Education 52:1 (2006): 1-39.