

## APPENDIX B DISCUSSION PAPER

### “Thinking Again, and Anew, About Global Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century”

Dr. Peg Lee  
President, Oakton Community College  
Des Plaines, IL

*“You must be the change you wish to see in the world.”*  
*Mahatma Gandhi*

Dear Colleagues:

As we move toward the fourth anniversary of the global horror that was 9/11, it is imperative that we reflect anew on global education in a world that changes at mach speed and challenges us to make sense and meaning in the midst of it all. This is the first attempt at some “white paper-like” thoughts on the importance of global education for community colleges in the year 2005 and beyond. Please consider it an invitation to dialogue and conversation. I will begin with recalling a little history of what amounts to our work together; continue reflecting on the first fruits of that work; move to thinking about the post 9/11 world; and finally, presenting some ideas that encourage reflections on both the day in which we find ourselves and where we might be tomorrow.

#### **A Look Back**

*“America is now at the crossroads. We will either rediscover our relationships globally or develop the dangerous and sometimes fatal attitude of isolationism. This country is struggling in its own soul as to whether we are a part of the larger human community. We are so big that we have the illusion that we can be isolationists. We dare not try to live with that delusion and fail to confront the human community and its future.”*

-Ernest Boyer, Keynote Address to Airlie I, 1994

In 2001, the American Association of Community Colleges engaged in a vision, mission, values, and goals planning process that resulted in the establishing of strategic directions for the organization and, by implication, for community colleges across the membership. Not initially embraced as a necessary strategic direction, the sixth goal area on International and Intercultural Education was adopted when the response from the membership to the first draft of the directions asked why such an important dimension was not included.<sup>i</sup>

The roots of the clamor for inclusion can be traced back to several catalytic forces. In 1988, AACC created the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges and charged this blue-ribbon task force to

consider the mission and role of community colleges at the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first century. The report of the taskforce, written with the guidance and inspiration of its chair, Ernest Boyer, insisted on the need for a broader and deeper understanding of community—"not a region to be served, but a climate to be created" in our classrooms, on our campuses and around the world.<sup>ii</sup> BUILDING COMMUNITIES: A VISION FOR A NEW CENTURY did not explicitly address global education, but it articulated eloquently the underlying rationale for community college involvement in a world wider than the local district, or even of the state or nation.

A year later, in 1989, the American Council on Education issued a "call to action on foreign<sup>iii</sup> language competence . . . addressed to the leaders of American higher education—the presidents and chancellors, academic vice presidents, provosts and deans who are responsible for giving academic direction to our colleges and universities." The monograph, WHAT WE CAN'T SAY CAN HURT US, demanded "action by all who are shocked and dismayed by reports of the level of ignorance of Americans regarding the rest of the world and those who are concerned by our continued inability to communicate with other people using their native language." Such competence, the report claimed, was nothing less than essential "for our economic competitiveness, national security, and the protection of America's position in the world."<sup>iv</sup>

Perhaps serendipitously, in 1993, the Stanley Foundation identified the American Council on International/Intercultural Education as a desirable partner in their mission of fostering world peace and the survival of the planet by shaping a globally competent citizenry. The first act of this partnership was the developing and convening of a conference at the Airlie Center in Warrenton, Virginia from November 28-30, 1994. The work of the twenty-four participants drawn from both the fields of international education and the federal government resulted in policy directions and implementation strategies recorded in the publication, BUILDING THE GLOBAL COMMUNITY: THE NEXT STEP.<sup>v</sup>

Motivated by a keynote address by Ernest Boyer (whose spirit shaped the AACC report) and charged with setting goals for the work of community colleges in global education, the participants adopted the following mission statement for the work begun at Airlie I: *"To ensure the survival and well-being of our communities, it is imperative that community colleges develop a globally and multiculturally competent citizenry"* (i) They established a plan of action, calling for an education which advances knowledge and understanding in five areas:

- Global interdependence
- Human resources, values and culture
- Global environment and natural resources
- Global peace and conflict management
- Change and alternate futures

The participants also outlined six categories and strategies within each to move toward accomplishing the mission:

- Educational approaches
- Organizational partnerships
- The technological frontier

- Consultation with other nations
- Coordination of community college efforts
- Celebration of our commonalities, our differences, and our interdependencies

Following Airlie I, the Stanley Foundation continued to collaborate with ACIIE, financially assisting community colleges in their efforts to raise global consciousness on their campuses and in their people and to reflect that consciousness in courses, curricula, and commitment to expanded mission. A number of regional meetings and a satellite teleconference helped to disseminate the findings of BUILDING THE GLOBAL COMMUNITY to trustees, presidents, administrators, faculty and staff across the country.

Interest and commitment continued to build and both were given additional vigor at the second conference at the Airlie Center. Given the theme, EDUCATING FOR THE GLOBAL COMMUNITY: A FRAMEWORK FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES<sup>vi</sup>, twenty-three community college leaders and representatives of government agencies gathered to think together about two critical questions:

- What does it mean to be a globally competent learner?
- What is required institutionally for community colleges to produce globally competent learners?

The participants agreed that *“Global competency exists when a learner is able to understand the interconnectedness of peoples and systems, to have a general knowledge of history and world events, to accept and cope with the existence of different cultural values and attitudes and, indeed, to celebrate the richness and benefits of this diversity”* (4).

Given this definition, the participants summarized the attributes of a globally competent learner and the institutions capable of educating for global competence. The globally competent learner is one who:

- Is empowered to make a difference in society
- Is committed to lifelong learning
- Is aware of diversity, commonalities, and interdependent
- Recognizes the geopolitical and economic interdependence of our world
- Appreciates the impact of other cultures on American life
- Accepts the importance of all peoples
- Is capable of working in diverse teams
- Understands the non-universality of culture, religion, and values
- Accepts responsibility for global citizenship

The institution equipped and empowered to create and support the globally competent learner will:

- Obtain the commitment of the college’s president and board of trustees
- Include global education as an integral component of the institution’s mission statement to establish it as a priority for the college and its community
- Review and revise accreditation criteria to acknowledge the importance of global competency
- Develop and implement a comprehensive global education program on campus

- Conduct a needs assessment for local businesses and others interested in global education and commerce
- Allocate resources, including released time, to faculty for research and development of curriculum, exchanges, and activities
- Provide support and incentives for international initiatives, both on and off campus
- Provide student services—academic advising, career counseling, instructional support services—to promote access to global education for all learners.

As the world and AACC moved closer to the millennium, the Association, together with the Association of Community College Trustees and with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, embarked on the NEW EXPEDITIONS project. The project posed and sought responses to the question: “If you could build a community college for 2010, what would it look like and whom would it serve?” ACIIE and CCID, working in partnership with the Stanley Foundation, developed a process that resulted in the submission of a key position paper on global education to the NEW EXPEDITIONS project. Returning to the mission statement developed at Airlie I (“To ensure the survival and well-being of our communities, it is imperative that community colleges develop a globally and multiculturally competent citizenry.”) and emphasizing their spreading the word subsequently to thousands of community college educators across the country—enabling them both to learn about the significance and possibilities for global education and to develop their own institutional action plans, the leaders of the movement within ACIIE, CCID, and the Stanley Foundation wisely surveyed community colleges across the country, called for testimony in Washington, DC and convened Airlie III. The message was plain and powerful:

*The challenges and problems faced by community colleges now and as we move into the next millennium are at their core, **global** challenges and problems. This report responds directly to the critical questions posed by NEW EXPEDITIONS in the areas of keeping pace with technology, meeting the needs of a diverse student body, and remaining economically viable and locally responsive in a community that has become global. Indeed, **all** of the issues being explored by the NEW EXPEDITIONS project are global issues. . . . The community college of the 21<sup>st</sup> century will position itself as a community of learners engaged in their world community, having evolved to that point through a series of intermediate steps (3).*

In CHARTING THE FUTURE OF GLOBAL EDUCATION IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES,<sup>vii</sup> the authors of the document describe and comment on the evolution of community colleges and assert that “Community colleges are charged to develop their learners as citizens of the world. . . . Global citizenship requires the understanding and practice of global ethics. In the world arena, community colleges are positioned to serve as the catalyst for linkages between local and state governments and their counterparts abroad” (9). In the authors’ view, globally competent learners understand and embrace the reality that we are interdependent and share more similarities than differences as human beings who call this shrinking planet our home.

The report concludes that

*The next natural evolution of community college development is global. . . . The true worth of community colleges continues to be understated, underappreciated, and undervalued by too many decision and policy makers at the federal, state, and local levels. It is our obligation to change this. There are far too few champions for community college capacities to transform society.*

*Global education has, as its core, the capability to educate generations of American global citizens about the world's condition, its past, present, and future. We must all learn that a more stable world produces greater peace and security with more freedoms and justice. A stable world has a better prospect of emerging when we understand it as a whole, without limiting our focus to . . . the US. What can be of greater importance than global education? The New Expedition envisioned by AACC and ACCT takes us across the world, simply by virtue of the realities of the world we inhabit. Global is not an add-on; it is the new expedition. And community and technical colleges will serve as the vanguard for global education into the next century (10).*

In spite of the compelling testimony and powerful report, it was evident that more convincing needed to be done. Only after a great deal of pressure brought to bear by global educators across the country did AACC include, actually did add-on, the international and intercultural component to its strategic directions. ACIIE remained faithful to its mission and insistent on the centrality of teaching and learning with a global perspective. By 2002, following seminars in thirty states focused on “going global” in the local community college, there were more than 20 state consortia comprised of community college faculty, administrators, trustees and staff committed to the good work of global vision for students and communities across the land.

There was growing realization that the concept and reality of “globalization” was multidimensional—embracing among its many characteristics, the intercultural as well as the international connection. Responding to the heightened interest in the intercultural dimension of globalization, the true believers representing ACIIE, AACC, ACCT, CCID and the Stanley Foundation convened once again at Airlie in March, 2002 to reflect on THE INTERCULTURAL CONNECTION: GLOBAL EDUCATION IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE.<sup>viii</sup> The participants in this last Airlie gathering engaged in conversation about the dimensions of global education with a slightly different focus

*International and intercultural education are the two aspects of what many educators refer to as global education. International education refers to the body of activities, which engages Americans in contact with individuals and institutions outside US borders, and intercultural (or multicultural) education focuses on undertakings which deal with the rich diversity of cultures within the United States. Taken together, the two currents form the seamless web that many refer to as global (4).*

The participants began by developing a definition of intercultural competence and went on to discuss how to achieve it. They agreed that “*Intercultural competence is defined as ‘the combination of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and awareness that results in effective and appropriate behavior in*

*interacting with those who are different from ourselves” (6). Such competence cannot be fostered without institution wide commitment through mission. The conferees articulated a statement that captures both the vision and the mission:*

*It is the role and responsibility of the community college to be actively engaged in the development of effective, appropriate, and sensitive behavior in college constituents and its community when interacting with those who are different from themselves. This is achieved through the cultivation of knowledge, attitudes, skills, and awareness appropriate to living successfully in a global society. The board, administration, faculty, staff and students are responsible for defining and demonstrating specific learning outcomes that achieve this vision (6).*

Among the elements of the conference were a discussion of varying definitions of international, intercultural, multicultural, and global education in use in the field of higher education. There was a good deal of conversation about the ways in which

*race and culture represent two separate threads within intercultural education. . . . [H]uman nature seeks to differentiate on the basis of our own uniqueness, the insinuated self in conflict with the collective self. We must learn to honor the part that is different as well as the part that we share. . . . If, as some propose, the sameness we experience in a homogeneous environment forms a barrier that prevents us from wanting to learn more about others, then we need to erase that barrier by facing it, acknowledging it, and moving forward(5).*

The Airlie IV participants considered how “many are trapped by memories of past experiences, including the scars of family prejudices often dating back generations. Those who have learned to overcome these obstacles frequently do so because of their own direct experience with real people of other cultures.” Inspired by the keynoter, Kent Farnsworth, who illustrated from his own teaching and learning that “‘information about’ a subject does not change attitudes. That changes comes only through some kind of ‘experience with’ the subject—an experience that connects at the emotional level rather than just the intellectual level” (18). Farnsworth helped lead the participants to the conclusion that it is the “heart connection” that effects the change in mind and thought: “the learning environment for the intercultural must be experiential as well as academic. It is often much easier to develop the knowledge base and skills than it is to incorporate the affective elements of intercultural understanding.” The conferees also stressed “the interdisciplinary nature of cultural studies and how multicultural and multilingual approaches add to the richness of the educational experience” and noted “recent studies [that] have supported the view that more critical thinking goes on in a diverse classroom” (5).

### **After Airlie**

*“[Globalization], the seismic realignment of our world—is being created, and will be formed, by human contact, human relationship, human conversation. Paradoxically, these one-on-one connections can be more immediate and effective in a global world than they ever were before.”*

(Krista Tippett, “Engaging with Others in a Plural World”)

Shortly after Airlie IV, the Stanley Foundation backed away from its nearly decade long support of the global education efforts of community colleges, but there was no lack of awareness of the importance of the global dimension across the spectrum of higher education. The American Council on Education demonstrated the interest in and focus evident in the 1998 publication, EDUCATING FOR GLOBAL COMPETENCE: AMERICA’S PASSPORT TO THE FUTURE<sup>x</sup> in its early Ford Foundation funded 2001 monograph: INTERNATIONALIZATION OF U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION: A Preliminary Status Report.<sup>x</sup> The study paints a bleak picture of the state of international education in the nation’s four year colleges and universities, concluding that “international education is . . . a poorly documented phenomenon” and the snapshot that is available “leaves much to be desired: Foreign language enrollments are low; international courses constitute only a small part of college and university curricula; study abroad . . . remains an undervalued and underutilized means of instruction; internationalization worthy of campus-wide integration is rare; and most graduates are ill-prepared to face the global marketplace of employment and ideas” (4).

In fact, the report concludes that there had been no improvement evident since ACE’s 1986-87 assessment of the status of international education. Thus, “the challenge to higher education . . . is clear. We need to increase the participation of students in international programs, reshape and internationalize the curriculum and co-curriculum of our . . . institutions, and develop a comprehensive international agenda for undergraduates across the curriculum. Now is the time to begin better preparing our graduates for productive roles in a world of new and rapidly changing realities” (4).

This preliminary report was followed by a 2003 collection of descriptive data and analyses, MAPPING INTERNATIONALIZATION ON U.S. CAMPUSES and a 2005 subsequent expansion of the study of each sector of higher education, including one monograph on community colleges, MEASURING INTERNATIONALIZATION AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES.<sup>xi</sup> Recognizing that community colleges make up nearly half of all higher education institutions and enroll close to half of the undergraduate population in the U.S., the authors of the monograph acknowledged that community colleges “are no strangers to the national conversation on internationalization” and cited the Airlie conversations as an indicator of the interest. However, community colleges did not measure up on the ACE’s metrics of internationalization.

### **The Post 9/11 World**

*“It is often said that the world changed on 9/11. I would argue, however, that the attacks on America that day served as a flash of lightning that illuminated an already changed world landscape—one that we have only just begun to understand and chart a course through.”*

(Joseph Nye, “Soft Power and Higher Education”)

In June, 2003 the American Council on Education, in cooperation with the European University Association and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada gathered a group of 30 presidents, rectors, and vice-chancellors in Salzburg, Austria at Schloss Leopoldskron, the home of the Salzburg Seminar for the eighth session of the Transatlantic Dialogue—a cross-border conversation that began in 1989. The ensuing report, HIGHER EDUCATION IN a PLURALIST WORLD: A TRANSATLANTIC VIEW<sup>xii</sup> reflects their broad and deep conversations centered on critical questions for higher education in the post 9/11 world: “How can academics, staff and students contribute to a community of tolerance and understanding? Could academe present a more universal view of diversity, in terms of people, interests, and cultures? Was not higher education a laboratory for pluralism, where different opinions, identities, and creative innovations informed a changing society?” And, assenting to the proposition that “higher education is more than a spectator of society; it is a part of its community and, indeed, an actor in its development. . . . [Its] role is not neutral” (15) The participants in the conversation agreed that “higher education’s capacity to stand apart from society is increasingly balanced by growing connections to it. . . . Where then does higher education integration with its community begin and end?” (15)

Although the focus was not inclusive of community college institutions, there were two community college CEO’s among the participants and, even more interesting, the language and conclusions of the report resound with values and perspectives at the heart of the community college vision and mission:

*Creating an institution that is both inclusive and coherent, that serves its people and its purpose, requires inspired leadership, strong institutional autonomy, and clear personal integrity from staff and students. The challenge to higher education institutions in a pluralist society is both to be responsive to the needs of society while also anticipating these needs and to create a path to new ways of being, doing, and thinking. To do both, institutions must confront their own assumptions and those widely shared in the larger society. They must ask themselves difficult questions about their goals, strategies, and accomplishments, so that they can propose early solutions to the problems emerging from a continually changing and increasingly complex world. If the first few years of the 21<sup>st</sup> century are any indication of the future, the defining challenge for the globe will be to create and sustain peaceful pluralist communities, nations, and regions. History has shown how daunting that challenge can be, and the astronomical cost of failure. The stakes are high for higher education and for the globe (29-30).*

In November, 2003 NAFSA issued the report of its Strategic Task Force, co-chaired by the late Paul Simon and former Education Secretary Richard Riley, on Education Abroad. SECURING AMERICA’S FUTURE: GLOBAL EDUCATION FOR A GLOBAL AGE<sup>xiii</sup> spoke with the same sense of urgency.

*The challenges of the new millennium are unquestionably global in nature. This reality imposes a new and urgent demand on Americans, one this country has been all too quick to ignore: international knowledge and skills are imperative for the future security and competitiveness of the United States. The rhetoric of a decade attests to the widespread recognition of this fundamental truth, yet concrete steps to fulfill this need have been few.*

*Strong leadership and a coherent policy are still lacking, and the cost of inaction grows ever greater. . . . We strongly believe that the events of September 11, 2001, constituted a wake-up call—a warning that America’s ignorance of the world is now a national liability. Americans in vastly greater numbers must devote a substantive portion of their education to gaining an understanding of other countries, regions, languages, and cultures, through direct personal experience” (iv).*

### **What about Today? And Tomorrow?**

*“In the weeks and months that have passed, it has become ever more clear that we face great dangers in the coming century, and that we are not adequately prepared for them. On the one hand, globalization is bringing us closer together than ever before, interweaving our lives, nationally and internationally, in complex and inextricable ways. On the other, a new tribalism—a regression to older and more fractious loyalties—is driving us ever more angrily apart. One way or another, religion is and will continue to be, part of these processes. . . . Politicians have power, but religions . . . have influence. Politics moves the pieces on the chessboard. Religion changes lives. Peace can be agreed around the conference table; but unless it grows in ordinary hearts and minds, it does not last. It may not even begin.”*

(Jonathan Sacks, THE DIGNITY OF DIFFERENCE: How to Avoid the Clash of Civilizations)

Nearly four years ago the world was shaken by the events of 9/11. And only four days ago, as I was working on this paper, four simultaneous explosions on mass transit wreaked havoc in the midst of the London rush hour. Earlier today, suicide bombers in Baghdad killed, maimed or injured more than 50 of their own people, including eleven children. Daily reports of such suicide bombings killing innocent people assault our senses and trouble our minds. In our roles as teachers and leaders in higher education, in our nation’s community colleges, what can we do? What should we do? What must we do? At our peril and for the survival of our planet and those who inhabit it, we must think (and understand) globally and act locally. How shall we do this at this time, in the places where we find ourselves?

I continue to worry when the reasons and strategies advanced for embracing the global perspective begin and end with the bottom line. Although economic realities compel our attention and the presence of Thomas Friedman’s THE WORLD IS FLAT at or close to the top of the best-seller lists suggest that, indeed, “it is the economy, stupid!” I believe it is foolish and short-sighted to so limit our vision and understanding. Even Friedman’s own propositions lead those who would read between the lines beyond the merely economic motivation. Before his best-seller was published, Friedman summarized his notion of how technology and geo-economics are reshaping our world and our lives by leveling the playing field, flattening out the world. He describes how, 500 years after Columbus concluded that the world was round; we citizens of the same planet had—in the intervening years-- made our world flat.<sup>xiv</sup> In Friedman’s own words

*Globalization 1.0 (1492 to 1800) shrank the world from a size large to a size medium, and the dynamic force in that era was countries globalizing for resources and imperial conquest.*

*Globalization 2.0 (1800 to 2000) shrank the world from a size medium to a size small, and it was spearheaded by companies globalizing for markets and labor. Globalization 3.0 . . . is shrinking the world from a size small to a size tiny and flattening the playing field at the same time (2).*

We've moved, according to Friedman's thesis, from countries globalizing through companies globalizing and are now in the era where the dynamic force driving globalization is small groups or individuals. And whereas the countries and companies were primarily European and American, the new push for globalization is driven by a much more diverse, non-western, non-white population. "In Globalization 3.0, you are going to see every color of the human rainbow take part. . . [With] the flattening of the world . . . we are now in the process of connecting all the knowledge pools in the world together" (2).

Both the perils and possibilities of such connectedness are great and some have already made their mark. Osama bin Laden connected terrorist knowledge pools through al Qaeda and hackers have brought down corporate computer systems; but on the other hand the same connectedness creates the possibility of innovation from every quarter of the planet. Friedman reminds us that "only 30 years ago, if you had a choice of being born a B student in Boston or a genius in Bangalore or Beijing, you probably would have chosen Boston, because a genius in Beijing or Bangalore could not really take advantage of his or her talent. They could not plug and play globally. . . {But, now} when the world is flat . . . anyone with smarts, access to Google, and a cheap wireless laptop can join the innovation fray" (2).

According to Friedman, the world flattened fast in the nineties as a result of the convergence of ten events and forces:

- First, not 9/11, but 11/9/89. The Berlin Wall came down, followed six months later by Windows 3.0 going up as a global computer interface.
- Second, another 9; this time 8/9/95, the day Netscape browser went public, bringing the Internet alive. It was, arguably, the Netscape stock offering that "triggered the dot-com boom, which triggered the dot-com bubble, which triggered the massive overinvestment of billions of dollars in fiber-optic telecommunications cable" (2). Supply exceeded demand and the cost of image, data and voice transmission connected the world for cheap.
- Third, made possible by the first and second flatteners, was "workflow." As the Netscape moment connected people to people as never before, what the workflow revolution did was connect applications to applications so that people all over the world could work together like never before.

The first three flatteners, in Friedman's view, established the platform for new kinds of collaboration. The new forms of collaboration force the world even flatter, transforming and revolutionizing the ways in which individuals and companies in all around the world could work together:

- Thus, the fourth, "outsourcing," the digitizing, disaggregating and shifting all over the world processes from accounting to software writing (Friedman says "where it could be done better and cheaper"—not acknowledging that bringing the bounty of new jobs to some and depriving others of their livelihoods).
- The fifth, "off shoring," moved whole factories "from Canton, Ohio to Canton, China with the same mixed blessings as "outsourcing."

- The sixth, “open sourcing,” producing operating systems such as Linux through online collaboration without compensation.
- The seventh, “in sourcing,” i.e. importing a company to function within another company—with some of the same mixed blessings as outsourcing and off shoring.
- The eighth, “supply-chaining,” is epitomized by Wall-mart’s strategy, i.e. creating “a global supply chain down to the last atom of efficiency so that if . . . an item [is sold] in Arkansas, another is immediately made in China. (If Walmart were a country, it would be China’s eighth largest trading partner.)
- The ninth, “informing,” enabled by search engines universally accessible that encourage unlimited data mining by individuals and collaboration across the globe.

The tenth flattener Friedman calls “‘the steroids,’ . . . wireless access and voice over Internet protocol (VoIP) . . . [that] turbocharge all these new forms of collaboration, so you can now do any one of them, from anywhere, with any device” (3) For Friedman, “the challenge of flatism” results from what he calls the practice of “extreme capitalism” and poses a challenge much greater than any challenge posed by Communism in the era of the Cold War where “[t]he main objective in that era was building a strong state, and the main objective in this era is building strong individuals” (5).

Friedman’s insights are compelling and his writing hard to ignore, but everything about globalization, its promises and its perils, for Friedman comes down to economics and the bottom line. There are several of his contemporaries whose vision has, I believe, more breadth and depth and whose message has more relevance for us as we reflect on the present and plan for the future. In the 2005 FUTURE’S FORUM, Lester Thurow, an economist himself, asks “Why Are the Fears of Globalization So High?”<sup>xv</sup> Thurow contends that “[a]ntiglobalization is not a traditional left-right political split. Both sides juxtapose their understanding of the good society with the American variant—‘cowboy capitalism’ on the left and ‘mongrelization’ on the right. Except for their dislike of globalization and what they see as the invasion of American culture, they agree on little else” (9).

In Thurow’s scheme of things, our world has moved from agricultural through industrial eras “in which wealth was based upon natural resources, into a knowledge-based era, in which wealth is built upon skills, education, research, and development. For the first time in human history, it is possible to be fabulously rich by controlling knowledge. Intellectual property rights have replaced mining rights as the drivers of success. The soft power of cultural, educational, and technological dominance has replaced the hard power of colonial rule and geographic military expansion. In a very real sense, intellectual conquest has replaced geographical conquest” (8).

While the economic causes and effects of globalization are important to Thurow, there are other dimensions that interest him as much or more—the cultural and the political in particular. For example, he suggests that “a new global culture is being built; much of it is being built in America, but what is emerging is not a global copy of traditional American practices. World football (soccer), not American football, is a global game” (9). As the growth of global culture is accompanied by the growth of a global economy, there is both a need for global management and a fear of global government. (Think of the recent votes against the EU constitution as a current and apt illustration of such fear).

“Today,” says Thurow, there is no world government so the U.S. plays the dominant role in globalization because it is by far the world’s largest economy and the globe’s dominant military power. This

dominance leads to resentment and fuels anti-American sentiments, as Americans are viewed as getting too many of the gains from globalization. American higher education could help defuse this situation by contributing to the development of international organizations that effectively manage globalization and ultimately build a prosperous, fair, and inclusive global economy” (9).

Education is the key to shaping globalization for the good of society. A fundamental component of the necessary social structure to “construct a better globalization” is the commitment to an educated society. “Societies in which everyone is educated are more productive than those in which just a few are educated. . . . Much talk centers on the digital divide between the rich and the poor, but the real divide is educational. . . . Higher education excels at generating knowledge. But we must also be responsible for managing and using that knowledge” (10).

It clearly falls to higher education to shape the future by managing and using knowledge as well as generating it, and by changing hearts as well as minds. Such education is an instrument of power—what Joseph Nye calls “soft power” rather than “hard power” in his essay “Soft Power and Higher Education.”<sup>xvi</sup> A co-contributor with Thurow to the FUTURES FORUM, 2005, Nye speaks of the relation between hard and soft power—“both aspects of the ability to achieve one’s purpose by affecting the behavior of others. The distinction between them is one of degree, both in the nature of the behavior and in the tangibility of the resources. Command power—the ability to change *what others do*—can rest on coercion or inducement. Co-optive power—the ability to shape *what others want*—can rest on the attractiveness of one’s culture and values or on the ability to manipulate” (12).

Nye makes a compelling argument for the role of higher education in the post 9/11 where the “focus has been on the use of hard power . . . . One metric to assess progress in the current struggle against terrorism is whether the number of terrorists being killed with hard power is greater than the number Osama bin Laden is recruiting with his soft power” (13). There is evidence that American higher education is the source of “significant soft power for the United States. Secretary of State Colin Powell . . . said in 2001, ‘I can think of no more valuable asset to our country than the friendship of future world leaders who have been educated here’ (14).”

### **Concluding Observations**

*We have all known the long loneliness and we have learned that the only solution is love and that comes in community. It all happened while we sat there talking, and it is still going on.* (Dorothy Day, THE LONG LONELINESS)

In these reflections on global education, I have looked back to the end of the 1980’s and considered the attention to and involvement of higher education, particularly community colleges. I have cited some of the principal documents—conference reports, monographs—that suggest both the underlying ideas and the strategies and actions developed as higher education responded. I have tried to represent the ideas accurately and have either paraphrased or quoted extensively from the original materials. In considering what has happened to global education “After Airlie” and in the “Post 9/11 World,” I have again selected what I consider representative materials and attempted to frame another snapshot of the

condition of global education in higher education and implicitly or explicitly advance some of the reasons for the current state of affairs.

Similarly, in wondering “What about Today? And Tomorrow?”

I have drawn on the ideas of the currently immensely popular writer, Thomas Friedman; the highly respected M.I.T. professor, Lester Thurow; and the former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs and Dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, Joseph Nye. Clearly, these are not the final or the only ideas that are relevant to what happens next and where we should go with our planning and advocacy for renewed interest and action in global education in higher education. However, I found them thought-provoking either through what they attended to and/or omitted from the discussions cited. I was reminded of the ideas and values that have compelled those of us who have carried the banner for global education for the last twenty years to begin and to continue to spread what we believe is not simply the good word about but the imperative to do education that is global.

*“We must love each other, or die.”*

W.H. Auden

Hopefully,

Margaret (Peg) Lee

18 July 2005

## ENDNOTES

The sixth strategic action area finally added to the AACC's BUILDING A NATION OF LEARNERS focused on the obligation of community colleges to prepare students for work and life in an increasing global economy and to extending the community college movement to other countries. The primary emphasis has been, from the beginning, the recruitment of international students. The full text of the document is available on the AACC website ([www.aacc@nche.edu](http://www.aacc@nche.edu)).

BUILDING COMMUNITIES: AVISION FOR A NEW CENTURY. Washington, D.C.: AACC, 1988.

Although the study is a powerful call to action, it is more than a little interesting to note the use of "foreign" rather than "other" languages.

WHAT WE CAN'T SAY CAN HURT US: A Call for Foreign Language Competence by the Year 2000 (An American Council on Education Policy Statement). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1989, 1.

BUILDING THE GLOBAL COMMUNITY: THE NEXT STEP was first published with the support of the Stanley Foundation and ACIE in 1995. The report is actually the proceedings of the first Airlie Conference held from November 28-30, 1994 at the Airlie Center in Warrenton, Va. The citations within this document are from the print edition but may also be found through ACIE (<http://www.acie.org>) and the Stanley Foundation websites (<http://www.stanleyfdn.org>).

Subsequently referred to as Airlie I, I use the same strategy for all four of what have become commonly known as the "Airlie Reports."

EDUCATING FOR THE GLOBAL COMMUNITY: A FRAMEWORK FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES was published in 1997. The report summarizes the discussions of the second Airlie Conference held at the Airlie Center from November 15-17, 1996 at the Airlie Center in Warrenton, Va.

NEW EXPEDITIONS: Charting the Future of Global Education in Community Colleges, December 1998 is the report of a joint effort of the American Council on International/Intercultural Education (ACIE), the Community Colleges for International Development (CCID), and the Stanley Foundation. It was developed by a group of community college leaders long invested in the work of global education at the Airlie Center in Warrenton, Va. from Dec. 4-6, 1998 and is the third Airlie document. The report was one of the working papers submitted to the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) in order to influence the organization's planning for the future in the hope that global education would indeed emerge as a priority.

The fourth Airlie document, THE INTERCULTURAL CONNECTION: GLOBAL EDUCATION IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES reflects the work of the participants from March 15-17, 2002 at the Airlie Center in Warrenton, Va. It was published later that same year by ACIE and Oakton Community College, Des Plaines, IL, and printed for wider distribution by the Association of Community College Trustees.

Carrying the endorsements of the American Association of Community Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Association of American Universities, The College Board, NAFSA: Association of International Educators, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the monograph, EDUCATING FOR GLOBAL COMPETENCE: AMERICA'S PASSPORT TO THE FUTURE, was published in 1998 in Washington, D.C. by the American Council on Education. The report focuses on "new realities of economic competitiveness and national security in a global context," recognizes the many issues which cross borders, and calls for new approaches and partnerships "to ensure a globally aware and competent citizenry" (v).

Published in 2000 by ACE, this monograph expands on the earlier 1998 study cited above.

Funded again by the Ford Foundation, these studies are statistical in nature and focus on categorizing kinds and numbers of activities engaged in by colleges “highly active” or “less active” in internationalizing their campuses.

Authored by Madeleine Green from the American Council on Education and Andris Barblan from the European University Association, HIGHER EDUCATION IN A PLURALIST WORLD: A TRANSATLANTIC VIEW was published by the American Council on Education in 2004. The report reflects the substance of the discussions that took place the previous year.

Published as an eighteen page monograph in 2003 in New York by NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

The article, “It’s a Flat World, After All” appeared in print in the NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE on April 3, 2005. Citations in this paper are from the web version, in which there are six pages of text.  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/04/03/magazine/03DOMINANCE>.

See Lester Thurow, “Why Are the Fears of Globalization So High?” in FUTURES FORUM 2005: EXPLORING THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 7-10.

Joseph Nye, “Soft Power and Higher Education” in FUTURES FORUM 2005: EXPLORING THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 11-14. Thomas Friedman asks “Why are young Sunni Muslim males, from London to Riyadh and Bali to Baghdad, so willing to blow up themselves and others in the name of their religion. . . . There are a lot of angry people in the world. . . . But the only ones who seem to feel entitled and motivated to kill themselves and totally innocent people, including other Muslims, over their anger are young Sunni radicals. What is going on?”

Friedman then cautions: “Neither we nor the Muslim world can run away from this question any longer.” He cites the case on the Dutch citizen of Moroccan origin who tracked down the Dutch filmmaker Theo van Gogh and, because van Gogh had been critical of Islamic intolerance, was brutally murdered by Muhammad Bouyeri. Bouyeri told the Dutch court “I take complete responsibility for my actions. I acted purely in the name of my religion.”

Friedman’s view is that Muslim minorities are marginalized as they move into societies where they are “cut off from their country, language, and culture of origin.” Without any sense of connectedness, they are “easy prey for peddlers of a new jihadist identity. . . . Some of these young Muslim men are tempted by a civilization they consider morally inferior, and they are humiliated by the fact that, while having been taught that their faith is supreme, other civilizations seem to be doing much better. . . . When the inner conflict becomes too great, some are turned by recruiters to seek the sick prestige of ‘martyrdom’ by fighting the allegedly unjust occupation of Muslim lands and the ‘decadence’ in our own. This is not about the poverty of money. This is about the poverty of dignity and the rage it can trigger.”