
Internationalization and the Cosmopolitical University

RODRIGO BRITZ & MICHAEL A. PETERS

*Department of Educational Policy Studies,
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA*

ABSTRACT This article discusses some of the issues that surround the internationalization of higher education as a way to open discussion about the construction of an alternative cosmopolitical vision of the university, necessary if the university is to fulfill any historic tasks concerning the creation of globally aware citizens. The authors indicate that economic and technological globalization has resulted not only in the growth of international education, but also in the increasing significance of transnational spaces. In this environment, the internationalization of higher education refers to strategies to attract students and also to specific patterns of movement. The authors maintain that the neo-liberal metanarrative informing strategies of internationalization not only ignores the complexity of those patterns of interaction, connectedness and movement, but also implies modes of insertion of higher education into transnational spaces, as receptors or senders of certain flows. The way in which students' movements are managed by university institutions and systems leads the authors to reflect about the cosmopolitical project of the university implicit in those strategies. The article presents different concepts of cosmopolitanism linked to projects of political integration in transnational spaces influencing university institutions and brings forward the argument that cosmopolitical neo-liberalism looks at the cultivation of students as consumers, ignoring the potential social and cultural disjunctures in current globalization projects. Moreover, it maintains that this neo-liberal project essentially ignores the potential contributions of university institutions to the creation of public transnational spaces. Finally, against this, the article presents a vision of a cosmopolitical project of the university as an alternative to the one implicit in neo-liberal internationalization strategies.

Introduction

In his book *Globalization*, Zygmunt Bauman (1998, p. 77) points out that mobility has become a byword of contemporary reality: 'nowadays we are all on the move'. Precisely, the current context of global connectedness and interaction generates a reality of increased mobilities and desires to be mobile by individuals and corporations. In this context, student populations at research universities around the world have become both more numerous and internationally diverse. This phenomenon is related not merely to the growing global demand for higher education, but also is a direct result of the increasing dependency of states and the influence of higher education institutions and their wealth on the capacity of states to participate and strategically position themselves in global markets. In those instances, the internationalization of higher education as part of a set of strategies to position higher education systems and institutions in a global context seems to be informed by the demands of neo-liberal capitalist economies and by a neo-liberal cosmopolitical concept of the university.

Basically, the neo-liberal position emphasizes the view of international students primarily as a strategic economic resource or a source of revenue for university institutions. Simply put, neo-

liberalism sees the export of institutional education services abroad as an economic export. This position is adopted by states in neo-liberal capitalist economies and subsequently enforced and encouraged by national education systems to pursue an economic agenda, even at the expense of the achievement of any political purposes regarding internationalism. We argue that in such instances, cosmopolitanism and the lure for cosmopolitan experiences and cosmopolitan practices become part of marketing apparatuses no different from those observed in the international recruiting of workers for transnational corporations. More importantly, we argue that these neo-liberal practices seem to ignore alternative ways of thinking transnational spaces, rather than viewing them as economic spaces of exchange or cultural spaces subordinated to the economy.

In this article, we discuss some of the issues that surround the internationalization of higher education as a way to open discussion about the construction of an alternative cosmopolitical vision of the university, which is necessary if the university is to fulfill any of its historic tasks concerning the creation of globally aware citizens. We begin with a historical overview of the notion of internationalization and indicate the way in which currently it has been used in higher education to refer to specific strategies to answer to globalization trends. We also indicate the way it has become subordinated to a neo-liberal metanarrative of development that contains a particular understanding of globalization and cosmopolitanism.

In the second, third and fourth sections, we indicate that economic and technological globalization has resulted not only in the growth of international education, but also in the increasing significance of transnational spaces, where accelerated patterns of interaction and worldwide connectedness can be best characterized in terms of global flows and networks. In this networked environment, the internationalization of higher education refers to strategies to attract students and also to specific patterns of movement. We maintain that the neo-liberal metanarrative informing strategies of internationalization not only ignores the complexity of those patterns of interaction, connectedness and movement, but also implies modes of insertion of higher education into transnational spaces, as receptors or senders of certain flows. The way in which students' movements are managed by university institutions and systems leads us to reflect about the cosmopolitical project of the university implicit in those strategies.

In the last section, we present different concepts of cosmopolitanism linked to projects of political integration in transnational spaces influencing university institutions. We argue that cosmopolitical neo-liberalism looks at the cultivation of students as consumers, ignoring the potential social and cultural disjunctures in current globalization projects. Moreover, we maintain that this neo-liberal project essentially ignores the potential contributions of university institutions to the creation of public transnational spaces. Finally, against this, we reflect on a vision of a cosmopolitical project of the university as an alternative to the one implicit in neo-liberal internationalization strategies.

Reconfiguring the Concept of Internationalization

Internationalization is a set of processes in search of a concept and theory of internationalism that has yet to be articulated. Most often, the use of the term 'internationalization' figures as a *strategy* with an emphasis on 'how to' questions, rather than a reflective discourse examining political ends or purposes. Increasingly, the term has become a significant part of strategic plans of universities, especially in the Western world, but more often than not the concept is not thought through or developed in line with the purposes of the university, but rather seen as a simple synonym for 'study abroad' or the recruitment of overseas students, especially by universities in neo-liberal economies that focus on 'export education'. Yet, the meaning of internationalization as a key word is indicative of a set of processes that have changed dramatically over time, most recently reflecting changes in the political economy of higher education and the global networked knowledge economy.

At this historical juncture in the development of the discourse, strategies and practices of internationalization, it is important to make explicit the different forms of internationalization that presently exist and to contextualize these forms in relation to the different means by which universities are linked to one another and the ways in which, as institutions, they are mediated by a historical diversity reflecting their colonial past, contemporary geopolitics and global location. A

consideration of these factors indicates that a more adequate understanding of the term is required and that the term should reflect a multidimensional understanding rather than being associated with a singular form or historical moment. Thus, we should talk of 'multiple dimensions' of internationalization in higher education.

We get some sense of this diversity in the ancient world, where internationalization was indicative of the process of exchange of ideas and the movement of students and itinerant scholars across territories. Internationalization in the ancient world was a common feature of the first academies in Pakistan, India, Egypt, China and Persia (Takschashila, Nalanda, Al-Azhar, Yuelu and Gandishapur) in the seventh and ninth centuries bc, attracting students from all over Asia and the Middle East. In the same way, it was a feature of the Academy established by Plato in 387 bc (also Kos, Rhodes and Alexandria) and traveling 'itinerant' scholars such as the sophists Protagoras, Gorgias, Prodicus and Hippias, who wandered throughout parts of Greece teaching the skills of rhetoric for a fee.

These exchanges were common among universities and followed the commercial exchanges and the circulation of cultural ideas across regions. It is difficult to consider scholar-sophists wandering across Greek states without a consideration of the diversity of links connecting those institutions or, indeed, 'traveling ideologies'. In similar terms, the first wave of internationalization in Europe during the period of the establishment of the medieval university (Magnuara and Salerno in the ninth century, Bologna in 1088, Paris in 1100, and Oxford and Cambridge shortly after) and cathedral schools established by papal bull operated under common dynamics of movement. Indeed, here the emphasis should be not only on exchange, but also on movement and linking across space – that is, an understanding of the early spatialization of knowledge that characterized the ancient and medieval worlds.

In the same way, we might also consider *translation* as a form of internationalization and the significance of the spread of texts not only from Egypt and Phoenicia to Greece, but also from Greek into Arabic, such as the wholesale translations that took place during the golden age (750-950) of Muslim scholarship, and into Latin, with the great revival of Greek texts. These translations and their protocols served to establish common patterns of exchange that favored the proliferation of texts from the East in fifteenth-century Italy, exerting a strong influence on sixteenth-century Britain. In all of these examples, a fundamental aspect to be noticed is the historical specificity in which the internationalization of ideas, the movement of scholars, the exchange of artifacts, the development of connections, and the direction and means of cultural mediation were established.

A full history of internationalization in the ancient and medieval world needs to take into account a complex set of movements that emphasizes the interrelationships between trade, conquest and traveling scholarship. For instance, those exchanges acquire particular characteristics that are the result of particular histories. In the case of Syria, internationalization is a complex process shaped by specific historical contexts, such as the Hellenization of Syria and the foundation of Gandishapur as a center of learning, enabling us to understand in retrospect how Greek science passed to the Arabic world, the way in which Christianity became a Hellenizing force, and the way in which Christian writers, scholars and scientists participated in those exchanges that crucially involved movement and the making of links and connections across territories. In the same way, in the contemporary period, academic exchanges still remain historically specific and part of a rich and complex history and global dynamics that also reflect dominance in a set of complex relationships and power relations.

Today, 'internationalization' in higher education has become a common phrase used by decision makers in higher learning institutions to refer to specific strategies implemented as an answer or solution to globalization trends. Internationalization is understood in most cases in narrow and instrumental terms. As Nelly P. Stromquist (2007, p. 81) notes, it most often characterizes the search for markets for students, 'rather than positioning the university's knowledge at the service of others'. In this case, internationalization as a strategy becomes subordinated to a particular understanding of globalization closely linked with a dominant political discourse as a term 'widely used only in [a] one-dimensional economic sense' (Beck, 2004, p. 135).

The most commonly used definition of internationalization of higher education, initially elaborated and subsequently adapted by Jane Knight and Hans de Wit in its most recent iteration

(Knight, 2003), is as follows: 'the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education' (Knight, 2004, p. 11).

However, in the current context, internationalization in most cases has to be understood very differently from 'internationalism'. The latter term is closer to the cultivation of a cosmopolitan perspective, while the former refers in practice 'to greater international presence by the dominant economic and political powers, usually guided by principles of marketing and competition' (Stromquist, 2007, p. 82).

Yet, the close connection between the root concept of internationalization and cosmopolitanism is thrown into some relief in its connection to internationalism understood as a theory of international relations, and opens up the discourse of internationalization to the consideration of cosmopolitanism and to the prospect of a form of internationalization tied to political purposes, inherent in notions of cosmopolitanism and the cosmopolitical university. One of the benefits of this conceptual move is that it enables us to understand that there are different projects of cosmopolitanization: for instance, one attached to a dominant discourse of economic globalization; another linked to the development of cosmopolitan perspectives and practices. In this case, a neo-liberal economic metanarrative of cosmopolitanism becomes the dominant view. Narratives of the cosmopolitan operate as 'bylines of globalization', which is to say that historically it is linked with the movements of people across borders, 'an outlook of those who look and journey beyond borders – whichever borders apply; of itinerant sages and scholars, warriors and aristocracies, merchants and moneylenders, journeying craftsmen, monks and pilgrims. The headings change with the times' (Pieterse, 2006, p. 1248).

However, contrary to the notion of the mere movement of people, goods and ideas, the notion of cosmopolitanism essentially refers to the ethos of traveling: institutionalized expectations, ethics and, overall, the actual practice and experience of movement across borders and territories. Nowadays, everyone travels. However, the ethos of our travel is quite diverse according to the circumstances. Analogously, it is important to question what kind of cosmopolitanization we are referring to. In other words, if cosmopolitanism refers to being a world citizen, then what are the experiences or practices of world citizenship and how are they fostered and enhanced by curricular, academic and administrative practices?

In this article, we argue that presently the narrative of cosmopolitanism which dominates the discourse of the internationalization of higher education institutions operates as a marketing strategy of corporate universities informed by neo-liberalism, rather than a critical position encompassing the political, social and cultural dimensions relevant to the practice and experience of being a world citizen. Thus, it becomes part of the normative project of cosmopolitanism, disassociated from practice – a neo-liberal cosmopolitical project of the university most often associated with the doctrine of 'free trade'.

The implementation of this cosmopolitical project certainly diminishes the value of study in university institutions. What makes the university different from a corporation? In part, it is the offering of something different from a banal form of cosmopolitanization, from travel as a kind of surface tourism. Only universities which attempt to differentiate themselves from the corporate form of and response to globalization can be genuinely called cosmopolitical in the actual sense of the term. By this, we mean those institutions that offer opportunities for the development of intellectual, social and life skills in their graduates, of the practice and experience of being a cosmopolitan citizen, and that offer something more than mere accreditation or perfunctory training for entrance into transnational labor markets and into a form of 'world citizenship'.

In short, we mean such institutions that offer a space to consider cosmopolitanism as an experience and form of *political action*; to recognize its many faces rather than it being merely an abstract, empty, ethical or normative position. We might say those higher learning institutions that recognize 'cosmopolitanism from below': the actual experience of world citizenship dominated by multi-ethnic diasporas, migrant experiences and the grass roots, as well as transnational enterprises.

Why is this important? It is because of the increasing relevance of two fundamental aspects in the contemporary historical period of globalization for the provision of quality education: networks and multiculturalism (Castells & Ince, 2003, p. 107). In other words, we can argue for the necessity

of an alternative cosmopolitical project of the university where 'multiethnicity and multiculturalism can be viewed as applied cosmopolitanism' (Pieterse, 2006, p. 1255).

Beck (2004, p. 134) indicates that cosmopolitanization refers to a multidimensional process, involving the formation of multiple identities and multiple loyalties, as well as the emergence and spread of multiple transnational lifestyles. Life in an age of globalization becomes a cosmopolitan reality, but globalization itself speaks of a multidimensional process that cannot be reduced solely to an economic discourse or a one-dimensional economic perspective.

Globalization speaks of the 'intensification of worldwide social relations which link localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa' (Giddens, 1990, p. 181). Changes in the modern condition are not produced in an empty space, but presuppose the existence of complex power relations that organize the contested decoding of the meaning of the world, and, thus, power relations emphasize a particular dimension of contemporary globalization. Hence, we can observe the way in which 'the multiple processes that constitute economic globalization inhabit and shape specific structurations of the economic, the political, the cultural, and the subjective' (Sassen, 2000, p. 215). At the same time, collective resistances and social, cultural and political dimensions influence the way in which economic globalization operates and how subjectivities giving meaning to the contemporary world are created.

In these terms, Beck's (2004) position that 'cosmopolitanization' is not merely 'economic globalization' seems correct. Cosmopolitanization is a multidimensional process which emphasizes the

fact that people have long been joined together between Moscow and Paris, Rio and Tokyo in a relationship of actual interdependence, which they help to intensify by their production and consumption, in the same way that the ensuing risks of civilization penetrate their everyday lives. (Beck, 2004, p. 136)

These processes of interaction are not new, and globalization processes in the past have shown the interdependence of communities across the planet. However, what is new is the emergence of a cosmopolitan perspective of reality, a self-consciousness that indicates the emergence of a social imaginary of reality which emphasizes multiple levels of interdependence – the tearing down and collapsing of some of the categories of political, cultural and social organization articulated in the first period of modernity.

In this context, higher education experiences a number of pressures not merely related to the primacy of economic demands and discourses. However, pressures related to the primacy of an 'internationalization' project are manifest in the dominant discourse of economic 'globalization', as well as observed in subtle responses affecting academic programs, faculty and students, and in the creation of administrative structures and new hierarchies of privilege (Stromquist, 2007, p. 81). For instance, mechanisms to expand the project of global education harmonize with a dominant metanarrative of globalization and can be observed in the GATS (General Agreement on Trade in Services) agreements on higher education, as well as in the links and growing partnerships between business firms and educational institutions. In the USA, the growing dependence of universities on external resources creates common patterns of development which influence the strategies adopted to answer those pressures – thus, emphasizing processes of integration of colleges and universities into the 'new economy' (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) as predominantly commercial enterprises.

However, universities are not corporations, but more complex institutions that have accumulated a number of contradictory roles not solely related to economic development. Universities are 'imagined communities' (in Benedict Anderson's [2006] sense) that have accumulated with time the changing aspirations and expectations of society at a time that encapsulated a number of contradictions. Those contradictory dynamics are characteristic of the particular tradition within an overall university system, the primacy of specific functions and the position of the institutions in national systems of education. For instance, the basic functions of the university were not merely related to the production and application of knowledge or training of a skilled labor force, but also operated as a mechanism of selection and formation of dominant elites, as well as the generation and transmission of ideology (Castells, 2001, p. 210).

The central question that we wish to pose is: What of universities considered in relation to internationalism rather than internationalization? It is a significant question because

internationalization is commonly seen as an all-encompassing concept that integrates many different activities such as forms of academic mobility, research collaboration on international development projects in higher education, curricular aspects in terms of the scope of programs and courses ('area studies') offered or changes in the curriculum of specific disciplines. It is also increasingly used as a rhetorical device to describe international exchanges in higher education and exchanges across nation states related to trends of a particular ethos of movement and, in the case of students, related to aspirations for an international experience in education that often have little to do with cosmopolitan perspectives. What might a theory of internationalism in relation to the university look like, what normative orientations would it imply and how might it guide the university in its practical strategies of internationalization? These questions also require a better understanding of the way in which internationalization differs from globalization.

Global Flows in Higher Education

A basic distinction between globalization and internationalization is that the latter is about 'bi-lateral or multi-lateral relations between individual nations: it presupposes the nation-state as the essential unit' (Marginson, 1999, p. 19). Globalization has different connotations: it also speaks of interconnectedness but it is not necessarily mediated by states. Therefore, patterns of interaction affecting higher education institutions indicate trends of worldwide connectedness that seem to be more properly analyzed in terms of networks and global flows (Marginson & Sawir, 2005).

One of the basic characteristics of contemporary globalization is the significant acceleration of interactions enabled by technology. Technologies of communication are shaping reality and reconfiguring world connectedness with concentrations of traffic taking place between some geographical nodes over others. Patterns of mobility and exchange have always been mediated by technologies of communication. We must remember that

[t]echnologies of communication are more than just nuts and bolts or ships and bites that constitute the apparatus they involve. Communication lies at the heart of sociality. It is the means by which symbolic knowledge is conveyed, stored, and circulated. Through communication people create connections between each other and construct communities of identity and belonging. Changes in the forms and scope of communication therefore impact on the nature of social interaction and the circulation of symbols, values, and cultural knowledge. (Schech & Haggis, 2000, p. 196)

Today, technologies of communication are globalizing forces through which projects of material integration of social spaces at a global scale are becoming possible, allowing for the emergence of 'a new material basis for time-sharing on which dominant activities are managed through flows' (Stalder, 2006, p. 6). In other words, they have made possible projects of global material and social integration. Transnational strategies of integration come to dominate the organization of economic activity through organizational networks (especially where corporations become transnational and finance becomes global). Networks based on information technologies are complex forms of organization that today dominate the way in which complex patterns of interaction are organized in the world.

The understanding of these processes of interconnectedness in terms of networks has the basic advantage of enabling an analysis 'based on flows, rather than isolated units, entities, and individuals' (Aneesh, 2006, p. 78), thereby allowing analysis of connectedness and of intrinsic interdependence (of economy, policy, society and culture) in terms of patterns of symbolic and material communication.

The strategies of states as well as higher education institutions are increasingly being formulated in relation to these global flows. In a world of interdependence, the ways in which exchanges are organized affect the ways in which individual institutions and states gain advantage or are relegated. There is an array of modes of insertion and participation in transnational spaces where the global production of wealth, power and experience is organized.

How to influence global patterns of movement, of people, ideas, money and technology, has become a critical and complex issue. In those instances, the 'internationalization' of higher education can be identified as a response to economic and technological globalization, and speaks of strategies emphasizing the attraction of specific global flows.

For most cases – and this only seems adequate for higher education institutions in the industrialized world – strategies of insertion in transnational spaces (for example, linking with industries, the recruitment of international students or international positioning through benchmarks) are related to a non-existent critical perspective of the transnational and the cosmopolitan, which we may assume is linked with a ‘neo-liberal cosmopolitical’ project of the university.

Student Mobility and the Internationalization of Higher Education

The *Global Education Digest 2006: comparing education statistics across the world*, published by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2006), clearly shows an aspect of this global context of increasing mobility and the growth of international education. The increase in mobility of ‘international mobile students’ has been marginal in relation to the total enrollment of students pursuing tertiary education. The flow of students moving abroad in pursuit of tertiary education increased by 41% between 1999 and 2004 from 1.75 million to 2.5 million at a time when enrollment in higher education increased dramatically from 92 to 132 million students.

This marginal growth in international mobile students has a contradictory correlation with the steady rise of economic globalization. Mobility has generated a complex picture of the provision of cross-border education as well as the way in which students’ mobility affects destination and sender countries and education systems. Currently, the USA, Japan, the United Kingdom, Germany, France and Australia account for 68% of the global mobile student population (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2006, p. 46). On the other hand, it is also noticeable that the greatest percentage and the most growth of global mobile students until recently have been in the Anglo-American neo-liberal capitalist economies of the USA, Australia, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Canada.

While the USA continues to be the favored place of destination for graduate education, since 2001 there has been a diminishing share of enrollment of the total international students, at a time when the United Kingdom and Australia have emerged as competing places of destination for large shares of undergraduate students. An article in the *New York Times*, ‘US Slips in Attracting the World’s Best Students’ (Dillon, 2004), indicates how the confluence of increased visa restrictions after September 11 and the aggressive competition over the recruiting of international students by other international providers – countries such as the United Kingdom and Australia – are affecting the enrollment of international students at US universities. In the same article, Tim O’Brien, at that time International Development Director at Nottingham Trent University in England, explained the diminishing share of enrollment of international students in US university institutions in the following terms:

International education is big business for all of the Anglophone countries, and the U.S. traditionally has dominated the market without having to try very hard ... Now Australia, the U.K., Ireland, New Zealand and Canada are competing for that dollar, and our lives have been made easier because of the difficulties that students are having getting into the U.S. (Dillon, 2004)

The destinations of students, observed in the case of the 15 major countries of destination, show a consistent pattern of concentration. Those countries raised their share of the global total of international students from 76% to 82% between 1994 and 2004 (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2006, p. 47). However the pattern of mobility of international students to those main countries of destination has its own dynamic patterns of concentration in the case of students seeking graduate and undergraduate education; hence countries capture different types of mobility.

In the case of graduate education, the USA seems to retain a large share of the mobility of highly skilled students in science and technology. This is, in part, explained by the role taken by higher education institutions in partnership with transnational corporations, as well as a long history of state-funded research strategies. The partnership with corporations is not only limited to research activities, but is linked to the recruitment of highly skilled workers for those corporations. Research universities in the USA attract flows of graduate international students not only to sustain the research activities in those institutions, but also so that they may serve as centers for the recruitment of highly skilled workers. The fact is that research centers at universities in the USA are heavily dependent on the constant flow of international graduate students to sustain the activities

of their research. Corporations also rely on attracting flows of highly skilled workers from foreign students graduating from US institutions. The current clamor by corporations in the USA over restrictions on visas for foreign workers is directly associated with international students graduating from higher education institutions in the USA. An article in the *Washington Post*, 'Gates Cites Hiring Woes, Criticizes Visa Restrictions' (Vise, 2005), mentions some of the comments made by Bill Gates, President of Microsoft Corporation, in a 2005 technology panel at the Library of Congress, illustrating this matter in unambiguous terms:

'We are very concerned that the U.S. will lose its competitive position. For Microsoft, it means we are having a tougher time hiring,' Gates said. 'The jobs are there, and they are good-paying jobs, but we don't have the same pipeline.'

Microsoft conducts 85 percent of its research in this country. 'We are very tied to the United States' when it comes to doing research and development on the company's Windows and Microsoft Office products, he said ...

Gates said the combination of tighter visa restrictions and increasing opportunity in rapidly growing economies in China and India means that more foreign students who study at U.S. universities are returning home to work, rather than seeking jobs in the United States. (Vise, 2005)

The restrictions on visas in the USA and the imperative to recruit international students for transnational corporations are not lost on those who pursue international education, regardless of the motivations that they may have to study abroad. As Rizvi (2005, p. 179) indicates: 'the motivations of students wanting to invest in international education vary ... [but] the desire to eventually immigrate has now been identified as one of the most important factors'.

Recruiting strategies (Australian Education International, 2005) are informed by the idea that international students are, to a great extent, strategic economic assets or new sources of revenue for university institutions and states (Middlehurst & Woodfield, 2004). This is associated, in part, with an international trend towards seeing education primarily as a trade commodity. Currently, the international education market is a great source of profits, already generating 'an estimated minimum of US\$30 billion in 1999, not much less than the financial services sector' (Larsen & Vincent-Lancrin, 2002). For instance, in 2008, 'export education' was Australia's third largest export, generating AU\$15.5 billion for the Australian economy (Australian Education International, 2009).

Finally, all countries are developing strategies to tap into the flows of international labor through their higher education systems. We see a complex picture where countries such as the USA are attempting to accommodate, in contradictory ways, strategies to tap into flows of graduate students in order to recruit potentially highly skilled workers. We see strategies by countries such as the United Kingdom (Johnes, 2004), Australia and others to trade educational services at an international level. Countries such as China are attempting to build their own university research capabilities and international reputation as higher education providers by seeking the collaboration of the knowledge diaspora of international graduates (Welch & Zhen, 2008), and increasing the number of their international students through government-sponsored scholarships (Wang, 2008); while other countries, such as the Philippines, are concentrating on strategies to trade skilled labor. The Philippines is one of the largest labor-exporting countries in the world (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2003), and its national system of higher education accommodates the training of highly skilled workers in certain fields (for example, nurses and teachers) to the requirements of foreign markets that demand their services.

These individual country strategies indicate a complex picture that is outside the scope of this article. However, this points to a context in which countries and universities are trying to position themselves in transnational spaces.

Networks and Power

One of the most relevant characteristics of globalization processes is the intensification of the flows of capital, goods and services, ideas, cultural symbols and people. As Castells (1999, p. 14) argues, technology has enabled the emergence of a new space of organization for dominant activities of the

world: from 'a space of places' to a 'space of flows'. Information technologies allow the digitalizing of 'different types of text (pictures, sounds, words)' (Schirato & Webb, 2003, p. 59), thus the convergence of different media, facilitating the processing and transferring of information. As Schirato & Webb (2003, p. 59) point out, those technologies facilitate the storage of ever-increasing amounts of information as well as the medium for its distribution in 'real-time' speed.

Hence, these technologies, rather than being solely technologies of material mobility, provide the means for virtual mobilities. Henceforth, the term 'space of flows' refers to a space of interaction where the mobility of the information contained in a book, a letter or a newspaper is no longer material because the information itself acquires a virtual form: it is immaterial in itself. Thus, information or any kind of code, including money, can be converted into any asset for instant transportation.

Those technologies are the ones closely related to current forms of global integration, providing 'affordances' (Benkler, 2006, p. 17) for reshaping main spheres of human activity, not only the economy. What we see is that the speed and mass information flows provide the basis for the development of dissimilar processes of integration. For instance, while financial flows become increasingly global and interdependent, the material movement of labor and people becomes increasingly dependent on states' policies and network strategies. This is to say that while capital becomes unbounded by operating through virtual mobilities, the free circulation of labor across state borders becomes increasingly problematic.

To understand this contradiction is precisely to understand that processes of global integration have been dominated since the 1980s by the metanarrative of a 'distinctive strand of neoliberalism' which emerged 'as the dominant paradigm of public policy in the West and continues to exert influence' (Peters & Besley, 2006, p. 31).

This dominant narrative has encapsulated globalization under a universal logic, as a basis for the global reconstruction of all aspects of society. In a sense, it is projects that have captured the policy agendas of most Western countries under the basic tenet of assuming human beings primarily as individual subjects of an economic rationale driven by self-interest. At the center of this ideology, mobility is seen as key to integration and wealth production. But, as we have indicated, it is also producing new forms of disadvantage and difference.

One of the fundamental problems with this neo-liberal narrative is precisely the lack of reflexive engagement with the potential consequences and complex dynamics of increasing transnational mobilities. For once, these flows are mainly organized through networks of the most varied kind – such as intergovernmental organizations, transnational corporations, non-governmental organizations (Held et al, 1999) and diasporic communities – where communications networks provide the material base for organizational forms distinct from those of traditional hierarchies. To be more precise, these networks are 'buil[t] around material and symbolic flows that link people and objects both locally and globally without regard for traditional national, institutional organizational boundaries' (Monge & Contractor, 2003, p. 4).

The way in which they mobilize is based on complex dynamics that include the creation of meaning and cultural values which are not necessarily subject to a dominant individualist economic rationale. Thus, it is within an understanding of these patterns of communication and movement that we can begin to understand their effects on higher education.

Concomitantly, power in networks is relational rather than based on markets or hierarchies, based on groups of individuals rather than individuals, as Monge & Contractor point out:

The theoretical mechanism that generates most network organizations are exchange and dependency relations. Rather than being organized around market or hierarchical principles, network organizations are created out of complex webs of exchange and dependency relations among multiple organizations. (Monge & Contractor, 2003, p. 219)

Those are fundamental aspects characteristic of the emergent organizational forms that appear to become a dominant influence in the organization of transnational mobilities. In a sense, communication networks are 'patterns of contact that are created by the flow of messages among communicators through time and space' (Monge & Contractor, 2003, p. 3), at a time when these networks favor forms of organization for material mobility.

In those instances, the internationalization of higher education as a set of strategies informed by the metanarrative of neo-liberalism offers a poor understanding of these processes and their

significance. The organizing principles of movement are not markets, or exclusively commercial concerns, but issues such as information, resources, trust and cultural values. Thus, it is defined in terms of relations and flows.

For instance, Meyer (2001) indicates the way in which the international intellectual mobility of knowledge networks at universities operates through networks linking diaspora members with their countries of origin. The relationships that enable this form of travel are quite different from the ones that characterize the linking to transnational corporations operating through 'head-hunting' companies recruiting skilled workers to be shipped to transnational labor markets. Different instances of the international mobility of people occur under different ethos, expectations, purposes and strategies.

The question 'What flows are universities tapping into?' is not merely a question about strategy, but also about purposes and political ends. If the consideration is merely to attract new sources of revenue, in the form of student recruitment, the internationalization of education begins to acquire the forms of an advertising campaign selling the fantasy of a cosmopolitan experience, not dissimilar to those used by transnational 'body-shopping' firms.

Those marketing campaigns can acquire bizarre formats, as seen in a recent article in the *Guardian* entitled 'Reality TV Hunt for Students' (Hemmens, 2007). The article describes a planned reality television show in which students from India will compete to obtain five scholarships to five universities in the United Kingdom (Cardiff, Leeds, Middlesex, Sheffield and Warwick):

The show then goes live in July, with tests selecting winners subject by subject. It runs until November, following the winners to university. BSkyB will air the show in Britain. Fees for overseas business undergraduates at Leeds for 2007-08 are nearly £9,000. The vice-chancellor of Leeds, Michael Arthur, said the business school had about 70 Indian students, mostly graduates. 'This will help Leeds raise its profile further in India and show potential students how much the university has to offer.' (Hemmens, 2007, para. 3-4)

By adopting certain strategies, university institutions choose modes of integration with transnational spaces that define their positions within networks as receptors or senders of certain flows. The sources of wealth and influence of nation states and university institutions, as well as the sources of exclusion across transnational spaces, become linked to the capacity to sway those mobilities. For instance, in an increasingly globalized economy, we see an increasing dependence on a global workforce. In addition, the reliance of the more productive segments of the economy, a 'new economy', becomes linked to a constant flow of skilled workers and highly skilled knowledge producers, as well as cultural producers.

The purpose and content of movements that influence the position of university institutions in distribution networks (for example, as places for the generation of ideas, accreditation or access to the transnational labor market) become more than a question of advertising. Instead, the content of flows requires a serious reflection about the way in which differences are managed within higher education institutions. In short, it is to discuss the cosmopolitical project of the university implicit in strategies of internationalization.

Three Concepts of the Cosmopolitical University

To talk of the cosmopolitical university is immediately to invoke a globally oriented institution that aims at the cultivation of globally minded citizens. In short, it is oriented to the cultivation of cosmopolitan citizens, scholars and researchers rather than merely national citizens.

As Derek Heater (2004, p. 218) indicates, the idea of a 'citizen of the world', though vague, has been characterized by 'the conviction that the world citizenship ideal has a practical validity and moral worth', which has been a persistent feature of Western political thinking. Indeed, the root stock of the word first used in 1614 to mean 'citizen of the world' derives from the Greek *kosmopolites* (*kosmos*, meaning 'world'; *polites*, meaning 'citizen'; and *polis*, meaning 'city'). 'Cosmopolitanism', with its first-recorded use in 1828, registers the idea that there is a *single moral community* based on the idea of freedom and, thus, in the early twenty-first century, it is also seen as a major theoretical buttress to the concept of universal human rights that transcends all national, cultural and state boundaries.

While the Greeks had a concept of 'cosmopolitanism' that issued from the sophists against the form of political culture advocated by Plato and Aristotle, which was wedded to the city and its citizens, and later took a Stoic form that was popular with early Christianity, its modern form emerged with the Enlightenment and was associated first with Erasmus's humanism and with the development of the doctrine of natural law.

Montesquieu, Voltaire, Diderot, Addison, Hume and Jefferson all saw themselves as cosmopolitans, but it was Kant (1991) who defended and popularized the idea that human beings belong to a single moral community sharing the characteristics of freedom, equality and autonomy that ground the concept and legitimacy of law.

The notion of the 'citizen of the world' or 'global citizens', in its oldest incarnation, is associated with ideas of cosmopolitanism. But, the capacity of cosmopolitans to proclaim the idea of a moral community and to travel has always been dependent on the capacity of states to guarantee safety and movement. At this point, Bowden points out an obvious dilemma confronting the idea of cosmopolitan global citizenship:

For cosmopolitan advocates of global citizenship there is an inescapable dilemma that is still to be addressed with any degree of satisfaction. If cosmopolites embrace and advocate only Western liberal-democratic values at the expense of non-Western values, then they are not truly multicultural pluralist cosmopolitans at all. Rather, they are (at best) cultural imperialists, perpetuating the Western Enlightenment's long history of universalism-cum-imperialism. On the other hand, if repelled by this prospect, cosmopolitans instead embrace cultural pluralism, that is, if they embrace all (or a broad range of) values, then it may very well be the case that they lack any, as Pagden suggests. And as Arendt rightly points out, as nothing more than human beings in general they lose all significance. (Bowden, 2003, p. 360)

In this article, we do not directly address this dilemma, although it is clear that the formulation avoids the fact that ideas which spring from one locality can take on universal significance, as in science, the adoption of universal number systems and also the ideology of human rights. However, we will indicate that cosmopolitan values which transcend all national, cultural and state boundaries are generally considered an essential component of cultivating the cosmopolitan perspectives of globally minded citizens. At this point, two questions become obvious: What kind of cosmopolitan values and what kind of globally minded citizens?

Besides moral and political (or legal) cosmopolitanism, there is also a form of economic cosmopolitanism associated with the work of Adam Smith, who sought to diminish the role of politics in the economic realm. Said to date from Quesnay, the notion of economic cosmopolitanism has been promoted strongly in the twentieth century by Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, and taken up in a particular form of neo-liberalism that now characterizes the policies of the World Trade Organization.

In contemporary discourse, cosmopolitanism is often referred to under the term 'globalization' and includes economic (neo-liberal) cosmopolitanism, political cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan law based on a form of moral universalism. For all three accounts, as Thomas Pogge (1992) notes, there is, first, an assumption of *individualism* (the unit of analysis is the individual rather than the state or some other entity); second, the assumption of *universality*; and, finally, an assumption of generality: 'the primary concern for the individual is extended to all humanity' (Bowden, 2003, p. 354).

In a liberal framework, these are the three more prominent forms of contemporary cosmopolitanism: Kantian moral cosmopolitanism represented by the discourse of human rights and, perhaps, institutionally by the United Nations; Kantian political cosmopolitanism represented by the likes of Habermas, Rawls, Beitz, Pogge and cosmopolitan democracy, argued by Held; and, finally, economic cosmopolitanism currently best exemplified by a form of neo-liberal 'free trade'.

Furthermore, each of these concepts of cosmopolitanism informs competing projects of political integration in transnational spaces influencing university institutions. More precisely, within those projects are the ideas influencing the type of globally minded citizens to be cultivated by universities.

For instance, cosmopolitan neo-liberalism assumes citizens as consumers. This perspective assumes that 'cosmopolitanism' is only a type of global commodity subordinated to the demands of capital. Students are considered consumers in transnational spaces, while university institutions

provide narratives and expectations of 'world citizenship' where cosmopolitan experiences and consumption become one and the same.

Neo-liberalism assumes an unbounded world in which nation states operate exclusively under the logic of the economic activity of supranational spaces. In these circumstances, international students are not only considered a mere reflection of the erosion of boundaries and frontiers, but also part of an ambivalent reality dominated by economic rationalities and perspectives.

The cosmopolitan values that dominate this concept are clear: the values of the consumer of transnational spaces. 'Cosmopolitan' refers to a specific type of traveler, the one who is able to choose where to be and to live without subjecting his or her own cultural values to the exchange and test of the host culture. In other words, universal values like freedom of movement are part of an image of the cosmopolitan citizen but they are restricted to those able to purchase and afford movement. Habermas (2003) points out some of the problems of the assumptions made by the advocates of this project, especially given the consideration of the potentially unintended consequences of a project articulated primordially in economic terms that creates forms of social integration of segments of the global population while encouraging forms of exclusion and marginalization for vast segments of the world population.

Furthermore, the attempt to cultivate globally minded citizens subordinated to this kind of cosmopolitanism is characterized by empty forms of political practices. Subtle feelings and growing sensibilities toward unfamiliar spaces become void. In other words, this is the cultivation of a type of cosmopolitan citizenship that does not demand any kind of responsibility or awareness towards others, toward their cultures, languages and traditions. Consequently, it cultivates perspectives which ignore that exclusion for most of the people on this planet is still operating through the government of spaces and territories, and over a large array of cosmopolitan experiences and differences.

Moreover, strategies of the internationalization of higher education subordinated to the primacy of this form of cosmopolitical vision of the university not only ignore the social and political roles that universities have played through time, but are unable to enhance educational experiences through the cultivation of cosmopolitan perspectives about the diversity and the preservation of the diversity of knowledge, languages and cultures.

Again, Appadurai (1996, p. 24) has noted that 'diversity is a particular organization of difference. The question is what kind of organization?' It is possible to say that if we are going to speak of a cosmopolitical project of the university, we also must refer to the way in which the 'economy of diversity' is managed in the academy.

We could assume that difference is managed in the academy according to the type of policies applied and, to the point of interest in this article, the type of cosmopolitical project that generates those political practices. In these terms, it may be that the official discourse of the university on internationalization is one of an essentially empty nature, driven by strategy and little awareness of broader philosophical goals or purposes: for instance, using the goal of promoting globally minded citizens as a marketing tool, or enunciating diversity by simply asserting the recruitment of students of color, international students, or scholars, as if diversity 'is a mechanical good' (Appadurai, 1996, p. 24).

In this article, we maintain that alternative ideas of the cosmopolitical university are possible. For instance, Kantian moral and legal cosmopolitanism are two projects that still have the potential as alternative projects of social integration. Both projects refer to the construction of democratic universes based on the construction of supranational political formations that point to the silent aspect of a project based on the idea of a cosmopolitan citizen as a consumer of markets: 'markets, unlike political entities, cannot be democratized' (Habermas, 2003, p. 95). Alternatives are necessary if we take into consideration the inability of cosmopolitical concepts of the university informed by neo-liberalism to address two critical aspects for the future development of higher education institutions.

First is the management of diversity. What makes colleges and universities different from specialized research centers or professional credentialed spaces today? Appadurai's (1996, p. 27) answer is that the 'university is also about thought and reflection, cultivation and conscience, disinterest and abreaction, literacy and cosmopolitanism.' Because the liberal arts remain quintessentially cosmopolitan, they provide a space for the cultivation of a specific cosmopolitan

habitus of research and inquiry. However, this is only possible today with the humanities that are able to escape traditional frameworks of reference. Thus, the humanities must be able to escape their local origins and trajectories, and broaden their accounts to take in the radical pluralism existing as part of a new globalism recognizing the claims of local autonomy made by first peoples, indigenous peoples, sub-state cultural minorities, international religious movements, youth cultures, gender groups and all sorts of political associations (Peters, 2007, p. 8).

The idea is that the creation of a research habitus cultivates a cosmopolitan perspective, rather than being merely a vocational habitus limited to the professional training of graduate students. The care and cultivation of habits of research and inquiry are based in the cultivation of a specific type of 'cosmopolitan self' and thus the object of post-humanistic pedagogies that focus on projects of organization of difference which cultivate a perspective that seriously engages the values of diversity.

First, the quality of the academic experience is not based on quantity but the acquisition of a habitus of quality control. In Appadurai's (1996, p. 25) words: 'the true scarcity is not of great books – an odd idea – but opportunities to impress upon students the right norms of quality control.' In other words, quality in the academy is tied to the creation of ecologies for organizing diversity: a culture of diversity rather than cultural diversity. It is dependent on political administrative practices, a management of diversity that allows the creation of an institutional climate 'that is actually hospitable to diversity: one which puts diversity at the center of the curriculum and the demographics of the university, rather than at its statistical or conceptual margin' (Appadurai, 1996, p. 26). Without 'conscious commitment to the mutual value of intellectual and cultural diversity' at the university, it is not possible to create a 'habitus where diversity is at the heart of the apparatus itself' (Appadurai, 1996, p. 26).

Today, quality education in research institutions requires the cultivation of a 'cosmopolitan perspective' as the habitus of research and inquiry. For university systems, university institutions and university sectors to become globalized in complex institutional settings, the following questions remain: What types of education will modern universities provide, to whom and in what spaces? How will the cosmopolitan political practices of universities be established? The potential of modern universities or their eventual irrelevance as educative and research spaces will probably be defined in those terms, as well as the potential sites of stratification within higher education systems.

In those terms, the relevance of universities as research spaces seems linked to developing strong forms of internationalization. A notion of 'strong internationalization' (in Appadurai's [2000] sense) implies the creation of open environments of debate about research. Hence, forms of strong internationalization require the cultivation of a climate of collaboration and 'conversation about research' with 'scholars from other societies and traditions of inquiry' (Appadurai, 2000, p. 14). In other words, this requires the development of a cosmopolitan research ethic of collaboration, allowing the recognition of different ways of imagining research and supporting the development of a more democratic global knowledge community of teaching and learning.

The second critical aspect about the future development of higher education institutions is the social role of universities: What will be the social role of universities in transnational spaces? This is an ethical question not only about the type of university, but the political project that we would like to see developed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, if we ask the question 'What kind of "cosmopolitan selves" is the project of the university cultivating?', we are also asking questions about ethics and politics (Peters, 2007, p. 8), and, according to the project of the cosmopolitical university, these questions will be answered in different ways.

We assume that the potential of the modern university as part of a democratic project will examine cosmopolitan political practices, looking for a humanistic view of cosmopolitanism, such as the one explicitly adopted by Derrida (2001): recuperating ancient concepts of friendship, the ethics of hospitality, forgiveness and the gift – the invitation that outlines his account of responsibility to the other (Peters, 2007, p. 8). Only in those instances will projects of the

internationalization of higher education also include places of critical resistance and dissidence against cosmopolitanization processes, and cosmopolitan political practices made under the claim of universal humanism or one culture – a claim of universal superiority characteristic of fundamentalist movements.

References

- Anderson, B. (2006) *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Aneesh, A. (2006) *Virtual Migration*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Appadurai, A. (1996) Diversity and Disciplinarity as Cultural Artifacts, in C. Nelson & D.P. Gaonkar (Eds) *Disciplinary and Dissent in Cultural Studies*, 23-36. New York: Routledge.
- Appadurai, A. (2000) Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination, *Public Culture*, 12(1), 1-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/08992363-12-1-1>
- Australian Education International (June 2009) Research Snapshot: export income to Australia from education services in 2008. http://aei.gov.au/AEI/PublicationsAndResearch/Snapshots/50SS09_pdf.pdf (accessed November 2009).
- Bauman, Z. (1998) *Globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Beck, U. (2004) Cosmopolitan Realism: on the distinction between cosmopolitanism in philosophy and the social sciences, *Global Networks*, 4(2), 131-156. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0374.2004.00084.x>
- Benkler, Y. (2006) *The Wealth of Networks*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bowden, B. (2003) The Perils of Global Citizenship, *Citizenship Studies*, 4(3), 349-362. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13621020302213>
- Castells, M. (1999) Flows, Networks, and Identities: a critical theory of the informational society, in M. Castells, R. Flecha, P. Freire, H.A. Giroux, D. Macedo & P. Willis (Eds) *Critical Education in the New Information Age*, 37-64. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Castells, M. (2001) Universities as Dynamic Systems of Contradictory Functions, in J. Muller, N. Cloete & S. Badat, *Challenges of Globalisation: South African debates with Manuel Castells*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.
- Castells, M. & Ince, M. (2003) *Conversations with Manuel Castells*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Derrida, J. (2001) *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. New York: Routledge.
- Dillon, S. (2004) US Slips in Attracting the World's Best Students, *New York Times*, 21 December. <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/12/21/national/21global.html?th>
- Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Habermas, J. (2003) Toward a Cosmopolitan Europe, *Journal of Democracy*, 14(4), 86-100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jod.2003.0077>
- Heater, D. (2004) *A History of Education for Citizenship*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Held, D., Grew, A., Goldblatt, D. & Perraton, J. (1999) *Global Transformations: politics, economics, and culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hemmens, W. (2007) Reality TV Hunt for Students, *Guardian*, 7 April. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2007/apr/05/highereducation.education>
- Johnes, G. (2004) *The Global Value of Education and Training Exports to the UK Economy*. London: British Council. <http://gianlucasalvatori.nova100.ilssole24ore.com/files/global-value-of-education-and-training-exports-to-the-uk-economy.pdf>
- Kant, I. (1991) Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose, in H. Reiss & H.B. Nisbet (Eds) *Kant*, 41-53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knight, J. (2003) Updated Internationalization Definition, *International Higher Education*, 33, 2-3.
- Knight, J. (2004) Internationalization Remodeled, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1028315303260832>
- Larsen, K. & Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2002) The Learning Business: can trade in international education work? *OECD Observer*, 235(December). http://www.oecdobserver.org/news/fullstory.php/aid/872/The_learning_business.html
- Marginson, S. (1999) After Globalization: emerging politics of education, *Journal of Education Policy*, 14(1), 19-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/026809399286477>

- Marginson, S. & Sawir, E. (2005) Interrogating Global Flows in Higher Education, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 3(3), 281-309.
- Meyer, J.P. (2001) Network Approach versus Brain Drain: lessons from the diaspora, *International Migration*, 39(5), 91-110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2435.00173>
- Middlehurst, R. & Woodfield, S. (2004) *The Role of Transnational, Private, and For-Profit Provision in Meeting Global Demand for Tertiary Education: mapping, regulation and impact*. Vancouver: Commonwealth of Learning.
http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/files/31948/10880658943INF6ETransnational_Summary_Report.pdf/INF6ETransnational%2BSummary%2BReport.pdf
- Monge, P. & Contractor, N. (2003) *Theories of Communication Networks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2003) *Trends in International Migration: SOPEMI 2002 edition*. Paris: OECD.
http://www.oecd.org/document/3/0,3343,en_2649_33931_31844576_1_1_1_1,00.html
- Peters, M.A. (2007) The Humanities in Deconstruction: raising the question of the post-colonial university, *Access*, 26(1), 1-11.
- Peters, M.A. & Besley, A.C. (2006) *Building Knowledge Cultures: education and development in the age of knowledge capitalism*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Pieterse, J.N. (2006) Emancipatory Cosmopolitanism: towards an agenda, *Development and Change*, 37(6), 1247-1257. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2006.00521.x>
- Pogge, T.W. (1992) Cosmopolitanism and Sovereignty, *Ethics*, 103(1), 48-75.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/293470>
- Rizvi, F. (2005) Rethinking Brain Drain in the Era of Globalization, *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 25(2), 175-193. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02188790500337965>
- Sassen, S. (2000) Spatialities and Temporalities of the Global, *Public Culture*, 12(1), 214-232.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/08992363-12-1-215>
- Schech, S. & Haggis, J. (2000) *Culture and Development: a critical introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schirato, T. & Webb, J. (2003) *Understanding Globalization*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2004) *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Stalder, F. (2006) *Manuel Castells*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Stromquist, N.P. (2007) Internationalization as a Response to Globalization, *Higher Education*, 53(1), 81-105.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-005-1975-5>
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) (2006) *Global Education Digest 2006: comparing education statistics across the world*. Montreal: UIS. <http://www.uis.unesco.org/TEMPLATE/pdf/ged/2006/GED2006.pdf>
- Vise, D.A. (2005) Gates Cites Hiring Woes, Criticizes Visa Restrictions, *Washington Post*, 28 April.
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/04/27/AR2005042702241.html>
- Wang, Y. (2008) Foreign Student Quota to Expand, *China Daily*, 29 July.
http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2008-07/29/content_6884445.htm
- Welch, A. & Zhen, Z. (2008) The Chinese Knowledge Diaspora: communication networks among overseas Chinese intellectuals, in D. Epstein, R. Boden, R. Deem, F. Rizvi & S. Wright (Eds) *Geographies of Knowledge, Geometries of Power: framing the future of higher education*, 338-354. New York: Routledge

RODRIGO BRITZ is a PhD student in Educational Policy at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA. His major research interests include globalization and education policy, higher education policy in South America and networks of governance in higher education policy. He is currently working on issues relating to social networks and the role of transnational agencies in policy processes in higher education. *Correspondence:* Rodrigo Britz, Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 360 Education Building, 1310 South 6th Street, Champaign, IL 61820, USA (britezcarli@gmail.com).

MICHAEL A. PETERS is Professor of Education in the Department of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA, and the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (School of Art), Australia. He is the founding editor of *Policy Futures in Education*. He held joint professorial positions at the Universities of Auckland, New Zealand, and Glasgow,

United Kingdom. He was elected Academic Vice-President of the Association of University Teachers of New Zealand and elected an Inaugural Fellow of the New Zealand Academy of the Humanities. He is the executive editor of *Educational Philosophy and Theory* (Blackwell) and editor of *E-Learning* (Symposium Journals). His interests focus broadly on education, philosophy and social theory, and he has written some 50 books and many academic articles, including, most recently: *Derrida, Deconstruction, and the Politics of Pedagogy* (Peter Lang, 2008) with Gert Biesta; *Neoliberalism and Intellectual Life* (Sense, 2009) with Peter Roberts; *Showing and Doing: Wittgenstein as pedagogical philosopher* (Paradigm, 2008) with Nick Burbules & Paul Smeyers; *Global Knowledge Cultures* (Sense, 2007) with Cushla Kapitzke; *Knowledge Economy, Development and the Future of Higher Education* (Sense, 2007); and *Subjectivity and Truth: Foucault, education, and the culture of self* (Peter Lang, 2007), *Why Foucault? New Directions in Educational Research* (Peter Lang, 2006) and *Building Knowledge Cultures: education and development in the age of knowledge capitalism* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2006) all with Tina Besley. Currently, he is writing a number of books including *The Virtues of Openness: education and scholarship in a digital age* (Paradigm) with Peter Roberts, and the final book in a trilogy with Simon Marginson & Peter Murphy: *Creativity and the Global Knowledge Economy* (Peter Lang, 2008); *Global Creation: space, mobility and synchrony in the age of the knowledge economy* (Peter Lang, 2009) and *Imagination: three models of imagination in the age of the knowledge economy*. Correspondence: Professor Michael A. Peters, Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 360 Education Building, 1310 South 6th Street, Champaign, IL 61820, USA (mpet001@illinois.edu).