
Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives. Jan Currie and Janice Newson, eds. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1998. pp. xii, 339. \$29.95 (paper).

JEFFREY GLANZ
Kean University

Globalization appears to have captured the imaginations and agenda of many universities. This inexorable movement toward globalization may need scrutiny. An extensive review of the literature reveals that although many universities embrace globalization (Scott 1998; Walters 1995), some scholars have proffered serious reservations about its efficacy. The nature of this critique focuses on the assertion that the globalized political economy has both an ideological component and a material base. Globalization ideas shaped by profit-motivated and commercial interests rather than sound educational practices and advocacy have dominated globalization efforts (Apple 1996; Spring 1998).

Globalization has been presented as an almost "irresistible idea" (10). Globalization as an ideology has become, in Foucault's (1991) terms, "a regime of truth," which tends to be all-encompassing or "totalizing." A variety of often contradictory meanings are attached to the term which is perhaps best used to describe a process of global change occurring in economic, political, social, and cultural realms worldwide. The term means something quite different when used to describe a desirable change in higher education, as is evident in the discussion here.

Critics of the globalization of higher education array themselves against a wide variety of social and educational phenomena. Some critics of globalization maintain that universities should not be influenced or shaped by external pressures, particularly those of the marketplace. Doing so, Slaughter argues in this volume, would be a disservice to students and, ultimately, counterproductive. Other possible trouble areas are concerns about an "overbearing and overly corporate-style management, the increasing commercialization of campus culture, and corporate influence over research and teaching programs" (296).

This book provides intelligent and thoughtful perspectives that serve to counterbalance those university administrators who jump on the proverbial bandwagon by implementing an array of programs and activities with an international focus without considering or, in many cases despite, sound pedagogical concerns. *Universities and Globalization* includes fourteen chapters divided into four parts written by prominent authorities in the field. Although the quality of the chapters varies slightly, they all contribute admirably to the book's theme, that globalization presents clear disadvantages and that advocates need to consider a multiplicity of factors prior to implementing international programs.

Notwithstanding the criticisms of globalization noted previously, many universities have developed international programs based on sound educational and pedagogical principles (Hanson and Meyerson 1995). Realizing the potentially problematic concerns alluded to previously, other scholars with a different understanding of globalization see it as supportive of the university's role in promoting democratic life. Democracy, in this view, is nurtured in terms of its role in facilitating social mobility, extending economic prosperity, and most important, developing democratic sensibilities and knowledge and skills that enable graduates to enter the affairs of a global world. Globalization advocates emphasize the opportunities to revitalize democracy and pursue social justice (Glickman 1993; Pickert 1992).

Indeed, to many authorities, including higher education administrators, the need to prepare students with an international or global perspective is axiomatic. The century that is about to end began with relatively little diversity and a great deal of prejudice. The twentieth century was ushered in with the accentuation of nationalistic racism in the form of imperialism. The situation continued to worsen with racial colonialism taking the form of mass atrocities (genocides), including the Holocaust. Since the end of World War II, however, we can see a different world emerging. As a consequence of the fall of the Berlin Wall and the disintegration of communism, internationalism as an economic and political force exploded. We are in midst of a world where cultural, ethnic, and religious diversity are becoming the hallmarks of societal development and a global transformation. The cultural and interpersonal understandings fostered by internationalization efforts in higher education, particularly, are of immeasurable benefit to graduates. Educators clearly understand that students need to be prepared to be sensitive to and appreciative of the nature of the interconnectedness with all humankind and to learn to communicate, negotiate, and perhaps most important, cooperate with fellow global citizens. Graduates who have a global perspective and who can function effectively in an international context will be best prepared to meet personal and professional challenges (Cushner 1999).

According to Lee Anderson (1990), "To globalize American education is to expand opportunities to learn about the world beyond the borders of the United States, and to learn about American society's relationship to and place in the larger world system. Finally, it means helping American students to see things from the perspective of other peoples of the world" (14). Moreover, in this context, university students must face critical issues in the twenty-first century, such as the world population explosion, global warming trends due to the greenhouse effect, the depletion of the protective ozone layer, and the mass of refugees attempting to flee areas of famine, among others. University students and graduates must be prepared to respond to these and other global challenges. Any institution of higher learning must ask itself this question: Are we willing to make the necessary curric-

ular and administrative adjustments to adequately prepare students for the challenges of the next century?

Attempts to globalize American higher education have been varied and comprehensive (Robertson 1992). They include efforts at

- Expanding and improving curricular offerings (world history, world geography, world economics, world politics, and world ecology).
- Expanding students' understanding of cultural diversity through cross-cultural study of literature, art, music, dance, religion, and social customs.
- Expanding students' facility with foreign languages (including languages that have been rarely studied but are of growing importance in the United States, such as Japanese, Chinese, Russian, and Arabic).
- Expanding knowledge of and improving instruction about often-slighted regions of the world, including Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America.
- Improving education about world problems (e.g., national security, hunger, human rights, and preservation of ecological well-being).
- Viewing American society and its history in a world context.
- Expanding the international education of teachers through undergraduate courses, in-service programs, and organized foreign travel.
- Creating offices and centers that focus on international studies majors and programs that include study abroad.

Several colleges and universities across the nation have developed noteworthy international programs that effectively prepare students for global understanding (Kelleher 1996; Kushigian 1998). These colleges and universities have similar characteristics and goals that include, among others,

- To establish cooperative relationships with institutions in other countries.
- To offer study or internships abroad opportunities for students.
- To encourage foreign-language study.
- To recruit and train foreign students.
- To include more international content in the curriculum (infusing international components across the curriculum in every major and at every level).
- To address the needs of an increasingly diverse population.
- To maximize student access to student abroad and exchange opportunities.
- To provide the appropriate academic support services.

Notwithstanding the benefits of globalization, this book does proffer invaluable suggestions and insights before undertaking such a comprehensive effort. *Universities and Globalization* cautions us to be wary of a plethora of unethical and unde-

sirable interests that may influence decisions by universities to embrace globalization. Political expediency and efforts to merely increase revenues that have no educational basis are anathema and should be decried. Rather, a successful international program is predicated on sound educational programming aimed at best preparing students to live and work in a global society during the new millennium (Hirsch and Weber 1999).

We in higher education are increasingly aware that we live, work, and think in a global marketplace. Our students, however, must be cognizant of this fact. Many students suffer from ignorance of world geography, the lack of proficiency in languages, and cultural parochialism when attempting to function in international settings. They must be willing to consider a wide array of perspectives (Glanz 1998). They must be competent to conduct education, business, and governmental activities in an international environment and be prepared to make personal and public policy decisions as responsible citizens in an international society (Cox 1995).

Moreover, growing global interdependence, the erosion of western dominance, and the declining of U.S. hegemony have substantially accelerated a broad social process of change. The convergence of these changes is globalizing many facets of American society, including its economy, polity, demography, and culture. Education mirrors society in the sense that social change generates educational change; the imperative is clear.

University administrators interested in globalization should read *Universities and Globalization* and consider these questions: "Where are we now?" "Where do we, more specifically, want to go?" "What political, economic, or social roadblocks exist that might thwart efforts to globalize?" "What viable alternatives to globalization exist?" "Do we realize that globalization is not a panacea?" and perhaps most important, "How can globalization contribute to the fundamental purpose of the institution?"

References

- Anderson, Lee F. 1990. "A Rationale for Global Education." Pp. 13-34 in *Global Education: From Thought to Action*. Edited by K. A. Tye. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Apple, Michael W. 1996. *Cultural Politics and Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cox, E. 1995. *A Truly Civil Society* (The 1995 Boyer Lexus). Sydney: Australian Broadcasting Corporation.
- Cushman, K., ed. 1999. *International Perspectives on Intercultural Education*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Desruisseaux, P. 1999. "Foreign Students Continue to Flock to the U.S. and 15% rise in American Students Abroad Shows Popularity of Non-European Destinations." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* XLVI (16): A57-A62.
- Foucault, Michael. 1991. "Governmentality." Pp. 87-104 in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Edited by G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- Glanz, Jeffrey. 1998. "Multicultural Education as a Moral Imperative: Affirming the Diversity of Ideas and Perspectives." *Focus on Education* 42:18-24.
- Glickman, Carl D. 1993. *Renewing America's Schools: A Guide for School-Based Action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hanson, K. H., & J. W. Meyerson, eds. 1995. *International Challenges to American Colleges and Universities: Looking Ahead*. Phoenix, Ariz.: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.
- Hanvey, R. G. 1976. *An Attainable Global Perspective*. New York: Global Perspectives in Education.
- Hirsch, W. Z., & L. E. Weber, eds. 1999. *Challenges Facing Higher Education at the Millennium*. Washington, D.C., and Phoenix, Ariz.: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.
- Kelleher, A. 1996. *Learning From Success: Campus Case Studies in International Program Development*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kushigian, J. A., ed. 1998. *International Studies in the Next Millennium: Meeting the Challenge of Globalization*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood.
- Lamy, S. L. 1987. *The Definition of a Discipline: The Objects and Methods of Analysis in Global Education* (Occasional Paper). New York: Global Perspectives in Education.
- Pickert, S. M. 1992. *Preparing for a Global Community: Achieving an International Perspective in Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
- Robertson, R. 1992. *Globalization*. London: Sage.
- Scott, P. 1998. *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Bristol, England: Taylor & Francis.
- Spring, J. 1998. *Education and the Rise of the Global Economy*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Walters, M. 1995. *Globalization*. London: Routledge.

**The Cold War Within American Higher Education:
Rutgers University as a Case Study.** Thomas F. Richards.
Raleigh, N.C.: Pentland, 1999. pp. xiv, 239. \$15.95 (paper).

BURTON WELTMAN
William Paterson University

Should schools transmit the dominant culture or act as countercultural institutions? Should schools encourage criticism or resist social change? These are among the key questions that have fueled the civil war between conservatives and progressives that has been raging in American education since at least the beginning of the twentieth century. By the early 1900s, the United States had been transformed from a largely traditional society in which change was slow enough that children could safely follow in their parents' footsteps to a dynamic society that changes so quickly that children cannot merely follow their parents' ways. Americans ever since have faced difficult questions about what changes should be fostered and which resisted. Conservatives have generally promoted laissez-faire change in economics but traditionalism and hierarchical controls over culture and