

Introduction: Globalization and Higher Education in the Americas

Carlos Alberto Torres

Robert A. Rhoads

The Global Context

Globalization is the buzzword of the day. Whether we like it or not, globalization is affecting our lives and the lives of most of the people on earth in complex ways. From the growing diversity of our urban centers to the many ways in which technology touches our lives, to the long arms of international economic organizations and transnational corporations, to the far-reaching power of weapons of mass destruction, to the violent and tragic responses of the disenfranchised, global processes abound. As with most social phenomena, globalization is contradictory and difficult to define. What cannot be disputed, however, is that globalization is playing a major role in reshaping culture, politics, and education.

Globalization provides the backdrop for this book as we seek to make sense of the dynamic relationships among universities, states, and markets throughout the Americas. Of course, the challenge is that there are many

definitions of globalization, or perhaps more accurately, there are many globalizations. For example, globalization has been defined as “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa” (Held 1991, p. 9). Another view sees globalization as “a feature of late capitalism, or the condition of postmodernity, and, more important, . . . the emergence of a world system driven in large part by a global capitalist economy” (Luke and Luke 2000, p. 287). Others see globalization as the transformation of time and space in which complex interactions and exchanges once impossible become everyday activities (Urry 1998). And still others see globalization as an assault on traditional notions of society and nation-state, whereby the very nature of citizenship and social change are dramatically altered (Castells 1997; Touraine 1988).

Images also suggest certain definitions of globalization. For some, the site of a Burger King in Merida, Mexico, or a Starbucks in Guangzhou, China, is telling. For others, the incredible cultural complexity of major urban centers produced by migration and the flow of peoples between countries and continents brings to mind the global nature of today’s world. Some may ponder the realities of globalization when they see the presence of US and British soldiers engaged in the construction and bolstering of an Iraqi government or when they see an airplane flying overhead and for an instant think of September 11, when similar planes were turned into missiles and the reality of terrorism instantly became global.

For the two editors of this book few images offer more profound insights into globalization than the trip we took to Argentina to conduct research for this project. In the spring of 2002 we flew from Los Angeles to Buenos Aires to interview faculty and policy makers at the University of Buenos Aires. After arriving at the Buenos Aires airport, we took a taxi to our hotel near the center of the city. Along the way, however, our driver encountered a crowd of maybe 200 people marching in the streets, banging on pots and pans. They chanted phrases condemning Argentine leaders and global financial agencies such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF). We had read about the nightly *cacerolazos* in the newspapers back in the states. In fact, one of us already had experienced the scores of unemployed protesters marching in the streets of Buenos Aires during a previous trip to his homeland and birthplace. For one of us the profound nature of the economic calamity that had

become the Argentine economy touched home most profoundly. But what brings the two of us together in this book—and what brings us together with the other contributors who have decided to join our project—is an attempt to make sense of the hegemony of a particular strain of globalization and the potentially devastating effects global economic policies continue to have throughout the Americas. And given that we are all educators and intellectuals who value the democratic possibilities of higher education, we have chosen to turn our critical lens on the university. Thus at the heart of this book is a grave concern about the ways in which relationships among universities, states, and markets increasingly are being shaped by forces that are at times antidemocratic. These issues matter to us because we are deeply concerned about the nature of democratic life in an age of globalization.

A Critical Perspective

This book is framed by an intellectual tradition associated with critical social science (Fay 1987). By critical social science we refer to a variety of theoretical frameworks that center social analysis on advancing democratic possibilities. Many critical social theorists see education as a key site for their work, given the role that schools, colleges, and universities play in preparing citizens for participation in the broader society (Giroux 1983; Rhoads and Valadez 1996; Tierney 1993; Torres 1998, 2002). Whether or not educational institutions actually embrace democratic values and also seek to instill such values in students is a major point of concern for critical theorists. From the perspective of the contributors gathered for this book, a central point of contention is the degree to which democratic values are brought to bear on the complex global processes that affect universities throughout the Americas.

Critical theorists tend to believe that all research is politically based and that it is incumbent upon investigators to clarify their basic theoretical positions (Tierney and Rhoads 1993). Consequently, we use the next few pages to identify the theoretical assumptions we bring to this work. And although each of the writers contributing to this book takes a slightly different direction in offering a critical analysis of globalization, all of them embrace the basic assumptions outlined here.

Critical theorists use inquiry as a means for challenging forms of oppression and marginality that limit full and equitable participation in public life (Habermas 1973; Horkheimer 1972; Marcuse 1972). Thus a key contribution of critical theory is the belief that research ought to serve an emancipatory goal. That is, and we paraphrase Karl Marx here, social scientists should not simply interpret the world but should use their inquiry as a vehicle for improving, reforming, or revolutionizing social life. Furthermore, from a critical perspective the changes that social scientists seek ought to advance democratic ideals and practices.

In thinking about democratic possibilities, we take the work of John Dewey and Paulo Freire as starting points for advancing a critical analysis of higher education in a global age. Dewey had a particular vision of democratic life that entailed much more than simply the right to vote. He saw democracy as people actively engaging in meaningful social relations and participating in decisions that affect their lives. Dewey's vision has a strong relational tone, meaning that democracy is dependent on the quality of social relations forged among individuals and groups. A passage from his classic work *Democracy and Education* is relevant: "A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own" (1916, p. 93). In simple terms, no woman or man is an island. Our experiences, our decisions, our actions all influence and shape the lives of others.

Dewey's vision of democracy challenges all citizens to take part in a variety of decisions that balance one's own interests with the interests of others. An important point relative to this book and to issues linked to globalization is Dewey's vision of citizens participating in everyday decisions that affect their lives. Given the role that economic policies play in the lives of citizens, Dewey's democratic vision calls for citizen input at the local, national, and global levels. But where is the democratic space within the context of corporate-driven forms of globalization, when public spheres are increasingly distanced from the nexus of decision making and global trade organizations and multinational enterprises (MNEs) define the terms of world economic affairs? Indeed, a fundamental criticism coming from a variety of

social movements, including those who gathered in the streets of Seattle in 1999 to protest the meetings of the World Trade Organization (WTO), is the lack of representation and the use of open and democratic processes in the construction of global relations. How can average citizens and workers influence global processes when they and their representatives are absent from the table?

Similar to Dewey, Paulo Freire's work in education focused on advancing democratic opportunities. Freire was deeply touched by the lives of quiet desperation that so many lower- and working-class citizens throughout his native homeland of Brazil experienced. He saw education at a grassroots level and believed that engaging people in their communities was key to elevating literacy and raising consciousness. Self-empowerment was vital to the pedagogical project spelled out in Freire's (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, and he believed that average citizens could take charge of their own lives and ultimately develop the critical skills necessary to write their own histories.

Developing literacy programs was a major component of Freire's early work in Brazil, but literacy was much more than simply the ability to read and write. For Freire literacy also involved reading culture and comprehending social structure; every citizen ought to have the opportunity to develop skills and dispositions that will be helpful to making sense of one's own life and for understanding the complex forces that shape the nature of society. The goal for Freire was to develop critical consciousness, or *conscientização*, whereby citizens develop the capacity to offer their own critical analysis of society. But simply critiquing society was insufficient for Freire; he also compelled citizens to act in order to change the course of events that contribute to lives of desperation. The action component of Freire's pedagogy is in part why his work is seen as revolutionary—its basis rests with the Marxist tradition of seeking to understand the world in order to change it. This is the essence of a critical treatment of education.

The Many Faces of Globalization

In seeking to convey a somewhat unified understanding of globalization, we found ourselves spinning in circles. In the end we came to the conclusion that globalization is far too complex to present in a simple formulaic man-

ner. What became rather obvious to us is that globalization has many manifestations that interact simultaneously in a fairly convoluted fashion (or multiple “globalizations”). Yet the many forms of globalization are all deeply affected by the dynamics of international relations of the past few years and, by implication, influence the role that higher education and reform play in the improvement of people’s lives and the societies in which they exist. Consequently, instead of presenting one notion of globalization, we have identified five primary manifestations that stand out in today’s context. Certainly, globalization takes other forms, but the following five provide a solid foundation for framing our book.

One form of globalization, often seen as “globalization from above,” is framed by an ideology that we describe as *neoliberalism*. Neoliberals call for an opening of national borders for the purpose of increased commodity and capital exchange, the creation of multiple regional markets, the elevation of free markets over state-controlled markets and interventions, the proliferation of fast-paced economic and financial transactions, and the presence of governing systems other than nation-states. Neoliberalism seeks to privatize virtually every process or service that can possibly be turned over to private capital. “Selective deregulation” is the motto of this version of globalization.

Another form of globalization is the antithesis of the first. This form of globalization is often described as “globalization from below,” or “anti-globalization,” which we see as a misnomer because various groups and movements whose aim is to challenge neoliberal versions of globalization are not opposed to increased international integration in general. Globalization from below is largely manifested in individuals, institutions, and social movements that are actively opposed to what is perceived as corporate globalism. For these individuals and groups, “no globalization without representation” is the motto.

A third form of globalization is represented by the movement and exchange of people and ideas and the subsequent influence on culture. Now, it is certainly true that the globalization of people and ideas dates back to the Colonial Period and the emergence of the first great navies and shipping industries. But, in the last part of the 20th century we have seen an escalation of international exchange such that now it is quite common to speak of the internationalization of cultures and societies. There is a “creolization” of the world to some extent, and technology is playing a central role in such processes, because transportation and communication technologies—the com-

puting industry and the Internet come to mind especially—increasingly are reshaping the world. Clearly, the international integration of culture is the theme of this manifestation of globalization.

A fourth form emerges from increased international integration and pertains more to rights than to markets: the globalization of human rights. With the growing ideology of human rights taking hold of the international system and international law, many traditional practices endemic to the fabric of particular societies or cultures (from religious practices to esoteric practices) are now being called into question, challenged, forbidden, or even outlawed. Advancement of cosmopolitan democracies and plural citizenship is the theme of this version of globalization.

Finally, there is a fifth manifestation of globalization that we consider. This form extends beyond markets and to some extent is against human rights. Here we speak of the globalization of the international war against terrorism. This new form of globalization has been prompted in large part by the events of September 11, 2001—which were interpreted as the globalization of the terrorist threat—and the reaction of the United States. The antiterrorist response has been militaristic in nature, resulting in two coalition wars led by the United States against Muslim regimes in Afghanistan and Iraq. Yet the overall theme of this process is not only its military flavor but also the emphasis on security and control of borders, people, capital, and commodities—that is, the reverse of open markets and high-paced commodity exchanges. Security as a precondition of freedom is the theme of this form of globalization. Not surprisingly, its nemesis, terrorism, endorses the motto that only chaos will bring about freedom.

Clearly, globalization can be characterized by multiplicity and contradictions, with deep-rooted historical causes. And, if one thinks of the tenets of human rights, for instance, globalization is a historical process that is difficult to reverse or even confront. Let us now explore in some detail these five possible forms of globalization vis-à-vis their implications for higher education.

The Impact on Higher Education

The impact of globalization on colleges and universities is both direct and indirect. An example of a direct effect is the way in which national economies are restructuring their systems of support for higher education as a con-

sequence of shifting economic priorities and structural adjustment policies mandated from above. Examples of indirect effects include the manner by which the war against terrorism has come to limit academic freedom and the transnational flow of scholars and students and the way in which academic culture at some Latin American universities is shifting from a collectivist orientation to ideals associated with individualism. What is clear is that the various manifestations of globalization have the potential to produce different kinds of effects, although disentangling cause and effect can be quite problematic.

GLOBALIZATION FROM ABOVE

Multilateral or bilateral agencies, such as the World Bank, the IMF, some agencies of the United Nations, and perhaps the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) have promoted a model of neoliberal globalization (Teodoro 2003). This agenda includes a push toward privatization and decentralization of public forms of education, a movement toward educational standards, a strong emphasis on testing, and a focus on accountability. Specific to higher education, neoliberal versions of globalization suggest four primary reforms for universities related to efficiency and accountability, accreditation and universalization, international competitiveness, and privatization.

Concerns about efficiency and accountability are manifested in the effort of legislatures, governing boards, and policy makers to increase the productivity of faculty while decreasing university and college expenditures. The classic example is the effort to increase faculty teaching loads without raising salaries. The proliferation of large classes in which one professor can reach hundreds of students is another example, as were early efforts to promote distance and Internet-based education, at least until universities discovered how costly such efforts can be.

With regard to accreditation and universalization, major efforts are underway throughout the world to reform academic programs through accreditation processes and various strategies that produce increased homogeneity across national boundaries. For example, in Mexico efforts are under way to reform various professional preparation programs in a manner consistent with those operating in the United States. Proponents argue that such efforts

will enable increased exchange between the United States and Mexico. Opponents see such programs as potentially increasing brain drain as part of the south to north flight of intellectuals and the highly skilled. Another example was the recent push by the Japanese government to open law schools mirroring American-style graduate-level legal education (Brender 2003), as was the plan by UNESCO to develop an international quality-assurance agency to monitor global higher education ventures (Lin-Liu 2001).

Reforms associated with international competitiveness are akin to what Martin Carnoy (2001) described in the K–12 sector as “competition-based reforms.” These reforms are characterized by efforts to create measurable performance standards through extensive standardized testing (the new standards and accountability movement), the introduction of new teaching and learning methods leading to the expectation of better performance at low cost (e.g., the universalization of textbooks), and improvements in the selection and training of teachers. Competition-based reforms in higher education tend to adopt a vocational orientation and reflect the point of view that colleges and universities exist largely to serve the economic well-being of a society.

Privatization, of course, is the final major reform effort linked to neoliberalism and is perhaps the most dominant. Neoliberal economic supporters view the marketplace as the ideal regulator of services, products, and costs. Consequently, if we think of higher education as a product or service, then from a neoliberal perspective the best way to regulate colleges and universities is to allow the market to do so. Nation-states need not fund or concern themselves with tuition costs; the market can take on such responsibilities quite handily. If institutions of higher education price themselves too high, prospective students will inform them by selecting other less pricey colleges. Alternatively, if a prospective student cannot afford to participate in higher education, then there are other options that societies offer for the less fortunate, including military service and work within the service sector of the economy. The rationality of such a system is purely economic. Furthermore, from the perspective of neoliberalism the system is entirely just, given that subjective individuals do not open and close doors, but a system of costs and payments dictates nearly every outcome.

The privatization of higher education in debt-riddled countries such as Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina typically is advanced by the IMF and the

World Bank as a precondition to further borrowing by these countries. A central precondition of such lending involves the transference of educational financing from higher education to lower levels of education—under the premise that subsidizing higher education is subsidizing the wealthiest members of society, because most of the students enrolled in higher education are from the middle and upper classes. This was one of the key premises of the failed Education for All Initiative sponsored in Jomtien, Thailand, in 1990 by UNESCO, the UN Development Program (UNDP), UNICEF, and the World Bank. The meeting attracted the participation of government representatives from 155 countries and more than 150 nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). The pledge was to provide education for all by the year 2000. As the argument goes, investments in lower levels of education, namely primary and secondary schooling, will result in higher rates of return and a better equity-investment ratio than investments in higher education. This strategy increasingly has come under attack in Latin America, in part because of long-standing social contracts between governments and citizens that include expectations of accessible, if not free, forms of higher education.

Privatization also has advanced hand in hand with increased entrepreneurialism, especially in the most developed countries, as universities have sought to expand their revenue through a variety of profit-seeking endeavors, including satellite campuses and extension programs around the world. In addition, many universities in the wealthiest countries are actively involved in shaping the nature of higher education in less developed countries, as is the case with a program funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in which US colleges and universities received funds to assist in the development of Iraqi higher education (Del Castillo 2003b). Similarly, US officials are actively involved in developing a stronger private higher education sector in Afghanistan (Del Castillo 2003a). In these two instances we see clear connections between neoliberalism and the US-led war on terrorism, with two countries identified by US officials as breeding grounds for terrorism on the receiving end of heavy doses of “American-style” higher education. Of course, privatization is also driving research and development agendas at universities, especially in the United States. The quest by US colleges and universities to acquire funds for research and development activities is discussed in much detail by Slaughter and Rhoades (2004), who highlight the “academic capitalist knowledge/learning/consumption regime.”

In closing this section, we think it is important to emphasize that privatization policies are crucial elements of the reforms oriented toward promoting open markets, and, as such, they are important policy tools of neoliberalism. Two key benefits are seen by neoliberals: (1) The pressure of fiscal spending is reduced by the privatization of public sector enterprises, and (2) privatization is a powerful instrument for depoliticizing the regulatory practices of the state in the area of public policy formation. However, as has been clear throughout the last two decades, the implications of privatization and the push for market policies to limit the state's role in social sectors pose serious problems: "In the context of the market forces, the state's interventionist role is likely to decline. This will have implications for all categories of people who, by virtue of their already weak position in spheres of knowledge, skills, access to goods and services and control over resources, need some protective legislations and provisions. Left to themselves in the open market, their situation is likely to get further deteriorated" (Kaur 1999, p. 126).

GLOBALIZATION FROM BELOW

Of course, the forces opposing neoliberal forms of globalization see a system that is based entirely on costs and payments as harsh and cruel. Individuals are not born into the same economic or class standing, and, consequently, governments acting in the name of the public good must intervene to create systems and processes that extend beyond the arbitrary rationality of economic determinism. The challenge that antineoliberalist forces are confronted with is the degree to which global economic systems—and, in effect, social relations—are being constructed almost entirely by corporations and a select group of extremely rich and powerful individuals.

Diverse groups have been brought together under the banner of anti-globalization (which should be understood as antineoliberal globalization), including groups opposed to corporate capitalism but also environmentalists, unions, and even nationalistic isolationists, such as Pat Buchanan's followers in the United States. The isolationists are worried about intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and NGOs replacing national governments, and they fear, in the United States, that their own country will lose its global dominance and that their citizens will lose their economic privilege. But the primary theme of "globalization and its discontents" concerns establishing a

set of rules governing a global economy and defining whose interests those rules ultimately serve (Stiglitz 2002).

The social movements opposed to corporate globalism argue from positions focused on social justice and democracy for workers and citizens. These movements have had a variety of important dissident voices. For example, world summits such as the September 2000 IMF–World Bank summit in Prague and the July 2001 G-8 meeting in Genoa took place amid a chorus of critics reacting to the closed nature of global decision making. Outspoken individuals and groups have included the likes of the late Pope John Paul II and the Catholic Church, various Protestant churches, feminist groups, environmental groups such as Green Peace, indigenous rights groups, and communist, socialist, anarchist, and libertarian groups. In short, the oppositional groups are vast and growing in number and degree of discontent (Rhoads 2003; Stiglitz 2002).

The rich array of worldwide anticorporate globalization views and actions have found sources of support within academe in part because colleges and universities also have come under the influence of global processes and at times seem just as disempowered as those groups and individuals who took to the streets in Seattle, Prague, and Genoa. Let us look to Latin America for an example.

Throughout Latin America universities have a distinguished and long tradition of academic work based on the notion of autonomy and financial autarchy. For example, the Autonomous University of Santo Domingo was founded in 1538, less than 50 years after the historic voyage of Christopher Columbus to America, and the Autonomous University of Córdoba, Argentina, was founded in 1613. Despite this long tradition, for the last two decades these institutions and many others throughout the region have faced the hammering of the neoliberal agenda of privatization, decentralization, and accountability based on entrepreneurial models, including productivity incentives that are leading professors in countries such as Mexico to mirror those in the United States. As a consequence of such forces challenging the very nature of academic life and the values that many academics hold dear, including the value of academic freedom, leading intellectuals such as Noam Chomsky (1998) have struck back with virulent criticism of neoliberalism, adding fuel to the movements opposed to corporate-driven forms of globalization.

In addition, colleges and universities throughout the world have been sites of student resistance to a variety of forms of globalization. As privatization spreads to the realm of higher education funding, increasingly colleges and universities are either implementing fees or raising tuition, the results of which have been large-scale student protests. Over the past few years we have witnessed a year-long fee-related strike at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (Rhoads and Mina 2001), nationwide protests by Canadian students over tuition hikes (Birchard 2002), university occupations by German students in protest of the privatization of education, and massive protests by students in Great Britain after higher education officials broke with tradition and implemented annual fees for first-year full-time students (Rhoads 2003).

Students also have been actively engaged in protests at the meetings of global trade organizations and world economic leaders. Students were well represented in the massive WTO protests in Seattle in December 1999. Furthermore, campus organizations with global concerns, such as the Free Burma Coalition and the Environmental Action Coalition, have been effective in forging worldwide Internet-based movements. And students have been actively involved in organizations such as the Citizens Trade Campaign (CTC), Mobilization for Global Justice, and the Poor People's Campaign for Economic Human Rights in the Americas. These groups reject the notion that neoliberal globalization is the natural outcome of contemporary economic relations and instead believe that powerful economic organizations create the climate and context for an oppressive version of globalization.

GLOBALIZATION OF CULTURE

A variety of arguments circulate around globalization and culture. One perspective suggests that the increasing exchange of peoples and ideas is producing a "creolization" effect as societies more and more resemble a complex mix of East and West, North and South. Another argument sees the globalization of culture as the "Americanization" of the world (or the "McDonaldization," as some like to say) and focuses on the ways in which central nation-states affect the semiperiphery and the periphery. Here, the flow of peoples and ideas is seen as mostly one directional, from west to east and north to south. Hence nation-states such as the United States impose their

values, norms, and beliefs on other parts of the world and for the most part are not mutually influenced, at least not to the same degree. In seeking to reconcile these alternative views, we think it is probably safe to say that some nation-states disproportionately influence other parts of the world, culturally speaking, but nonetheless also are influenced by remote regions and countries. In addition, although powerful nation-states with colonial and imperial histories have no doubt shaped the cultural landscape of remote parts of the world, clearly such influence has met with much resistance, and in many cases local cultures have adapted impositions to form a variety of cultural hybrids (Said 1993).

Of course, universities play a central role in advancing increased cultural exchange. For example, the Internet has made transnational scholarly collaboration a common endeavor. Some of the most significant intellectual innovations of the past 20 years have been the result of international collaboration. In addition, improved transportation technologies make travel more affordable, and international conferences and forums flourish in today's environment, despite the restrictions of the post-9/11 era. And the movement of students from country to country for the purpose of studying abroad continues to be a major source of international exchange for nation-states around the world.

But elements of imperialism also exist within the context of universities and cultural globalization, particularly in the area of higher education reform. For example, US universities and their scholars have the ability to shape a variety of discourses associated with university reform; this influence is clearly evident in the Americas as well as throughout vast regions of the world. Interestingly, here we see "globalization from above" intersecting with cultural globalization; elements of the US system of higher education are transmitted to other nation-states, both through the growing power and influence of neoliberalism and through cultural exchanges, which reflects the strength of US universities.

GLOBALIZATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The presence of another form of globalization that is centered on advancing human rights poses, by itself, yet another round of issues to be addressed. The movement toward universal human rights is a powerful force that pushes

us beyond conversations about certain rights being “a good idea to that which ought to be the birthright of every person” (Bunch 2001, pp. 138–139). Furthermore, the idea of global human rights has become a central issue in considering citizenship and democracy. Nuhoglu Soysal’s (1994) analysis of the limits of citizenship in the era of globalization highlighted some of the issues. She argued that “the logic of personhood supersedes the logic of national citizenship [and] individual rights and obligations, which were historically located in the nation state, have increasingly moved to a universalistic plane, transcending the boundaries of particular nation-states” (pp. 164–165). Soysal went on to discuss the idea of “cosmopolitan democracies,” or transnational political systems relatively divorced in their origin and constitute dynamics from nation-states.

If the agenda for human rights is reconfiguring the boundaries of nations and individual rights of national citizens and if they are seen as preconditions to attain basic equality worldwide, then educational systems will need to confront more and more the tension between human rights as a globalized project of cosmopolitan democracies and the long-standing influence of nationalism. This tension also is projected in questions of identity and whether the particular rights of cultural and religious groups will be upheld in the face of an ideology of global human rights (Torres 1998).

The interests of global human rights advocates largely center on the universal rights to food, water, and health care. But other issues also arise within the context of global rights discussions, including equality for all women, indigenous peoples, and ethnic minorities. Others suggest that the right to participate in a society’s governance structure and the right to a quality education also ought to be universal. In terms of the last two rights, schools and universities become key sites of struggle, because concerns about what constitutes “quality” and the role that educational institutions play in shaping expectations and dispositions relative to civic participation come to the forefront.

A key concern specifically tied to higher education is the question of whether a college or university education is a privilege or a right. This has become a major point of contention in countries such as Mexico and Argentina, where structural adjustments clearly situate participation in higher education as a privilege but long-standing social contracts within these two countries suggest otherwise. Here we see a clear clash of two oppositional

agendas, one focused on privatization and advancing a competition-based social structure and the other focused on social intervention and advancing a spirit of collectivism (Torres and Puiggrós 1996).

GLOBALIZATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL WAR AGAINST TERRORISM

The most obvious change in the process of globalization in the last few years is the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001, which undermined the invincibility of the United States. In waging a relentless counterassault against the Taliban and Al-Qaeda, and a second war against Iraq, the United States has produced massive change at a global level. In combination with the continuing reverberations of September 11, US-led antiterrorist initiatives continue to transform global relations, including significant changes within the spheres of economics, politics, culture, and education (Apple 2002).

The reverberations of the September 11 attacks and the ensuing global war against terrorism have important consequences for an increasingly interconnected world. Our concern here is with the effect on higher education. One consequence is the restrictive climate for scholars and students seeking transnational mobility. This phenomenon, of course, is most notable in the United States, where political and social pressure to ensure domestic security has led to more highly regulated and monitored borders and points of entry. A concern for many universities is the availability of international education for foreign students—not a minor source of income for countries heavily involved in international education. The United States, for example, is the biggest exporter of international education. Ravinder Sidhu (2003) pointed out that the United States had 547,867 foreign students studying at American institutions during the 2000–2001 academic year. Second to the United States is the United Kingdom, which during the 1999–2000 academic year had 277,000 international students (129,180 were at the post-secondary level). According to Sidhu, the US economy benefited in the billions (US dollars), and the United Kingdom brought in roughly £8 billion. The fear, of course, is that September 11 and the responses to it, such as those enacted by the US Office of Homeland Security (OHS) and stricter policies with regard to visas, will curtail international students seeking to study at US universities.

In addition to possible financial reverberations associated with international education, there are concerns about limitations placed on scholarly

exchange and the general assault on academic freedom. Here, we focus our analysis on the United States, but we note that the effect extends to the global intellectual arena. A key threat to academic freedom centers on the US government's demand on colleges and universities to track foreign students and some professors through a computerized system known as the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System, or SEVIS. The US government requires that colleges and universities keep track of who is admitted and hired from a foreign country and when they enter and leave the country. This requirement creates a situation in which members of a particular academic community are expected to monitor the movement of members of their own community, contributing to an environment of mistrust; we must keep in mind that foreign students and professors are full members of the same academic community that is now expected to monitor their coming and going. The responsibility for managing SEVIS is more likely than not to fall on staff at campus international centers. Consequently, instead of providing academic and cultural support, staff members may be just as likely to be engaged in information management for the US government, all in the name of the "new militarism" aimed at fighting global terrorism.

Threats to academic freedom come in many forms under the new militarism. Burton Bollag (2003) described the case of Professor Carlos Alzugaray Treto, a leading expert on US-Cuban relations. Professor Alzugaray and more than 30 other Cuban scholars were denied visas when they sought to participate in the Latin American Studies Association (LASA) International Congress in Dallas in March 2003. Homeland-security policies deemed them potential risks, and so instead of participating in three panels on Latin American issues and "giving American scholars and students a Cuban perspective, Mr. Alzugaray [was] driving his blue 1979 Soviet Lada each day down Havana's palm-tree lined roads to his job as professor at the Advanced Institute for International Relations" (Bollag 2003, p. A16). In addition, Professor Alzugaray was scheduled to visit Ohio's Miami University for six days in April 2003, but this trip also had to be canceled because his visa request was rejected. One Miami University professor described it as a "deeply disturbing sign of the many impacts of the 'war on terror'" (p. A17). One year later, similar events took place when LASA met in Las Vegas and all the visa requests from Cuban scholars were rejected by the US Department of State (Lipka 2004).

Although all the forms of globalization outlined in the preceding pages

contribute in complex ways to transformation within higher education, in this book we primarily center on “globalization from above”—the form of globalization that we have come to associate with neoliberalism. However, the reality is that the other manifestations of globalization, relating to the spread of culture, oppositional social movements, human rights, and the global war on terrorism, cannot easily be separated from concerns linked to the political economy of globalization. Consequently, although we focus primarily on neoliberal globalization and its relationship to universities throughout the Americas, we also bring the other forms of globalization to bear on our analysis.

Why the Americas?

One major consequence of globalization is increased regionalization. As pressure to participate in global markets increases, nation-states seek economic partnerships and arrangements that better enable their own industries to compete. One response has been to strengthen ties to neighboring and proximal countries as well as among countries sharing a common geographic identity. By increasing the strength of regional relationships, nation-states hope to enhance their ability to compete in globalized markets. We see this phenomenon in a variety of geographic contexts. Countries in Europe have forged the European Union (EU). Asian countries have enhanced trade opportunities through the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) agreement, and a variety of sub-regional trade arrangements (RTAs) have flourished over the past decade or so in eastern and southern Africa.

Given the context of globalization and the role that regionalization plays as an economic buffer, one might expect that countries in the Americas also would forge formal trade relations and seek to take advantage of regional connections among nations in the Western Hemisphere. And this is precisely what is taking place; nation-states in the Americas increasingly are becoming economically and politically interdependent. Countless examples support such a conclusion. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) has brought the economies of the United States, Canada, and Mexico into greater interdependence. Following NAFTA, the Central America Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) has sought to increase economic