
1 Introduction to Part I

Simon Marginson

Codified knowledge and higher education have always been, in one respect, essentially global. From their beginning in India (Tilak, 2008) they derived their meaning and value from the movement of ideas and people between place-bound centers of learning. No doubt cultural globalization of a kind has a long history, back to the radiation of farming in the Neolithic age and before, but the first global process we can identify with certainty is the spread of the Asian world religions, which began almost 3000 years ago. Centers of higher education were outgrowths of religious organization. Their distinguishing feature was that their main purpose became learning and scholarship, not worship. This enabled them to contribute to a variety of purposes, providing their local autonomy was sustained and they retained a recognizable position within larger networks of universal knowledge.

In the third century BCE the library and academy at Alexandria consolidated Greek and Persian learning under the Ptolemaic Dynasty in Egypt, becoming associated with path-breaking achievements in science, medicine and technology. In the sixth century CE in China the Sui Dynasty introduced written examinations of candidates for bureaucratic office to ensure they were steeped in Confucian attributes. In the Tang regime that followed, Wu Chao, China's only ruling empress, who reigned at the peak of the greatest of all China's dynasties, 'wished to further the formation of a new class of administrators recruited by competition' (Gernet, 1996, p. 257). She consolidated the civil service examination and grades of seniority, founded schools, and issued authorized versions of the classical writings. The number of meritocratically selected mandarins greatly expanded under the succeeding Song Dynasty (Ebrey, 1996).

Meanwhile learning flourished from the fifth to the twelfth centuries CE at the north-east Buddhist centre of Nalanda in India, which at its peak is said to have housed 10000 students and a library with several hundred thousand volumes that was often visited by scholars from the Middle East and East Asia. Then there were the academies of Islam, including Al-Azhar, which began in the 970s as an attachment to the mosque of the same name and is maintained today in Cairo, the world's oldest center of higher education in continuous existence. The first of the medieval European universities was Bologna, founded in 1088 for the study of Roman law (University of Bologna, 2010). It was followed by more universities in Italy; by the University of Paris, which joined theology and philosophy; and later by Oxford. The first institutions were replicated across major cities within each culture in a wave of imitation. Thus began the mimetic pattern of development that still drives higher education and that embedded its differing forms within each regional domain. Eventually, in the era of science, the Humboldtian formula of the European/American university became the globally dominant model, and research the determinant of its mobile and universal value, as the University of California's Clark Kerr explained in the best of all the books on the modern institution, *The Uses of the University* (1963).

From the start these scholarly centers were all animated by a common principle – or rather they all rested on the common antinomy between place-bound identity and mobility. The early European universities combined an evolving sense of self-identity – partly grounded on site and partly derived from the surrounding cities, religious organizations and national cultures – with a characteristic openness to and engagement with a larger circuit of knowledge that stretched well beyond national borders. The illuminated books in the library, like the precepts of the Confucian classics in China, signified the universal mission of the institution, while its external engagement was continually renewed by traveling scholars and provided a material foundation for the mind's imagining of universal reach across a world without end. The universities (or their equivalents) rested on the intrinsic value of a set of common and portable ideas and ways of speaking that could be carried between the different centers of learning; and also carried between those centers and the sites of civil authority, commerce and the state–military world. The very *raison d'être* of the university lay in this paradoxical combination of place-bound concentrations of power based on localized resources and identity, with mobile and universal knowledge and discourse.

When scholarship was drawn to the center of the state, as under the Tang and in early imperial Rome, where the philosopher Seneca advised the emperor, and in the co-option of science to the aid of navigation in the European trading empires (Marginson, 2010), this betokened the need of rulers for a universalizing vision and technique to match their ambition and reach. The world was becoming wider. Knowledge lit the path ahead. When learning was forced back into itself in fragmented pockets, in isolated monasteries away from towns and off the beaten track, it was a sign that the spatial reach and mental horizons of state authority and commerce had shrunk.

All the great centers of learning founded before Al-Azhar were destroyed. They ran out of the conditions of existence that sustained them. The long history of universities shows that these institutions need states, never more so than in the modern nation-building period, as Peter Scott points out in his chapter; and increasingly, states also need universities. But universities are also troubled by states and their financial dependence on them (relations with cities are often happier). The coupling of power and knowledge is fecund but never easy, and is constantly renegotiated. Power always wants to bind universal knowledge to the agendas of the moment. Knowledge draws its authority from somewhere else and spills out from under all efforts to contain it. Nevertheless, both the potency and the vulnerability of knowledge are found in the places where it takes form as institutions.

A MORE GLOBAL ERA

This long antinomy between place and mobility, and the two different kinds of tensions associated with that antinomy, are more than ever evident today. The first tension is between local/national particularity and universal (global) knowledge. The second tension is between two different parts of local/national identity, between the autonomous identity of the institution and the requirements of external authority – whether church, or, increasingly as time went on, the nation-state. Arguably, in the absence of this antinomy and these two kinds of tension, the university as an institution would cease to exist.

If it severed its dependence on locality and the nation-state, not only would its resource base fragment; it would jettison much of its organic identity and potency. If its role as authoritative interpreter of universal knowledge was usurped by other entities, it would disappear. If it collapsed its local identity into the agenda of the nation-state, again it would vanish.

Although the antinomy between place and mobility was always integral to the university, it has undergone successive changes as higher education has moved to a more prominent role in human affairs, while human affairs have become more globalized. If the university's mission was always part-global, this aspect has been heightened – rendering the university more central because of its role in global networks that are becoming part of daily life, while also intensifying the tensions between the global and national missions of the university.

Contemporary globalization first followed in the wake of the European trading empires. It coincided with the spread of the modern nation-state across the world as the dominant political form (Bayly, 2004). In the nineteenth century higher education slowly shifted from the reproduction of knowledge to continuous change, to match the dynamism of the applications of knowledge in military and industrial technologies. In the twentieth century nations began to need mass higher education to meet their economic, social and cultural needs, including the needs of their own global engagement. And in the last generation education and research have been transformed by communicative globalization and the growing mobility of ideas, people and educational capital across borders.

Universities continue to source their authority in their traditional role of scholarship, but university-created knowledge is now accessed as a one-world library on the web. There every university in the world has become visible to every other. Some set up branches in foreign countries. Joint degrees abound. Student and staff mobility is commonplace. The global dimension can no longer be marginalized in relation to local and national-systemic affairs in higher education. It is now omnipresent – at least in research-intensive universities. Yet governments see the world in nation-bound terms, with themselves at the brightly lit center and the world beyond fading into a misty realm of opportunities and threats. The nation-state is focused on global reference points, but only in relation to its own competitive position. Research universities place themselves more modestly within the larger global setting, not only because it sets the standards they must achieve, but because the horizon of knowledge is, as it has always been, beyond the nation, at the world's very edge.

THE CHAPTERS

Part I of the Handbook considers globalization in higher education at the level of the world as a whole, although there is an inevitable focus on those institutions and parts of the world that are the most globally engaged. The chapters divide into two groups: three that provide world pictures of globalization and higher education (Simon Marginson, Rajani Naidoo and Peter Scott); and five that provide slices of the whole: Michael Peters on concepts of the knowledge economy; Chris Ziguras on cross-border movement of both students and programs; Marijk van der Wende on the global role of the Organization for

Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in higher education policy; Yann Lebeau and Ebrima Sall on the roles of UNESCO and the World Bank; and Vincent Carpentier and Elaine Unterhalter on globalization, higher education and inequality.

The global dimension of higher education and research is not a natural domain. It is one that humans make. It is formed by acts of imagining; by acts of practical strategizing and cross-border activity; and also by acts of formal and informal control, regulation and limits. All this generates the world patterns, institutional forms, and the openness, boundaries and constraints that make the global dimension. In Chapter 2 Simon Marginson looks at how we imagine global higher education and global strategy, and how path-breaking initiatives happen. He discusses partnerships, consortia, capacity-building in research, education 'hubs', knowledge cities, regionalization (especially in Europe), commercial education exports, offshore 'transnational' campuses, and virtual e-universities. There have also been two moves designed to shape the global space as a whole: global comparisons and rankings; and the WTO–GATS attempt to remake world higher education as a free trade zone. In these processes distances are reduced; place-based identity remains as important as it has always been; and universities have to be effective in all three dimensions of global, national and local activity at once. The chapter draws out the key ideas and ways of thinking that fashion approaches to cross-border higher education: the different subject-positions of university, national system, individual (student or researcher) and the global public good; and three 'world imaginaries': the global economic market, the world of university status competition, and the world of networks and 'flat' knowledge flows.

In Chapter 3 Rajani Naidoo explores the potentials of higher education systems in emerging nations, in the context of the 'new imperialism' with its international rivalries. The new imperialism works at the intersections of economic and territorial logics, and of knowledge, capital accumulation and discursive power. International borders are penetrated, not dissolved. The old international agency line that low-income countries should focus on universal basic education and postpone higher education and research has now been discarded. In its place is the new fetish with higher education as an instrument of the 'competition state' in the global setting, which combines too sanguine a view of the potentials of knowledge and communications technologies, with higher education as a means to global and regional cultural influence. These are joined to neoliberal marketization strategies and an open door to foreign capital in the developing world.

The orthodox policy prescriptions for low-income countries meet the interests of the education export nations, but fail to focus on collaboration and public goods, leaving developing countries without the full-blown infrastructures they need, and with access issues and, in some cases, a long tail of commercial 'diploma mills'. But for developing countries there are opportunities as well as limits. To see them as 'passive subjects of inter-hegemonic rivalry', as does much of the literature, misses the significance of the different adaptive strategies that have emerged.

A distinctive contribution of the chapter is the focus on China's capitalism and global trajectory, and its patterns of aid and investment, especially in Africa. China's globalization is led by state enterprises and World Bank prescriptions on higher education are ignored amid accelerated capacity-building. Other emerging nations operate effectively outside the formula, such as Cuba and the Gulf States.

'The university has always been an important mediator between local environments

... and global, or universal, cultures', says Peter Scott in Chapter 4. But the universalism or globalism of the university itself is continually evolving, and the 'national' and the 'global' do not always operate as separate categories. In a succinct and sweeping review of the university form across time, Scott corrects the too-easy assumption that universities are always and essentially 'global' and 'international'. As nation-builders and mass institutions they are embedded in localities and polities. The growth of cross-border international education mirrors the growth of mass participation as a whole. Knowledge itself and its applications are often locally manifest.

Even in their transcendent moments universities often exhibit particular national cultures rather than the mentality of an emerging world society. An earlier internationalism was expressed as imperialism. 'Even today the patterns established by empire still influence the flows of staff and students, as the links between anglophone and francophone countries demonstrate', Scott notes. But globalization has heightened the ambiguities of the university, which is positioned as both an agent of techno-scientific culture and universal modernism, general to part of but not to the whole of the world, and an agent of cultural definition and resistance. Globalization is also associated with tensions between global research communities and national innovation agendas. But the more contextualized research practices now apparent are not necessarily 'less global', as the global dimension is itself one of the arenas of directed research.

Since the Second World War different theorists have focused on a deep-seated transformation that appears to be moving capitalist society to a post-industrial economy focused on knowledge and symbolic goods. This transformation, which is both a cause and effect of accelerated globalization, is implicated in mass higher education and mass communications and the greater premiums attached to creativity and innovation across all fields. In Chapter 5, Michael Peters reviews three main strands of literature on the knowledge economy or information society. Each represents and points higher education, learning, pedagogy and knowledge formation in distinctive directions. The first is the 'learning economy', based on the work of Lundvall, in which the capacities to learn and innovate, and to do so on the basis of social interactions, determine the position of individuals, firms and nations. The second strand is the 'creative economy' of Richard Florida and others, which emphasizes the design and production of cultural goods in creative industries and institutions, along with intellectual property rights. In this imaginary, urban centers that have clustered the capacity for creative work – with intensive networks between artists, scientists and industries – are increasingly strategic in the global economy. The third strand is the 'open knowledge economy', a radically non-proprietary form that combines work on open education and open science. Networked relations combine autonomy and community, as in the longstanding collegial relations in university scholarship, throwing into question neoliberal assumptions about self-interest.

In Chapter 6, Marijk van der Wende recounts how the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has foregrounded, aided and abetted the connections between higher education and globalization in the minds of policy-makers – and describes the rise of the OECD itself as a distinctive multilateral policy space, joined to an active secretariat that has become a global policy actor. From the beginning, the OECD located the discussion of higher education and globalization in an economic policy setting – it positions higher education as a capacity-building sector essential in

national responses to globalization – and it advocates the liberalization of educational trade. But one of the OECD's strengths is its acknowledgment of the social and cultural aspects. The OECD has developed a distinctive argument concerning the rationales for cross-border education and future global scenarios; and in its dealings with member governments it uses a number of different 'methods of persuasion' to advance its policy agenda: comparative education statistics, analysis of selected statistical trends, reviews of national higher education systems, the combined 'thematic reviews' of a large number of national systems enabling key criteria to be advanced, new data collection on comparative learning outcomes in higher education, and specific projects such as the work on higher education and globalization to the year 2030. It cooperates with other agencies and pays growing attention to the emerging economies and to the need for 'balancing globalization' in the light of global inequalities.

The focus of Chapter 7 by Chris Ziguras is the global mobility of teaching and learning in all their forms, from students who cross national borders to enroll in foreign systems to transnational education – the innovative movement of institutions and their programs onto foreign soil, which has grown rapidly in the last 15 years – to distance education and e-learning in all its forms. Ziguras provides data on student and program mobility, and analyzes the varied rationales for cross-border provision, noting the key roles played by global English and global communications in global higher education developments. The market-oriented philosophy of the Westminster countries, combined with the importance of the language factor in driving global demand, has enabled those countries to build large-scale export industries. He also dissects the respective cases for and against the growth of a global market in degrees, noting that globalization has brought with it both a tendency to unproductive political posturing and a set of difficult access and inequity issues. He suggests that these developments, and particularly institutional and program mobility, have begun to 'unravel' the national character of the university.

Other international agencies that have helped to shape worldwide higher education are the World Bank (WB) and the United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (UNESCO). In their historical account of agency thinking, Yann Lebeau and Ebrima Sall (Chapter 8) show that while UNESCO began with a humanist developmental agenda, one that respected self-determination and cultural diversity in the emerging postcolonial world, and while the World Bank has long operated a neoliberal economic agenda, from time to time the two approaches have achieved partial convergence – especially in the landmark Task Force Report, *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise* (Task Force on Higher Education and Society, 2000). The World Bank has dropped the argument that investment in basic education should take priority over tertiary education and has become (a little) more culturalist and developmental in its thinking, without repudiating its core concepts. On its side, UNESCO has partly adapted to the economic notions of modernization such as human capital theory that are central to the World Bank and the OECD. The Bank and UNESCO agree about the importance of expanding tertiary participation, but differences remain on the meaning and forms of participation. Amid the emphasis of the Bank and the OECD on commercial international education as a strategy for capacity-building, UNESCO attempts to sustain an argument for higher education as a national and global public good.

In the final chapter in Part I, Vincent Carpentier and Elaine Unterhalter tackle the key

issues of globalization and inequalities in and between higher education systems. The expansion of higher education has had limited success in fostering more equal provision of education, in part because inequalities are formed not simply by exclusion but also by the stratification of opportunities and institutions. Do global convergence and partial integration in higher education tend to exacerbate socioeconomic stratification and exclusions, and/or inequalities of opportunity and outcomes, on the basis of gender, ethnicity, disability and other factors? Are the dynamics of inequality in the global dimension different from those within national systems and do global transformations offer the potential to catalyze or correct national inequalities?

Carpentier and Unterhalter survey differences in participation rates across the world. They find that neoliberal policy-driven globalization enhances inequalities within and across borders, and that the benefits of globalization are unequally distributed. Yet there are also new freedoms. For example, from time to time global student mobility opens new doors for those excluded from their home-country systems. But again, what is missing is a global social justice agenda.

REFERENCES

- Bayly, C. (2004), *The Birth of the Modern World 1780–1914: Global Connections and Comparisons*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ebrey, P. (1996), *The Cambridge Illustrated History of China*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gernet, J. (1996), *A History of Chinese Civilization*, 2nd edn, trans. J. Foster and C. Hartman, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kerr, C. (1963), *The Uses of the University*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Marginson, S. (2010), 'World', in P. Murphy, M. Peters and S. Marginson, *Imagination: Three Models of Imagination in the Age of the Knowledge Economy*, New York: Peter Lang, pp. 139–65.
- Task Force on Higher Education and Society (2000), *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*, Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Tilak, J. (2008), 'Higher education: a public good or a commodity for trade?', *Prospects*, **38**, 449–66.
- University of Bologna (2010), *Our History*, <http://www.eng.unibo.it/PortaleEn/University/Our+History/default.htm>, accessed 25 July 2010.