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Abstract

The emerging trend and pressure for higher education to internationalize the curriculum, meet the challenges of globalization and prepare students for global citizenship is identified as the 'global turn' in education. The notion of knowledge production in a global context raises epistemological questions regarding the community of knowing subjects and institutions who participate in and structure such knowledge systems. Critical pedagogy offers a theoretical framework in which we can imagine students and teachers engaging in dialogue with knowing subjects of other cultures and locations with the aim of creating a global community of knowledge production. Challenges to such dialogue as articulated by subaltern studies are viewed as critical in considering the politics of knowledge claims and imagining the possibility of democratic practices and discourse in global and international knowledge construction.
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Over the past decade, educational policymakers have called for US higher education to internationalize the curriculum, to integrate international studies across the disciplines and to meet the challenges of globalization in the post-Cold War era. As part of this shift, which I call here the global turn in higher education, many colleges and universities have also begun to re-articulate the mission of liberal arts education to include global citizenship. In this article I consider some of these challenges of internationalization from a perspective of critical pedagogy. In particular, I want to explore the notion of what it would mean to develop a sense of democratic citizenship within the community of global knowledge construction.

In undertaking this global turn, I want to argue that critical pedagogy can contribute important theoretical insights for examining knowledge production and education through the integration of international studies across the curriculum. A particular challenge for Western academic knowledge in international studies are the epistemological and moral questions raised by the emerging fields of subaltern and postcolonial studies within the academy. These debates present the interdisciplinary field of international studies with as serious a challenge to the canon and knowledge production as did the culture wars of the 1980s and 1990s. In many ways the debates over the inclusion of texts, and which texts, have matured into a more serious exchange regarding the validity of testimony, narrative
argument versus rational logic, and the more philosophical debates around the politics of difference, of recognition, of presence, of distribution and, more importantly, of the discursive space in which these debates take place. From a critical pedagogy perspective, I explore the question of whether we as educators, with our students, can engage in dialogue with the subaltern (because the subaltern may not want to, or may not be able to, speak to or with us) as an initial step toward the potential creation of democratic global communities of knowledge.

The global turn in US higher education

The twin moves within the global turn in higher education, to call for internationalization of the curriculum and the articulation of global citizenship as part of this mission, raise a set of critical questions for educators: how is our knowledge of international subjects, issues and themes transformed by integrating an international or global perspective across the disciplines? In this process, how is new knowledge sought, framed by questions, constructed through dialogue and reasoning, validated, legitimized and promoted? And, if we, as members of the academy, are to see ourselves as global citizens, or even as responsible citizens in a global interdependent world, and to educate students as citizens with global responsibilities, this has implications for democratic engagement and pursuit of knowledge. The implications are profound for the professional practices and norms of professionals, administrators, academics and students in international education and international studies.

Just over a decade ago, Lambert's research on the extent of international studies in US higher education surprised many in the area studies and international studies fields. Despite 30 years of federal, public and private foundation support, Lambert found that many US undergraduates and professional students received very little instruction on international topics and were inadequately prepared as either citizens or professionals for an increasingly globalized economy and public arena. The Lambert study was pivotal in reshaping much of the thinking in higher education administration as the bipolar US–Soviet hegemony collapsed and many academics and policymakers scrambled to explain why they were not better prepared or able to predict the rapid changes that ensued in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

The response was a heightened awareness of the greater need for international exchange and education, with support and funding from federal agencies, scholarly councils and foundations. By 1992, the American Council on Education issued a Handbook on Internationalization of the Undergraduate Curriculum; a consortium was formed of the 50 leading 'International Liberal Arts Colleges' to provide support and recommendations for the internationalization of undergraduate teaching; and many campuses saw positive increases in some aspects of internationalization, especially in the numbers of both foreign students coming to the US and US college students studying abroad.
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As cited in a 1995 report of a Working Group on a Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education, funded by the US Department of Education:

The simplistic view that the end of the Cold War has reduced the need for the US to have a knowledge of the rest of the world . . . is clearly not logical. The priority to knowledge of other countries as friend or foe . . . does not resonate in a post-Cold War world. In the view of the Working Group, the post-Cold War situation had made global and/or international knowledge even more important. The world today and into the 21st century is much bigger, more complex, more stridently pluralistic and more dangerous.9

The 2003 assessment of the field, conducted by the American Council on Education, has found limited improvement since Lambert’s 1989 study.10 While faculty, student and public support for international education is high, the level of institutional commitment to programs is low. Foreign-language offerings and requirements have increased over the past decade, but a significant gap still exists between offerings and actual participation in internationally oriented activities or courses. In 2002 only three percent of US college students study abroad, foreign-language enrollments amount to only eight percent of all course enrollments, and only two-fifths (41 percent) of all college institutions require even one course with international content. Of those that do, just 19 percent require more than two courses with an international focus.11

The assessment of internationalization efforts presented at the recent ‘Global Challenges and US Higher Education Conference’ at Duke University suggests that there is still little coherence and institutional commitment to the effort, despite some very exemplary practices at a handful of model institutions.12 Most leaders in the field agree that there needs to be continued leadership and financial support for this effort. Conference participants at a November 2001 conference on ‘Globalizing Education at Liberal Arts Colleges: Best Practices, Models for the Future’, held just after the September 11th attacks, endorsed a set of principles for the field, including experiential and interdisciplinary learning, cultural and scholarly exchange, public outreach, and the inclusion of a wider range of non-Western languages and themes in the undergraduate curriculum.13 Major obstacles, though, identified by many international education administrators, are found in engaging faculty in a conceptual transformation of their course designs and research interests, as well as grappling with difficult challenges to existing bodies of disciplinary knowledge.14 These obstacles, though, are built into the very structure of the educational institutions. For example, in a survey of US colleges and universities, only five percent considered international work or research to be an element in tenure decisions.15

Most of the literature on this global turn in higher education is coming out of official working groups, formal professional associations, national surveys and assessments of the institutional mappings of US universities and colleges. It is
generally aimed at busy university administrators who need relevant data to support arguments in favor of internationalization, tested and reliable recommendations for programming, and non-controversial rationales that can appeal to a wide audience – students, faculty, donors, trustees, alumnae, local corporate sponsors – necessary in the end for successful acceptance of internationalization efforts. International knowledge and global competencies are argued to be in the national interest, providing foreign affairs knowledge needed for long-term security, enhancing our national human resource capabilities, ensuring global competitiveness of our businesses and services in world trade, and ensuring US pre-eminence among international academic institutions. Even the recourse to global citizenship and preparation for responsible, moral participation in world events is often couched, if not implicitly understood, in these terms.

Over the past 40 years, between the initiation of area and international studies and this current global turn, the US has become the singular hegemonic power in world economics, politics and culture. Yet although US academics have produced a significant body of international scholarship, US higher education on a whole is still not effective in producing students with adequate knowledge about the world outside its borders (or even within its borders – say, of American history).

The context for the push toward internationalization of the curriculum needs to be understood in its relation to both the rationale and federal support for area studies, the US education and national security concerns about the role of education in the 1990x post-Cold War era and the emergence of globalization in the late 20th century as an ideological, economic and symbolic representation of the era. The 1958 National Defense Act initiated the proliferation of area studies programs, courses, departments and National Resource Centers in the US with the explicit aim of increasing our knowledge of areas that might fall prone to pro-communist ideology and sympathy, if not outright alliance. While many scholars would argue that academic freedom was retained despite the funding source for area studies, and that this was an avenue for many international scholars to become known within US international studies, the area studies funding and research agenda has been deeply contested and, until September 11th, even under review for partial dismantling.

Debate over this concern has intensified since the passage in October 2003 of the most recent version of the US Higher Education Act (House Bill 3077) renewing the Title VI area studies funding. The 2003 renewal of this critical component of international studies in the US includes a new ‘Advisory Board’ with investigative powers to examine possible anti-Americanism among Title VI-funded international studies and area studies centers. The chief advocates of this bill have included Stanley Kurtz, Daniel Pipes and Martin Kramer, who view US academic Middle Eastern studies in particular as reflecting ‘dangerous’ Middle Eastern perspectives, largely identified with the work of Edward Said. This political intervention in university funding reflects this new preoccupation that US higher education, and especially international studies, should serve the needs of US national security. Michael McKinley, in this issue, points to this characteristic
of US education, with its devastating consequences in the promotion and support of political domination of other nations and cultures through military intervention.\textsuperscript{17} In the context of this discourse on security in US higher education, even progressive advocates of internationalization frame their arguments in terms of security. The recently released report of the Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad, co-chaired by former Secretary of Education under Clinton, Richard W. Riley, and former Senator Paul Simon, calls for greater access to international study opportunities for US students. While acknowledging the security context, the report emphasizes the need to increase our understanding and knowledge of other areas of the world: ‘We are unnecessarily putting ourselves at risk because of our stubborn monolingualism and ignorance of the world’\textsuperscript{18}.

A few dissonant voices have emerged recently in the international education literature that support the global turn, but in a context that is critical of instrumental rationales or an emphasis on ‘global competency’ skill development. Cornwell and Stoddard, most notably, attempt to frame international studies and education in the philosophical debates surrounding multiculturalism and the postcolonial critique of the Western academy. They advocate a cosmopolitics of international studies in which new paradigms and approaches to knowledge are more explicitly a part of the global turn in higher education.\textsuperscript{19} Gillespie, more radically, argues that accepted goals of global competence are not only incoherent, but ‘morally, philosophically, and politically inadequate’\textsuperscript{20}. Sensitive to perspectives on Western academic hegemony from partner institutions outside the developed industrial West, she argues for linkages and networks of mutuality and equality that can build collaborative global approaches to education and research. Blaney argues that the acceptance of globalization as a foregone conclusion can have the effect of depoliticizing students and undermining the goals of developing critical thinking skills. Many students who enter international fields or engage in study abroad come from privileged class positions vis-à-vis the world population and he argues that we need teaching methodologies that can ‘disempower’ students and assist in unlearning an ‘interpretive privilege’ that is often unquestioned in their views of the world.

Blaney makes an important point that, despite the evidence cited by Lambert and others that American students’ knowledge of the world is woefully inadequate, this does not mean that they do not have knowledge of the world. His concern is that their sense or knowledge of their place in the world is already well entrenched:

I would argue that it is not simply that our students know little about the rest of the world, however true that may be. Rather, it is that our students already possess a knowledge of the world and their place in it, that they have already inherited a set of linguistic and sensory resources through which they experience the world and ‘make sense’. . . . Thus our pedagogical strategies should aim at least partly to disturb and displace what is already there.\textsuperscript{21}
Blancy's recommendation here echoes that of Rosow (2003) and McKinley (in this issue). In arguing for an anti-disciplinary global studies, Rosow argues that we need to challenge the current obsession with 'self' that dominates US higher education and pay attention to the various 'sites of ambivalence' that challenge notions of national identity and citizenship. McKinley, in critiquing the instrumentalism of international studies for military and security purposes, notes that it is the power of disciplines to create 'orders' and 'structures' that codify the very disciplines Rosow would like to dismantle (or at least traverse). If 'the world in its proliferation of meanings generates intellectual confusion', then the disciplines produce the 'generators of tidiness' that reproduce the narratives of national identity and security. The challenge for international education is to value the multiplicity of meanings and world views as a foundation for egalitarian or global democratic principles.  

The dilemma we face as educators is serious and involves more than new readings, more than new teaching methodologies and programs, and more than new funds to support more conferences, although all of these are important. We face a dual dilemma of needing to understand the structural location of the academy within larger societal and political forces of globalization, while at the same time attempting to transform our institutions from within. As part of our effort to understand why internationalization has not been effective, despite 40 years of support, we need to develop new frameworks of analysis. One such perspective which I explore in this article is the contribution of critical pedagogy as a field of inquiry which places the question of global or international knowledge in the wider societal structures that constitute a culture of knowledge construction.

Critical pedagogy

Critical pedagogy as a field encompasses a diverse set of approaches in education that have alternately been called liberatory, emancipatory, empowering, transformative or transgressive education. It is often associated with the work of Paulo Freire as an early influence, with bell hooks, an African-American feminist and critical theorist, with the educational philosophers Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren who have both written extensively about the challenges of multiculturalism in the US educational system, or in the UK the work of Lawrence Grossberg, Stuart Hall and the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies.  

Critical pedagogy has often been used to support educational efforts with disenfranchised communities, with informal community-based education, or with efforts to create a more diverse and culturally inclusive learning environment within the formal university or college context. For example, feminist academics working to integrate gender awareness in the curriculum have learned that it is not just a content add-on, as in another chapter to read in an existing syllabus, but that it involves a wider analysis of different learning styles, language use, and even the
kinds of metaphors and analogies that we use in the classroom to facilitate learning. They have also learned that bringing in new content areas and changing the way learning takes place in the academy challenges the status quo and power hierarchies that protect traditional domains of academic knowledge.

Critical pedagogy can provide insight and direction for this global turn in higher education by identifying sites of knowledge production resistant to change and offering productive ways of engaging in international or intercultural themes. If we understand that internationalization of the curriculum, integration of international studies across the disciplines, and articulation of global citizenship are not just add-ons, but transformative practices, we can also imagine a spectrum of potentialities within higher education that may range from the reproduction of existing hegemony of Western academic knowledge to a widening and democratization of the community of knowledge construction associated with the academy. I believe that most of us would argue that assimilating notions of the global 'other' into existing paradigms and frameworks of knowledge is unlikely to contribute to a widening of knowledge in anything other than an informational sense. Unless we are willing to encompass new perspectives and challenges to our theories and conclusions, we may fail to learn or predict events and outcomes in our interdependent world. (This was the concern indeed that sparked much of the high-level support for internationalization in the immediate post-Cold War days of the early 1990s and again following the September 11th event.) It is critical, then, whether from a national security perspective or a commitment to a radical project of grassroots democratization, that this internationalization process be inclusive in the full sense of the term – not just inclusive of existing sets of knowledge within disciplines or curricula that traditionally have not had an international emphasis, but inclusive of alternative perspectives with an international or global knowledge community.

Within the literature on critical pedagogy can be identified three angles or approaches to the question of knowledge construction that are useful for the analysis of the global turn in higher education. The first is a methodological stance placing the student at the center of the learning process and thereby shifting the epistemological frame or knowledge acquisition. This is sometimes referred to as a decentering of authoritative knowledge and results in creative and non-traditional ways of engaging students in learning – whether in the classroom, by informal interaction in the student life-world, or by support for experiential learning activities. The second is also a methodological stance that examines cultural practices of education and the ways in which social learning takes place. These practices include specific cultural forms such as art or religion as aspects of social learning; educational methods as cultural practices; and a broader sociological critique of education as an institutional set of practices that reproduce and/or challenge the dominant power hierarchies of a nation or community. The third is a philosophical angle following on the methodological examination of practices. In examining the practices and process of research, teaching and knowledge construction as sites of power, the critical pedagogy literature joins
with critical theory and much of the post-Enlightenment and post-structural critique of positivist and empiricist knowledge claims, but in particular questions the meta-theoretical criteria of knowledge validation and legitimation.

Central to these dimensions of critical pedagogy are the role of dialogue and the recognition of an intersubjective constitution of world views. Freire's foundational work begins with an assumption that we approach a new understanding of the world by naming it and that this knowledge is validated through communication with others. Knowledge is not an authoritative body of information and frameworks to be delivered to students, but emerges through an acquisition or learning process in which students come to see the world from their own life experiences. This is not an individually informed process, however, as part of this learning is to understand that these processes of knowledge acquisition and construction are social and cultural. To this extent, they involve a community of learners and knowers.

It is this notion of a community of knowing subjects in academic knowledge production about the world that I am concerned about and where I believe critical pedagogy brings insights. Who are the knowing subjects, how is the community of subjects constituted through practices (including communicative and dialogical), and how are knowledge claims validated?

Critical pedagogy identifies the subjects who form the discursive community of learners and knowers. One concern in critical pedagogy is how to avoid turning inclusion as a subject into accommodation or assimilation. Chandra Mohanty's work provides examples of this dilemma in her discussion of political processes by which race and gender issues have been institutionalized in the academy. On the one hand, the emergence of women's studies, race studies and ethnic studies programs from the late 1960s onward has presented opportunities to gain ground for alternative voices within the academy: 'By their very location in the academy, fields such as women's studies are grounded in definitions of difference, difference that attempts to resist incorporation and appropriation by providing a space for historically silenced peoples to construct knowledge.' On the other hand, Mohanty points to examples and analyses of how the ideology of cultural pluralism has resulted in such programs diffusing the 'oppositional' character of feminist and progressive race politics. She cites work that examines the acceptance of women's and ethnic studies programs as 'a defensive political move: the state's institutionalization of a discourse of reform in response to the civil rights movement' (p. 150).

This question of accommodation of race and gender issues through the 'management of diversity' is key to the discussion here regarding internationalization and the articulation of global citizenship within the academy. Mohanty is passionately committed to the pedagogical questions of knowledge production beyond scholarship, in the practices of teaching and learning as well as the 'discursive and managerial practices of American colleges and universities' (p. 146). Too often, however, in the US classroom, 'giving voice' is a process of validating an individualistic experience, or of allowing a single individual of a
given cultural or gender group to 'speak for' the whole. At the same time, students not identified with these groups 'listen' in a 'harmonic acceptance of difference'. Mohanty warns that an outcome of this reductionism to individual feelings and experiences can be the commodification of culture and '... an erasure of the structural and institutional parameters of what it means to understand difference in historical terms' (p. 153).

The communities of knowing subjects that Mohanty describes are ones which include students representing disenfranchised or marginalized populations along with students from more privileged social positions sincere in their desire to understand the 'other'. These settings reveal some of the difficult challenges in the formation of a democratic community of knowledge production. The focus on the subject-as-learner's knowledge is key to critical methodology. However, in this process and pedagogy, we still struggle to understand how to include or to represent the 'other' without a voice in the dialogical construction of knowledge, and an 'other' who is too often an object rather than a fully recognized member of a community of knowing subjects.

Subalternity and the potential of a global community of knowing subjects

This is the crux of the problem as raised by the emerging field of Subaltern Studies, a field that attempts to formulate the theoretical issues and to document the empirical experiences of marginal or subjugated communities. In her now classic article, 'Can the Subaltern Speak?', Spivak suggests that dialogue with and knowledge of the marginal 'other', or subaltern, is not possible from the privileged subject position of Western hegemonic institutions. In many ways the question of the subaltern has brought academics trained in the Western tradition to acknowledge that our knowledge constructs and paradigms are shaped largely by the dominant political structures and ideologies in which we work. Arising first in South Asian historians, by the early 1990s, subaltern studies had been adopted by Latin Americanists and other groups as a powerful theoretical and empirical conceptual framework for understanding how we study communities and groups who lack an effective voice in society.

Spivak raises the alarm that the very possibility of voice and communication within the hegemonic community erases the marginal subject position of the subaltern. Following this argument, Beverley, in Subalternity and Representation, asks whether subject and marginal subject positions can be represented at all within academic knowledge. He struggles with the dilemma of how a formal set of knowledge called subaltern studies does not in effect appropriate the subaltern identity to benefit hegemonic positions within the academy. (Theorists within subaltern studies are themselves aware of the elitist positions they hold vis-à-vis their subjects of study.) Rather than studying the subaltern as object, he argues for the study of subalternity as a condition that clarifies the boundaries and limits of Western academic knowledge: 'We do not claim to represent ('cognitively map',...
'let speak', 'speak for', 'excavate') the subaltern. Subaltern studies registers rather how the knowledge we construct and impact as academics is structured by the absence, difficulty, or impossibility of representation of the subaltern'.

Rather than a methodology that accumulates data and knowledge about a culture, Beverley advocates a critical role of subaltern studies as a project 'to register where the power of the university and the disciplines to understand and represent the subaltern breaks down' (p. 38). Beverley's understanding of the subaltern identity relies on the Hegelian and Nietzschean notions of negation and a politics of resistance. Much of the historical and empirical literature on the subaltern examines this political position of resistance and protest in the process of nation-building in postcolonial states.

There are interesting parallels here in the historical and empirical work on subaltern insurgency and resistance in political nation-building with the question of the subaltern or global 'other' in this global knowledge-building effort within higher education. From a subaltern position, the same contradiction that exists vis-à-vis the nation state exists in relation to academic knowledge. Movement into a hegemonic institutional structure, whether political or academic, implies loss of the subaltern position of marginality. Beverley, along with Mohanty, would caution though against a celebration of 'difference and alterity' and suggests that this only reproduces the liberal multiculturalist model of tolerating difference. The question then is how to 'decenter' the hegemonic practices of the academy and to develop what Beverley calls 'active solidarity between ourselves and subaltern subjects' (p. 82). If we cannot engage in dialogue, can we at least identify potential sites of dialogue?

Conclusion

I want to end with the larger question of what it means to construct a global democracy of knowledge production. What does that mean philosophically? What does it mean for international studies? Within liberal democratic theory, political philosophers have engaged in the debates around the politics of recognition and difference as a way of understanding how to expand notions of democracy to include citizens who may not identify with the nation or the dominant political culture. Benhabib, following a Habermasian understanding of communicative action and intersubjective knowledge, suggests that we can imagine a multicultural democracy which does not expect assimilation into hegemonic structures through what she calls a 'complex cultural dialogue'.

Along with Benhabib, I believe that we can develop ways of working within this complexity. Giroux, for example, describes critical educators as 'border intellectuals' who learn to mediate the spaces of difference, not necessarily to know the other, but to know the limits and boundaries of one's own position. This is similar to the position of Beverley in at least being clear in our limits to fully represent those who are marginal to this community of knowledge con-
struction. In some of her latest work, Spivak suggests that representations of the global 'other' have already been accommodated by the international NGO and global civil society movement, and she seeks not to reproduce these representations, but to engage with marginal or subaltern communities in a learning process that does not result in academic knowledge about the 'other', but is useful in developing theoretical insights about one's own positionality.30

We can bring these questions to our work, whether in international scholarship, teaching or administration of international programs, by rethinking our knowledge claims. Can we create a discursive space in which non-hegemonic practices can develop, thus allowing new voices to emerge?

This suggests that we also challenge the notion that the site of dialogue be one of personal interaction. A realm of increasing interaction within global higher education is cyberspace, with virtual classrooms and asynchronous learning. Luke, in this issue, examines some of the pertinent issues contrasting 'face-to-face' and virtual communication. A potential area for exploration with cyberspace is the possibility that new forms of subjectivity, self-identity and autonomy are able to emerge that are not necessarily associated with entrenched power interests. These are the same questions raised within critical pedagogy and subaltern studies and suggest that cyberspace may be a site of engagement that challenges hegemonic structures.41

If groups outside the Western academy feel that dialogue and communication with academics results in an appropriation of their knowledge for the benefit of the hegemonic subject, we lose the ability to create a discursive space in which a democratic community of knowing subjects can emerge. Spivak may be right in that our efforts to engage in an authentic dialogue with the subaltern or marginal 'other' ought not to have an immediate instrumental aim of building our knowledge base. The intersubjective relations of the life-world that presuppose a shared language and ability to understand another's world view require the degrees of trust and solidarity needed for any sense of community. I would argue that our internationalization efforts need to recognize the need for community-building that is not tied to the instrumentality of our own knowledge acquisition. At the same time, this process can lead us to recognize our own boundaries and thus clarify the contingencies of our own existing knowledges.
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Note that there were many efforts dating back to the early 1980s supporting the ‘internationalization of the curriculum’, but this work did not gain full force and institutional momentum until the early 1990s. Also there is a distinction between the guidelines and recommendations for strengthening international education, or international studies, or even a more general ‘international dimension’, and the push that came later for Internationalization of the Curriculum in a more integrative sense with highly centralized state support. On the latter, see Michael Kennedy, ‘The Articulation of International Expertise in the Professional Representations and Potentials in the Extension of Area Studies’ (Global Challenges and US Higher Education Conference, Duke University, January 2003).


Association of International Education Administrators (1995), p9. Stanley Heginbotham, at that time vice president of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), was a member of this working group. See his 1994 articles in Chronicle of Higher Education and the SSRC Items and Issues on the policy shift cited in this report.


Green, ‘Challenge’

See NAfSA: Association of International Educators, Internationalizing the Campus: Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities (New York: NAfSA, 2003) for the profession’s selection of best practices in internationalization efforts. See also the University of Michigan and its commitment to integration of international studies documented in its Journal of the International Institute.


Barbara Burn, ‘The Curriculum as a Global Domain’, Journal of Studies in International Education, 6(3), Fall 2002, pp253–61. Burn, for example, in citing this resistance to curricular change, suggests bypassing faculty and focusing on study abroad as a way of engaging students in international issues. She suggests that this may result in ‘piecemeal’ changes over time as students return to the campus with new interests. See her reference to assessments of curricular change in P. O’Meara, H. D. Mehlinger and R. M. A. Newman (eds), Changing Perspectives on International Education (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001).

Siaya and Hayward, Mapping Internationalization, p15.

Michael McKinley, ‘The Co-option of the University and the Privileging of Annihilation’, *International Relations*, in this issue.


25 For example, in this issue, Janice Newson, ‘Disrupting the “Student as Consumer” Model’, considers how we can invent the ‘consumer model of education’ and empower students to take responsibility for their own learning. This approach opens a new discursive space that can then be accompanied by an awareness of consumption within capitalist society and the corporate university.


28 See Timothy Reagan, *Non-Western Educational Traditions: Alternative Approaches to Educational Thought and Practice*, 2nd eds (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000), for a consideration of non-Western educational practices and the implications that these raise for educational thought.

29 See Giroux and McLaren, *Between Borders*, for the duality of culture as practice and practice as culture; I am viewing this as embedded in the wider social structures and an assumption that these structures and the social practices of a community mutually constitute each other.

30 See Mohanty, *On Race and Voice*, for a footnoted discussion of this notion of intersubjectivity and the problems it raises in terms of ‘historical agencies’ (p163).

31 In much of Freire’s work he discusses the student-teacher and teacher-student. While this is an important decentering of authority, I think that even this dyad is too narrow to fully appreciate the community learning approach.

The term subaltern, as originally defined by Ranajit Guha, referred to a subjugated and subordinate subject position. Influenced by Gramsci and E. P. Thompson, the concept was originally applied to the understanding of rural peasant insurgency movements in India. These were groups that lacked formal representation or recognized agency within either the British colonial or local Indian political hierarchies. See Chaurvedi, *Mapping Subaltern Studies* for a review of the history of subaltern studies.


This is not a new perspective, as many Third World intellectuals, feminists and critical theorists had been making this argument throughout much of the 20th century.

In a Gramscian mode, Beverley asks how the dilemmas posed by subaltern studies can lead subjects of higher education to rethink their roles and responsibilities of transforming higher education into an institution where democratic practices serve as a model for liberatory structure within a wider society.


