

**Regional Worlds:
Transforming Pedagogy in Area Studies and International Studies**

Sita Ranchod-Nilsson

Post-doctoral Fellow, Regional Worlds, University of Chicago (Fall, 2000)
Assistant Professor and Director, International Studies Program, Denison University

How do we teach undergraduate students about the world at the beginning of the twenty-first century? As director of the International Studies Program at Denison University I am routinely asked to respond to this question. And as the poor inquisitor soon discovers, the answer is complex and, at the present moment, somewhat vexing. For some, the last two decades of the twentieth century have been a period of flux and uncertainty. The dissolution of the Soviet Union marked the end of the Cold War and a shift away from categories and relationships that typified that forty-year period. Characterizations of the post-Cold War era abound and highlight the reconfigured identities and relationships connected to the demise of the nation-state; the assertion of new/old national groups; new cultural frameworks associated with media, technology and migration; the rise of transnational capital and concomitant reconfiguration of global production processes; and, the growing importance of global social movements associated with environmentalism, women's rights, human rights and labor. For some, the questioning of concepts and categories have created spaces that illuminate identities and relationships in provocative new ways. For others, the new developments and approaches amount to chaos that drives a search for order and fixed boundaries. Overall, these developments have infused new energy into international education. But that energy is tempered by tremendous challenges, since in many instances the new geographies, identities and conceptualizations associated with "globalization" do not fit neatly within intellectual fields and institutional frameworks that originated during the Cold War. Area studies programs and international studies, or global studies, programs are rethinking their intellectual boundaries and institutional arrangements in light of these and other developments.

Area studies continue to dominate intellectual inquiry and institutional structure for students, policy makers and professional scholars engaged in explorations of international and comparative issues.

Indeed, one cannot contemplate the comparative studies of global processes without fully understanding the specificities of place, time, cultural form and language. However, area studies as currently practiced in the United States and parts of Europe are problematic. The historical conceptualization of “areas” that dominate scholarly inquiry, foreign policy and institutional structures – African Studies, Near Eastern Studies, European Studies, Latin American Studies, and Caribbean Studies - is profoundly shaped by histories of colonialism. Later, national, ideological priorities driven by the Cold War exerted a tremendous influence on both the focus and form of area studies scholarship. The CIA spent almost two hundred million dollars subsidizing academic conferences, journals, prizes, art exhibitions, concerts, musical competitions and many individual scholars, writers, intellectuals and projects. All of this “had a profound effect on the kind of cultural product that appeared and the kind of activity carried on in the name of freedom and humanistic or social science activity” (Said 2000, and Saunders in Said 2000). In the post-Cold War period the geographical boundaries of area studies are challenged within academic institutions by post-colonial studies, the re-emergence of nationalist struggles throughout the world, and the rush to embrace “globalization,” among other issues. What had previously been accepted as a “territory” bounded in both geographical and cultural terms, now seems to be called into question. Toby Volkman points out that many of the most compelling critiques have emerged from within area studies as scholars contextualize the definition of heretofore-accepted “areas” within broader social, political and economic processes. “Debates about the definition of areas are not mere academic quibbles. On the contrary, reformulations of taken-for-granted geographies are key to contested contemporary claims about identity, culture, and territory” (1998, 1).

International Studies is another field that has, traditionally, shaped ideas about the world outside the U.S. A survey of international studies programs at large research universities and small liberal arts Colleges offers no clear guidelines as to the boundaries of the field. At some institutions international studies is used as a kind of shorthand for the collection of political science subfields that engage global issues and interactions: political economy, comparative politics, international relations and, in some cases, public policy. At others international studies is more broadly inclusive of social science inquiry into

places, people and processes throughout the world. Many international studies programs, particularly at liberal arts colleges, are an amalgamation of area studies interests with majors comprised of courses focusing on the histories, cultures and global processes “out there.” What constitutes the category of “international” too often excludes the “west” – North America and Western Europe. A number of international studies programs, including my own at Denison, have set out to explore a broadly interdisciplinary approach to international studies. The convergence of perspectives from the social sciences, the humanities and the arts is particularly useful in addressing a number of contemporary global issues involving, among other issues labor migration, national identity, human rights, development, the AIDS pandemic, environmental degradation and consumer culture.

By now the poor inquisitor has discovered that there is no easy answer to the question, “how do we teach undergraduate students about the world at the beginning of the twentieth century?” Indeed, an examination of programs from the last three meetings of the International Studies Association illustrates, “the enormous diversity of approaches, theoretically, philosophically, and methodologically, that co-exist, sometimes peacefully, sometimes not, but almost always in interesting and thought-provoking ways” (Boyer *et. al.* 2000, 2).

But the need to educate students about the world – particular locations, global processes, and linkages between the global and the local – is imperative. The dramatic events of the last two decades of the twentieth century – too often casually evoked by the term ‘globalization’ – force us to raise anew questions about how we teach our students about the world around them and get them to think critically about their place in it. The dissolution of the Soviet Union was one of several developments that led scholars, policy makers, and many others, to question what until that time had seemed to be clear concepts and boundaries. At the same time states seemed to lose their privileged, sovereign status as the dominant arbiters of cultural identity and actors with economic power.¹ The global capitalist economy now involves new forms of offshore production and innovations in finance and investment. Rapid development of communication technologies and transportation have led to unprecedented levels of movement in terms of people, ideas and commodities. New international institutions and reconfigured

roles for existing institutions are defining new architectures of international space and creating possibilities for global societies that transcend old boundaries of space and identity. Simultaneously the assertion of “tradition” in what Zillah Eisenstein refers to as the “new old” nationalisms of the twenty-first century disrupt linear notions of history and progress (1996).

Against this backdrop, how do we frame curricular goals for international education?

Associations and policy makers have weighed in on this issue. In a representative example, a 1998 report from the ACE (the American Council on Education) calls for a partnership between the federal, state and local governments, the business community and colleges and universities to ensure that we have citizens who are globally competent for, “our nation’s place in the world will be determined by our society – whether it is internationally competent, comfortable, and confident.”² This was followed in April of 2000 by a White House Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies in which President Clinton called for a “coherent and coordinated international education strategy [to] help us meet the twin challenges of preparing our citizens for a global environment while continuing to attract and educate future leaders from abroad.” According to this memorandum educating foreign students contributes \$9 billion annually to our economy, enriches our communities by exposing them to multiple cultures and helps us ensure that we have friends and staunch supporters abroad. In somewhat less nationalistic terms Richard Wood, of Yale University, identifies the goals of an internationalized curriculum as (1) developing cultural empathy and (2) developing a conceptual framework for understanding global issues and interdependence. At the University of Chicago Susan Randolph identifies the need to educate students about (1) local and regional particularities and (2) the emergence of a global community (from Johnston 1999, 4).

What are some of the pedagogical and curricular challenges raised and how shall we begin to address them? In this post-Cold War period old models and concepts for categorizing the world and explaining social, economic and political processes are inadequate. Urgent calls for renewed and revised attentions to international education are ubiquitous.³ Yet, existing institutional structures continue to be dominated by traditional disciplinary and area studies boundaries that, too often, serve to limit inquiries

and explorations of this new era. Institutional inertia is compounded by a number of new challenges from the increasing pressure to apply principles of business management to the decidedly nonbusiness environment of academia, increased pressure on faculty in the areas of research and publishing, heightened attention to issues of identity and diversity in the classroom, and the shift from so-called passive learning styles to more active, student-centered learning. Nevertheless it would not be an exaggeration to argue that within institutions of higher education, area studies programs, along with multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary programs in comparative studies and international studies, have become key components in achieving the widely professed goal of preparing students for an increasingly interdependent world. The challenge, then, is finding ways to simultaneously work within and transform institutional structures to create space for pedagogical strategies that address the intersections between global processes and the specificities of place, time, cultural frameworks and language.

From the fall of 1996 through the spring 2000, the Globalization Project at the University of Chicago took on the challenge outlined above through its “Regional Worlds” program. With funding from the Ford Foundation’s “Crossing Borders” initiative the program set out to re- think the traditional boundaries of area studies and the boundaries between research and pedagogical strategies. The four-year effort involved numerous faculty and graduate students at the University of Chicago, a series of visiting experts from major research universities and a number of faculty from liberal arts colleges throughout the Midwest. Each year of the program was organized around a particular theme that engaged the intersections of area studies and global processes in various ways. Several colloquia were held at the University of Chicago during each year with a consistent emphasis on the interconnections between research and pedagogy. In May 2000 the program concluded with a capstone conference, “Mobile Geographies and Plural Histories: New Paradigms in Area Studies,” that featured a keynote address by Edward Said and papers by a number of research scholars. The conference also included a session on pedagogy, involving most of the Midwest Faculty Fellows from the four year Program, in which participants talked about strategies and obstacles they encountered when raising new ideas, curriculum and institutional frameworks on their campuses. This paper is the result of that particular discussion and

an attempt to broadly disseminate some ideas, solutions and materials that can be adapted for a variety of institutional contexts.

Regional Worlds

The Regional Worlds Program emerged out of and engaged with a number of concurrent developments. Perhaps most obvious is the particular historical moment at the end of the twentieth century. The post-Cold War period is characterized by the unprecedented mobility of people, ideas, information and capital that underscore in dramatic fashion the fluidity and permeability of national borders. At the same time, this period is also characterized by the global emergence of particularly violent and exclusionary forms of nationalism, the reconfiguration of production and finance associated with global capital, and the emergence or creation of global social movements focusing on issues related to women's rights, environmental rights and human rights. The combined impact of these developments has led to a radical questioning of the ways in which we conceptualize the world, including the rationale for area studies. These events were echoed within academia as feminism, post-colonialism, post-modernism and queer studies, to name the locations of just a few of the dissenting voices, raised questions about the perspectives we bring to academic inquiry, the designation of appropriate 'objects' of study and the tangled web of political power, identity and epistemology. Premised on the need to question heretofore unquestioned categories, the Program sought to reveal perspectives hidden by the seemingly ubiquitous gaze of Western power and knowledge and the related scientific guise of objectivity. Edward Said describes this growing sense of dissatisfaction with traditional models for engaging area studies and international studies and the growing demands of inclusion as the "slow, seismic change in perspective that is ours today at the beginning of the twenty-first century" (Said 2000).

The conceptual framework of Regional Worlds Program is based on a new vision of area studies based on a shift from "trait geographies to "process" geographies. Trait geographies grew out of a combination of colonial cartographies, European notions of civilization and cold war security frameworks. Notions of "area" rooted in an emphasis of trait geographies are "driven by conceptions of

geographical, civilizational and cultural coherence which rely on some sort of trait list – of values, of languages, of material practices, or ecological adaptations, of marriage patterns and the like” (RW 1996, 1). The geographical coherence of many areas is certainly questionable as many of the states, territories, and regions recognized in contemporary contexts were products of the colonial scramble for power in the nineteenth century. From Nigeria to Indonesia, states were created from populations with disparate languages, social practices and economic systems. Yet, in the context of areas based on “trait” geographies, regions like sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America assume a kind of coherence and unity that is, at the very least, misleading; and perhaps worse, obscures interactions and boundaries that do not conform the accepted geography of area studies. Similarly the association of “area” with “civilization,” whether conceptualized as the converse of barbarism or the existence of plural entities based on distinctive cultures, is also problematic. Often civilizations are conceptualized in highly idealized terms that overlook material practices. Of even greater concern at the present moment, when the notion of “clashing civilizations” has gained a certain currency, is the tendency to see civilizations as wholly discrete and bounded entities that are at odds with other civilizations. Too often the notion of “civilization” elides with conceptions of separate, discrete cultures unified by language, social practices, cuisine and a self-conscious attempt to preserve “tradition.” This false unity obscures not only divisions within civilizations but also linkages and connections between them. The national, civilizational, cultural and regional boundaries of trait geographies “frequently draw the wrong boundaries, ignore important interactions and are driven by obsolete assumptions about national interest, cultural coherence and global processes (RW 1997,1).

This is not to claim that all work beginning with the premises of “trait” geographies is flawed. Indeed there is much work done within the institutional and professional parameters of area studies that problematizes boundaries of areas, regions, states and cultures. However, even when these approaches are quite sophisticated, a tendency remains to link geographical areas with relatively immobile aggregates of traits and with relatively fixed historical boundaries that become associated with a notion of endurance and impermeability. This linkage also runs the danger of privileging a kind of conceptual unity, often

despite multiple resistances and the movement of people, ideas and imaginations across geographical spaces. Moreover, academic professional associations, national diplomatic structures and academic institutions have reified trait geographies within their institutional structures. This may be particularly true of area studies at the undergraduate level in the United States, where students often have little knowledge of the world and easily fall back on unified, compartmentalized understandings of the world.

In contrast, “process” geographies not only begin with the critique outlined above, but go further to shift the focus to the many varieties of large-scale, social organization precipitated by various kinds of action, interaction and motion – trade, travel, migration, pilgrimage, warfare, colonization, exile (RW 1997, 2). These processes are grand in scale, both geographically and historically, and crisscross the traditional boundaries of area studies. Process geographies allow one to take into account both the reconfigurations of production processes linking capital with numerous off-shore production sites, as well as the ways in which ideas and imaginations are fueled by migration, tourism, media and capital. Viewed in this way, process geographies allow a conceptualization of world, “not as an aggregation of fixed, historically stable, geographically bounded civilizations, but rather as a cross-cutting map of diasporic identities, translocal interactions and large-scale resource flows” (RW 1998, 1). These processes create their own regions that have very different boundaries, which include, but are not limited to, geographical space. Multiple regions overlap and contradict one another to form complex webs of power, interaction and imagination that are constantly in motion.

There are a multiple of ways to think about process geographies. Arjun Appadurai conceptualizes these process geographies in terms of five dimensions of global cultural flows: ethnoscape, mediascape, technoscape, financescape and ideoscapes. These five landscapes are the building blocks of what Appadurai calls imagined worlds, “the multiple worlds that are constituted by the historically situated imaginations of persons and groups spread around the globe” (Appadurai 1996, 33). The multiple landscapes capture the complex, overlapping, disjunctive, and perpetually changing order of the new global cultural economy that is inaccessible through existing models of global development. But others conceptualize process geographies in different ways. Ulf Hannerz, for example, is concerned with

the limitations of core-periphery models and cultural homogenization arguments in understanding the intersection of global process and local realities. Drawing from his work in Nigeria, he identifies four cultural frameworks that shape local cultural processes: markets, the state, forms of life,⁴ and social movements. These frameworks overlap and are sometimes contradictory (Hannerz 1997). Many focus on process geographies associated with capital, particularly in its current phase characterized by hypermobility, over-reliance in market mechanisms, dispersed production, and hyperconsumerism. For example, Saskia Sassen looks at the linkage between these few formations of capitalism, migrations and cultural frameworks in the context of “global cities” (Sassen 1998). Global cities are linked to each other by capital, finance, information technologies and migrations in ways that shape a unique geography that is quite separate from areas that are not global cities. Global cities are also linked to offshore production sites through capital, production processes and migrations. Thus, for Sassen global cities become strategic sites for current leading economic sectors, as well as strategic sites for the negotiation of cultural formations in connection with transnationalization of labor and the formation of transnational political identities (Sassen 1998). In a different approach to global capitalism, Timothy Mitchell reveals the glaring limitations of viewing the political economy of Egypt in the 1990s through a myopic lens of economic liberalization and global capitalism. Here the discourse of economic liberalization, promulgated through the World Bank and the IMF, proved to be far less of a factor in Egypt’s fiscal turnaround than the decision of the U.S. and European creditors and the Gulf “to write off almost half of Egypt’s external debt” (Mitchell 1999, 9). For Mitchell the achievements of neoliberalism “remain successes of the imagination,” that are particularly dangerous because they lead to the disappearance of political alternatives involving claims of the rural population as well as civil and human rights (1999, 20).

These are just a few ways of conceptualizing process geographies and there are many more linked to diaspora, economic liberalization, trade, labor migration, immigration, to name just some of the process that can be conceptualized as global. What process geographies have in common is a focus on “identity” or culture” as formed by diasporic, interactive, and large-scale processes and configurations (RW 1999, 2). They are associated with, but not reducible to, the processes located within the global cultural

economy, or what Lash and Urry call “disorganized capitalism” (in Appadurai 1996,33). Or, in a different formulation, a process geographies approach is consistent with David Harvey’s understanding of globalization as a transition from Fordism to flexible accumulation. This allows for a range of views about a world economy that “is being transnationalized at an extremely uneven pace in various regions of the planet (Miyoshi 1998, 250). In these contexts, process geographies illuminate motion – not only the various forms of hypermobility that characterize the present phase of global interaction, but also the movements, interactions and mobilities that shaped earlier historical periods.

It is important to underscore that a focus on process geographies does not in any way suggest that the specificities of historical, linguistic and geographical knowledge are irrelevant, or even somehow tangential. Indeed, quite to the contrary, a pedagogical approach based on process geographies puts renewed emphasis of the need to teach the particulars of space, place and identity. Processes geographies are not comprehensible in the abstract. They are comprehended in the contexts of historical, spatial, cultural and linguistic specificity. As such specific knowledge does not lead to a single, immutable set of civilizations and regions.

However, a focus on process geographies does suggest some alternative approaches to teaching about history, territory, cultures and languages. For example, languages are a critical component of any revised approach to area studies. But the study of language can be carried out in a way that incorporates, “basic cultural, geographical and historical knowledge, while introducing new ideas about language boundaries, language and ethnicity, mixed or hybrid languages, socio-linguistics and the like. It would also incorporate the many recent advances in thinking about textuality as a historical and social phenomenon which have been generated from linguistic and literary studies, as well as from anthropology” (RW 1997, 4-5). Histories would also be central to a process geography approach but they would be taught as more consciously “constructionist,” building on the area that they are not facts, but rather artifacts. History courses must pay more attention to interactions, motion and linkages, as well as to the ways in which power is implicated in all forms of historical knowledge.

The Regional Worlds Program explored process geographies as a way to re-think traditional models of area studies through four different themes, each involving an academic year of colloquia and workshops. The overall program was directed by a committee of University of Chicago faculty: Arjun Appadurai, from Anthropology and South Asian Languages and Civilizations Program; Jacqueline Bhabha, from the Law School and Director of the Human Rights Program; and, Rashid Khalidi, of the History Department, Near Eastern Studies Program and Director of the Center for International Studies. The first three years of the Program explored the intersection of trait and process geographies from the vantagepoint of a series of regional anchors, based on the model of traditional area studies. These “area” specific themes highlighted the ways in which area studies scholarship has tried to come to terms with the intersection of trait and process geographies. In 1996-1997 the theme involved “Rethinking Civilization in South Asia.” During 1997-1998 the theme was “Cultural Environments and Development Debates in Latin America.” The third year of the program, 1998-1999 was organized around the theme “Visual Culture, Regional Identities, and Transnational Modernities in East Asia.” In the final year, 1999-2000 the focus of the program was on process geographies with the theme “Diasporas, Minorities and Counter-Geographies.” This theme explored the kinds of geographies, or conceptual spaces, that emerge when global processes, not territories conceptualized within the frameworks of traditional area studies, are the starting point.

The colloquia involved in “Reconceptualizing South Asia” focused on re-thinking both historical and geographic boundaries of South Asia and pedagogical approaches to teaching from a process geography perspective in four general areas: space, time, identities and themes. These colloquia were premised on the idea that defining areas such as “East Asia,” “South Asia,” etc., in terms of geographical space is difficult, if not impossible, to do with any precision. “So many of the ideas, languages, practices and the like which we identify as those of a particular civilization have always been both in motion and in overlapping contact with others.” One of the colloquia explored this theme through the history of Western cartographic picturing of South Asia and of the linguistic background to the idea of ‘Dravidian’ ‘South India.’ Another colloquia highlighted the “various territorialities in which Sri Lanka participated in

pre-modernity” (RW 1997, 10) Pedagogical discussions focused on teaching about areas in ways that emphasize both a contextual approach to historical knowledge and the fluid boundaries of regions, cultures and political entities.

The second year the Program highlighted Latin America through its focus on “Cultural Environments and Development Debates.” Professor Alan L. Kolata, Director of the Center for Latin American Studies at the University of Chicago was the coordinator of the colloquia. The thematic focus centered on the complex, interdependent relationships of culture, environment and development, and in particular the multiple and changing conceptions of “culture” and “development.” The colloquia during this year involved three particular issues: the politics and practice of territorial demarcation and “ethno-mapping” project; intellectual property rights, particularly as related to the ecological knowledge and practice of indigenous and traditional peoples; and environmental ethics. These discussions illuminated the “spatio-temporal flux of cultural politics and environmental practice,” across the continent while at the same time drawing attention to the varying strategies employed by local peoples to reconceptualize their relations to their environments and to a variety of groups engaged in struggles over “development.” The pedagogical materials from this year focus on “(1) territory, land reform and tenurial relationships; (2) intellectual property rights regimes; (3) and the role of new social actors and social movements in the complex field of environment and development” (RW 1998, 4).

In 1998-99 the Regional Worlds Program held three colloquia with a thematic focus on “Visual Culture, Regional Identities, and Transnational Modernities in East Asia.” Professor Xiaobing Tang of the Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations at the University of Chicago coordinated the colloquia. The East Asian context provides provocative juxtapositions between national formations, enduring cultural formations (“Japan,” “China,” and “Korea”) and circulating discourses such as “Confucianism,” “Asian” capitalism, and nationalism” (RW 1996, 6). In the fall, two scholars address the “shifting role of Japan in the formation of globally inflected (and regionally contested) ideologies of Pan-Asianism” (*ibid.*, 7). The winter Colloquium, which centered on political economy, brought together two specialists in China and Korea to discuss ‘Long-Run Change and Regional Constructs: East Asian

Economies in Global Perspective.” For the Spring Colloquium Regional Worlds invited overseas scholars of literature and history for the seminar “Alternative Frameworks: History, Nation, and Area Studies in Australia and Taiwan.”⁵ The focus on ways in which multiple processes criss-cross the region underscored how multiple geographies can emerge from a particular region.

The final year of the program, “Diasporas, Minorities and Counter-geographies,” put thematic concerns in the foreground in order to explore how particular geographies, both those conceptualized in spatial terms and those conceptualized in non-spatial terms, are shaped in connection with particular issues. Two of the colloquia were structured around individual papers. In October, Timothy Mitchell, a political scientist and Middle East scholar from New York University, presented a paper entitled, “Dreamland: the Neoliberalism of Your Desires.” In January, the colloquium focused on a discussion of a policy-oriented paper by Gurdial Singh Nijar, director of Third World Network, entitled, “Intellectual Property Rights and the WTO: Undermining Biodiversity and Indigenous Knowledge Systems.” The final meeting took place at the capstone conference, “Multiple Geographies, Plural Histories: New Paradigms in Area Studies.” The conference featured a keynote address by Edward Said entitled, “Humanism in the Cold War Era: The Shifting Context of Area Studies,” and sessions on “Geographies of Process,” “Locations, Dislocations, Voice,” and “Rethinking Area Studies: Pedagogy.”

Pedagogical Innovations:

Pedagogy was a central focus of the Regional Worlds Program and each of the colloquia held under its auspices explicitly addressed strategies for teaching about process geographies. Perhaps because we are regularly inundated with realities that are so glaringly out of sync with conceptualizations of areas as separate, coherent entities, the pedagogical discussions were characterized by a sense of urgency about finding ways to incorporate processes geography approaches and materials into the curricula of our various institutions. The presentations and discussions were wide-ranging, addressing pedagogical issues both in terms of problems or barriers encountered in teaching about areas, particularly areas conceptualized as the result of process geographies, and innovative approaches to introducing process

geographies into area studies and international studies curriculum. The pedagogical discussions involved faculty from a wide variety of institutions: research institutions, small liberal arts institutions and community colleges. Although the faculty worked in very different academic environments with divergent institutional demands and diverse groups of students there was a surprising degree of consensus on pedagogical issues. Concerns with pedagogy are not the exclusive purview of faculty at liberal arts colleges. Nor is research the exclusive concern of faculty at research institutions. Rather, for all of the faculty associated with the Program research and teaching exist on a continuum and as research interests have moved toward issues connected with process geographies, pedagogical approaches must also incorporate and reflect those interests.

In conceptual terms, the major recommendation at the end of four years was the same one iterated at the end of the Program's initial year, that

“areas” need to be thought about as results of processes, including research processes, rather than as objective clusters of cartographic, material or cultural facts. Emphasizing “process” geographies suggests new ways to approach both space and time in relations to “areas,” with space becoming more flexible and porous and time less sequential and cumulative (RW 1997, 23).

But at the end of four years we have a much clearer sense, not only of the challenges involved in teaching about processes geographies, but also of the kinds of innovations possible for reconceptualizing individual courses, redesigning broader area studies curricula and for making insitutional changes that will support the kinds of connections inherent in a process geographies approach. What kinds of changes does this approach entail for undergraduate teaching? Institutional frameworks are, by in large, premised on area studies conceptualized on the basis of “trait” geographies. In large, research universities, area studies programs typically have numerous faculty connected with them as well as administrators and graduate students. In smaller, liberal arts colleges, faculty tend to be hired in departments with some of their teaching responsibilities attached to an area studies program. In this context administrative arrangements vary considerably and it is not uncommon for curricula to be uneven, as the needs of departments and area studies programs clash over demands for faculty time.

Student populations also vary from institution to institution and this certainly has bearing on the kinds of pedagogical approaches utilized by particular faculty. Liberal arts colleges and research universities are likely to draw students of very different ethnic backgrounds to their campuses. For example, at the University of Chicago “at least half of the students in the South Asia civilization course are Americans of South Asian extraction. Students of south Asian origin often bring with them a set of assumptions about their cultural backgrounds that may be difficult to shake, particularly if the instructor is not himself or herself of South Asian origin” (RW 1997, 15). Liberal arts colleges, with few notable exceptions, tend to have student bodies comprised mainly of white students who come to “area studies” or “international” course with different kinds of “baggage,” often in the form of stereotypical images and conceptualizations gleaned from media and popular culture. In either case, pedagogical approaches must be tailored to the particular student audience involved.

In addition to these challenges, teaching about “process” geographies also runs counter to the ways in which undergraduates have been conditioned to learn. Undergraduate students are much more accustomed to thinking about fixed and enduring identities, places, countries, civilizations and other social phenomena. They are most comfortable, particularly at the introductory level, when learning involves the mastery of sets of facts about places, cultures and global events. “To convey the idea of process, and more importantly, to show processes at work, is much more difficult” (RW 1997, 18). Pedagogical approaches based on process geographies run counter to the logic of most survey courses that focus on either “area” or “civilization.” These courses tend to cover grand historical sweeps using too much material in too little time. The result, however well intentioned the instructor, is to convey an overall coherence and unity that leaves the students with stereotypes and reductionist understandings

What does all this mean for pedagogy? How do we teach about a world where trait and process geographies intersect in multiple ways, none remaining sedentary for too long? How do we simultaneously construct and deconstruct places, social practices, and identities in ways that undergraduate students will find coherent, useful and engaging? How do we conceptualize particular courses and broader curricula (concentrations, majors, programs) that continue to engage scholarly

debates over the theorization of “global,” “local,” “culture,” and their intersections, while at the same time seriously engaging the varied dimensions of global capital, the struggles of a variety of regional and global social movements and the many lived realities of local communities. While it is too soon to suggest the parameters of a new canon for pedagogy in area studies and international studies, there are some definite trends that emerged from this project. The syllabi and course descriptions attached in Appendices A, B, C and D illustrate several different approaches to integrating processes geographies in current area studies, comparative studies or international studies curricula. These courses were developed in very diverse institutional contexts in connection with participants’ involvement in the Regional Worlds Program. While some of the syllabi and descriptions are for graduate student courses, most pertain to undergraduate courses. They reflect the Program’s concern with the intersection of traditional area studies and process geographies and thus, suggest multiple ways for integrating a process geography approach in a variety of institutional settings.

1. Courses that contextualize “areas” within frameworks that highlight the production of knowledge and/or world history. - One of the dilemmas facing faculty and students is how does one deconstruct traditional area studies approaches when undergraduate students have very little concrete knowledge about a particular region? Most faculty felt that their American students had little knowledge about areas outside the U.S. Or worse, students can with horrible stereotypes and misconceptions gleaned from both media and secondary education. Before a particular concept can be problematized or interrogated, students must have some foundational knowledge about a particular region. For example, one cannot “critique the way Western scholarship has constructed India as a caste society if students do not know what caste is or, even worse, have their own misconceptions of it” (RW 1997, 18).

One way to introduce process geographies within institutional frameworks based on traditional area studies is to address the ways in which traditional “areas” are, in fact, products of particular historical dynamics. “Areas” and their histories are not artifacts, but rather the products of interactions between nations, elites, schools and other relevant actors. These courses explore how knowledge (about particular areas) comes to be constituted and shaped. Such an approach does not view world history as an “additive

process” constituted by a cumulative body of separate regional and civilizational histories, but rather as a series of integrative processes which link regions and peoples, in different ways, over time.⁶ As an alternative to survey courses, this approach would suggest courses based on in-depth explorations of a few topics as a way to get students to think processually. One kind of in-depth exploration would be to get students to focus on particular categories within historical contexts that require an “unpacking” of meanings associated with that category.

In his course on “Geneologies of Area Studies,” anthropologist Arjun Appadurai focuses on the idea of “area studies” and how, and in what context, particular “areas” become the objects of study. The course, which is required for all graduate students in the Department of South Asian Languages and Civilizations, situates South Asia, specifically India, at the interstices of European nation-building, imperialism, capitalism and, by implication, the power-laden constructions of knowledge that informed European explorations and cartographies of the colonial world. In taking this course, students learn to situate historical and anthropological texts in critical and comparative perspective. In a somewhat similar approach, Arjun Guneratne, an anthropologist at Macalester College, teaches about European social theory by focussing on the ways in which those theories were used to construct representations of India in his course, “The Construction of South Asia.” Guneratne’s course looks at European constructions of India through the writings of Hegel, Marx Weber and Durkheim and the ways in which, throughout these works constructions of India have represented the antithesis of Europe: tradition vs. modernity, superstition vs. rationality, society vs. individual. Guneratne also teaches a “Peoples and Cultures of South Asia,” course that addresses the ways in which Western knowledge has shaped contemporary understandings of the region. Here, the focus is on how knowledge gets constructed and, in the process of unfolding this story, students are exposed to anthropological writing on culture and society in India, Nepal and Sri Lanka.

Marcia Yonemoto, a historian at the University of Colorado at Boulder, focuses on histories that connect Europe and the Americas to other world regions in her course, “Thinking Across Space/Time: Connective Histories of the Early Modern Era.” This course is aimed at graduate students in history who

have little or no formal training in areas outside the U.S. or Europe. By focusing on transoceanic trade, migration, and travel; borderlands and peripheries; maps; commodity flows and material cultures, students get exposed to methodologies that allow them to focus on processes that connect different regions over time. By emphasizing these kinds of movements the course highlights the fluidity of identities and conceptual categories as well as the ways in which processes associated with global capitalism in the early modern period created linkages that shaped local communities in mutually reinforcing ways.

In their course, “Frontiers in China and Japan,” Melissa Wender and William Schaeffer, of the East Asian Languages and Civilizations Program at the University of Chicago, explore the geographical and cultural border areas of China and Japan. By focusing on the geographical periphery as well as those who have been defined as cultural minorities despite the spatially central locations, Wender and Schaeffer illuminate the ways in which borders and frontiers literally and figuratively shift in connection with processes associated with modernization, economic globalization and media networks.

Each of these courses provides students with specific cultural and historical information, but in ways that contextualizes that information within broader frameworks that emphasize interaction and struggle, and related questions about how knowledge of a particular area or people emerges from these interactions and struggles. In beginning with these premises, students are encouraged to resist the temptation to see “areas” as singular entities with fixed and enduring territorial and cultural boundaries. Histories and cultures are not constituted by sets of facts, but rather are contextualized by interactions between groups that are shaped by cooperation and conflict.

2. Courses that employ comparison or unusual juxtapositions to highlight process geographies. – Process geographies can also be placed in sharp relief through the use of comparison or juxtapositions that cut across regions that comprise traditional area studies. In “African American Internationalist Writing,” David C. Moore of the English Department and International Studies Program at Macalester College, pulls students into the African diaspora through the ties of great twentieth century African American writers to West Africa, the Caribbean, Soviet Central Asia, Indonesia Japan and other places

outside the U.S. The writings of Zora Neale Hurston, Langston Hughes, James Baldwin, Richard Wright, Octavia Butler, Maryse Condé and others illuminate border-crossings and global identities that characterize African American experiences within the broader African diaspora. Moore created the course to deliberately challenge the boundary between “internationalism” and “multiculturalism” that exists in so many contexts within the U.S.

This course suggests possibilities for numerous other courses based on particular juxtapositions to highlight global processes. For example, one could teach about global capitalism and related cultural practices related to consumption in the twentieth century by focusing on the global trade in second hand clothing, bananas, or sneakers.⁷ Similarly there is a proliferation of materials addressing dispersed processes associated with production under global capitalism, particularly focusing on sweatshop issues.⁸ Other possibilities for highlighting global processes through the use of juxtaposition might include courses that link particular cases based on global social movements (eg. related to the environment, women’s rights, human rights), popular culture or diasporas and migrations.

3. Courses that focus on process geographies to develop new “regional worlds.” – Privileging various processes is another way of highlighting diverse landscapes formed by process geographies. Process geographies can be linked to global capitalism, cultural flows and ideas with an emphasis on mobility and perpetual change. When of the benefits of conceptualizing curricula in terms of process is that it requires those of us living in the “west,” to include and interrogate ourselves. In this way a focus on process geographies breaks the problematic, though ubiquitous, dichotomies that position the “west” against “the rest” or vice versa “the rest” out to get “the west.”

One set of processes is linked to indigenous rights and struggles of indigenous peoples throughout the world to assert their rights to resources, practices and autonomy in the face of efforts by transnational and local capital, banks, international financial institution, national governments, NGOs and science foundations to appropriate material and intellectual resources. Indigenous populations from Thailand to the Americas and Oceania to Africa face similar struggles. Jerome Levi, an anthropologist in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Carleton College, highlights global processes surrounding

the struggles of indigenous peoples in his course, “Anthropology and Indigenous Rights.” This course posits a comparative approach to indigenous rights in relation to human rights, ethnic groups and the state. On the one hand, a number of states nominally guarantee the political and cultural autonomy of indigenous minorities. However, on the other hand, land and biological resources utilized by indigenous minorities continue to be threatened by, the too often violent, exploitation of these populations and their environments. Levi’s course takes up the status of indigenous populations by looking at case studies from Africa, Asia, Oceania and Latin America. In this course, indigenous rights is constituted as a process geography by similarities created through linkages to global capitalism and through emerging social movements that take up issues ranging from violence against indigenous groups to legal battles over control of indigenous property rights. At the University of Chicago, Manuela Carneiro da Cunha, an anthropologist, also looks issues related to indigenous populations in her course, “Indigenous Intellectual Rights.” This course interrogates the role of anthropology in debates about indigenous intellectual rights, as well as delineating the ways in which local knowledge is accessed and used in a variety of debates involving governments, international legal regimes, NGOs, transnational corporations and local people. The course involves case studies of lawsuits involving indigenous intellectual rights from Thailand, the Philippines and Colombia.

Two courses from the University of Chicago highlight the mobility and circulation of ideas and cultures. Anna Tsing’s course on “Environmental Discourses” looks at the ways in which environmentalism has become a way of thinking about global processes. Through environmentalism “nature” and “politics” get shaped in mutually reinforcing ways that have spatial implications. The course asks questions about the subjects and objects of environmental discourse, as well as about the ways environmental programs and ideas travel. In a somewhat similar trajectory, “East Asian Cultures of Circulation,” a course taught by Melissa Wender and William Schaefer, look at the mobility of Asian culture through migration and ask how does circulation shape and reshape one’s conception of the region in which one lives? And conversely, how have peoples in East Asia experienced, imagined, and represented circulation in mass, popular and elite culture? The course focuses on three time periods: the

mid-nineteenth century to the end of the colonial period, the Second World War in the mid-twentieth century, and the postwar era.

Van Dusenbery of the Anthropology Department at Hamline College teaches about process geographies in “Transnational Migration and Diasporic Communities.” This course is geared to upper level students and is cross-listed with International Studies. The course investigates the global movement of people across national boundaries in the late twentieth century, with particular emphasis on the ways in which people build social networks across national boundaries. This exploration of transnational identities utilizes case studies of a number of transnational populations including Sikhs, Roma, Russians, Turks, Palestinians and Nuer.

My own course on “Gender and Globalization” explores how gender identities and relations shape global processes in connection with militarization, production and nationalism in the post-Cold War period. Through reading a combination of theoretical works and case studies students grapple with questions about whether or not processes associated with “globalization” create pressures for similar gender identities and relations across diverse local contexts, and how different gender identities (eg. women working in maquiladora and American women consumers) get linked through global processes.

4. Courses that explore the intersections of process geographies and geopolitical/cultural areas.

Each of the courses outlined above deals with intersections of process and location in some manner. Indeed processes are not comprehensible without reference to the ways in which they take shape within particular parameters of time and space. These course, however, offer more detailed understandings of the ways in which processes shape, and are shaped by, dynamics within regions recognized by traditional area studies. They offer the opportunities for more in depth explorations of local histories, cultural practices and social dynamics while at the same time throwing light on global processes.

Social movements provide one set of lenses through which to view the intersections of process geographies and regional areas. At the Law School of the University of Chicago Jacqueline Bhabha proposed a module on “Human Rights, Gender, and South Asia.” This module situates human rights issues in South Asia, specifically issues related to gender issues including sati, abortion, Muslim personal

law and the women's movement within a broader historical context involving British colonialism, cultural relativism, and British conceptions of human rights arguments. In a course cross-listed between South Asian studies, Anthropology and Environmental Studies Anthropologist Carol Breckenridge has students look at the ways debates about health and the environment in Asia have been restructured in light of globalization. By highlighting the ways in which debates of health are linked to environmental dimensions of global capital, this course raises questions about what constitutes "public" health in an era of globalization, how debates on health and environment constitute particular subjects and objects in the context of the U.S., Japan and South Asia, and the implications for "deep democracy" and sustainable development.

At Carleton College, Anthropologist Jerome Levi proposed a course to explore the intersections of process and place entitled, "Indigenous Mexico: A Global Genealogy of Chiapas." Levi draws upon Appadurai's notion of "global ethnoscape," the complex transnational flows that link various parts of the world in a web of deterritorialized and fluid interconnections, and Foucault's notion of "genealogy," as critical historiography that uncovers in the past not a singular origin or pure essence of things, but instead a diversity of trajectories that construct themselves from alien forms. Through these conceptual lenses the course explores the lives of native peoples in the Mexican state of Chiapas from antiquity to the present.

Other courses situate thematic issues in particular geographical spaces within the context of global processes. For example Political Scientist Richard Leitch of Gustav Adolphus College situates the national politics of China, Japan, Vietnam and Korea within the context of a developing world economy of the early and pre-modern periods. Art Historian Kathleen Ryor's course on "Twentieth Century Chinese Art," places the study of Chinese Art within a framework of modernity defined from a Chinese perspective and the potential linkages and discontinuities with Western notions of modernity.

These courses that explore the intersections of process geographies and particular territories are particularly well suited to institutions that are beginning to re-think their area studies curriculum because although they challenge traditional "boundaries" of area studies knowledge they can be taught within curricular programs based upon "trait" geographies.

The courses described in this section represent the efforts of faculty at the University of Chicago and at a number of liberal arts colleges throughout the Midwest and, thus, represent a range of institutional contexts. The divisions among them were intended a heuristic device to suggest one way of conceptualizing distinctions among them. Clearly, there is considerable overlap across these categories and others could be employed as well. Within these varied contexts the courses were institutionally situated in different ways. Many of the courses were taught within the parameters of traditional disciplinary homes but also cross-listed with one or more interdisciplinary programs and area studies programs. On the one hand this suggests considerable institutional flexibility in terms of interdisciplinary knowledge and overlapping areas. But, on the other hand, too often the courses were not part of a concentration, sequence or core that would enable students to have a more extended exposure to a process geographies approach. Occasionally, individual courses also run into problems in connection with how they “count” between disciplinary departments and interdisciplinary and area studies programs. For example David Chioni Moore’s course on “African American Internationalist Writing” is organized as a literature course and is cross-listed in English and International Studies at Macalester College. Macalester has general education requirements in areas of “domestic diversity,” and “international diversity.” Since this course is based on the internationalist writing of African Americans, Moore applied to have the course count toward both designations, the Curriculum Committee denied “the *domestic* part of the request because the course was not about the African American experience – but rather about Indonesia, Central Asia, Jamaica and so forth.”⁹

Institutional Constraints and Opportunities

The materials described in this essay (and attached in the Appendices) are meant to convey some of the substance of the pedagogical work of the Regional Worlds Program, but also, and perhaps more importantly, to stimulate thinking within institutions of higher education about how we teach our students about the world. Most of the pedagogical work of the Program involved constructing sets of materials, syllabi and bibliographies, that would be of use to colleagues who wanted to re-think conceptual

frameworks in area studies and international studies that inform teaching, particularly undergraduate teach, at a wide variety of institutions. While the syllabi in the appendices provide ample evidence of the many inventive ways faculty are rethinking the boundaries of area studies and institutional studies, there was also strong sentiment that individual courses are not enough. Rethinking the ways we teach students about the world, the ways in which we conceptualize “areas” and the “international” must entail an broad institutional commitment to curricular transformation and, in many cases, institutional transformation as well.

Faculty were concerned that project based approaches – involving curriculum development and/or faculty development – were likely to be ephemeral since, in most cases they do not lead to new institutional arrangements that would sustain curricular goals. For example, at the current moment significant resources exist to support faculty development and new curricular initiatives that fall under the broad rubric of “internationalization.” Federal sources of funding through the State Department and the Department of Education (Title VI and Fulbright programs) support a wide range of international education activities ranging from language study and study abroad, to faculty exchange programs and curricular development initiatives. Private foundations, such as the Ford Foundation and the Mellon Foundation, also provide funding in these areas. But do these project-based approaches lead to sustainable institutional change? A project might, for example, involve the exploration of a region that is not generally highlighted in the context of institutional area studies divisions, such as Eurasia, the Mediterranean world, or the Atlantic world. The project might involve a two-year faculty development seminar drawing faculty from different disciplines and interdisciplinary programs together, a series of co-curricular events and several linked courses. When the project funding is finished, how has this project impacted the education institution that hosted it? On one level the faculty and students have undoubtedly participated in engaging intellectual experiences for a sustained period. But, on another level, has the project led to institutional change in terms of faculty expertise, curricular development, or the configuration of departments, area studies programs and international or global studies?

The concern about the potential ephemerality of curricular development centered on one or two courses (what happens when the particular faculty member no longer teaches at the institution?) and projects based on “extra” activities and events (seminars, co-curricular events, travel) is that they do not create the institutional circumstances for the fullest exploration of a process geographies approach to a world comprised of “regional worlds.” In other words one of the benefits of a process geography approach is its flexibility to meet a variety of institutional contexts through as little as one course. However, this approach, as exemplified by the materials included in this essay, suggests multiple possibilities for much broader transformations of institutional arrangements involving area studies, international studies and language studies.

The pedagogical discussions that were part of the Regional Worlds Program did not progress to the point of suggesting alternative institutional models. Indeed, there was broad recognition that obstacles to transformation were formidable. Area studies as currently practiced in the United States not only has deep roots in the post-World War II period, but is thoroughly institutionalized within government structures, professional associations and institutions of higher education. Faculty who teach in area studies are hired and evaluated within the parameters established in these areas. In our discussion, most faculty were keenly aware of the potential pitfalls of sitting on the margins of established disciplinary boundaries, as well as area studies boundaries. In discussions of attempts at curricular innovations that involved more than several courses, faculty spoke the difficulty of suggesting new approaches, and the prevalence of “turf battles” in terms of numbers of student majors, faculty lines and budgets. Nevertheless, if we are to meet the tremendous challenges of teaching undergraduate students about the world, in both contemporary and historical terms, we must rise to the challenge of rethinking the curricular and institutional frameworks that shape our work.

¹ The argument that states are weakened and losing sovereignty in connection with “globalization” is controversial. Steven Krasner, for example, argues that state sovereignty has not declined and that states will not disappear, or become one set of actors on par with others that include transnational corporations, NGOs and IGOs, although the particular form of state sovereignty has altered.

² American Council on Education, Commission on International Education: Educating for Global competence: America's Passport to the Future." Washington, DC, 1998.

³ See, for example, White House Policy Statement on International Education (April 2000); "Educating for Global Competence," Report of the American Council on Education's Commission on International Education (1998); Josef A. Mestenhauser and Brenda J. Ellingboe (1998) *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum:*

Internationalizing the Campus; Crossing Borders: Revitalizing Area Studies (1999), Ford Foundation; and, Joseph S. Johnston, Jr. (1999) "Missing the Big Picture: General education and Global Systems of Interdependence."

⁴ For Hannerz, the cultural framework, "forms of life" refers to "the everyday practicalities of production and reproduction, activities going on in work places, domestic settings, neighborhoods, and some variety of other places" (Hannerz 1997, 113).

⁵ Final documents for each of the first three years of the Regional Worlds program can be found at University of Chicago's Globalization Project website: <http://humanities.uchicago.edu/cis/globalization/rwp.html>

⁶ For elucidation on this perspective see Janet Abu-Lughod *Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250-1350* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), and Eric Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997, second edition).

⁷ For some ideas about how to pursue these connections see Karen Tranberg Hansen, 2000, *Salaula: the World of Secondhand Clothing in Zambia*; Cynthia Enloe 1989, *Bananas, Beaches & Bases*; and Cynthia Enloe 1996, "Feminists Try on the Post-Cold War Sneaker" and Miguel Korzeniewicz, 1993, "Commodity chains and Marketing strategies: Nike and the Global Athletic Footwear Industry."

⁸ For example see Andrew Ross, ed., *No Sweat: Fashion, Free Trade, and the Rights of Garment Workers* (New York, Verso, 1997); Altha Cravey, *Women and Work in Mexico's Maquiladoras* (New York: Rowan and Littlefield, 1998); and, "William M. Adler, *Mollie's Job: A Story of Life and Work on the Global Assembly Line* (New York, Scribner, 2000)

⁹ This is taken from a preface to David Chioni Moore's "African American Internationalist Writing" syllabi that he made available for the session on "Rethinking Area Studies: Pedagogy" at the Capstone Conference, "Mobile Geographies, Plural Histories," University of Chicago, May 20, 2000.

Sources

- Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).
- _____. 1990. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy," *Public Culture*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Spring 1990)
- Boyer, Mark A., Mary Caprioli, Robert A. Denemark, Elizabeth C. Hanson and Steven L. Lamy. 2000. "Visitins of International Studies in the New Millenium" *International Studies Perspectives*, No. 1, 1-9.
- Enloe, Cynthia. 1996. "Feminists Try On the Post-Cold War Sneaker," in Nancy Hewitt, Jean O'Barr, and Nancy Rosebaugh, eds. *Talking Gender*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 167-189.
- _____. 1989. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Eisenstein, Zillah. 1996. *Hatreds: Racialized and Sexualized Conflicts in the 21st Century*. New York: Routledge.
- Ford Foundation. 1999. *Crossing Borders: Revitalizing Area Studies*.
- Hannerz, Ulf. 1997. "Scenarios for Peripheral Cultures," in Anthony Kind, ed., *Culture, Globalization and the World-system: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. pp. 107-128.
- Hansen, Karen Tranberg. 2000, *Salaula: The World of Secondhand Clothing and Zambia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Harvey, David. 1990. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Jameson, Fredric and Masao Miyoshi, eds. 1998, *The Cultures of Globalization*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Johnston, Joseph S., Jr. (1999) "Missing the Big Picture: General education and Global Systems of Interdependence," *Peer Review*, 1:2 (Winter). p. 4.
- Korzeniewicz, Miguel. 1993. "Commodity Chains and Marketing Strategies: Nike and the Global Athletic Footwear Industry," in Gary Gereffi and Miguel Korzeniewicz. Eds., *Commodity Chains and Global Capitalism*. Westport, CT: Greenwood press.
- Krasner, Stephen. 2001. "Sovereignty" in *Foreign Policy*, January/February, pp. 20-29.
- Miyoshi, Masao. 1998. "'Globalization,' Culture, and the University," in Jameson and Miyoshi, eds., *The Cultures of Globalization*. Durham: Duke University Press. 247-270.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 1999. "Dreamland: The Neoliberalism of Your Desires," paper presented at the Regional Worlds Seminar, University of Chicago, October 22nd.
- Nixon, Rob. 1999. *Dreambirds: the Strange History of the Ostrich in Fashion, Food and Fortune*. New York: Picador.
- Said, Edward. 2000. "Humanism in the Cold War Era and After: the Shifting Context of Area Studies." Keynote address, Regional Worlds Capstone Conference, *Mobile Geographies, Plural Histories: New Paradigms in Area Studies*, University of Chicago. May 19.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1998. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: The New Press.

Regional Worlds. 1999. "Visual Culture, Regional Identities, and Transnational Modernities in East Asia," The University of Chicago.

_____. 1998. "Cultural Environments and Development Debates: Latin America" The University of Chicago.

_____. 1997. "Area Studies, Regional Worlds: A White Paper for the Ford Foundation," The University of Chicago.

_____. 1996. "Proposal for Developing New Approach to Area Studies"

Volkman, Toby. 1998. *Ford Foundation Report: Crossing Borders*. (Winter) <http://fordfound.org/publications/>

White House Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, "International Education Policy," April, 2000.