

# THE ARTICULATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXPERTISE IN THE PROFESSIONS

Michael D. Kennedy and Elaine S. Weiner  
The University of Michigan

Please direct correspondence to  
midake@umich.edu  
International Institute  
<http://www.umich.edu/~iinet/>  
University of Michigan  
February 24, 2003

Prepared for presentation at  
Global Challenges & US Higher Education,  
Duke University  
January 23-25, 2003  
<http://www.duke.edu/web/cis/globalchallenges/>

## Abstract:

Over the 1990s, professional schools in US higher education significantly extended their international reference in the mission to globalize. Professional schools articulate that commitment in different ways, however. We review representations of leading professional schools' international ambitions and consider their existing and potential articulation with area studies and its contextual expertise. Beyond obvious markers of affinity with joint degrees and emphases on place, we also explore how one might extend the contextual expertise of area studies into the problem formation of research and education in the professions. In general, we recommend that we consider how to extend the American academy's engagement with publics abroad, on the one hand, and extend the American public's debate about globalization's value and alternatives by drawing professional students from abroad into the constitution of global publics on American campuses.

\* We have already received considerable assistance on several parts of this essay from many colleagues at the Global Challenges and US Higher Education conference and beyond. We are grateful to all and we welcome additional comments. We are especially interested in those ideas that might increase the articulation of professional expertise with the contextual expertise of area studies. We would be very pleased to weave those reactions into subsequent versions of this article, so that the text itself might represent the very process of collaboration this endeavor seeks to realize on the ground in the internationalization of knowledge cultures.

# THE ARTICULATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXPERTISE IN THE PROFESSIONS

Michael D. Kennedy and Elaine S. Weiner

One might identify two waves in the internationalization of knowledge cultures at US universities: one associated with the Cold War and area studies, and the second associated with globalization and the diffusion of claims to international competence. Gil Merx has written an excellent organizational sociology of this transformation,<sup>1</sup> in which the former era is characterized by a decentralized, relatively limited and rarely prioritized array of international efforts, focused in various international relations, area studies and development studies projects. The second era is characterized by the development of a university-wide mission in the internationalization of knowledge in which a wide array of professions come to use globalization as their marker of achievement.

Internationalization's extension has also led university presidents and chancellors to identify the distribution of internationalism's benefits across the whole of the university as a priority.<sup>2</sup>

Extending internationalism can crash, however, on the shoals of very different sensibilities of globalizing knowledge. In this paper, we explore some of that variety within and across the professions, and the different ways in which those approaches articulate with area studies. By considering this variety in more systematic fashion, we can identify new opportunities and overlooked barriers to the globalization of knowledge across the US university, and in this way refashion a sense of need in the globalization of professions that extends beyond both first and second wave in anticipation of a new internationalism befitting the twenty-first century.

While we focus in this paper on the variety of international professionalisms, one could undertake a similar exploration of the variety of area studies projects. There is, of course, a common sense of area studies as an investment in interdisciplinary assemblies of scholars from the humanities and social sciences with expertise on particular regions of the world.<sup>3</sup> However, each region is associated with a different configuration of scholarship and support. While the US Department of Education can fund the study of all regions, some regions are more likely to have additional private endowments. While we might say that history, political science and language/literature faculty “typically” organize area studies, anthropologists are especially prominent in leading South Asian studies while the literary are surprisingly absent from West European leadership. The southern side of the world seems to have greater disciplinary diversity in its leadership than the north.<sup>4</sup> There is great variety in area studies to be explored and explained; its homogeneity across regions, and across universities, should not be assumed. However, one commonality prompts much of the generalizing about area studies.

Area studies was founded in a security culture that emphasized the importance of cumulating knowledge about temporally and spatially bounded cultural and social processes. The knowledge cultures connected with globalization are associated with the decreasing significance of political boundaries and the diversification of knowledge flows about the world. This distinction between knowledge cultures is no longer so powerful in the wake of 9/11/01 and its aftermath, however, and deserves sustained reconsideration in the articulation of need in the globalization of knowledge.

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE

If one can't easily generalize about area studies, one certainly can't about professions: not only do they organize different bodies of knowledge, but they also occupy very different statuses in power and privilege and consequently, deploy different strategies to advance their interests. Given this variety, there are critically important differences in the ways in which different professions, and different groups within professions, view the world.<sup>5</sup>

Nonetheless, here too, there are some important commonalities. They are reproduced through higher education; one can therefore reshape professions by engaging higher education. They also have relatively clear hierarchies; by shaping leading professional schools, one also increases the chance of reshaping an entire profession by encouraging the transformation of the most influential.<sup>6</sup> There are critical debates particular to each of the professions, but it is also possible to read some debates across professions. Given the politics of globalization itself, all the globalizing professions must ask, at some level, for whom they globalize. By considering this question across professions in their engagements across the world, one might find new synergies that allow not only the extension of area studies, but also the transformation of professions. It is also clear, however, that this extension cannot happen simply, within existing frames of either area studies or professional expertise. It also can't happen by fiat; this new project must happen in collaboration, across professions and international studies. Finally, this new internationalism requires more than adding programs; it requires a new vision of international engagement, one that should start by considering how professions are themselves globalizing.

We focus in this paper on the five leading schools<sup>7</sup> in nine fields.<sup>8</sup> Because of the importance of going beyond the website “front region”<sup>9</sup> to get off and back stage in understanding the dynamics of intellectual transformation, we also add the case we know best, the University of Michigan, when it is not otherwise part of the assembly. Drawing on website representations about missions, special features, curricular programs, and other activities, we paint brief portraits of this professional variety in international engagement. But in order to present a point to this variety, we also ask about the grounds of this globalizing knowledge by considering how each profession situates its knowledge in place and time. In other words, how does it articulate the value of contextual expertise?

Table 1: TOP FIVE SCHOOLS IN NINE FIELDS\*

1. Architecture/Planning (Harvard, MIT, Princeton, Columbia, Yale + Michigan)
2. Information (Michigan, Illinois, Pittsburg, Syracuse, Berkeley)
3. Public Policy (Harvard, Syracuse, Indiana, Princeton, Berkeley, + Michigan)
4. Natural Resources and Environment (Yale, Duke, Michigan, Berkeley, Wisconsin)
5. Public Health, (Hopkins, Harvard, North Carolina, Michigan, Washington)
6. Medicine (Harvard, Hopkins, Washington University, Pennsylvania, Duke, + Michigan)
7. Engineering (mechanical, civil and naval – MIT, Stanford, Georgia Institute for Technology, University of Illinois, Michigan)
8. Business (Stanford, Harvard, Penn, MIT, Northwestern, + Michigan)
9. Law (Yale, Stanford, Harvard, NYU, Michigan)

\*Sources: U.S. News and World Report *Best Graduate Schools*, 2003 edition (architecture, public policy, public health, medicine, engineering, business, law); and personal communications with various deans in fields that were not ranked.

At the University of Michigan, we use “contextual expertise” to denote the kind of scholarship dedicated to understanding the historical, cultural, and institutional conditions of any structure, process or product, resulting in particular appreciation not only for context but also the challenge of difference across the world.<sup>10</sup> Area studies is

one obvious articulation of contextual expertise, but it is also important to recognize other forms of contextual expertise that don't identify with the particular traditions or boundaries of area studies. By considering the value of grounding and translation in the expression of any form of expertise, one might identify new common grounds for area studies in internationalism.<sup>11</sup>

Nevertheless, one of the simplest ways to identify the articulation of area studies and professional expertise would be to consider the presence or absence of joint degrees between the professions and international and area studies. One can construct a pretty sensible array of professions this way by considering the commonality of these joint degrees across leading professional schools.

Table 2: PROFESSIONAL AFFINITIES WITH INTERNATIONAL AND AREA STUDIES (JOINT DEGREES)

1. Public Policy (Princeton; Syracuse; Indiana; Berkeley; Michigan)
2. Law (Yale; Michigan; Stanford; Harvard; NYU)
3. Public Health (North Carolina; Michigan; Hopkins)
4. Natural Resources and Environment (Michigan; Berkeley; Yale)
5. Business (Pennsylvania; Michigan)
6. Architecture and Planning (MIT; Columbia)
7. Information (Pittsburgh)
8. Medicine
9. Engineering

However, this approach only considers existing practice and past recognitions of common interest. It overlooks several important dimensions of these professions, and the ways in which professional and area studies expertise might find newly common ground in addressing key problems for each.

In order to find that common ground and develop the proper incentives, one also needs to take into account the power and privilege of schools. Medicine, law,

engineering, and business typically command greater resources than architecture/planning, information, public policy, public health, and environmental studies. The greater the resources of any particular unit, the more they can, and are likely to, pursue their own internationalism without significant collaboration across the university. However, the relative power and privilege of individual schools varies across universities, and stratification is only one variable that shapes the conditions of collaboration. Indeed, one should imagine that intellectual affinity is one of the greatest predictors signaling the association between area studies and the professions, and in this, one could imagine few more obvious partners for area studies than architecture and urban planning.

#### CONTEXTUAL EXPERTISE IN SPACE<sup>12</sup>

Perhaps more than any other field, schools of architecture and urban planning identify with contextual expertise. In some ways, this is not at all surprising given that this field is itself organized around space and place, if in typically two very different ways. Although originating as an offshoot of architecture, after World War II, and especially in the 1960s, urban and regional planning developed more of a focus on social and economic space, with social science and policy affinities predominating. The humanities and the creative sparks of the arts shape the design concerns of architecture more. Deans of these schools and directors of area studies thus could share common concerns and strategies for cultivating interdisciplinarity across humanities and social sciences.<sup>13</sup> The more obvious commonality is the common premium placed on identification with places and peoples from abroad, however.

While there are important examples of diasporic communities shaping important programs in architecture,<sup>14</sup> the more widely shared value appears in the significance given to fieldwork abroad. Historically, travel/study programs have been an especially important for the architecture sides of these schools, either as a component of executive education or regular curriculum. Just as in conventional study abroad programs, urban design studios and programs have also been located in particular European cities, drawing on cultural and historical expertise in addition to more specific architectural studies to elaborate their work. Columbia, for instance, has an ongoing relationship between Paris and New York (<http://www.arch.columbia.edu/nyparis/index2.html>), although they have also given their undergraduate students extended opportunities to study in Antwerp, Brussels, Caracas, Istanbul, London and Naples ([http://www.arch.columbia.edu/MAIN/PROGRAMS/URBAN\\_DESIGN/program.html](http://www.arch.columbia.edu/MAIN/PROGRAMS/URBAN_DESIGN/program.html)). Michigan has also tended to focus on a broadly defined Europe, suggested by its conference on Berlin in 1999<sup>15</sup> and its March 2003 conference on St. Petersburg,<sup>16</sup> but Europe is no longer the preoccupation in these schools that it once was.

Some schools have developed especially extensive ties with Asia. Princeton has a joint design studio with University of Hong Kong and Tongli University in Shanghai (<http://www.princeton.edu/~soa/index2.htm>). MIT's joint urban design summer workshop focused in 1998 on revitalizing a traditional neighborhood in Beijing (<http://loohooloo.mit.edu/spotlight/spot6.html>). MIT's Special Program for Urban and Regional Studies (SPURS) itself identifies its association with development studies, international studies, and area studies at universities throughout the region (<http://loohooloo.mit.edu/departments/spurs.html>). The University of Michigan's recent

hire of the distinguished architect Rahul Mehrotra from Mumbai suggests additional potential in South Asian studies, especially with the formation of in-country design studios there (<http://www.tcaup.umich.edu/facultystaff/faculty/mehrotrarprofile.html>).

Asian studies becomes relatively more important as students from abroad, especially from Asia, come to study in US programs. While the expertise might rest in these schools, the limitations of US-based assumptions become much more obvious, and potentially problematic, with the changing demographics of the student base. As one colleague put the problem to me,

We want to maintain our competitive advantage in education and research and at the same time not continue what has arguably been an arrogant US-centrism in urban research and prescriptions.... It is a tricky balance to look to other countries for alternative role models to our sprawling, suburbanized, aesthetically impoverished built landscapes when the rest of the world looks to us for a model of late-capitalistic economic development – can one separate economic development from its underlying urban development patterns?<sup>17</sup>

Much more occasionally, schools of architecture move beyond Europe and Asia. Yale, for example, offers international design studios in Ghana. Michigan is also committed to work in that country, resulting in part from cross-university collaboration between the Center for Maternal and Child Health and the Center for Sustainable Design in Tropical Climates at the University of Michigan and University of Ghana. They address “African vernacular as an overarching medium for spiritual and environmental well-being,” in which Ghanaian society’s “primary life themes” organize curriculum (<http://www.tcaup.umich.edu/studios/ghana02.html>).

Although there is thus substantial overlap with the contextual expertise of area studies, architecture and urban planning deans have often ridden the second wave of

internationalism, expressing their concerns in the language of globalization. Consider MIT's mission:

Our outlook is global. Students and faculty come to the School of Architecture and Planning from all over the world, and our alumni are to be found everywhere. We are vitally concerned with understanding and responding to today's complex interactions of local communities and cultures with systems of global interconnection, and with preparing students to work in a world where time and difference are electronically compressed (<http://loohooloo.mit.edu/vision/index.html>).

By combining the language of globalization with the traditional focus on particular places abroad, one might find in architecture and urban planning that very synthesis one seeks in the articulation of a broader scholarly mission for internationalism's third wave. However, the value of looking to this profession rests not only in its fusions, but also in the dissonances global ambitions produce. Whose globalization is it anyway?

This is one of the questions motivating Anna Rubbo, a scholar of architecture from University of Sydney, to research how her profession might become *more* global.<sup>18</sup> What, after all, would it mean to produce "globalization from below"? The Union of International Architects/UNESCO's charter of international education provides one important starting point:

- a decent quality of life for all the inhabitants of human settlements;
- a technological application which respects the social, cultural and aesthetic needs of people;
- an ecologically balanced and sustainable development of the built environment;
- an architecture which is valued as the property and responsibility of everyone.<sup>19</sup>

One can find several exemplars within the US academy too. Rubbo especially notes the 1999 work of Jan Wampler of MIT to design socially, economically and

environmentally sustainable settlement for earthquake regions in Turkey.<sup>20</sup> She finds his capacity to engage students in complex problems, and to “learn through doing” particularly inspiring.

Based on her extensive web-based survey of architecture schools, Rubbo nonetheless finds that schools rarely put this kind of internationalist perspective to the heart of their work, even though it could respond well to student needs. She finds students looking for ways to understand cultural diversity better, and to find a way to respect it without restraining economic development. She also finds students increasingly interested in understanding their “context for being in the world,” and worried about how the US is seen from elsewhere. Toward this end and beyond, both faculty and students have asked why the diversity of the global student body on US campuses is not brought more to the center of the mission to globalize professional knowledge.

While debates about regional foci and globalization’s level within architecture and urban planning are important, it is also clear that architecture and urban planning schools appear to be a particularly valuable if underdeveloped partner in extending the meaning of academic internationalism and of area studies’ place in globalization’s university. Whether in the Columbia program for understanding the shape of two cities in New York and Paris (<http://www.arch.columbia.edu/gsap/284>), or the Michigan course in palimpsests and laboratories that uses GIS techniques to explore the variety of urbanism in the Mediterranean (<http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/vol8no2/gobetti.htm>), the contextual expertise of area studies and this profession’s interest in the design and organization of space can work powerfully together.

INTERNET INTERNATIONALISM<sup>21</sup>

In stark contrast to architecture and urban planning, only two of the top five schools of information – Berkeley, Syracuse, Pittsburgh, Illinois and Michigan -- explicitly referenced the international. Pittsburgh’s mission statement said,

The SIS faculty, staff, students, and programs – uniquely interdisciplinary, multicultural and international by design – are dedicated to the building of a global society and an informed citizenship based upon the foundation of knowledge made possible only through access to reliable and useful information (<http://www2.sis.pitt.edu/aboutSIS/missions.html>).

Michigan’s mission statement and representation of initiatives is far more explicitly worldly than others:

Unprecedented change in the use of information is reshaping our personal activities, our community and organizational practices, and our national and global institutions. In managing these transformations, *our society* (our italics) too often focuses narrowly either on extending technology or revising social policies. We need an integrated understanding of human needs and their relationships to information systems and social structures. We need unifying principles that illuminate the role of information in both computation and cognition, in both communication and community (<http://www.si.umich.edu/about-SI/mission.htm>)

The emphasis on place is nearly invisible, however. Indeed, consider the ways in which “our society” continues to structure the imagination. Which society is “our society”? Is it the global society mentioned by Pittsburgh? Or is it a vision of the US, understood as global because globalization is US?<sup>22</sup>

In many ways, the US and other advanced societies shape the key questions of the field because it is their policies and practices that shape the conditions of the global information infrastructure. For instance, the questions organizing Indiana University’s 2002 conference on internationalism and information<sup>23</sup> could be applied just as easily, if not more easily, within the US than abroad:

- 1) How should the university treat the information it produces? Is it a commodity? Part of the global commons?

- 2) What is the responsibility of the university in developing the information architecture of international engagement? What priorities should the university establish in that architecture, and who should decide them?

These are great questions, but on first glance, they don't appear to have much to do with internationalism. They are, however, central to *internet* internationalism because of the ways in which the "death of distance" structures the global imagination in this field. One author categorized that position so:

The convergence of computer and communication technologies permits people to meet anywhere at any time, thereby making possible the ubiquitous exchange of information from the simplest two-person exchange to the operation of the multinational conglomerate, with its vast requirements for moving information and ideas, rapidly, efficiently, and with close to complete security....<sup>24</sup>

If the "death of distance" is a serious hypothesis, the presence of international students, scholars and subjects within the centers of information science production does not necessarily create any special opportunities since the world is only a mouse click away. The information revolution has after all generated remarkable transnational epistemic communities whose interests and sensibilities appear global.

If globalization were only a technical matter, distance might indeed be dying. However, given the alternatives within globalization, and the abiding significance of place in the analysis of the information revolution, simplistic notions of place, people and interest are the only mortal risks in the explication of internet internationalism. For example, while there is increasing access to the web, thus diminishing the significance of distance in shaping the distribution of knowledge consumption, there also is growing spatial concentration in the provision of information on the web, increasing the geographical concentration of power over information's production.<sup>25</sup> Place matters, even on the web.

In this light, area studies expertise can become a powerful partner for information science if both fields consider how context shapes questions about information consumption *and* production. But both fields need to rethink the relationship between place, culture and interest in order to frame the question properly. The development of collaboratories on AIDS research may be concentrated across North America, but that concentration also has particular benefits for those regions, notably Botswana, where AIDS ravages the country and economy.<sup>26</sup> At the same time, one also needs to consider what kinds of incentives are necessary to move information science to consider issues that are relatively more important beyond the information revolution's core production sites. Consider, for example, the status of information. Whether it is a commodity or part of the global commons is an important debate within America,<sup>27</sup> but the relative significance of that question appears greater in the South African context<sup>28</sup> given the number of interests in the US who stand to benefit from information's commodification. How do we assure that the critical questions of those places on the periphery of the information revolution become central to those places shaping the production of information in virtual space?

Those in international studies have long been familiar with debates about the ethnocentrism of American scholarship.<sup>29</sup> However, one cannot assume simple extensions of that critique in the aftermath of a globalization motored by the information revolution. Given the creation of genuinely transnational epistemic communities and the transformation of space, place and distance in their wake, the qualities of contextual expertise in the transformation of information science are not obvious. Is it only a matter of facilitating the localization of interface by translating Microsoft Office into a variety of

languages? Is it a matter of extending our conception of the digital divide, so that we are not only asking who has access to the information revolution, but whose problems might be addressed by its technology? Or is it a matter of taking on more fundamental questions about the ownership of information itself? In this sense, the implications of the information revolution extend far beyond the questions raised by the death of distance, and into the question of whose globalization is it anyway. In other words, whose and which public goods are on globalizing information's table?

#### ASSURING PUBLIC GOODS BEYOND AMERICA

Schools in public health, natural resources and environments, and public policy are all focused on public goods, and might, therefore, be a good place to begin the search for those public goods in globalizing knowledge. All three also occupy a relatively similar, liminal position in the contextual expertise spectrum. Each has an explicitly international focus that developed in an earlier period of time, which is now subject to critical debate over how it is to be practiced.

#### *The Contextual Expertise of Public Policy*<sup>30</sup>

Of all the professional schools, public policy has the greatest common interest with area studies given their common origins in the concerns of the American foreign policy community.<sup>31</sup> In some cases, in fact, international and area studies and public policy schools are competitors in a field of international education; in other instances, public policy faculty occupy, after humanities and social science, the most important constituency for international and area studies.<sup>32</sup>

Most schools of public affairs emphasize that they train people from around the world in public leadership and public governance. They are especially prominent in dealing with matters associated with the social science end of area studies, whether in studies of democratization and governance,<sup>33</sup> economic reform and development studies,<sup>34</sup> ethnic conflict and nationalism,<sup>35</sup> or security studies.<sup>36</sup> They also develop centers devoted to particular issues in international affairs too – Princeton University’s Woodrow Wilson School for instance has centers devoted to migration and development, international organization, and programs devoted to leadership in international affairs, international political economy, US-Japan relations, international security and other areas (<http://www.wws.princeton.edu/research/researchprogs.html>). Harvard’s Kennedy school has centers devoted to science and international affairs, human rights policy, Asian economic development, and China public policy ([http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/ksgpress/research\\_pub/index.htm](http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/ksgpress/research_pub/index.htm)). Any of these *could* be closely articulated with area studies. It all depends on the organizational, faculty and fiscal structure of a university.

With Harvard’s particular structure, area studies and professional school initiatives have little incentive to combine, and rather have more reason to multiply. As such, most of the area studies centers at Harvard are relatively distant from professional school concerns, even to those professional initiatives so obviously tied to their own world regions. This differs from the other leading schools.

The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University is not only closely tied to the substance of area studies, but it also organizes the university’s area studies programs. It organizes internship and study programs abroad. It operates a

Global Affairs Institute to integrate and focus their international programs, research, service and training activities, including their development studies, South Asian studies, European Union Center and Latin American and Caribbean program. They also have developed particularly close ties with Chinese and Korean administrative schools, addressing issues like civil service reforms and performance evaluation.

In most instances, however, area studies is autonomous from public policy's formal organizational structure, even though they typically have important co-curricular interests. Berkeley's Master's Degree in Public Policy, Michigan's Ford School for Public Policy, Indiana's School for Public and Environmental Affairs and Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School explicitly partner with area studies programs in organizationally distinct realms to combine credentials and competencies.

In short, there is a terrific intellectual affinity between area studies and public policy schools, which works variably well because of different organizational setups at various universities. Princeton's mission statement for its Master in Public Affairs degree illustrates the compatibility nicely: "It teaches skills in analyzing the political, economic, quantitative, organizational and normative aspects of complex policy problems. It fosters an appreciation of the historical, institutional, and cultural contexts of public and international policy" (<http://www.wws.princeton.edu/degree/mpa/master.html>). This latter appreciation is clearly rooted in the contextual expertise of area studies.

Schools of public policy are also, however, one of the familiar sites where the opposition between globalization and area studies is most typically reproduced. One could paint globalization as being the opposite of area studies, with the former's interest in shifts in exchange rates, patterns of international trade and policies in global welfare,<sup>37</sup>

questions that cannot be addressed within particular regions. This opposition exists partially because most such schools are led by political scientists and economists, where that opposition between globalization and area studies organized so much discourse in the 1990s (that opposition is not especially important in anthropology, history and sociology). Fortunately, that debate about area studies and social science has faded.<sup>38</sup> More critical questions about varieties of globalization, and the global publics with which one identifies, should take the place of those more academic conflicts. Indeed, to the extent that students entering schools of public policy come from abroad, one of the very founding purposes of these schools comes into question: should these schools teach global public policy from an American point of view? Clearly, they can no longer be focused primarily on training students for careers in American government. What, then, does an American point of view mean in teaching global public policy?

*The Global Expertise of Environmental Studies*<sup>39</sup>

Schools of environmental studies typically organize the world in different ways from both area studies and public policy because they attend to the biophysical rather than (or in addition to) the political or cultural environment. This environmental approach is a different kind of contextual expertise, one that incorporates the human factor as one element among many in the assessment of the ecosystem, within a framework that also thinks about the world as context. In many ways, it is easier to shift beyond the American viewpoint because it is quite easier to speak of global needs in biophysical terms rather than political terms.

This global emphasis is evident in the website welcome by the Dean James Gustav Speth of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies: “The increased awareness that environmental concerns are moving into the international arena will require that US environmental policy be more in concert with other nations, thus giving birth to a new field of environmental diplomacy”

(<http://www.yale.edu/forestry/about/message.html>). They explicitly state their wish to build a “truly global school of the environment.” Duke University’s school says much the same thing, if in a particularly compelling fashion:

In this dawn of a new millennium, we now know that many environmental problems are global in nature. The health of one forest, the integrity of a single barrier breach, and the quality of the air we breathe, are not just isolated problems. These environments have shaped the evolution of our world and define its future (<http://www.yale.edu/forestry/about/message.html>)

The University of Wisconsin-Madison’s Center for Sustainability and Global Environment (SAGE) articulates a similar global environmental approach, beginning in specific ecosystems, whether in the Amazon Basin or the Boreal Forests of Canada, or across apparently different substantive concerns, as in biodiversity protection and Watershed Management in China’s Yunnan province (<http://www.sage.wisc.edu/>). These environmental efforts are explicitly linked with Madison’s International Institute in the Environment and Development Advanced Research Circle, where three primary themes are explored: “(i) the economics of local resource use outcomes; (ii) the politics and policy of resource and conservation management and practices; (iii) environmental analysis of human-induced change.” Evidence of the Ford Foundation’s “Crossing Borders” project is present here with the circle’s explicit commitment to “innovate

interdisciplinary and cross-regional research and graduate training, and expand linkages to scholars around the world” (<http://www.intl-institute.wisc.edu/ASIResCircles.htm>).

However, expertise within schools of natural resources and environment is organized variably. Those working on climate change typically begin their questions with global transformations in mind, and then consider variable impacts on particular sites. In this way, they resemble information science more than architecture. On the other hand, significant elements of the environmental field define their expertise in terms of specific ecosystems – whether in the analysis of deciduous forests or tropical ecosystems. Michigan’s environmental studies, for instance, is particularly committed to tropical ecosystems and recently organized a conference together with the Latin American and Caribbean Studies Program on environmental science and politics.<sup>40</sup>

One ecosystem has been historically important in many US schools of the environment and can be internationalized effectively. North American forestry questions can be extended relatively smoothly to Russian forestry questions, notably in the use of geographic information techniques in mapping land use patterns, one project underway at Michigan.<sup>41</sup> The dynamics of water use and conservation is another traditional concern for those universities close to the Great Lakes and involves important cross-border issues with Canadian and American interests in mind.<sup>42</sup>

While area and environmental studies can plausibly find common ground in any of these questions, their collaboration appears more likely when environmental work requires extensive fieldwork among those whose distance from US cultural presumptions is greatest. For those who must learn local languages and rely on indigenous peoples for environmental expertise, the synergy with area studies becomes even more powerful.

This focus also can be extended beyond the strategy of the particular researcher.

Berkeley's approach to environmental design is explicitly focused here

([http://arch.ced.berkeley.edu/people/faculty/faculty\\_intro.htm](http://arch.ced.berkeley.edu/people/faculty/faculty_intro.htm)). It emphasizes "how the physical environment, in the so called 'third world' nations of the world, is shaped by larger global, cultural, historic, social, economic and environmental factors.... Unlike similar areas of study in other schools, the Berkeley program is premised on two interlinked concepts: first, that the study of other cultures, societies, and peoples is a fundamental exercise for the creation of a better physical environment, and second, that the first world can learn from the experiences of the third world as much as it can contribute to it." They expect doctoral students to study languages.

This program is especially and obviously linked to area studies commitments, but the more general point about environmental studies is important for area studies to consider: how might area studies incorporate more directly concerns for the biophysical environment into its mission? And how might expertise on environments beyond American convention enhance the development of that global awareness constituting the new environmental studies?

### *The International Science of Public Health*<sup>43</sup>

Although one leading school in the international public health profession explicitly links some of its work to global environmental change,<sup>44</sup> most schools of public health have had two traditional foci in their international programs: the epidemiology of infectious diseases and population planning. Both have been designed from the beginning for students from abroad and for US health professionals to work in international

agencies and collaborative projects abroad. And both have had a traditional focus on the developing world.

For example, Johns Hopkins' Institute for International Programs was set up to serve faculty and student interests in such international public health programs. Its international health degree reorganizes its work into four broad subject areas -- disease prevention and control; health systems; human nutrition; and social and behavioral interventions ([http://www.jhsph.edu/Dept/IH/Centers/Inter\\_Programs.html](http://www.jhsph.edu/Dept/IH/Centers/Inter_Programs.html)). The first focuses on infectious diseases, most notably diarrhea, AIDS, acute respiratory infection, and tropical diseases like malaria.

One critical part of the school's internationalism is to assure learning opportunities abroad. For example, Hopkins offers training and research opportunities around the study of tuberculosis in India, South Africa and Peru ([http://www.jhsph.edu/Dept/IH/Centers/TB\\_Research.html](http://www.jhsph.edu/Dept/IH/Centers/TB_Research.html)). The program does not emphasize learning opportunities beyond the health sciences, although there are some fascinating ventures across schools. Its Center for International Emergency, Disaster and Refugee Studies works directly with their medical school's Department of Emergency Medicine ([http://www.jhsph.edu/Dept/IH/Centers/Inter\\_Emergency.html](http://www.jhsph.edu/Dept/IH/Centers/Inter_Emergency.html)). For the most part this leading school of public health appears self-sufficient in generating international activities.

This by no means suggests a narrow scope. For example, Harvard's Center for Population and Development Studies focuses on the "well-being of the global poor" (<http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/hcpds/>); the Harvard AIDS Institute is dedicated to "conducting and catalyzing research to end the worldwide AIDS epidemic"

(<http://www.aids.harvard.edu/>). The Francois Xavier Bagnoud Center for Health and Human Rights is the first to academic center to make an explicit link to this discourse (<http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/fxbcenter/>). In this sense, one hardly needs to ask how to extend internationalism in public health, in part because it is intrinsic to its educational and research mission.

This international focus depends on the international emphasis of granting agencies. The John E. Fogarty Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences (<http://www.fic.nih.gov/>) has been especially important in this regard, by providing training grants for both American and international students and researchers, and for inter-institutional linkages strengthening research ties across institutions. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has, for instance, developed critical links to other universities across the world through this mechanism in particular fields, in reproductive health (with Mahidol University) and in environmental and occupational health (The Federal University of Bahia).

While scientific research might be the principal focus of granting agencies, these schools also have another kind of focus that suggests one answer to the question about globalization's publics. North Carolina, for example, emphasizes the importance of "community-based practice," suggesting an approach to scholarship that can be translated across sites regardless of political location (<http://www.sph.unc.edu/>). This orientation may also make cross-campus collaboration more likely. Much as University of Washington links its international health project to their public policy school's certificate in international development policy and management

(<http://www.evansuw.org/students/intdev/>), North Carolina's Public Health makes an explicit link to its University Center for International Studies.

The University of Michigan's School of Public Health also draws on Fogarty awards among other international grants to enhance its international mission. The traditional approach to international health focused on the needs of developing countries is also still evident, and most apparent in its United States Agency for International Development-funded population fellows program (<http://www.sph.umich.edu/pfps/>). The school is also developing a new focus, one that also emphasizes the globalization of health issues and the value of their study across disciplinary terrains (<http://www.sph.umich.edu/ghic/>). The School's Center for Research on Ethnicity, Culture and Health focuses in particular on how diseases and health practices are transmitted in the migration of populations across the world (<http://www.sph.umich.edu/crech/>). The university's Center for Human Growth and Development organizes faculty in public health and elsewhere to consider development's relationship to culture, mental health and children in poverty, with special attention to minority international research training (<http://www.umich.edu/~chgdwww/>). Michigan's International Institute has also made public health one of its primary foci.<sup>45</sup> Various projects and publications are devoted to analyzing the relationship between science-based risk assessment and international trade law<sup>46</sup> or health and occupational safety in the organization of Chinese labor.<sup>47</sup> Each of these combines the contextual expertise of area studies faculty with the expertise of health science professionals.

These three professions have a strong commitment to identifying and supporting the public good in other nations or for the well being of the planet. Each is tied to the

policy-making domain. Perhaps these professions, even more than others, can provide the lead in developing what former University of Michigan President, Lee Bollinger, identified as globalization's major challenge to the university:

We need to consider the extent to which we are going to take on an identification with people outside of our own borders. Of course, right now we regard it as very important that we interact with and understand people from other societies. But we do not have the same sense of collective responsibility, of shared responsibility, of shared identification with those individuals as we do with people in our own society. Over the past century, this university and many like it have added to our sense of responsibility to our state a sense of national responsibility as well. We supplemented the identification with citizens of the state with that of citizens of the nation. The question now is the extent to which over the next century we will entertain the idea of a broader identification.<sup>48</sup>

While this identification with global publics is compelling at a university level, the struggle over the claim works differently within professions depending on the history of this international identification.

Public Policy, Environmental Studies and Public Health all have strong roots in a bifurcated approach to international and domestic studies, and are all struggling with the question of how to develop a "global" approach to their field. Each debate has very different qualities, but they are all engaging the question about how to make the American viewpoint more explicit, less dominant, and better informed by the needs of publics and environments across the world. Rather than pose the question as globalizing from below, one might instead consider how to "provincialize"<sup>49</sup> American professional education, by asking how well it translates across different world regions and public needs. This approach, perhaps associated with "globalization from below," might be viable in these professions, or at least in some portions of them. Globalization from below is not especially compelling, however, when the concentration of resources is so great as it is in the most powerful and privileged schools of the US university system.

## GLOBALIZING PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND LINKAGES

Even when the school is global in its mission and its courses and has many students from abroad, as the leading engineering and business schools tend to have, parochialism can predominate. This dilemma of defining internationalism is evident when internationalism assumes that extending American sensibilities and databases is the same as globalizing the mind, and capturing the intellects of other areas. It is, therefore, critical to consider how internationalization not only extends American academic reach, but challenges the presumptions on which that reach is extended.

Physicians are the exemplary profession and their schools are typically the most autonomous and powerful within the university system. Medical schools are also “going global” for reasons associated with globalization, rather than development, with a new global economy, information networks, standards, and interest in US academic medicine.<sup>50</sup>

Most of the top medical schools have international exchange programs, international health programs, established partner institutions, and have made international research a priority, although each also has a distinctive element. The most highly ranked school, Harvard, has developed an explicitly international component since 1994, with a commitment to provide quality health care to “citizens of the world” within his or her own community (<http://www.hms.harvard.edu/hmi/about/index.html>). Johns Hopkins International has also developed a particular biomedical center in Singapore (<http://www.jhs.com.sg/>). Washington University developed a forum for international health and tropical medicine, emphasizing a cross cultural experience for all 1<sup>st</sup> year

medical students, summer international scholarships, and volunteer work in rural Nicaragua (<http://medicine.wustl.edu/~fihtm/>). Learning abroad is a common theme for most of the leading medical schools. Pennsylvania's Office of International Medical Programs is the only medical school to explicitly mention its link to those beyond the health sciences, with particular emphases on four places: Africa, India, the Middle East, and St. Petersburg (<http://www.uphs.upenn.edu/oimp/>).

Sometimes medicine's global ambitions are based on capturing new markets for services, drawing wealthy foreigners to America for care. But there is also much more to this professional globalization too. There *are* global standards that contribute significantly to the well being of broad sectors of the population abroad. The value of global vaccination programs is well understood, but how might insulin treatment of diabetes be extended more widely? Those who discuss such global standards assume that about 40-60% of what allopathic physicians do should be based on global standard; but much is yet to be learned about critical cultural differences and appreciating the context in which one works. One cannot build health capacity effectively in different world regions without significant contextual expertise going into the assessments of need. Michigan's OBGYN program, for example, has been tied to Ghana for some time, facilitating other research projects in the region and developing especially powerful collaborative relations (<http://www.med.umich.edu/obgyn/resdir/research.html>).

Sociologists often identify engineering as a "failed" professional project, but only because their profession is less self-regulated and more closely articulated with corporations.<sup>51</sup> Globalization, therefore, became prominent in the definition of this profession's schooling when it became important to the corporations with which this

profession is closely tied. Because of these ties to the corporate world, however, the field tends to be highly differentiated, and therefore it is useful to consider more specific elements of the profession. Nevertheless, just as in medicine, the global economy, information networks, standards, and interest in US academic practice leads the motivation to go global.<sup>52</sup>

Some fields have always been international, however. Naval architecture and marine engineering has always been an international field given the business for which they work, and the global locations of their clients. Korean, Russian, and other national schools of engineering have made this field global in its epistemic community.

Most of engineering's projects are themselves discussed in terms of global awareness, as the Georgia Institute of Technology's website suggests: "It is increasingly important for mechanical engineers to operate in, or at least appreciate the challenges faced by global, competitive industries."

(<http://www.me.gatech.edu/me/publicat/GTLorraine.htm>). Although these schools emphasize advanced communication technologies as much as schools of information, several schools have established branch campuses or close affiliations: Georgia Institute of Technology has established one in Metz, in the French Lorraine region (<http://www.coe.gatech.edu/gtl/>); MIT has established an alliance with the National University of Singapore and Nanyang Technological University (<http://web.mit.edu/sma/>), and the University of Michigan with Shanghai Jiaotong University and Warsaw Technical University (<http://www.engin.umich.edu/relations/corporate/ops/pdf/corpreinternational.pdf>).

One of the most dynamic aspects of the field rests in the linkage between the globalization of engineering expertise and the challenge of cultural and political differences. Science, Technology and Society programs typically articulate this interest, but very often from the points of view of historians and sociologists of science and technology rather than the more applied or experiential interests of engineers themselves. It's unusual when such programs take hold within schools of engineering, although that appears to have taken place at Stanford (<http://www.stanford.edu/group/STS/>). More typically, engineers are driven by the technological questions of their field and the questions of corporate clients.

Corporate clients are increasingly interested in the challenge of political difference, however. They encourage universities to focus on developing global standards for manufacturing. However, their academic colleagues are additionally interested in the ways to explore cultural differences. Michigan engineering professor Debasish Dutta has become increasingly interested in how globalization, technology and culture are related, in part stimulated by his teaching a global design course taught simultaneously in Michigan, Seoul National University and Delft University<sup>53</sup>.

In their first year, Dutta's students focused on how to design a coffee pot that would successfully manage different tastes. For example, Korea had to have a pot that would make instant coffee, while European and American tastes were stimulated with a slower roast. But one Norwegian student from Delft took the point to a different level. She asked whether the aim shouldn't be to design a pot that helped to express and refine local tastes, rather than to introduce modules that could merely accommodate them. Whether in the design of a washing machine or the placement of a coffee cup holder,

understanding cultural tastes become critical to developing appropriate products for a global audience.

At one level, this attention to taste and other contextual factors might serve only to refine product design. However, one can underestimate the potentially revolutionary effects of contextual expertise in the multinational corporate process. As C.K. Prahalad and Kenneth Lieberthal pointed out some years ago, corporations need to struggle against the presumptions they bring from their richer markets when working to develop markets in developing countries.<sup>54</sup>

## PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP IN GLOBALIZATION

Challenging American presumption in global product development may not be so novel for business experts in marketing. They have been long accustomed to developing an international approach and have been deeply involved in the debate about globalization's potentials and how to develop a "global" company. Pankaj Ghemawat, a Harvard specialist in the strategy and dynamics of globalization, makes a familiar point in business school circles: full global market integration is nowhere close to being realized, and managing a truly multinational corporation is extremely difficult

([http://hbsworkingknowledge.hbs.edu/pubitem.jhtml?id=2970&sid=-1&t=special\\_reports\\_globalization](http://hbsworkingknowledge.hbs.edu/pubitem.jhtml?id=2970&sid=-1&t=special_reports_globalization)).

Business leaders therefore have much to learn in business schools about globalization's limits and potentials, and how to balance within their firm global efficiencies and local context

Stanford's presentation of global issues emphasizes its immersion in the entire program (<http://www.gsb.stanford.edu/>). Their "strategy and organization in the global

economy” course is a required core course for all students. The “international flavor” of the school is decidedly enhanced, they say, because of the significant percentage of students with international work experience. The school also organizes month long internships with companies around the world and international study tours to explore the business environment. Their “Working Across Cultures Series” leads students to understand the “business protocols, decision making systems, religions, values and beliefs of countries around the world.” The University of Michigan presents similar opportunities to its prospective students, declaring that “understanding and being effective in the global business environment is... fundamental”

(<http://www.bus.umich.edu/prostudents/mba/global.html>).

It is difficult to say which business school is the most international, however. Northwestern’s Kellogg School offers joint degrees with universities in Israel, Germany, Hong Kong and Canada. Its Global Initiatives in Management course is designed by students with the help of a faculty advisor, and is organized around 10 weeks of classroom instruction and a two week research trip to a given region. In 2001, 13 different courses enrolled 360 students studying 14 countries

(<http://www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/academic/international/gim/>). Pennsylvania’s Wharton School may be the most international of all the business schools in its representation (<http://www.wharton.edu/>). It offers joint degrees and certificates in international studies not only bridging the campus but also linking to other institutes within the US (to the Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies) and to INSEAD in France and to Singapore. Its Lauder Institute of Management and International Studies exemplifies the linkage, by combining “an outstanding management

education with intensive exposure to a foreign country's culture, politics, economy and language."<sup>55</sup> By now, globalization is clearly the business of business schools.

Internationalization cannot be the principal challenge of international business education, at least in the leading schools. It should go beyond facilitating study abroad and developing global modules within existing frameworks if it is to provide the vision and leadership its already extensive investment in global learning and experience suggests.

The University of Michigan's William Davidson Institute has developed a particular niche around facilitating transition to market economies across the world (<http://www.wdi.bus.umich.edu/>). Its origins suggest an especially close tie to the Center for Chinese Studies and Center for Russian and East European Studies, but it has extended its focus to other parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America in recent years with its broader focus on the relationship between political economy and firms. Michigan's Center for International Business Education, located both within the Business School and the International Institute, explicitly brings international studies expertise and business expertise together (<http://www.umich.edu/~cibe/>). Most notably with its new initiative to focus on corporate social responsibility abroad, it is producing new opportunities for area studies to identify the resonance between a variety of contexts – social, political, cultural, and biophysical – and American multinational corporate practices. Michigan also has an extensive set of joint degrees between area studies and business – in Chinese, Japanese, Middle Eastern and North African, Russian and East European, South Asian and Southeast Asian studies. (<http://www.umich.edu/~iinet/iisite/academic.html>). Despite this substantial globalization and extensive set of ties between area studies and business, it's not always clear how much interest there is in the contextual expertise of area studies.

As one scholar wrote, “The problem is not so much that we haven't defined international business expertise--it is that we have defined it in a way that is disappointing to our colleagues in area studies: virtually no focus on deep culture and language expertise, favoring a more superficial approach--the "global mind set." This is consistent with what the majority of our students want and what MNCs say they need.”<sup>56</sup> But what do they *really* need?

Although businesses and business schools may not find the value in contextual expertise, at least one business school professor, Linda Lim, has argued its value in terms of the real globalization of the mind, and not just the parameters with which one thinks:

It is not surprising, then, that so many around the world dismiss "globalization" as a smokescreen for "American domination," and are beginning to resist the spread or at least question the superiority of the "American gospel" of free markets and even of democracy. I have seen this resistance surface even in my nationally diversified MBA classroom, where many international students' hyper-sensitivity to U.S. hegemony interferes with rather than facilitates instruction and discussion on globalization and the world economy.

Many in our community of scholars and students reinforce this resistance when they act as if it is all right to ignore what makes the rest of the world different from "us" (the U.S.), while discussing only what makes it the same.

The hegemonic U.S. university's ethnocentric and parochial misidentification of the intellectual challenge of globalization could actually *diminish* our capacity to understand, interact with, and enrich the "globalized" world in which we live. Only rarely does it acknowledge the importance of globalization in the *intellectual content* of what its members research, study, teach and learn--the language, culture, business or scientific practices of the "other."

The University of Michigan's diverse area studies programs and resources, including training in "less-commonly-taught" but nonetheless populous languages (like Hindi, Thai and Indonesian) remain a rare and precious treasure that few other institutions can claim to match and that contribute much to the intellectual, as distinct from commercial, challenge of globalization today. In its efforts to come to terms with its mission as a global institution, the University might do well to keep in mind the words of Jack Welch of General Electric, arguably the most successful and widely-admired CEO in the U.S. (if not the world) today,

"The real challenge is *to globalize the mind* of the organization. Until an organization captures *the intellects of other areas*, it really does have a problem. Until you globalize intellect, you haven't really globalized the company." (*Fortune* 10/2/00, p. 178, *emphases added.*)<sup>57</sup>

In many ways, therefore, business schools are in the vanguard of globalizing knowledge, but like many aspects of globalization itself, suffer from some of the cross-cultural blinders embedded in it. As the University of Michigan Business School Dean, Robert Dolan, said in a symposium shortly after September 11, 2001:

...a member of my visiting committee ... said to me, "we were educated about global challenges but not educated about real-world perceptions, perceptions that we would not like to hear. Our students cannot and should not be sheltered from this." And so that, I think, is the change I would take from this—that we have to do the research and find ways to really communicate to the future leaders of businesses how they can understand the new global realities in order to create a situation where we can contribute to society along with our capabilities.<sup>58</sup>

## PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP IN INTERNATIONALISM

Legal expertise provides much of the intellectual foundation for internationalism. Whether in the constitution of transnational organizations like the United Nations, in the development of transnational documents like the Charter of Human Rights and the transnational organizations in its support, or in the development of constitutions for emerging democracies, international trade law or arguments for or against in the debate about the appropriateness of preemptive military strikes,<sup>59</sup> legal scholars typically provide leadership. And this organizes their academic work.

Of course, law schools' internationalism can function in much the same way as any other school's internationalism, based especially on the arrival of students from abroad. LLM or JSM degrees are often designed to help link an American legal degree

with concerns based in an international fellow's home country, as the Stanford Program in International Legal Studies is most explicitly designed to do.

Stanford is most explicit about transcending the traditional divisions of public international law, private international law, and comparative law, however, because “these categorizations are no longer particularly useful because of the overlap between international regimes, the activities of non-state actors, and the various practices through which law and lawyers engage in the international system”

(<http://www.law.stanford.edu/international/courses.html>).

Within and across the university, law school faculty are almost always central in the development of centers for human rights and the activism that attends them. Yale's Orville H. Schell, Jr. Center for International Human Rights was established in 1989 to “increase understanding of human rights issues, equip lawyers and other professionals with the skills needed to advance the cause of international human rights and assist human rights organizations” (<http://www.law.yale.edu/outside/html/Centers/cen-schellctr.htm>). New York University's Global Public Service Law Project, created in 1998, was developed to “increase awareness and understanding of the variety of public interest lawyering done in different contexts across the (developing and transitional – MK emphasis) world” (<http://www.law.nyu.edu/programs/globalpublicservice/>).

Typically, these contexts are “various” without any particular places in mind, but a few law schools identify particular and enduring commitments. Michigan notes its investment in South Africa with an externship program (<http://www.law.umich.edu/curriculum/externshipsandindependantstudy/>) and to Cambodia with internships available for work in human rights organizations there

(<http://www.law.umich.edu/CentersAndPrograms/cicl/international/center.htm>). It also offers joint degrees with several area studies centers, including Japanese, Russian and East European, and Middle Eastern and North African studies center. Yale is also particularly committed to a few places: it offers support for its students to work in Chile, Argentina, and Brazil to work with law students there to extend democracy's potentials, and it has developed a China Law Center to increase understanding of China's legal system and assist in China's legal reform process (<http://www.yale.edu/chinalaw/>).

Indeed, this suggests one other important dimension of international law: it can collaborate with activists who work with those at the bottom of society and it can work with those defining the rules from the top. Yale's global constitutionalism seminar brings together supreme court and constitutional court judges from around the world to discuss matters of common concern on an annual basis

(<http://www.yale.edu/bulletin/html2002/law/lecture.html>). Michigan's work in refugee and asylum law focuses on developing theories of and strategies for defending the rights of those beyond their nations and whatever legal protections that had been offered for them (<http://www.law.umich.edu/centersandprograms/pral>).

New York University's law school is famous for its own internationalism, using that strategy as a means to catapult its status from a respectable school into one of the top five schools in the nation. Globalization is, as the school itself writes, "not a catchword limited to adding course to cover 'hot' international topics or to respond to passing demands for relevance. It's a fundamental organizing principle"

(<http://www.law.nyu.edu/magazines/autumn01/nylsm68-87.pdf>). Its project on transnational justice is explicitly linked to transitional societies in the search for

retroactive justice. This course move beyond theory into comparative and historical studies in the winter term, and is worthy of repeated description here, for it focuses on cases studies which include

a) new democracies such as Chile and Poland; b) aspiring democracies in conflict such as the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda and Cambodia; and c) mature democracies under new challenges, such as Japan challenged by China and Korea concerning World War II atrocities and Switzerland challenged by allegations of collaboration with the Nazis

(<http://www.law.nyu.edu/programs/globallawschool/projects/transitional.html>).

This terrific course is not identified with other parts of the university, however.

Given the resources associated with law schools, they don't necessarily need to work with area studies per se. And given area studies' tendency to develop comparisons within world regions rather than across them, a course like this one – depending on rich case studies for its own theoretical innovation and empirical adequacy – can remain quite distant from the expertise located elsewhere. Here, then, is the opportunity.

Area studies can become much more appealing to law schools, and other professional schools, if it is organized around comparisons across regions and not only comparisons within regions. By bringing area specialists together in collaborative and comparative endeavors, as the Ford Foundation's Crossing Borders project stimulated, the value of area studies grows dramatically.

## ARTICULATING NEED IN GLOBALIZING PROFESSIONS

We are often drawn to the lowest common denominator when we seek to identify “need” in higher education. This is especially true when it comes to international education. Given American political, economic, and military leadership in the world, the dominance of English as a world language, and the globalization of American culture,

Americans can easily imagine the world to be a smooth extension of their mindset. By offering Americans the opportunity to go abroad, to learn another language, and to include the experiences of others in their generalizations about how the world works, internationalization becomes a vital complement to that broader liberal education that seeks to cultivate an open mind and capacity to recognize the challenge of difference. Diversity is a vital element to quality higher education.

All professional schools could embrace diversity more in the development of their institutional mission, but it would be a mistake to say that professions need more support to internationalize. Leading professional schools represent themselves as global in their ambitions, if not also their practice. Indeed, for all nine fields visited in this paper, none seem to lack international vision, or accomplishment, and many of them have developed substantial endowments and won external grants to extend their missions. They all have very different needs and issues confronting them, of course, and one might consider each school's vision by itself in order to develop a program to enhance their own international ambitions. One might also consider the needs of area studies programs themselves, and figure what they need above all. But this search would reflect previous waves of internationalism in higher education, and fail to take into account the need for university-wide thinking in globalizing knowledge, and consideration for what universities can do in the address of the larger questions challenging America and the world in the present era.

To be sure, each pillar of higher education needs to stand on its own ground. One can't create university-wide initiatives that address major global challenges without considering the particular needs of each of a university's constituent units. Where internationalism is weak, one might focus on building up its rudiments, focusing efforts

on those schools whose international vision and resources are weak. But one should not presume that where internationalism is already strong that there is no work left to be done. Indeed, if one were to attend closely to the visions and accomplishments of the schools we reviewed in this document, much remains to be done not only to meet the needs of individual schools, but to address more fundamental questions across the world.

Most professions express their needs in terms of the development of “global awareness,” whether in terms of professional standards, personnel, students, connections, opportunities or challenges. They rarely identify particular places worthy of extensive investment – professional expertise is, by most of their definitions, transnational or global, and thus likely to follow individual faculty priorities and forms of expertise. In this sense, professions express their needs very much in terms of the second wave of scholarship’s internationalization, with globalization as the keyword organizing their expressions of purpose. They are not, however, likely to emphasize another dimension of that second wave –the value of cross-university work. Most schools, and professions, prefer to express their need in ways that augment their own capacities for action, on their own terms. Of course there are many cross-unit initiatives focused on particular international projects – the link between health and environment, between manufacturing and marketing, between area studies and professional expertise – but these are unlikely to be the core problem of any profession, and unlikely to be identified as a core need.

There are, however, critical needs that cross professions, and are unlikely to be elevated to the center by any one of them. All professions struggle over the relationship between their American location and their global vision; what aspects of their American-grounded expertise are valuable assets that can be globalized with little modification?

What aspects blind them to the opportunities and challenges the diversity of the world presents? How do American universities structure education to recognize this problem?

One way to address this challenge would be to elevate the significance of contextual expertise beyond America, and across professions. If one is working in a language other than English and in places beyond America for extended periods of time, one is more likely to acquire some of the worldview embedded in other publics, and to be able to recognize the unreflective American extension. To the extent those places and partners in knowledge production are working in ways that are distant from the parameters of a globalization defined by American power, one is also more likely to be able to appreciate the particularity of American standpoints, or the needs of those unlikely to be recognized by American priorities. In short, by extending contextual expertise in the professions, especially to those parts of the world underattended by American higher education, one is more likely to produce professionals that are able to present global awareness in terms that can be recognized in a wider variety of the world's places.

If this were to be our guide, one might simply provide more support to area studies programs to support professional students, programs and faculty learning opportunities. This would augment those existing or latent ties organized around conventional terms of contextual expertise in public policy and law, and then public health, environmental studies, business and architecture/urban planning. Although this could be an important stimulus to valuable ties, it would do little, most probably, to bring medicine, engineering, and information to the center of area studies. But because these fields are moving so effectively ahead on their own terms, it is not clear that they would

miss the opportunity. But without them, some of the most critical questions in international education's bigger picture might not be addressed.

Area studies, by themselves, are unlikely to be generating that bigger picture, at least to the extent they remain defined in their own terms rather than in broader comparative terms. To the extent area studies' centers work collaboratively across regions, they are more likely to develop projects and comparisons that resonate with professional school interests, and approaches that address a new internationalism. For example, the University of Michigan's recent set of applications to win Title VI National Resource Centers had three cross cutting themes. Although the initiative to compare Islamic practices across world regions was planned by faculty in the humanities and social sciences, interest in the two other projects – democratization, decentralization and governance, on the one hand, and stress and resilience in social and ecological systems on the other, was inspired by professional school input into the Centers' priority setting.

Area studies also becomes more relevant to the professions and the broader international question when it extends its notion of "context." This is clearest in terms of environmental studies; when area studies supports work that defines the biophysical environment, and not only the cultural and institutional environment, it extends its relevance. To the extent area studies supports research that compares tropical ecosystems from Southeast Asia to the Amazon, it extends its reach to the professions. This is also relevant, however, to consideration of other professions. To the extent area studies supports the study of contexts *within institutions*, whether of firms (for business), families (for public health), or local governments (for public policy and regional planning), for example, it becomes newly relevant. Indeed, it becomes vitally important when it can

help explain how aspects of globalization – whether the information revolution or the standardization of regulations for commercial products – are transformed by the contexts understood by area studies.

Much as professions would prefer to develop their international agendas on their own terms, so would area studies. That possibility is greater today than in the last two decades with concerns about war and national security shaping our international vision. The need for expertise in language, culture, history and institutions of those places considered potentially threatening to the United States is now self-evident.<sup>60</sup> The expertise of some professional schools is also deeply implicated in the transformations occasioned by the global war on terrorism and other conflicts conducted in its wake. Public policy is in the middle of the debate about appropriate security policies; public health is critical to designing responses to the effects of bioterrorism and war; law scholars are debating the legality of preemptive strikes. But most professional schools are not driven by this agenda. Investing in area studies to understand the immediate conditions of this war will do little to address the new internationalism, although to ignore the violence that violates globalization's presumptions would risk extending internationalism's second wave into ignorance.

As Michael Ignatieff most recently argued,<sup>61</sup> for America to manage its leadership in the world properly, it needs to take seriously its own rhetorical claims about spreading democracy and well-being and developing cross-cultural dialogue; it cannot afford to choose the stability of a friendly tyrant if terrorism is to be contained. Likewise, the presumptions of simple-minded globalization are no longer operative: war and violence are not local, and Americans are more at risk throughout the world, and at home. While

the social scientist could always see the politics at work in extending globalization, it is no longer possible for globalization's proponents to overlook the politics and commercial interests of globalization's management.<sup>62</sup> Globalization must work from below, on behalf of publics not only in the US but also abroad, if globalization is to be sustainable. In this, rethinking the relationship among globalizing knowledge, well-being, democracy, peace and violence may be an abiding theme that cuts across not only area studies, but also the professions. It's certainly part of the vision that should sustain the new internationalism, but how can American universities and their partners contribute to this new vision?

#### SUSTAINABLE GLOBALIZATION

The United States increases the likelihood of developing a sustainable globalization to the extent it can take its own history of public education into account. By supporting the work of higher education to support the public good, federal and state levels of government cultivated in their constituencies a terrific appreciation for higher education. By supporting the professions in their mission to engage publics abroad, the United States could cultivate appreciation for American culture beyond Hollywood.

However, this global public engagement could be counterproductive to the extent that it reproduces the problems of globalization itself. We need education about "real-world perceptions, perceptions that we would not like to hear," as Michigan's Business School Dean Robert Dolan emphasized.<sup>63</sup> That means our engagements in the professions, and in higher education more generally, cannot focus on those who most resemble us, or those who most apparently share our values, interests, and professional

expectations. Investing in such a new international agenda committed to diversity's recognition might build on the first two waves of internationalization.

First, American higher education needs expertise in world regions that professional schools may not prioritize with their own academic agendas. While China might be on the top of most professional school lists, some critical world regions rarely leap to the top of any profession's list of priorities, and are therefore unlikely to shape their global awareness. Southeast Asia, for example, although vitally important for many reasons, is unlikely to be prominent in many professions given the demographics of its diaspora and the diversity of the region itself. We need to assure the diversity of higher education's internationalism. Area studies provides one vital investment in that effort, and remains important to assure that American higher education recognizes those marginalized by globalization's currents, or anticipations.

Secondly, when the conditions of success are uncertain, promotion is more likely to take place on "homosocial" terms.<sup>64</sup> Although these research findings were developed within the American corporate world, they might easily extend to the realm of international collaborations.<sup>65</sup> Professional education should globalize on its own terms, but it may need additional incentive to reach beyond those who speak English best and know American cultures of collaboration. By developing incentives to extend area studies expertise in the professions, one might extend the diversity of partners within regions, and in that fashion, challenge American presumptions in recognizing who are the most appropriate partners for extending the values of international collaborations. By investing in the link between area studies and the professions, one could extend the global diversity of professions themselves. This, however, is relatively expensive.

Internationalisms vary considerably in terms of their resource intensity. One reason internet internationalism is so appealing is that it can be extended along technological infrastructures and epistemic practices that extend smoothly from other purposes.<sup>66</sup> Area studies is one of the most expensive, given that it seeks to recognize and embrace the challenge of difference to its fullest, from the study of language to the priority on fieldwork. Department of Education resources in area studies training has typically focused on extending the scholarly capacities of American citizens beyond their citizenship. It is, however, much cheaper to realize professional school internationalism by recruiting faculty and students from abroad. Indeed, these are often among the best investments given that these students and faculty not only have the language skills but also are likely to have the social capital that can produce the networks necessary for collaborations and access to the powerful and privileged.<sup>67</sup>

Across the board, professional schools are relying increasingly on international recruiting of faculty and students to define and direct their internationalism. The market in higher education is thus driving the internationalization of professional education. This is a significant, if unstated, aspect of the second wave of internationalism, but it articulates poorly with the emphasis on security in either the first or the third wave of internationalism. However, international education must consider the value of this international studentry, and rethink how its value might even be extended.

First of all, one should not assume that markets will provide the right balance of students to assure global diversity in higher education. Universities, and the nation's political authorities, should consider this value of representation across the world, and across the disciplines, to the making of a vital university and a sustainable globalization.

But it should not end with the demographics of the studentry. One should also create the conditions for those students to study and discuss the value to and alternatives within globalization, beyond their discipline, with experts beyond their field. Of course there are many students from abroad working in business or politics who have these discussions as a part of their professional education, but there are many more in scientific and technical fields that are not necessarily part of the larger debate about globalization and its alternatives. By creating the conditions for this exploration on American campuses, civil containers of global publics in formation, American higher education could help to create the conditions for a new cross-national dialogue, based not only on what ties us together, but on recognizing the values to be found in diversity, the foundation of America's own distinction in the world.

Finally, however, one should conclude this review of need in globalizing professional education by considering the public reference that has animated many professional school endeavors. While there have been many important projects in the health sciences and in other professions dedicated to the address of needs in publics abroad, this identification with publics abroad has not been a core element organizing curricula, research priorities, or institutional visions. This is the next challenge. As one university leader has said, the new internationalism for the twenty-first century will certainly have to consider the extent to which we are going to take on an identification with people outside our own borders. If globalization is to be sustainable, and if American leadership is to be viable, this investment in extending professional engagement with publics abroad cannot be only a matter of academic concern.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gil Merkx, "Waves of Internationalization and their Administration in the U.S. Research University: A

---

Weberian Analysis,” paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Association of International Education Administrators, 2002.

<sup>2</sup> Mary Sue Coleman, “Crossing Borders: A Global Focus for the University of Iowa,” 1998 Presidential Convocation Address. [http://www.uiowa.edu/~fyi/oldfyi/issues97-98/100998web/crossing\\_100998.html](http://www.uiowa.edu/~fyi/oldfyi/issues97-98/100998web/crossing_100998.html); Nancy Cantor, Chancellor, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. “Making the Case for the Global Imperative Post 9/11,” paper presented at NASULGC Meeting, 2002. This question motivated a major discussion in the Journal of the International Institute as well; see U-M Faculty. [Globalization's Challenge](#) (8.2:2001) and Lawrence S. Root, Fatma Müge Göçek, Paul N. Edwards and Deba Dutta. [Globalization's Challenge: Four More Voices Join the Discussion](#) (8.3:2001) and Michael D. Kennedy. [Globalization's University Challenge](#) (8.2:2001) See also Sheila Biddle, “Internationalization: Rhetoric or Reality?”, paper prepared for the Ford Foundation, December 2002, for an assessment of 1990s internationalization strategies at Duke University, University of Michigan, University of Iowa, Columbia University, and University of Washington.

<sup>3</sup> See Sidney Tarrow and Peter Hall, “Globalization and Area Studies: When Is Too Broad Too Narrow?” [The Chronicle of Higher Education](#) January 23, 1998 (<http://globalization.about.com/gi/dynamic/offsite.htm?site=http%3A%2F%2Fchronicle.com%2Fdata%2Farticles.dir%2Fart-44.dir%2Fissue-20.dir%2F20b00401.htm>) for an excellent discussion of the relationship. Typically, these assemblies of area studies expertise had faculty from history, political science, and language and literature, as well as economists, sociologists, geographers or anthropologists. The notion, as originally embodied in the founding cooperation between the Ford Foundation and the federal government, and staffed and mobilized to some degree by those who fought and saw the effects of World War II, was that we needed to train a wider array of scholars who could research and teach students about other areas of the world. The Cold War had a profound effect on leading research universities. For instance, our own University of Michigan has “national resource centers” in five world regions – Middle East and North Africa, Russia and Eastern Europe, East Asia, South Asia and Southeast Asia, and we have internally supported area studies programs in Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean and Africa too.

<sup>4</sup> This is based on a survey of disciplinary affiliations of NRC directors in the year 2000, discussed in Michael D. Kennedy, “Discipline and Region: A Sociology of Sociology and Area Studies.” Paper presented at the 2002 Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies.

<sup>5</sup> This section benefits considerably from the Ford Foundation-sponsored May 2002 Seminar on Expertise at the University of Michigan. For some of the results of that seminar, see [http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/vol9no1/cohen\\_expertise.htm](http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/vol9no1/cohen_expertise.htm).

<sup>6</sup> We therefore focus on what the “best” schools are doing, or might do, in international affairs. This is not necessarily the best strategy for recognizing need or for creating potentials in international affairs, however. Title VI-supported centers for international business education have not, for instance, focused on the most highly ranked business schools (but rather those in the top 30 or so), and have realized important effect. Indeed, in his paper presented at the conference on Global Challenges & US Higher Education at Duke University January 23-25, 2003, “Back to the Future: Internationalization in Professional Schools”, Gilles Bousquet focused on innovative practices regardless of rank in the field. This is an important complement to what we have done here, and suggests that innovation is not always found at the top of lists made for other reasons.

<sup>7</sup> These rankings are always problematic; we don’t necessarily endorse the accuracy of these rankings by using them. We use them only to reflect one set of conventions apparently operating in the establishment of quality.

<sup>8</sup> There are a number of other professions we might have considered: Social Work, Nursing, Agriculture, Journalism, Education, and so on. We chose these professions simply because they represented an important range of fields, whose focus might be international, and whose resources are sufficiently limited

---

and whose field is sufficiently close to area studies that they might be influenced by a new area studies strategy for the professions.

<sup>9</sup> See Erving Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City: Anchor, 1959.

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/iisite/mission.html>. For one social science elaboration of this challenge, see Craig Calhoun, Critical Social Theory: Culture, History and the Challenge of Difference. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell, 1995 and his comments, as President of the Social Science Research Council, in the summer 2002 publication of Items and Issues. ([http://www.ssrc.org/programs/publications\\_editors/publications/items/Items3.3\\_4.pdf](http://www.ssrc.org/programs/publications_editors/publications/items/Items3.3_4.pdf)).

<sup>11</sup> This epistemological transformation organized our Ford Foundation – supported project on rethinking area studies, see <http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/CrossingBorders/index.html>.

<sup>12</sup> For articles published on architecture, space and urban studies in the Journal of the International Institute, see [http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic\\_index.htm#SAUS](http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic_index.htm#SAUS). This section benefits considerably from conversations with Doug Kelbaugh, the Dean of the Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning, and with Scott Campbell, from the faculty of the Urban and Regional Planning Program, Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning.

<sup>13</sup> Sometimes, as in area studies, the duality is hard to maintain; the planning side of the school has, at least according to some, declined at Harvard, Princeton, and Columbia and disappeared at Yale. Of the five, only MIT has maintained that strong balance. If planning were the focus, UC Berkeley, UCLA, Cornell, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Rutgers, University of Southern California, University of Illinois and Michigan would be contenders for the top five.

<sup>14</sup> For example, Harvard's architecture program has the Doxiadis Scholarship for Greek citizens (<http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/academic/fellowships/>) and the Agha Khan Program for Islamic Architecture (also at MIT) (<http://web.mit.edu/akpia/www/AKPsite/>). ArchNet extends that focus to organize a virtual community to extend our understanding of Islamic architecture; it offers one interesting example too of how the web might link diverse communities of scholars, professionals, and interested citizens. (<http://archnet.org/lobby.tcl>).

<sup>15</sup> See Steven M. Whiting. "(Re)constructing Berlin: Architects and Academics Consider the Once and Future Capital" The Journal of the International Institute (8:1:2000) (<http://www.umich.edu/~iinet/journal/vol8no1/Whiting.htm>).

<sup>16</sup> Information on this program around St. Petersburg is found at <http://www.umich.edu/~urel/stp/intro/index.html>.

<sup>17</sup> personal communication from Scott Campbell, Assistant Professor, Urban and Regional Planning Program, College of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of Michigan.

<sup>18</sup> Anna Rubbo, "Educating (Architects) for Globalisation" Center for the Education of Women, December 5, 2002. Some of these issues have been explored in Rubbo, A. 'Values and Architectural Education', Architectural Theory Review, Vol. 6, no. 2, 2001, pp.65-80, and 'Educating Architects for Globalization: A Neglected Responsibility? Forthcoming in Proceedings of 'Architecture, Culture and the Challenge of Globalisation International Conference, Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, Washington DC.)

<sup>19</sup> THE UIA/UNESCO Charter for Architectural Education <http://www.unesco.org/most/uiachart.htm>.

<sup>20</sup> See Jan Wampler, Open Notes for Harmony: Six Places. MIT, Department of Architecture, 2001.

- 
- <sup>21</sup> Michael Kennedy gave a more extensive version of this section to the monthly colloquium of the Center for Research on Electronic Work in the School of Information. He learned a great deal from colleagues there, and thanks them and the dean of the University of Michigan School of Information, John King, for their advice on the challenges of internet internationalism.
- <sup>22</sup> Michael D. Kennedy, "[Globalization is US?](#)" *Journal of the International Institute* (10.1:2002)
- <sup>23</sup> "The Impact of New Technologies on Teaching and Research in International Studies" at Indiana University, October 13-14, 2002.
- <sup>24</sup> Vincent Mosco, "Webs of Myth and Power: Connectivity and the New Computer Technopolis" in Andrew Herman and Thomas Swiss, *The World Wide Web and Contemporary Cultural Theory* New York: Routledge, 2000, p. 38.
- <sup>25</sup> Manuel Castells, *The Internet Galaxy: Reflections on the Internet, Business and Society*. Oxford University Press, 2002, Pp. 207-46. See also Saskia Sassen, "Electronic Space and Power," in *Globalization and Its Discontents* New York: the New Press, 1998, Pp. 177-94.
- <sup>26</sup> <http://www.si.umich.edu/features/CFAR.htm>.
- <sup>27</sup> See Charlotte Hess and Elinor Ostrom, "Ideas, Artifacts, and Facilities: Information as a Common-pool Resource," *Law and Contemporary Problems* (forthcoming). International Association for the Study of Common Property (<http://www.iascp.org/>) and Indiana University's Digital Library of the Commons (<http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/>).
- <sup>28</sup> Derrick Cogburn, "Partners or Pawns? Developing Countries and Regime Change in Global Information Policy Governance" in Sandra Braman (ed.) *The Emergent Global Information Policy Regime*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan (forthcoming). Cogburn is also the director of the Collaboratory on Technology Enhanced Learning Communities (Cotelco) linking South Africa and the University of Michigan. In the latter, Professor Derrick Cogburn links teaching about globalization with his central research question about how the global information infrastructure might be organized around the global commons rather than a notion of information as property.
- <sup>29</sup> C. Everett Hughes, "Ethnocentric Sociology," *Social Forces* 40(1961):1-4 is one important touchstone in that extensive list of critiques.
- <sup>30</sup> This section benefits from a number of conversations Michael Kennedy has had with Rebecca Blank, Dean of the Ford School for Public Policy at the University of Michigan, and other faculty colleagues in the School.
- <sup>31</sup> See the comments of Robert Vitalis on the history of international studies in America, in Summer 2002 issue of *Items and Issues*: [http://www.ssrc.org/programs/publications\\_editors/publications/items/Items3.3\\_4.pdf](http://www.ssrc.org/programs/publications_editors/publications/items/Items3.3_4.pdf).
- <sup>32</sup> For effective demonstration of this relationship, and the availability of joint degrees, see <http://www.apsia.org/>.
- <sup>33</sup> The following assembles articles in the *Journal of the International Institute* about democracy and other political public policy issues: [http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic\\_index.htm#PS](http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic_index.htm#PS).
- <sup>34</sup> The following assembles articles in the *Journal of the International Institute* on economic, business and technology questions: [http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic\\_index.htm#BET](http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic_index.htm#BET).
- <sup>35</sup> The following articles address questions of nationalism in the *Journal of the International Institute*: [http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic\\_index.htm#NE](http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic_index.htm#NE).

---

<sup>36</sup> The following articles address security questions in the Journal of the International Institute: [http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic\\_index.htm#SVR](http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic_index.htm#SVR). See also the commentary by Ford School of Public Policy faculty member Robert Axelrod on the costs of war and risks of peace in regard to Iraq: [http://www.umich.edu/~iinet/iisite/pubs/rsvge\\_iraq.htm](http://www.umich.edu/~iinet/iisite/pubs/rsvge_iraq.htm).

<sup>37</sup> See for example Kathryn Dominguez's assessment of globalization's challenge to public policy: <http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/vol8no2/Dominguez.htm>.

<sup>38</sup> Although that difference always remains in the cultural tool kit of those who wish to argue for a different share of the pie. See the discussion in Sheila Biddle, "Internationalization: Rhetoric or Reality?" paper prepared for the Ford Foundation, December 2002.

<sup>39</sup> For articles on environment and ecology published in the Journal of the International Institute, see [http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic\\_index.htm#EE](http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic_index.htm#EE). This section benefits considerably from the number of conversations Michael Kennedy has had with Rosina Bierbaum, Dean of the School of Natural Resources and Environments, at the University of Michigan, and with other faculty colleagues in the School.

<sup>40</sup> Nuestro Ambiente: Latina/os and Environmental Justice, November 23-24, 2002, University of Michigan. Organized by the Latina/o Studies Program, Latin American and Caribbean Studies Program and the School of Natural Resources and Environment.

<sup>41</sup> Kathleen Bergen leads this effort, having recently collaborated with colleagues in Russia on this analysis. See <http://www.snre.umich.edu/faculty-research/faculty-updates.html#Bergen>.

<sup>42</sup> See <http://www.snre.umich.edu/faculty-research/research.html>.

<sup>43</sup> For articles published on health in the Journal of the International Institute, see [http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic\\_index.htm#Hth](http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic_index.htm#Hth). This section, and indeed the larger paper, benefits substantially from conversations with Sioban Harlow of the School of Public Health, and Associate Director of the International Institute.

<sup>44</sup> They work to explain the risks of global environmental degradation and climactic change to human health (<http://www.jhsph.edu/globalchange/>).

<sup>45</sup> See for example Sioban Harlow's articulation of globalization's challenge to the university: <http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/vol8no2/Harlow.htm>.

<sup>46</sup> Public Health professor Sioban Harlow and Law School professor Rob Howse assembled lawyers, public health officials, and others from around the world to meet and ask what kind of science is really used in assessing risks in the regulation of trade. Not only were the limitations of lawyers' understandings of science clarified, but I was most impressed by the ways in which certain national models and assumptions were smuggled into documents about regulating trade. Mexico's capacities, for example, to assess the health risks of various international trade products were simply assumed, and in fact, overestimated, with negative implications for Mexico's public health. See <http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/hte/wto.htm>.

<sup>47</sup> See <http://www.ilir.umich.edu/chinaconf/>.

<sup>48</sup> For a discussion of this symposium, see Michael D. Kennedy "Globalization's University Challenge" *The Journal of the International Institute* (8:2:2001). See also subsequent articles from a range of professions on this challenge: ([http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic\\_index.htm#Gbnz](http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/thematic_index.htm#Gbnz))

---

<sup>49</sup> To develop this notion, one might consider Dipesh Chakrabarty, Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002 as one important starting point.

<sup>50</sup> This section benefits substantially from conversations with David Stern, Director of the Global Reach Program at the University of Michigan Medical School

<sup>51</sup> See for example Magali Sarfatti Larson, The Rise of Professionalism. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

<sup>52</sup> See for example Andrzej Nowak's reflections on globalization's challenge to engineering: <http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/vol8no2/Nowak.htm>.

<sup>53</sup> Debasish Dutta, "Teaching 'Global Product Realization Globally.'" The Journal of the International Institute (8:3:2001). (<http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/vol8no3/globalization.html>).

<sup>54</sup> C.K. Prahalad and Kenneth Lieberthal, "The End of Corporate Imperialism" Harvard Business Review pp. 69-79.

<sup>55</sup> In some ways, it is surprising that Penn only won its CIBER in this most recent round of competition. Indeed, it is the only business school in the top five to have a Department of Education-supported Center for International Business Education. Nevertheless, each represents intriguing and important innovations in the field. See the following websites: [Brigham Young U.](#) [Columbia University](#) [Duke University](#) [Florida International University](#) [Georgia Institute of Technology](#) [Indiana University](#) [Michigan State University](#) [Ohio State University](#) [Purdue University](#) [San Diego State University](#) [Temple University](#) [Texas A&M University](#) [The University of Texas at Austin](#) [Thunderbird](#) [UCLA](#) [Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign](#) [University of Colorado at Denver](#) [University of Connecticut](#) [University of Florida](#) [University of Hawaii at Manoa](#) [University of Kansas](#) [University of Memphis](#) [University of Michigan](#) [University of North Carolina](#) [University of Pennsylvania](#) [University of Pittsburgh](#) [University of South Carolina](#) [University of Southern California](#) [University of Washington](#) [University of Wisconsin](#)

<sup>56</sup> Bradley Farndworth, Director of the Center for International Business Education, University of Michigan, January 13, 2002, personal communication.

<sup>57</sup> <http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/journal/vol8no2/Lim.htm>.

<sup>58</sup> [http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/iisite/events/terrorism\\_and\\_globalization.html#dolan](http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/iisite/events/terrorism_and_globalization.html#dolan).

<sup>59</sup> See for instance the commentary by UM Law School Professor Rob Howse on the prospects of war in Iraq: [http://www.umich.edu/~iinet/iisite/pubs/rsvgc\\_iraq.htm](http://www.umich.edu/~iinet/iisite/pubs/rsvgc_iraq.htm).

<sup>60</sup> See the obvious value of area studies expertise in the assessment of the costs of war and risks of peace around invading Iraq in the assessment of Juan Cole: [http://www.umich.edu/~iinet/iisite/pubs/rsvgc\\_iraq.htm](http://www.umich.edu/~iinet/iisite/pubs/rsvgc_iraq.htm).

<sup>61</sup> Michael Ignatieff, "The Burden." The New York Times Magazine January 5, 2003, p. 26.

<sup>62</sup> Joseph E. Stiglitz, Globalization and Its Discontents. New York: Norton, 2002 made this abundantly clear.

<sup>63</sup> [http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/iisite/events/terrorism\\_and\\_globalization.html#dolan](http://www.umich.edu/%7Eiinet/iisite/events/terrorism_and_globalization.html#dolan).

<sup>64</sup> Rosabeth Moss Kantor, Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

---

<sup>65</sup> See Michael D. Kennedy, Cultural Formations of Postcommunism: Emancipation, Transition, Nation and War. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002 for how this worked within transition culture's firm in Eastern Europe.

<sup>66</sup> The Center for Research on Electronic Work at the University of Michigan addresses how various levels of difference are incorporated into different kinds of electronically mediated collaborations and learning. See <http://crew.umich.edu/>.

<sup>67</sup> This approach to internationalism works across the professions, but works very unevenly across regions. For example, while Chinese and Indian studies are significantly enhanced by the presence of Chinese and Indian professionals in the faculty, Southeast Asian and African studies are less so.