



Center for Global Studies

A NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Occasional Paper

Edward A. Kolodziej
Director
Center For Global Studies
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Center for Global Studies
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
June 20, 2005

This publication is supported by funding from the U.S. Department of Education's Title VI Program and is produced by the Center for Global Studies (CGS) at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. The University of Illinois is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

CGS *Occasional Paper* series is the principal publication to circulate the research and analytical results of faculty and students associated with CGS. Publications of CGS are available upon request. For additional information consult the CGS home page on the World Wide Web at:

<http://www.cgs.uiuc.edu/>

Published 2005 by CGS 2005

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

1705 Presidential Tower

325 E. John St.

Champaign, IL 61820

Series editor: Steve W. Witt

Copy editor: Beth Bailey

Plotting an Intellectual Jailbreak: Rationale For Globalizing the Campus and University

Edward A. Kolodziej,
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Presented on June 20, 2005, Center for Global Studies,
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign**

Center for Global Studies
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
June 20, 2005

Précis:

Absent a compelling rationale, there is little reason to create a new program of global studies in an already crowded academic landscape, nor much justification for re-allocating scarce (and often shrinking) human and material resources to this enterprise.

Four propositions provide a necessary if insufficiently complete and comprehensive rationale for global studies programs.

First, and increasingly, fundamental problems of deep and universal concern to humans everywhere can be resolved or managed only if they are addressed — *simultaneously and synchronously* — at local, national, regional, *and* global levels by relevant actors.

Second, the scope of these global and globalizing problems evidences the emergence of a global society for the first time in the evolution of the species.

Third, the description, explanation, and understanding of globalization, marked by globalizing problems of a world society, require dedicated interdisciplinary and interprofessional programs of study.

The obverse to this proposition, fourth, is that, notwithstanding its many merits, the current diffuse and decentralized organization of educational programs and disciplinary units across the academy at all levels is ill-suited — in some instances a serious impediment — to the study of globalization and to the discovery of ways to employ and deploy the forces unleashed by globalization for human good or, conversely, to limit and frustrate the damage they do.

The principal aim of this brief is to lay the conceptual foundation for global studies programs. This foundation is the precondition for the development of specific guidelines to assist strategic decisions relating to the re-allocation of academic priorities; the re-definition of faculty responsibilities, expertise, and skill sets; the reformulation of instructional programs and their delivery; and the adaptation of university and college organizational, financial, and logistical structures and processes to support these reforms.

Plotting an Intellectual Jailbreak: Rationale For Globalizing the Campus and University

Absent a compelling rationale, there is little reason to create a new program of global studies in an already crowded academic landscape, nor much justification for re-allocating scarce (and often shrinking) human and material resources to this enterprise.

Four propositions provide a necessary if insufficiently complete and comprehensive rationale for global studies programs. Their evolving form and substantive content in any particular academic setting will depend on the results of a continuing dialogue within the academy and between the academy and its many stakeholders at each intellectual and policy studies site. No assumption should be made that this process of mutual adaptation will ever be complete. Upheaval is endemic to globalization. Its study must also be protean, flexible, and agile in response to its enlarging and changing dimensions and the multiple forces shaping human behavior and thought in new and revolutionary ways.

First, and increasingly, fundamental problems of deep and universal concern to humans everywhere can be resolved or managed only if they are addressed — *simultaneously and synchronously* — at local, national, regional, *and* global levels by relevant actors.

Second, the scope of these global and globalizing problems evidences the emergence of a global society for the first time in the evolution of the species.

Third, the description, explanation, and understanding of globalization, evidenced by the deepening and enlarging problems posed by a world society, require dedicated interdisciplinary and interprofessional programs of study.

The obverse to this proposition, fourth, is that, notwithstanding its many merits, the current diffuse and decentralized organization of educational programs and disciplinary units across the academy at all levels is ill-suited — in some instances a serious impediment — to the study of globalization and to the discovery of ways to employ and deploy the forces unleashed by globalization for human good or, conversely, to limit and frustrate the damage they do.

The principal aim of this brief is to lay the conceptual foundation for global studies programs. This foundation is the precondition for developing specific criteria to guide strategic decisions relating to the re-allocation of academic priorities; the re-definition of faculty responsibilities, expertise, and skill sets; the reformulation of instructional programs and their delivery; and the adaptation of university and college organizational, financial, and logistical structures and processes to support these reforms. The challenge facing the academy is to enlist the proven knowledge, methods, and rules of evidence of established disciplines and professional codes in a larger interdisciplinary and interprofessional learning system capable of addressing the problems of a rapidly changing world.

First things first: ideas to drive the process of reforming the academy's agenda.

1. The Multiplication of Global Problems and of Autonomous Domains of Globalization

Globalization is a highly contested notion. For many observers, whose views are typically reflected in the popular media and polemical debates, globalization is reduced to worldwide economic actors and factors. For some, it is a fighting word associated with the rise of capitalist markets, the growing economic and political power of multinationals, and the corruption of international organizations like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the World

Trade Organization, as mechanisms to exploit and suppress the world's populations.¹ For others, globalization is the solution for world poverty and the impulse for the spread of freedom and democracy.² All the boats rise, so to speak, with the tide of increased wealth swelled by a global division of labor, competitive markets, and the diffusion of scientific knowledge and technological know-how. Greater material wealth supposedly spells greater demands for personal freedom —³ even the end of history as a record of incessant struggles between rich and poor; between oppressors and oppressed.⁴

What does appear certain when globalization is viewed as an inexorable economic process enveloping most of the world's populations is that it will be a very competitive and swiftly changing as markets, following Schumpeter's visionary grasp of capitalism, ⁵ will create powerful incentives for innovation that will make once prevailing technologies obsolete. There will winners and losers in this race of the swift.⁶ Many may never catch up unless massive assistance is available by developed donor countries, whose promise of assistance through the Millennium Development Goals currently languishes for lack of financial support.

In the foreseeable future, there is little likelihood that even these narrowly conceived contentious notions of globalization will be eventually harmonized. Too much of human value, not to say personal and professional interests, are at stake in these debates. It is precisely because the phenomenon of globalization is so disputed and because it provokes so much profound discord that global studies programs are needed. As a potentially rigorous field of study, globalization requires new thinking about its scope; about innovative, cross-disciplinary methods to validate interpretive and empirical knowledge about the human condition today and its prospects; and about evaluative criteria, quantitative and qualitative, to assess globalization's

1 See, *inter alia.*, Broad, Robin (Ed.). 2002. *Global Backlash: Citizen Initiatives for a Just World Economy*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2004. *War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Press, Wallerstein, Immanuel (Ed.). 1975. *World Inequality: Origins and Perspectives on the World System*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.

2 Friedman, Thomas. 2000. *Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Farrar Straus, Giroux, Yergin, Daniel and Joseph Stanislaw. 2002. *The Commanding Heights: The Battle for the World Economy*. New York: Touchstone.

3 Friedman, Milton. 1962. *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Hayek, Friedrich von. 1948. *Individual Freedom and Economic Order*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

4 Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.

5 Schumpeter, Joseph A. 1954. *History of Economic Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

multiple impacts on the world's populations.

So what is the scope of global studies? What should be included within the set of global matters? What disciplines and professions are most relevant and central to these programs? What methods, research protocols, and instructional mechanisms are required to advanced knowledge about globalization and to address the challenges it presents for humankind? What justifies these choices?

Communications and Transportation. Certainly the revolutions in communications and transportation, which have connected the world's peoples in ways never imagined or possible before, merit inclusion. No global studies program can ignore these continuing revolutions and the need to determine where they are pushing the peoples of the world, whether together or further apart in understanding, mutual tolerance and cooperation. Technology can be used either way, as the war on terrorism and the culture wars within and between states, evidence. 9/11 illustrates the malevolent uses of planes and explosives; the internet, the potential availability of human knowledge to everyone at the click of a mouse as well as the pollution of child pornography. To global studies falls the responsibility of leading the academy to determine and apply what evaluative measures properly define techno-scientific discovery and innovation as neutral or as biased for good or ill.

Global Markets. Similarly, no viable and relevant global studies program can neglect the centrality of global markets and the powerful actors, principally multinational corporations, driving them. These humanly constructed social institutions and instruments have not only yielded immense and unprecedented wealth for billions of people, but they also commodify human values and homogenize identities into standard consumer modes, while distributing their wealth-creating assets unequally and inequitably among the world's populations. These contradictory outcomes of globalization are clearly perennials in the global studies garden. Globalization in its economic form broadens and deepens rather than resolves the continuing debate and struggle for power between the partisans of Adam Smith and Karl Marx to determine whether markets increase or decrease the wealth of nations and peoples and whether the gap

6 Friedman, Thomas L. 2005. *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, Kennedy, Paul. 1993. *Preparing for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Random House.

between the rich and poor widens or narrows.

Security. Notwithstanding the central importance of the forces just recounted for any global studies program, concentration on them would exclude many issues. These also have a strong claim on our attention. Global order and security issues, which revolve around the use or threat of force or coercive threats and their limitation, resist reduction as simply derivatives of economic exchanges in world markets, arising from conflicts associated with trade, investments, monetary transactions, labor migration, the power of multinationals, the unequal diffusion of techno-scientific knowledge, and the inequitable distribution of wealth. Global economic exchanges and practices can scarcely be fully understood or explained, much less reliably predicted, if abstracted from the national, regional, and global security contexts within which they are nested.

National and international security and economic development are mutually contingent domains. The state and its coercive powers are central to both in theory and practice. These constraints can neither be ignored nor neglected if globalization is to be understood, as institutional economists increasingly insist to their skeptical disciplinary colleagues.⁷ Property rights are at base defined by coercive stipulation in law and custom. Economists can tell us much about how to define property rights to efficiently and effectively maximize the production and distribution of wealth; they have much less to say about the perversions of human choice that deviate from their counsel of universally applicable practices and transparent rules to guide competition and cooperation. What explains why actors defect from stipulated rationality and, opt for coercion over consent in pursuing their values and preferences?

Contracts also depend ultimately on the threat of their forceful execution, however much the mutual self-interest of transacting parties may rationally dictate their performance without resort to the state's coercive mechanisms — courts, fines, police, and jail.⁸ Force and threats always lurk just below the surface of what may well appear to be consensual economic exchanges. They are, as Joseph Conrad suggests, the secret sharer of all economic exchanges and

7 North, Douglass C. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Smelser, Neil J. and Richard Swedberg (Ed.). 1994. *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

8 Coase, Ronald H. 1960. "The Problem of Social Cost." *Journal of Law and Economics* 3:1-44.

cooperation.

There is, of course, more to the problem of security and order than defining property rights and enforcing contracts, key elements of market transactions and the market system.⁹ These extend to the mounting threats posed by the spread of weapons of mass destruction,¹⁰ increasing military expenditures, the global arms trade,¹¹ terrorism,¹² and criminal human trafficking and slavery.¹³ In a word, security and order occupy a distinct, autonomous domain in global studies.

An exclusionary focus on markets, as some global studies programs may be tempted to adopt, neglects or marginalizes thinking about old politics. The latter comes in many shapes and sizes. Among the most prominent today is the globalization of identity politics. These violent clashes shred the social fabric of nations and spread infections across national borders, as in Iraq, Rwanda, Sudan, or the Congo today. Old politics is also about nation-state competition for power and status. There is too easy an assumption that armed conflict between states, big and small, will somehow atrophy, much like dueling and slavery as human institutions.¹⁴ Hostilities between states are subordinated by most security analysts today — if armed conflict is conceded still to be a problem —¹⁵ to conflicts *within*, not *between*, states or across states along class, culture and religion,¹⁶ or unique local social fault lines.¹⁷

9 Lindblom, Charles E. 2001. *The Market System: What It is, How It Works, and What to Make of It*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

10 Allison, Graham T. 2004. *Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophy*. New York: Times Books.

11 Pearson, Frederic and John Sislin. 2001. *Arms and Ethnic Conflict*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.

12 Crenshaw, Martha and John Pimlott (Ed.). 1996. *Encyclopedia of World Terrorism*. Armonk, N.Y.: Sharpe, Hoffman, Bruce. 1998. *Inside Terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

13 U.S., Department of State, *Trafficking in Persons*, June 2005, Washington, D. C.

14 Mueller, John. 1989. *Retreat from Doomsday*. New York: Basic Books.

15 These positions are evaluated in Kolodziej, Edward A. 2005. *Security and International Relations*. Cambridge, U. K.: Cambridge University Press.

16 Bozeman, Adda. 1960. *Politics and Culture in International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Bozeman, Adda. 1984. "The International Order in a Multicultural World." Pp. 387-406 in *The Expansion of International Society*, edited by Hedley Bull and Adam Watson. New York: Oxford University Press, Huntington, Samuel P. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

17 Gurr, Ted Robert. 1993. *Minorities at Risk: A Global View of Ethnopolitical Conflicts*. Washington, D. C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, Kaplan, Robert D. 2000. *The Coming Anarchy: Shattering the Dreams of the Post Cold War*. New York: Random House.

Some optimistic liberal economic theorists, echoing Joseph Schumpeter,¹⁸ posit the likelihood of peace arising from the globalization of markets which putatively depend on consent, not coercion, to work.¹⁹ This view is supported by some academic theorists who believe the international system has essentially moved from a Hobbesian world of war of all against all to an essentially peaceful, if competitive, liberal Lockean economic and political system,²⁰ In the latter system, global democratization moves relentless forward.²¹ In tandem, state relations, hitherto characterized by war and threats of violence, are progressively institutionalized and limits on state exercise of its material power is gradually enlarged.²² The stipulated accumulation and synergistic convergence of these trends are presumed to be leading eventually, as some observers believe to a universal state and global peace.²³

In these optimistic visions, where then in global studies is there room to assess the claims for greater influence and status of rising powers, like China, India, and Brazil and a potentially politically coherent and cohesive Europe, or for an examination of demands by medium powers, like Japan and Germany, for a greater say in shaping international order? These claims and the increasing military power of states, like nuclear China and India (not to overlook North Korea and Iran), pose particularly significant challenges to current American announced and operational policy to prevent any one state or a coalition of states from challenging United States

18 Schumpeter, Joseph. 1955. *Imperialism*. New York: Meridian.

19 n. 3.

20 Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. especially pp. 246-312.

21 Lipson, Charles. 2003. *Reliable Partners: How Democracies Have Made a Separate Peace*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Russett, Bruce and Harvey Starr. 2000. "From Democratic Peace to Kantian Peace: Democracy and Conflict in International Relations." Pp. 93-128 in *Handbook of War Studies II*, edited by Manus I. Midlarsky. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Russett, Bruce and John R. Oneal. 2001. *Triangulating Peace*. New York: W. W. Norton.

22 For examples, consult Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye. 2001. *Power and Interdependence*. New York: Longman, Russett, Bruce and John R. Oneal. 2001. *Triangulating Peace*. New York: W. W. Norton. For a critique, see, *inter alia.*, Waltz, Kenneth N. 1986. "Reflections on Theory of International Politics: A Response to My Critics." Pp. 322-45 in *Neorealism and Its Critics*, edited by Robert O. Keohane. New York: Columbia University Press.

23 Wendt, Alexander. 2003. "Why a World State Is Inevitable." *European Journal of International Relations* 9:291-542.. Immanuel Kant was less convinced of this inevitability; after two centuries of experimentation and two world and one Cold War, he still seems to have the better of the argument. Kant, Immanuel. 1983. *Perpetual Peace and Other Essays on Politics, History and Morals*. Indianapolis. See also Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

hegemony.²⁴ The gauntlet thrown down by the United States has many of the same features as the failed attempt of the British Empire to maintain its hegemony of the seas by adopting a two-battleship standard to any challenger, notably Germany, before World War I.²⁵ Global studies programs overlook these emerging conflicts at their intellectual and academic peril and at the risk of their public obligation to portray the world as it is as a precondition for how it might be perfected and for what it might become.

It is important to remember that one salient, if often slighted, property of globalization by global studies programs is the adoption by the world's diverse and divided peoples of the nation-state and the nation-state system as the principal, if flawed, solution to global order and security.²⁶ A system of states, each claiming the legitimate right to use force to assert its rival claims against others, remains a warfare system, however gentelized by commerce as Immanuel Kant predicted.²⁷ Neither Thomas Hobbes nor Carl von Clausewitz are quite ready to relinquish their hold on the choices of humans to use force to get their way to satisfy the expectations of Adam Smith, John Locke, Immanuel Kant, or their contemporary fellow travelers. Global governance and order remain high on the global studies agenda.

Ecology and Environment. Global security also means a lot more than just the use or threat of force. What of looming ecological and environmental threats to the life on the planet? Rising world population —nine to ten billion by 2050 — puts enormous stress on the world's resources and physical capacity to sustain the material needs of peoples around the world, notably in the developing world. The demand of peoples everywhere for “more now” to better their material lot, whether in the rich North or poor South, reinforces the pressures on the world's eco-system.

24 U. S., White House, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, September, 2002. For a probing critique, see Reus-Smit, Christian. 2004. *American Power and World Order*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

25 Kennedy, Paul M. (Ed.). 1979. *The War Plans of the Great Powers, 1880-1914*. London: Allen & Unwin, Kennedy, Paul M. 1980. *The Rise of the Anglo-German Antagonism 1860-1914*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

26 Spruyt, Hendrik. 1994. *The Sovereign States and Its Competitors*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Watson, Adam. 1992. *The Evolution of International Society: A Comparative Historical Analysis*. London: Routledge.

27 Kant, Immanuel. 1991. *Kant: Political Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press., p. 114.

The rising global demand for energy illustrates the synergistic intersection between discrete domains of globalization, viz., between expanding economic development, sustainable growth, and ecological threats to the global environment. Expanding pressures for economic development, especially strong and explosive in China and India, which together account for over 40 percent of the world's population, require greater amounts of energy. These pressures drive up world prices, while contributing to global warming and to the erosion of the globe's supportive capacity. If, for example, the science of global warming is increasingly solid and universally acknowledged (current American policy notwithstanding), solutions to resolve the tension between the energy requirements of economic growth and the costs of coping with global warming remain elusive.²⁸

Whether human societies can survive these ecological pressures are questions of real and significant moment.²⁹ What is particularly worrisome is that serious and informed analysts sharply and fundamentally disagree over the scope and depth of the eco-ecological problems besetting the planet and its populations and — here division is even deeper — over what strategies and over what distribution of burdens would be fair and effective among states and peoples to effectively cope with these problems. The debate between those concerned about the limits of economic growth posed by expanding world population and those convinced that human ingenuity will solve these problems remains unresolved, yet the implications of who's right is of immense importance to the globe and its inhabitants.³⁰

Health. And what of threats to world health and to the integrity of the species? HIV/AIDS annually kills tens of millions around the globe. Africa is impacted most heavily. Dangerous new epidemics — carried, for example, by new strains of avian flu — are also possible.³¹ The adaptability of bacteria and viruses to survive human intervention to eradicate them and to mutate to superior, resistant forms of infection poses an ongoing struggle for human

28 See, for example, the unconventional views of a sympathetic environmentalist favoring increased expenditures for economic development over the allocation of these resources to slow global warming. Lomborg, Bjorn. 2001. *The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the Real State of the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

29 Diamond, Jared. 2005. *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. New York: Viking.

30 Contrast Brown, Lester. 2003. *Plan B: Rescuing a Planet under Stress and a Civilization in Trouble*. New York: Norton, Simon, Julian. 1981. *The Ultimate Resource*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

31 Garrett, Laurie. 2005. "The Next Pandemic?" *Foreign Affairs* 84:3-23. See also the other articles of this mini-symposium on global health threats in the same issue.

survival.³² Adding to this agenda of global health is the distinct possibility of human cloning. Posed is the very biological integrity of the human species and, accordingly, the complex and tangled ethical, moral, and religious issues raised by biological genetic engineering. These issues were already foreshadowed in the ongoing controversies over Genetic Modified Organisms (GMOs) that led the European Union and several developing world countries, most in need of foodstuffs, to ban their importation.

Human Rights. Other global processes no less command our attention and add to the global studies agenda. They also resist reduction to other, purportedly more fundamental global forces. These are associated with the spread of democratic regimes and the quest for legitimacy,³³ unremitting and enlarging demands for human rights.³⁴ These latter forces clash with the persistence and spread of religious, ethnic, national, cultural, racial and gender defined discrimination. There are no less formidable than those of human rights.³⁵

No less important are rising criticism and increasingly organized resistance to globalization in response to the relentless expansion of markets, their unequal distribution of wealth, and their intrusion into almost every important aspect of daily life.³⁶ These real and perceived depredations prompt widespread, anti-global movements and demonstrations, like those in Seattle against the WTO. These and still other areas of human exchanges that might be readily cited — each encompassing diverse and diverging actors and discrete global processes and institutional structures — suggest that these domains, too, are autonomous areas of human

32 Dawkins, Richard. 1976. *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. For a human, historical perspective, see Diamond, Jared. 1997. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. New York: Norton, Jones, Eric Lionel. 1987. *The European Miracle: Environments, Economies, and Geopolitics in the History of Europe and Asia*. New York: Cambridge University Press, McNeill, William H. 1976. *Plagues and Peoples*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press., especially Chapter 1.

33 Huntington, Samuel P., Jr. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: Oklahoma University Press..

34 Hochschild, Adam. 1998. *King Leopold's Ghost*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, Kolodziej, Edward A. (Ed.). 2003. *A Force Profonde: The Power, Politics and Promise of Human Rights*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

35 See ns. 15 and 16. and Brzezinski, Zbigniew. 1993. *Out of Control: Global Turmoil on the Eve of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Scribners, Moynihan, Daniel P. 1993. *Pandaemonium: Ethnicity in International Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

36 Falk, Richard. 1999. *Predatory Globalization: A Critique*. Cambridge: Polity, Gills, Barry K. (Ed.). 2000. *Globalization and the Politics of Resistance*. Houndmill, UK: Palgrave, Khor, Martin, et al. 2000. *Views from the South*. Chicago: Food First Books, Petras, J. and H. Veltmeyer. 2001. *Globalization Unmasked: Imperialism in the 21st Century*. London: Zed. See also n. 1.

concern. They are appropriate and vital objects of global studies programs.

Marshalling the Human and Material Resources of the Academy

What are the implications of so capacious a view of globalization for global studies?

The challenges presented by globalization, as sketched above, suggest strongly the proposition that local, national, and regional problems of security, welfare, identity expression, and the like, cannot be resolved unless they are *simultaneously and synchronously* addressed at a global level. They are now magnified and made more complex by the nexus of global exchanges in which they are progressively embedded and ensnared. Examples abound. National economic growth depends increasingly on a state's competitive position, defined in no small way by its social values, the quality of its educational system, and the state's capacity to influence market rules to its liking.³⁷ Similarly, defeating terrorism in the United States requires cooperation with regimes, some heinous and authoritarian (e.g. Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen), a convergence of interest at odds with the demand for democratization and the creation of an open and free civil international society.

In focusing the study of globalization on current and future forces shoving and shaping the world society, it is important to recognize that old politics, and ways, rooted in local, national, and regional conflicts, continue to flourish. Global studies programs, as Robert Axelrod suggests,³⁸ must surely be concerned with the "shadow of the future" in cataloguing and tracking actor exchanges across the many and multiplying domains of globalization and what threats and opportunities they pose for humankind. Global studies programs are also obliged neither to overlook nor slight, as some do, the continuing deep and forbidding "shadow of the past" in determining current actor behavior. The shadows of the past and future merge to form a seamless web of evolving human initiative and strategic choices for engaged actors. Analysts, like Axelrod, may have good cause to simplify their research designs by parsing "shadows," but actors are not so delimited — nor disposed.

37 Hirst, Paul and Grahame Thompson. 1999. *Globalization in Question*. Cambridge: Polity.

38 Axelrod, Robert. 1984. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.

What people need and want in their local settings depends increasingly on the cooperation of countless anonymous individuals, groups, corporations, states, peoples, and organizations (governmental and non-governmental) around the globe. As suggested earlier, cooperation will be elicited by consent or coercion by actors seeking favorable outcomes from their interdependent exchanges. To borrow from Tennessee Williams' Blanche in "Streetcar Named Desire," preferred outcomes will depend on the kindness of strangers – and many, as Al Qaeda illustrates, are not very kind.

It is fruitless and misleading, not to say mischievous, to believe that simply asserting national claims of security and projecting national power around the globe will ever again be sufficient (if it ever was) to command the cooperation of others, even for wannabe hegemony. Power of all kinds — material and non-material — is now too diffused among the world's populations and states to assume that its national partial and circumscribed assertion will be self-executing in the face of formidable and unremitting countervailing opposition. Ceaseless negotiation and bargaining among variously empowered actors, possessed of limited hard and soft power, is the disciplining condition under which interdependent actors will necessarily survive and thrive in a globalizing world. Opportunities to advance local and national interests depend, paradoxically, on recognizing the constraints of these enlarging, deepening, and accumulating interdependencies.

Accurately presenting these complex images of interdependence across the many domains of globalization, as an intersecting process from the top-down and bottom up, is a key component and central criterion to assess the effectiveness of a working global studies program. No less crucial is the articulation of creative options potentially available to national states and their populations to address their common problems and collective needs for cooperation to cope with them. It is not enough to think globally and to act locally, as conventional wisdom suggests, but to think and act simultaneously and synchronously at both levels as fused facets and phases of a globalizing world.

2. The Emergence of a World Society

The many parts of globalization, depicted by this brief sketch of the problems and issues they raise for humankind, should not be confused or allowed to substitute for the whole of globalization. The totality of global exchanges within the set marked globalization constitutes a human system. This system, arguably, has its own causal impacts on the parts and pieces of globalization and, accordingly, on actor choices and prospects at local, national, and regional levels of analysis and action. The parts may be viewed as observations of the causal impact of a *force profonde*, as the French might say, that evidence a distinctive and revolutionary change in the human condition. Globalization as a system is greater than the sum of its parts. It is that whole, conceived as an evolving and expanding universe or system — a world society — that should be a central object of study of global studies programs. This emerging and expanding global system is the fundamental empirical and normative justification for the creation of strong interdisciplinary and interprofessional global studies programs.

For the first time in the evolution of the human species and its population of the planet in the great Diaspora, which began out of Africa, millennia ago, a world society has now emerged over the past several centuries. This does not imply by any means a socially or culturally, much less a politically coherent or cohesive society. The understanding of “society” meant here has no teleological implications or notion of a necessary convergence of human interests, aims, and values, as some might contend.³⁹ All that is required for a “society” in these lean terms are continually interacting interdependent actors who need the cooperation of each other to get what they mutually and differentially want, whether by persuasion and mutual interests or simply by force.

The global society is characterized by the increasing, widening, deepening, and accumulating interdependence of the multiple actors populating this society, and not by any explicit or expected convergence in goals and objectives that may underlie their mutually contingent behavior.⁴⁰ What appears new to the human condition is the existence of a world society understood in these transactional terms as the widening scope, intensity, accumulating density, real-time speed and impact, cascading effects and synergisms of exchanges of humans and their agents across the globe over an increasing number of domains that these actors care

³⁹ Waters, Malcolm. 1995. *Globalisation*. London: Routledge.

about or, as in the case of world wars or markets, where they are drawn into engagements beyond their power or will to resist.

We can conceive this world society as expanding, thickening, and continuing sets of interdependent exchanges between and among actors of all kinds across state boundaries— individuals, groups, corporations, states, and international organizations — governmental (IGOs) and non-governmental (NGOs). These bewilderingly multiplying transactions between and among these actors are self-sustaining as they cycle and recycle the globe. Increasingly, those engaged in these transactions are prompted to consciously affirm that **the realization of their particular interests, aims,** and values depends on the cooperation of others elsewhere in the world society, if they are to get what they need and want. This pervasive and insurmountable condition and its conscious realization and incorporation in the psyche of daily life by increasing numbers of the world's populations and global actors marks globalization as a new and revolutionary development in the social evolution of the human species, since its emergence and ascendance over the physical world and its creatures. This spreading and magnifying consciousness of interdependence marks not only a global system (viewed as the calculation by actors of their interdependence) but also, as this analysis stresses, the gradual morphological transformation of this system into a global society (viewed as calculated interdependence by actors in pursuit of contesting and common interests and values).⁴¹

In *The Human Condition*, William McNeill identified the emergence of this shared psychological disposition as the key product of a long and arduous evolutionary process:

Real human consciousness can only be expected to arise after political and economic processes have created such a tight-knit human community that every people and polity is forced to recognize its subordination to and participation in a global system. We are not far short of that condition in the last decade of the twentieth century . . . ⁴²

40 Mann, Michael. 1986. *The Sources of Social Power: A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

41 The contrast between a system and society is developed in more detail than can be done here in Bull, Hedley. 1977. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. London: Macmillan.

42 McNeill, William H. 1992. *The Global Condition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press., pp. x-xi

That threshold has evidently passed in McNeill's mind since he wrote these words. *The Human Web*, written with his son, reflects their acknowledgement of this new plateau of human consciousness.⁴³ Both take up the challenge of *The Human Condition*; namely, that historians give voice to this deepening and widening consciousness among humankind, much as historians did for nationalism in its struggle with feudalism and localized ethnic, religious, and cultural identities in the nineteenth century. That humanly created identity eventually dismantled empires and laid the foundation for nation-states and the nation-state system. Widening reflection of each individual's acknowledgement of his and her participation in a global system sets the stage for the reflexive creation of a global society in the image best suited to human design. In this sense, human history is just starting rather than ending as some appear to have hastily concluded.⁴⁴

Two Countervailing Imperatives of Global Studies Programs: Species Unity and Diversity

Once we begin to unpack what may be inside what is stipulated as a shared consciousness among members of a global society, it is readily apparent that we face two conflicting imperatives in creating a global studies program. The first emphasizes what makes humans alike and their shared and collective wants and needs. Darwinian evolution theory and the more recent, and arguably more conclusive, discoveries of the biochemical sciences and the construction of the human genome implicitly strengthen the biological dimension of this orientation. Over a century earlier, Ferdinand Tönnies identified the social parallel to this biological convergence.⁴⁵ A globalizing *Gesellschaft* or society, with modernization as its handmaiden, is entangling diverse peoples together in social webs around the globe across all domains of human concern, while dissolving the community ties (*Gemeinschaft*) that previously bound them to locale and tribe.

Humankind As a Unit of Analysis—The ceaseless spread of human demands across states, nations, and cultures for rights inherent in their shared humanity testifies to the conscious

43 McNeill, J. R. and William H. McNeill. 2003. *The Human Web: A Bird's Eye View of Human History*. New York: W. W. Norton.

44 Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.

45 Tönnies, Ferdinand. 1957. *Community and Society*. New York: Harper.

recognition of their status as members of a human society,⁴⁶ however otherwise they may be divided against themselves. This particular global *force profonde* shows no signs of losing power or pace, although it may well be impeded by oppressive regimes, like the Chinese government's massacre of democracy demonstrators in Tiananmen Square, or constrained by cultural sanctions or local customs. Ironically enough, one is reminded of the reported reply of Chou En-Lai to Henry Kissinger's question of what are the repercussions of the French Revolution on world politics. Chou is supposed to have observed that "it was too early to tell." The "shadow of the past" casts a long if invisible pall over the "shadow of the future."

For global studies programs, the consciousness of a shared humanity has important implications for what should be the principal (if not exclusive) unit of study and the moral and political implications of this choice. A viable and credible global studies program is obliged to take humankind as its lodestar: that is, to stipulate the diverse peoples of the globe as a singular unit of analysis. Both common threats and prospects of collective gain argue for the whole of humanity as the object of study. The stresses of globalization, generated by its crosscutting forms, puts humankind at hazard, as more than one informed and prominent global theorist has argued.⁴⁷ In light of these multiplying threats, the replication, perfection, and survival of the species comes more clearly into view as a focused and central concern of any program in global studies. The rise of global society poses the question of what it means to be human on a scale far broader and more probing than that raised by Renaissance and Enlightenment thought. It now extends beyond the West to embrace all peoples in their shared humanity. Raised into question, too, are the rights and obligations of citizenship of the members of this society. These concerns are clearly more virtual than real today, since local and national sentiments and loyalties trump claims of global responsibility and interest. What will be the eventual endgame of globalization remains very much in doubt. It's too early to tell whether humans will prefer to dwell in national or local time warps or whether a

46 Donnelly, Jack. 1984. *The Concept of Human Rights*. London: Croom Helm, Donnelly, Jack. 1989. *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, Donnelly, Jack. 1993. *International Human Rights*. Boulder: Westview, Kolodziej, Edward A. (Ed.). 2003. *A Force Profonde: The Power, Politics and Promise of Human Rights*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

47 Rees, Martin. 2003. *Our Final Hour: A Scientist's Warning: How Terror, Error, and Environmental Disaster Threaten Humankind's Future in This Century — One Earth and Beyond*. New York: Basic Books. and n. 23.

transformational process will occur some day in the social evolution of the species, at least in and among large segments of the global society.

As Peter Singer argues, it is not sufficient any longer to pose an issue, like state security, global warming, or rampant poverty, exclusively in national or local terms.⁴⁸ If these particular claims remain important in developing a comprehensive response to the ethical and moral issues embedded in global concerns, they are increasingly subordinate to the logic and claims of humankind as a privileged if still emerging social entity in the minds of individuals around the globe. Absent this globalist dimension, humanity risks falling into the cracks created by humans — including certainly members of the academy — whose social constructions divide them from themselves and forestall the cooperative strategies and creative institutions needed to cope with their common challenges, impacting with differing weight on populations across the planet.

Human Diversity As Units of Analyses — The hard facts just noted point to a second and countervailing imperative. Global studies programs must also take the world as it is and portray it accurately on its own terms. This is a world of a bewildering mix of differentiated and diverging populations.⁴⁹ They are deeply split by race, class, gender, ethnic, tribal and national loyalties, religion, culture, language, custom, geography and historical memory. This mosaic is as much global — and indeed more so in bone, blood, and human emotion — than posited abstract notions of a shared and consciously experienced humankind. (When was the last time anyone spoke or had lunch with humankind or the United States and China?) In concrete fact and time, the connections between the individual actors populating the globalization set are no less real than a conceptualized totality of these connections grouped under the somewhat obfuscating heading of a global society.

What should be kept in mind is that history over the *longue durée* of human evolution has served up a rich stew of socially created differences among particular human societies and within the human stock. These are the real-life components of any collective noun like humankind. However much social, cultural, and political differences may have been shaped by the

⁴⁸ Singer, Peter. 2002. *One World: The Ethics of Globalization*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

environmental and material constraints where humans first settled,⁵⁰ these humanly created differences are not simply the products of Darwinian evolutionary selection. They are best understood as the distinct products of human social construction. As globalization and its many distinct processes and domains abundantly illustrate, these social constructions are not just replications of the past but social forms and norms that continue to be created at what is now a feverish pace. This process is testified to not only by the creative destructiveness of global capitalism, as Joseph Schumpeter was among the first to recognize,⁵¹ but also by the globalization of human rights and, in particular, the demands of women everywhere across cultures for equality and for a greater say over their lives. These social creations and the deeply held values and emotions they express won't go away. If globalization is to be accurately described, explained, and understood, they command pride of place in new academic programs that will give them sensitively articulated, well-tuned voices. History as the past is hardly extinct in the minds and habits of the world's populations. History as the future faces no precipitous end anytime soon as long as human creativity and resourcefulness are in play.

Humanity in parts has claims against humanity as species. The latter depends totally on the former for its replication, perfection, creativity, and forward thrust.⁵² Individuals, groups, and nations act, not humanity as a whole, however much such concepts and representations may serve as vehicles for the moral determination of universal individual and group rights. More darkly, many of the world's populations and their particular, historically evolved societies are under siege by the powerful forces unleashed by globalization. The identities of their members

49 Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 1994. "Globalization as Hybridization." *International Sociology* 9:161-184, Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 2003. *Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

50 Diamond, Jared. 1997. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. New York: Norton.

51 Schumpeter, Joseph A. 1954. *History of Economic Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

52 Partisans of undiluted individualism have a compelling point. For extended analysis, see Elster, Jon. 1989. *The Cement of Society: A Study of Social Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. and the uncompromising works of the Chicago school of economics. Towit: Friedman, Milton. 1953. "The Methodology of Positive Economics." in *Essays in Positive Economics*, edited by Milton Friedman. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Social constructions will not long survive their rejection by individuals who orient themselves to the constraints and opportunities these institutions and practices afford. For extended analysis of this simple iterative process, see the many works of Anthony Giddens. For a start, see Giddens, Anthony. 1993. *New Rules of Sociological Method: A Positive Critique of Interpretative Sociologies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. Notes Giddens: "But nothing is more central to, and distinctive of, human life than the reflexive monitoring of behaviour, which is expected by all 'competent' members of society of others. In the writings of those social thinkers who do not acknowledge this as central, there is an odd paradox, often pointed to by their critics; for recognition of their very 'competence' as authors involves just what is obliterated in the accounts they offer of the behaviour of others." (p. 120).

and their very physical survival and well being, like the Incas, Aztecs, Native Americans, African tribes, and Aborigines before them, are threatened. A vibrant and relevant global studies program is obliged then to give equal voice to the social diversity of the species and to the interests, aims, and values they putatively share in common. If bio-diversity is a valued condition of life on the planet, cultural and social diversity merits at least equal value.

3. Global Studies Programs as Supplicants, Servants, and Masters of the Traditional Disciplines and Professions

If the preceding two propositions are affirmed, it logically follows that no particular discipline or professional program can lay claim to global studies as its exclusive object of study, covering research, teaching, or civic engagement — the generic triumvirate of the academy’s educational missions and social responsibilities. Conversely, for theoretical and practical reasons, global studies programs, as new entrants to the academy, need the established disciplines and professions. The challenge is to enlist the hard-won and tested knowledge of this vast array of particular canons in the service of global studies as well as to win the confidence and support of the faculty who are the purveyors of these knowledge cores and keepers of the methods and protocols relied upon to expand and purify these bodies of knowledge and know-how. Global studies programs make a grave, arguably fatal, mistake if they either isolate themselves from or, worse, pit themselves against these prevailing academic programs.⁵³

At a theoretical level, the established disciplines and professions monopolize, and not without merited credentials, the authority over what knowledge and which degrees are to be legitimated. They are also the repositories of the specialized methods, quantitative and qualitative, required for the acquisition, dissemination, and testing of knowledge. Global studies

⁵³ In contrast to the position advanced here, a participant in a recent national workshop on global studies argued for a strategy of guerrilla warfare in battles with the established disciplines and professions. I would venture to say, based on the discussion that ensued, that he was not alone in rejecting the recommendations of this paper in favor of internecine academic warfare.

programs do not now have, nor will ever command, the full complement of these assets, even in those instances where they may be free standing and independently funded programs or enjoy independent organizational status as a college or school within the academic landscape.

At a practical level, budgets are structured around these traditional claimants. They control most of the faculty and staff resources vital to the research, teaching, and engagement components of a viable and effective global studies program. Absent substantial funding and authority over faculty hiring, courses and degrees, global studies programs will depend for some time to come on these specialized branches of learning. And this is scarcely all bad, since the proven rigor and high expectations of performance, guided by tested and widely supported professional codes, check loose thinking and lax standards that can easily infect any interdisciplinary program. There is always the danger that interdisciplinary programs become the default mode of a college or university setting, attracting to its midst the cast-offs and “dead cats” of the traditional disciplines.

Conversely, if global studies programs are supplicants and servants of the traditional disciplines and professions, the fundamentally interdisciplinary and interprofessional nature of global studies programs, drawn to real-world issues and not constrained by disciplinary boundaries, bring new conceptual and problem-solving assets to the academic table. They offer new intellectual perspectives beyond what traditional studies can provide. They inspire innovative instructional programs and delivery systems to educate the next generation of national and world leaders. They delineate challenging civic missions not otherwise articulated, much less pursued, by institutionalized academic practices and ingrained habits.

In these ways, global studies programs assume a master’s role. Established knowledge systems of the academy are enlisted into service to do their bidding. The dialectic between the two can widen the scope of prevailing paradigms and modes of thought. These changes can take form in conferences and workshops or in new courses, new degree programs and doctoral sub-fields. When sufficient credibility and smooth working relations can be built up across units and faculty from different disciplines and professional orientations, the setting may be ripe to create undergraduate majors or certificates, master’s degrees, and new doctorates in global studies as free standing certification of marketable skills and professional competences.

What we are describing here is a process *à longue haleine*. The academic landscape will not be changed overnight. Some global studies programs will sprout quickly; others will take longer to start up. Some, alas, may never take root. What progress can be made along these varied fronts will depend on the particular culture and composition of a college or university setting. What we are describing is a long-term process of academic change to respond to changes in the social life of the world's populations. The former may very well not change at all. Academia is not only a place of great upheaval, but also among the most stable and conservative of humanly created institutions. Sclerosis of the academy's intellectual arteries will not greatly impede the relentless processes of globalization impacting on the planet and its inhabitants. One is reminded of the story of the client at a cafe during the French Revolution. As a mob rushed by shouting revolutionary slogans, he told the waiter to hold his drink while he ran ahead to lead the mob. The academy will either get ahead of the globalization mob or be mobbed by it.

Three Additional Assets of Global Studies Programs

Aside from widening the intellectual visions of established academic programs, global studies programs have at least three other assets to put in play. Such programs are uniquely situated to organize if not arbitrate the ongoing struggles within and outside the academy over the meaning of "globalization." Second, global studies programs which are obliged to survey the human and material resources of their specific college or university settings to exploit these assets are strategically placed to bring units and faculty together who might otherwise be ignorant or misinformed about the possibilities of mutually beneficial collaboration across disciplinary and professional boundaries. Their power arises from persuasion, intellectual leadership, and example, not from hierarchically dictated reforms, which lack both legitimacy and the nurturing atmosphere of academic give-and-take. Third, through creative enterprise, in possession of a new and revolutionary intellectual product for sale, global studies programs can attract new private and public funding to the academy and to mutual benefit of the disciplines and professions on which it depends.

The experience of the Center for Global Studies, in working with units at the University of Illinois, illustrates the workings of these assets. In the planning for the submission of UIUC's

proposal to the Department of Education (DOE) in 2003 for recognition under Title VI as a National Resource in Global Studies, an all-campus committee of accomplished faculty members who were in different ways already doing “global studies” was empanelled. One of the members of the committee was Professor Fazal Rizvi. He had been newly recruited by the College of Education and charged with the task of renovating its comparative education program. In the course of a year-long discussion within the committee about what initiatives appeared competitive to be put into the grant proposal to DOE, Professor Rizvi decided to completely revamp the prevailing comparative education paradigm. He proposed instead an entirely new professional degree, a Master’s in Education in Global Studies. He then enlisted the assistance of his colleagues in different units in the College of Education to develop six new courses, all on-line, to flesh out the degree.

Currently, 24 students have been admitted to the program in the first cohort in 2005. A quarter of these are out of state on the West coast and in the United Kingdom, the Middle East, and Japan. The initiative for this new and exciting degree program is entirely the work and creativity of Professor Rizvi and his colleagues. Some of the impetus to explain this process of change can arguably be traced to the incipient emergence of a global studies program. The success of the 2003 grant proposal also brought new resources to the College of Education to successfully mount the Global Studies Master’s degree, matched by other sources within the University and the College of Education. This package of support enabled Professor Rizvi and his colleagues to create a Master’s of Education in Global Studies, the first of its kind in the country.

Centers of global studies, which are implicitly charged with organizing the debate and discussion of globalization, can also serve to bring units and faculty working along parallel lines into working partnerships that benefit each and produce an interdisciplinary contribution to global understanding and the dissemination of knowledge that would not otherwise have materialized. In the run up this spring for renewal of the Center’s Title VI status, a Request for Proposals was sent to all units at UIUC by the Center (thanks to a suggestion arising from a previous campus evaluation conference). Some fifteen proposals were received for possible incorporation into the Title VI grant. One proposal which was developed by an interdisciplinary committee representing several units, most notably Anthropology and Landscape Architecture,

requested CGS assistance to develop an international program in cultural heritage studies. Among the elements of this request was the need for technical assistance to create an interactive website of contributors to this program from around the globe.

Another proposal arising from UIUC's Graduate School of Library and Information Sciences (GSLIS) sought funds to perfect a program developed by faculty and graduate students that is tantamount to a universal web site platform that will permit self-defined groups to interact with each other on their own websites, using the GSLIS program as a template and its server. In the proposal that will go to DOE in the fall, the Center for Global Studies will adapt the GSLIS program to the needs of the cultural heritage group to serve as a model for this technology. Two other programs in the projected CGS grant renewal proposal will also profit from the GSLIS platform, including environmental and media studies.

Organization Reform within a Decentralized University-College System to Advance Interdisciplinary/Interprofessional Cooperation

This three-pronged rationale for global studies programs has largely remained at a conceptual level of analysis and exposition. The concrete organization of the research, teaching, and civic engagement components of such a program are left to another phase in the development of this rationale. No one organizational form that draws on the human and material resources of a university or college will work universally. Much depends on the history and culture of each college or university setting. Whether the program will assume the form of a school or college or remain a facilitating agency in support of existing units or some combination of these two models or others that might be proposed will depend on local circumstances. Either of these two contrasting models — an autonomous college or all-campus facilitating agency (IPS?) — may well advance interdisciplinary/interprofessional cooperation at UIUC. The precondition of either model or some mutation will depend, however, on dedicated faculty lines either lodged in the college or in the facilitating agency (whether IPS or something else). What is essentially are lines that can be directed or that can be used as negotiating levers in orchestrating programs with existing colleges and units. In the latter scenario, when unsatisfactory cooperation is elicited, then the lines would revert back to the facilitating agency and other cooperating units would then be sought.

Whatever the final organizational solution might be, what is clear is that the case for the intellectual and collective public good elements of global studies — and of interdisciplinary and interprofessional cooperation more generally — warrants serious consideration in reforming the academy's agenda. They give impetus to the search for criteria and guidelines for the creative construction of the organizational forms, faculty recruitment strategies, and financial supports — public and private — needed to adapt the academy to the challenges of this century and to meet its responsibilities to its students and stakeholders.

Conclusions

Global studies programs can enrich the intellectual life of the academy, contribute significantly to instructional performance and delivery of new knowledge, and serve the public good. Before they can make their way, their value added must be persuasively articulated and understood by all stakeholders in — and of — the academy. A necessary if not sufficient condition of the success of these programs is a clear and compelling rationale why such programs should be mounted and supported by the necessarily scarce human and material resources available to college and university leadership.

This brief argues for these programs along three lines of analysis: First, global studies programs are crucial to show that the challenges confronting the peoples of the world can only be solved if they are addressed at all relevant levels, i. e., *simultaneously and synchronously* at local, national, regional, *and* global levels by relevant actors at each level of analysis and action, positioned at key points in this global grid.

Second, the multiplication of global issues and problems evidences the emergence of a global society for the first time in the evolution of the human species; that society urges dedicated study.

Third, that study can be conducted successful only if two conditions are met: that reliance on the established disciplinary and professional programs of the academy are essential, but these knowledge resources must be harnessed, channeled, and progressively transformed from the

multidisciplinary and *multi*professional study of the global society to the *interdisciplinary* and *inter*professional study of this revolutionary change in the human condition if the human species, and its individual members, are to survive and thrive.

Bibliography

- Allison, Graham T. 2004. *Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophy*. New York: Times Books.
- Axelrod, Robert. 1984. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bozeman, Adda. 1960. *Politics and Culture in International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 1984. "The International Order in a Multicultural World." Pp. 387-406 in *The Expansion of International Society*, edited by Hedley Bull and Adam Watson. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Broad, Robin (Ed.). 2002. *Global Backlash: Citizen Initiatives for a Just World Economy*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Brown, Lester. 2003. *Plan B: Rescuing a Planet under Stress and a Civilization in Trouble*. New York: Norton.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew. 1993. *Out of Control: Global Turmoil on the Eve of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Scribners.
- Bull, Hedley. 1977. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. London: Macmillan.
- Coase, Ronald H. 1960. "The Problem of Social Cost." *Journal of Law and Economics* 3:1-44.
- Crenshaw, Martha and John Pimlott (Ed.). 1996. *Encyclopedia of World Terrorism*. Armonk, N.Y.: Sharpe.

- Dawkins, Richard. 1976. *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Diamond, Jared. 1997. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. New York: Norton.
- . 2005. *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. New York: Viking.
- Donnelly, Jack. 1984. *The Concept of Human Rights*. London: Croom Helm.
- . 1989. *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- . 1993. *International Human Rights*. Boulder: Westview.
- Elster, Jon. 1989. *The Cement of Society: A Study of Social Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Falk, Richard. 1999. *Predatory Globalization: A Critique*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Friedman, Milton. 1953. "The Methodology of Positive Economics." in *Essays in Positive Economics*, edited by Milton Friedman. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1962. *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Friedman, Thomas. 2000. *Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Farrar Straus, Giroux.
- Friedman, Thomas L. 2005. *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- Garrett, Laurie. 2005. "The Next Pandemic?" *Foreign Affairs* 84:3-23.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1993. *New Rules of Sociological Method: A Positive Critique of Interpretative Sociologies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gills, Barry K. (Ed.). 2000. *Globalization and the Politics of Resistance*. Houndmill, UK: Palgrave.

- Gurr, Ted Robert. 1993. *Minorities at Risk: A Global View of Ethnopolitical Conflicts*. Washington, D. C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 2004. *War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Hayek, Friedrich von. 1948. *Individual Freedom and Economic Order*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hirst, Paul and Grahame Thompson. 1999. *Globalization in Question*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hochschild, Adam. 1998. *King Leopold's Ghost*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hoffman, Bruce. 1998. *Inside Terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Huntington, Samuel P., Jr. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: Oklahoma University Press.
- Jones, Eric Lionel. 1987. *The European Miracle: Environments, Economies, and Geopolitics in the History of Europe and Asia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1983. *Perpetual Peace and Other Essays on Politics, History and Morals*. Indianapolis.
- . 1991. *Kant: Political Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaplan, Robert D. 2000. *The Coming Anarchy: Shattering the Dreams of the Post Cold War*. New York: Random House.
- Kennedy, Paul. 1993. *Preparing for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Random House.
- Kennedy, Paul M. (Ed.). 1979. *The War Plans of the Great Powers, 1880-1914*. London: Allen & Unwin.

- . 1980. *The Rise of the Anglo-German Antagonism 1860-1914*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye. 2001. *Power and Interdependence*. New York: Longman.
- Khor, Martin, et al. 2000. *Views from the South*. Chicago: Food First Books
- Kolodziej, Edward A. (Ed.). 2003. *A Force Profonde: The Power, Politics and Promise of Human Rights*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . 2005. *Security and International Relations*. Cambridge, U. K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Lindblom, Charles E. 2001. *The Market System: What It is, How It Works, and What to Make of It*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lipson, Charles. 2003. *Reliable Partners: How Democracies Have Made a Separate Peace*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lomborg, Bjorn. 2001. *The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the Real State of the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mann, Michael. 1986. *The Sources of Social Power: A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McNeill, J. R. and William H. McNeill. 2003. *The Human Web: A Bird's Eye View of Human History*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- McNeill, William H. 1976. *Plagues and Peoples*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press.
- . 1992. *The Global Condition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Moynihan, Daniel P. 1993. *Pandaemonium: Ethnicity in International Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mueller, John. 1989. *Retreat from Doomsday*. New York: Basic Books.

- North, Douglass C. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pearson, Frederic and John Sisin. 2001. *Arms and Ethnic Conflict*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Petras, J. and H. Veltmeyer. 2001. *Globalization Unmasked: Imperialism in the 21st Century*. London: Zed.
- Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 1994. "Globalization as Hybridization." *International Sociology* 9:161-184.
- . 2003. *Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Rees, Martin. 2003. *Our Final Hour: A Scientist's Warning: How Terror, Error, and Environmental Disaster Threaten Humankind's Future in This Century — One Earth and Beyond*. New York: Basic Books.
- Reus-Smit, Christian. 2004. *American Power and World Order*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Russett, Bruce and Harvey Starr. 2000. "From Democratic Peace to Kantian Peace: Democracy and Conflict in International Relations." Pp. 93-128 in *Handbook of War Studies II*, edited by Manus I. Midlarsky. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Russett, Bruce and John R. Oneal. 2001. *Triangulating Peace*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Schumpeter, Joseph. 1955. *Imperialism*. New York: Meridian.
- Schumpeter, Joseph A. 1954. *History of Economic Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Simon, Julian. 1981. *The Ultimate Resource*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Singer, Peter. 2002. *One World: The Ethics of Globalization*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Smelser, Neil J. and Richard Swedberg (Ed.). 1994. *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Spruyt, Hendrik. 1994. *The Sovereign States and Its Competitors*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tönnies, Ferdinand. 1957. *Community and Society*. New York: Harper.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (Ed.). 1975. *World Inequality: Origins and Perspectives on the World System*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. 1986. "Reflections on Theory of International Politics: A Response to My Critics." Pp. 322-45 in *Neorealism and Its Critics*, edited by Robert O. Keohane. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Waters, Malcolm. 1995. *Globalisation*. London: Routledge.
- Watson, Adam. 1992. *The Evolution of International Society: A Comparative Historical Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2003. "Why a World State Is Inevitable." *European Journal of International Relations* 9:291-542.
- Yergin, Daniel and Joseph Stanislaw. 2002. *The Commanding Heights: The Battle for the World Economy*. New York: Touchstone.

