

II. The Five Plenary Papers

[THIS PAGE IS BLANK]

Plenary Paper 1

Intellectual and Organizational Challenges for International Education in the United States: A Knowledge System Perspective

Burkart Holzner and Matthew Harmon

University of Pittsburgh

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to provide as comprehensive a sketch of the intellectual and organizational terrain of and challenges to international education as possible. Within this broad domain, HEA Title VI and Fulbright/Hays serve very specific functions that need to be assessed as contributions to the larger system.

To do this, the concept "international knowledge system" is used. It denotes the total complex of activities of knowledge production, structuring, storage, distribution, utilization, and intellectual leadership that enable the people of the United States to learn about the outside world and the relationship of the United States to that world. Within that system, the focus is on those institutions that are primarily responsible for the production of validated knowledge about the world. The components of this international knowledge system are listed and examined.

This system is in the turbulent process of adapting to rapidly emerging and in part radically new conditions in the world. Globalization is easily the most important transformation affecting international education. The nature of this process and its impact on the international knowledge system are examined.

There are four general challenges to the international knowledge system in the United States:

1. The subject matter of international scholarship in all its forms is both changing and expanding.
2. The demand for international education is expanding while at the same time new international specialties requiring in-depth expertise are emerging.
3. Pressure is growing, because of rapid global and local change, to increase the speed of knowledge flows.
4. Resources in universities are becoming scarcer while support systems are becoming overloaded.

The components of the international knowledge system, such as area studies, language education, humanities studies, transnational and global studies, international student mobility, and international professional work each face their own specific challenges, which are outlined and briefly examined.

A systematic strategy of focusing on centers of strength and synergistic networks appears a promising approach to respond to these challenges both at the national and the individual institutional levels. This strategy is used to define the functions of HEA Title VI and Fulbright/Hays in the international knowledge system and the recommendations for improvement. Eight specific recommendations conclude the paper.

1. Introductory Note: Context and Purpose of This Paper

In 1996 the associations of higher education in the United States began to consider the Higher Education Act in view of its impending reauthorization. Title VI of that act provides one of the major frameworks for assessment and support of international education. This paper is intended as a contribution to the discussion of this title by the academic community. It also includes consideration of the overseas programs supported under Fulbright/Hays since they are clearly intended to be a supplement to HEA Title VI. This is one of several such papers. Its purpose is to provide as comprehensive a sketch as possible of the changing intellectual terrain of international education, of the major sources and forces of change and of their implications for institutional and national strategies in the field. It does this in order to allow a clear focus on the special functions of Title VI and Fulbright/Hays in this broad context, as distinct from other international education functions and the programs that serve them.

The term “international education” is used here in its broadest possible sense. It refers to all intellectual activities including research, teaching, writing, learning, consulting, that deal with countries and regions outside the United States and their interrelations, or with global topics focusing on the planet as a whole (Arum 1987). On occasion we will be using the term “internationalization of institutions of higher education,” by which “we mean the complex of processes whose combined effect, whether planned or not, is to enhance the international dimension of the experience of higher education in universities and similar educational institutions” (Holzner and Greenwood 1995, 33).

This broad definition of international education is deliberately much more inclusive than the domains addressed by Title VI of the Higher Education Act, which are primarily foreign language and area studies, international studies, and international business education and research. We use this inclusive definition in order to be able to define the location and function of the domains served by HEA Title VI and Fulbright/Hays within the context of the total

scope of international education and the contributions of Title VI to the broader system.

2. The Knowledge System Perspective

By the “U.S. knowledge system of international education” or “international knowledge system” we mean the total complex of activities of knowledge production, structuring, storage, distribution, utilization, and intellectual leadership that enable the people of the United States in their various groupings and institutions to learn about the outside world and the relationship of the United States to that world. The term “knowledge system” is chosen to emphasize the interconnectedness and interdependence of its components, but it does not imply anything like a high degree of “orderliness” or “rationality.” Social entities such as news organizations, information and entertainment organizations, schools, universities, libraries, scholarly associations, foundations, federal government agencies, state governments, and so on each are linked in varying degrees with the processes through which valid knowledge as well as errors about the world are produced, distributed, stored, used, and misused in the country. Schools, colleges, and universities are key structures in that system, both as knowledge producers and as educational channels for the next generation.

We will refer to this complex and in many ways diffuse knowledge system for international education as the “international education system.” Certain components of this system, especially the higher education institutions, scholarly associations, and certain foundations and centers for scholarship, are primarily responsible for the *production of validated knowledge* about the world. (Note that even knowledge validated by high standards of scholarship is likely to contain at least some errors.) These components of the knowledge system are our special focus here. We refer to them as the “international knowledge (IK) system.”

The IK system consists of many different activities “many of which are carried out by specialized practitioners from many different professions, such as foreign student advisors, language teachers, area specialists, international relations experts, professors of world history, of international affairs, student exchange and

study abroad professionals, development assistance specialists and many more” (Holzner and Greenwood 1995, 35).

The component communities of professionals and students in the IK system are often unaware of their location in the broader system and their dependencies on other parts of this system. This is a point very forcefully and clearly made by Richard D. Lambert in his essay “Domains and Issues in International Studies” (Lambert 1996). He provides a brief overview of the domains within international studies, a term he uses quite similarly to our “international education.” Each domain tends to

behave like separate academic tribes. Each has its own membership, its own folkways, and they rarely come together, let alone inter-dine. Inter-marriage is almost unheard of and within some of the tribes there are separate sub-groups that act as distinct clans. For instance, within areas studies, the distinct area specialist communities tend to behave totally independently of each other. While to the outside world a specialist on China and on Latin America may both be considered fellow area specialists to other academics, to those inside the field, they have very little in common and very rarely act in concert. (Lambert 1996, 2)

Lambert proceeds to divide the domains into two sets: his first domain deals with those groups that “conduct research and teach about international regions or topics” (Lambert 1996, 2). In this category he deals with area studies, transnational studies, and foreign language instruction. His second set of domains deals with those who do their professional work mostly abroad. These groups include people concerned with study abroad, foreign students, and international aspects of applied and professional fields.

Our assessment of the IK system suggests that this categorization is not comprehensive, in that it does not include the totality of the American international knowledge system. A comprehensive categorization yields four categories. These include the two categories discussed by Lambert plus the following two. The third category, support institutions, includes foreign language instruction, student exchange professionals and agencies, private funding organizations such as foundations, and research libraries. These organizations rarely produce formal international knowledge; rather, their primary role is

in enabling others to produce such knowledge. The fourth category, government, includes those agencies of the federal government involved with the establishing of national objectives (e.g., the White House, Department of State, etc.), funding international research (the National Science Foundation, Departments of Education, Agriculture, and Defense), providing language instruction (through the Department of Defense’s Defense Language Institute in Monterey, California), or gathering and analyzing information directly (the FBI, CIA, NSA, Departments of State and Defense). Much of the information produced by these agencies is not public or reproduced in any readily usable form. However, they do represent an important element of the total U.S. international knowledge system, and any discussion of the worth of this system in national security terms must take these agencies into account.

We are in agreement with Lambert’s assessment of the fractured nature of the IK system. Yet, there are also strong integrative forces at work moving the component professions closer together, at least to the point of knowing about each other’s existence. It is noteworthy that the intellectual process toward this integration has been significantly furthered by organizational efforts related to policy concerns, such as this conference itself. It is not at all surprising that mutual challenges and conflicts arise in this process (Holzner 1995).

We will take a broad and inclusive view of international education and deal with five major components of the IK system: The first three components are directed explicitly and specifically at producing knowledge about the world outside the United States (and often also about the position of the United States in that world):

1. *Area and language studies*—focusing on particular countries, cultures, and world regions;
2. *Transnational and international studies*, i.e., efforts that seek to understand phenomena that involve more than one country or world region and the interrelations between events within and across countries;
3. *Global studies*, i.e. work that deals with processes that are global in scope or that analyze the human planetary habitat as the context of all human activities.

The next two components involve educational and professional activities beyond the boundaries of the United States:

4. *International education professions* responsible for mobility of students, scholars, and others across national boundaries; and
5. *Scientific and professional activities* carried out in international settings.

3. Globalization and Its Relationship to Scholarship

We have to take such a broad view of the international knowledge system because it is in the turbulent process of adapting to rapidly emerging and in part radically new conditions in the world. Globalization is easily the most important transformation affecting international education. Simply put, globalization is the “compression of the world as a whole” (Robertson 1992, 1). The world is indeed getting smaller, as advances in transportation and communications allow close contact between far-flung parts of the globe, the powers of individual nations decline in favor of transnational arrangements, and new, globally based identities develop. More specifically, by the term “globalization” we mean the complex set of processes that increasingly produce effects on a large share of human activities in many, sometimes all, parts of the globe, and the cultural process of orientation changes as people in more and more countries and world regions become aware of the local consequences of global changes.

Globalization is rooted in technological and economic developments. These include (but are not limited to) improvements in technologies of transportation, information processing, and communication that have made massive and rapid movements of people as well as large financial and commodity flows around the world and huge increases in world trade possible (Cassing and Husted 1988). They have increased the scope and speed of human migrations, both for temporary (e.g., for higher education) and permanent stays (fleeing repression, economic migration). Large-scale movements of industries disperse production sites across vast distances. We recently found a package of machine screws (“round head slotted stainless steel screws”) whose origin was labeled “Made in either Hong

Kong, Malaysia, Taiwan, Japan, Korea or United States.” The workplaces of university educated professionals in internationally active corporations are being transformed as global competition forces multinational strategic cooperation and corporate alliances or mergers (Hamburg Institute for Economic Research, Kiel Institute for World Economics, and National Research Council 1996).

While many elements of these processes in international trade and communication are not in themselves new, the scope and speed of the change are and amount to a world system transformation, rather than merely an incremental change. The global economic expansion of the last decade has been impressive, while it has affected world regions in very different ways (World Bank 1996).

We need to remind ourselves that the world has seen profound structural changes of international scale before. Obviously, the industrial revolution was one of those periods. The vast expansion of systems of domination as well as of trade and production in that era affected the entire globe in profound ways. Similarly, this worldwide scope of change (while not complete) is a hallmark of the globalization process today. The widespread changes of the industrial period were reflected in similarly fundamental changes in the nature and organization of thought and knowledge. We believe that equally profound epistemological, and therefore organizational, changes are necessary in the era of globalization.

One of the most powerful sources of successful resistance to change in the past used to be isolation of cultures and countries from each other. Under conditions of globalization, isolation remains a favored strategy of ruling, authoritarian elites, as in the former Soviet Union (but not necessarily in their successor states), the People’s Republic of China, North Korea, and in many other places, but it requires more and more effort to sustain isolation and in many cases it proves to be a futile strategy in the face of powerful global information streams.

The cultural impact of globalization is deep and turbulent, posing in many cases difficult challenges to traditional, national, religious, or ethnic identities. The global exposure to multiple cultures has become not only possible but almost ubiquitous. The fact of multicultural social realities has developed—through migration as well as communication—in many countries whose electorates and governments are still unwilling

to acknowledge and deal with it. The dialectic of particularism and universalism produces strong tensions and conflicts in virtually all countries, often focusing on religious or civilizational confrontations.

The political changes in the context of globalization have had truly profound effects—especially in the collapse of the Soviet Union, the end of the cold war, and the dawning of an era of widespread insecurity, involving an array of new security risks (Bobrow 1996). It is important to realize that the end of the cold war itself is a product of the dynamics of globalization and must be understood in this context. This perspective differs from the view that the end of the cold war as such was the pivotal event that forces new paradigms on international education.

There is considerable pressure on nations to enter into transnational arrangements in the process of globalization since many problems faced by their governments require transnational solutions. The European Union was created as a political project (to make war in Europe impossible) and as an economic strategy. The logic of the single market has led the EU into legal, cultural, and educational integration as well. It is by far the most ambitious and so far successful of regional integration efforts. However, integrative processes are occurring also elsewhere. There is a definite growth in the scope and range of international law with regard to trade, the oceans, the environment, and several other issues of global import. The fact that the proposal for an international court of criminal justice is receiving serious discussion is itself remarkable. In a very uneven and tumultuous way something akin to “global society” is, in fact, emerging (Walzer 1995).

There is also a dark and threatening side to globalization. The expansion of human activity almost everywhere is pushing the limits of the global environment. New “Hobbesian actors,” not accountable to anyone, such as international criminal organizations, terrorist cults, and the like have emerged as significant threats, and ethnic, racial, or religious conflicts create sometimes intractable, endemic violence and insecurity.

The IK system is, of course, forced to adapt to the changes sketched here, but it is also very directly affected by changes in the global contexts of knowledge, i.e. the beginning of developments toward a global knowledge system. There

are several factors to be considered here. One is the information flow and communication dimension of globalization itself that we have noted above. The speed with which the news of events in countries very distant from each other is reported and broadcast worldwide has often been noted and admired. Less frequently has it been noted that the global information flow of this type is highly selective. Major developments as well as regions are often completely ignored in the media, leaving vast domains of popular ignorance about world affairs intact. This is certainly true of the United States but of most other advanced countries as well. National and transnational information flows in the media are large, but very selective and uneven.

A second factor to be considered is the structure of the national IK systems. For example, it is a fact that most recent American textbooks of political science are virtually silent on the massive transformation of Europe underway through the process of integration in the European Union. This has its effects on what students do and do not learn. The root of this phenomenon can probably be traced to the specialty structure of the discipline of political science in America and the location of textbook authors and publishers within it.¹

Many observers have noted the national focus of several social science disciplines and their resulting deficiencies in international knowledge (Gareau 1988; Kyvik 1988). The established frames of reference of the disciplines and professions in the IK system become barriers as well as pathways for knowledge across national boundaries. An especially important resource for scholarly production of international knowledge in the United States is the area studies communities and the National Resource Centers under HEA Title VI.

Part of the national strategies for modernization in virtually all developing countries has been an emphasis on building institutional capacities for scientific research, especially in the natural sciences and technical fields, but also in the social sciences and humanities (Shahidullah 1991). Systems of higher education have expanded worldwide. There are now substantial communities of scientists and scholars,

1. Professor Alberta Sbragia, director of the Center for West European Studies, University of Pittsburgh (through personal communication).

including in the humanities in many countries across the continents. This effect of the globalization of the knowledge systems poses substantial opportunities and challenges. Many of the faculty members in developing countries have been educated in the West, often in the United States. The patterns of knowledge production of the contemporary world open vast opportunities for scholarly cooperation in all forms of international education.

The expanding role of international organizations is a further factor in the changing IK system. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has become a major force in producing information and stimulating analyses of a comparative, transnational, and global kind. The same can be said for many of the special organizations operating in the United Nations framework and other, more regionally limited, institutions such as NATO and the European Union.

It is very much evident that the ways in which IK systems function and in which international scholarship is conducted are changing rapidly. The changes in the technologies of scholarly communication through electronic media open up entire ranges of new possibilities.

In combination, the structural changes of globalization have created effects on scholarship and education that force new frames of reference, disciplinary realignments, and the forming of new scholarly communities.

Changes in the world have always been accompanied by struggles for new perspectives to comprehend the new realities. The philosophies of Hegel and Comte were certainly attempts to search for an underlying dynamic order in a world in which the future was clearly to be different from the past. Karl Marx's effort to develop a "scientific" theory of the historical "dialectic" led him to examine the foundations of previous knowledge claims—which he found faulty. The emerging reality of capitalism and industrial society posed not only challenges to then-existing concepts, but to their very epistemological grounding. In the classical period of the founding of the social sciences as academic disciplines, international knowledge was a pivotal dimension of the enterprise. Emile Durkheim turned to the comparative method to explain social facts. Max Weber founded sociology as the scientific study of social action on a gigantic project, the comparative study of the world civilizations. The interaction between

change in the world and change in knowledge of the world always has produced struggles about intellectual boundaries and about the legitimacy of knowledge claims in an international context. It cannot be a surprise that in this current period of particularly turbulent change knowledge disputes should become contentious. It seems to us that this turbulence is also the opportunity for major intellectual advances.

4. The IK System in the United States and Its General Challenges

The intellectual and organizational challenges to the IK system in the United States flowing from the current global condition can be grouped under four broad categories from which flow a strategy:

4.1. The subject matter of international scholarship in all its forms is both changing and expanding

Today, area specialists deal not only with area-specific cultural knowledge, but often encounter issues of a transnational or global nature. Similarly, scholars working on the global level often encounter the need to understand how global forces are so differently refracted in the dynamics of particular regional constellations and their cultures. The frames of reference of disciplinary scholars and of scholars in the professions (e.g., of law, business, engineering, public health, medicine) are expanding in the internationalization process, often taxing competence levels attained by scholars during their own education.

4.2. The demand for international education is expanding while at the same time new international education specialties are emerging

On the campuses of virtually all American universities there is considerable pressure to include as many undergraduate students as possible (preferably all of them) in some international educational experience. The idea of "international competence," while not well defined, has become a standard of aspirations for under-

graduate education in the view of many members of the internationally active business community. Evidence for this point is mounting (Holm, Vaughn, and White 1996).

At the same time, the internationalization of the professions requires the addition of specialized educational programs. For example, in recent years the University of Pittsburgh added to its portfolio of international centers the International Business Center in the Katz School of Business, the International Technology Center in the School of Engineering, the Center for International Legal Education in the School of Law, in addition to the already existing Institute for International Studies in Education in the School of Education and the Ridgway Center for International Security Studies in the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs.

Clearly, the challenge of expanding scope and increasing numbers of advanced, specialized programs is not an easy one. An especially difficult area in this connection is the role of language education and the structures for literary and cultural humanistic scholarship. Here, some institutional changes can be expected (Lambert 1996).

4.3. Pressure is growing, because of rapid global and local change, to increase the speed of knowledge flows

Modern centers of international education are typically embedded in far reaching networks linking them abroad to scholars, students, academic institutions, and government agencies, and domestically to business organizations, international agencies, and the like. The pace of change in some of these domains requires rapid response from researchers. At the same time such centers must preserve and further long-range scholarship on basic issues in historical perspective. The challenge is one of having effective links to institutions in rapid change while maintaining strong intellectual commitments to basic scholarship. It needs to be addressed seriously: many members of today's university faculties have only a very hazy (and we believe often wrong) idea of what the world of work that their graduates will enter looks like.

4.4. Resources in universities are becoming scarcer while support systems are becoming overloaded

Finally, all of the expanding demands on the IK system occur at a time of shrinking resources and overloaded support systems. The budget limitations in American universities are well known—they are not unique. Often even greater difficulties are encountered by institutions in the university systems in other countries. Support structures such as research libraries are particularly impacted (Association of American Universities Research Library Project 1994). The challenge of generating resources for international education has become a major policy issue in many countries and obviously is one in the context addressed by this paper.

4.5. The strategy of centers of strength and synergistic networks

The demands placed on the IK system are certainly daunting and not all will be met with great efficacy. However, we must remember that the system of higher education in the country is large and resilient, encompassing more than 3,000 degree-granting institutions and more than twelve million students. Progress toward meeting these challenges can certainly be made. A systemwide perspective at the national level needs to provide strength to the major centers of excellence in the country, while pursuing a policy of effective cross-institutional and cross-disciplinary linkages. Resource sharing must be a component of the approach.

At the institutional level similarly comprehensive thinking is needed to focus support on centers of strength while pursuing systematically the construction of synergistic networks that extend the scope of educational reach beyond the centers of strength.

5. Components of the IK System and Their Special Challenges

In this section we highlight briefly the special issues faced by the major components of the international knowledge system. The system, of

course, is vast and highly differentiated; indeed, there are deep fissures within it. Nevertheless, an inventory of what appear to us as the main issues facing the component professional communities is necessary to make strategic policy choices both at the national and the institutional levels. We have assembled a considerable amount of information on some of these matters which we offer in the appendices to this paper.

5.1. Area Studies

The creation of the scholarly tradition of area studies and their organizational format in the academy is a major American accomplishment. The roots of this tradition, however, go far back to the study of the classics of Greece, Rome, and Egypt in Western scholarship. Language, literature, archeology merged in fields of study that gradually expanded in both Europe and America to produce such domains of learning as Sinology and Japanology. America's special links to the world colored other scholarly currents—the work and writings of missionaries, scientific racism, and unverified travelers' reports all played their roles. Area scholars early on made efforts to replace these modes of discovering and thinking about the world with disciplined scholarly inquiry and strove for scholarly rigor.

The link between social science and area knowledge goes back to the origins of some social science disciplines. For example, Max Weber's intellectual journey into sociology included his early studies of classical civilization and Roman agrarian history in its significance for Roman law (Weber 1891). His life work required him to assess and use vast amounts of knowledge of world civilizations. Many early developments in the discipline of anthropology are other examples.

America's experience in World War II proved to be a decisive force in the development of area studies. Robert McCaughey writes: "With the possible exception of those physicists engaged in the Manhattan Project, no academics were so dramatically affected by the national mobilization following Pearl Harbor as were those in international studies" (McCaughey 1984, 114).

Recently, the history of area studies has become contentious because of certain contemporary concerns. Stanley J. Heginbotham has argued that in the era of the cold war interest in area studies was primarily motivated by the

need "to know the adversary" (Heginbotham 1994). A secondary motive was to know a great deal about contested world areas. However, while these were undoubtedly reasons that swayed many policymakers and political supporters, the actual history is more complex. As Gilbert Merkx points out, the political debate in the 1950s used cold war concerns to also achieve other long-sought goals, such as federal aid to higher education (Merkx 1995). Merkx can also show that relatively little area research was directly focused on cold war issues. On the proposal of a new thematic approach to international knowledge, made by Heginbotham, Merkx writes:

the same themes [referring to those cited by Heginbotham] were fashionable after World War II during the process of decolonization and the achievement of independence by many African and Asian nations. However, the attempt to intellectually organize Western scholarship around such trendy themes as nationalism and the spread of Western values failed.... Due to its inherent limitations, the thematic approach to understanding the events of the post-colonial, cold-war, and post-cold-war periods has been largely replaced by a combination of foreign area research and comparative scholarship. (Merkx 1995, 7)

The debate about the proper missions of international studies between leaders of certain social science disciplines has become heated. Robert Bates, president of the Section on Comparative Politics of the American Political Science Association, made the statement in his newsletter that "Within the academy, the consensus has formed that area studies has failed to generate scientific knowledge" (Bates 1996). The idea that area studies has not produced scientific knowledge is obviously untrue, indeed comical. It presupposes an unrealistically narrow definition of what science is. By a realistic conception of the nature of science, the disciplined pursuit of increasingly valid knowledge about the world, area studies have made enormous contributions to scientific knowledge, especially through empirical challenges to scientific theories, social and otherwise. An example of area studies' contribution to the natural sciences is the anthropological discovery that the potentially catastrophic weather phenomenon El Niño is much younger than previously supposed, forcing a reevaluation of global weather patterns (Richardson 1994). Further, area studies involve nec-

essarily a focus on the particular as well as on general principles. Certain social science disciplines, especially anthropology, geography, and history are traditionally ideographic and have traditionally incorporated area-level knowledge into their work. Other social sciences such as sociology, political science, and economics strive for more nomothetic knowledge. The tension between ideographic and nomothetic poles remains a challenging dialectic. Bates actually wishes to strengthen area studies, since he is aware of the fact that weak area studies scholarship weakens the social sciences.

The making of exaggerated claims by proponents of certain disciplines against “traditional” area studies is understandable in the context of the challenges and strains the IK system faces in a period of change and resource scarcity. The debates found one focus in the restructuring of the international programs of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies. The reorganization of the system of joint area studies committees, the emphasis on internationally cooperative research, and the efforts to infuse area expertise into the social science disciplines started under SSRC President David Featherman and is being completed under President Kenneth Prewitt. These measures have created a far reaching debate. Initially, at least, it seemed to be uninformed about the reality of modern area studies centers, many of which are already doing what some social science critics hope to accomplish.

In spite of the initial hostilities in this debate, it seems now to be moving in a direction that can create opportunities for enormous improvement in both area studies and the social sciences. In a recent conversation with Kenneth Prewitt it became clear that he and we have the same view of the importance of area studies and of the internationalization of the disciplines. Since the Social Science Research Council as a special national structure has its own specific functions, its organization cannot be taken as a model for on-campus structural arrangements. Prewitt views the maintenance of the National Resource Center system under Title VI as a necessity and emphasized that to dilute its mission would be a disaster for the entire system. The recent request for proposals from the Ford Foundation appears to take a similar line. It invites proposals from universities strong in area studies to build on these strengths and to link area scholarship to transnational and global issues.

Certain crucial points need to be kept in mind:

- Area studies are essential to the social sciences to overcome the inherent ethnocentrism and theoretical limitations of the disciplines as they are currently structured.
- Area studies require strength in humanistic scholarship and language skill.
- Substantial theoretical and methodological progress has been made in all social science disciplines that can enhance area scholarship.
- Neither area studies nor the social science disciplines have adequately responded to the challenge of global studies as yet.
- The education of area-competent social scientists and social science competent area specialists is a serious problem. Area expertise requires language mastery, the competence to understand and participate effectively in the common-sense structures of the area cultures, as well as a great deal of factual knowledge. Social science expertise today requires theoretical, mathematical, and methodological sophistication that takes years to acquire. The recent announcement of an international predissertation fellowship program by the SSRC seems to us to be a step in the right direction.
- The multidisciplinary area studies centers in the universities, many (but not all) of which are evaluated and partially funded by HEA Title VI, are an organizational accomplishment that provides a proven vehicle for the realization of the possible intellectual advances between social science and area studies and humanities if they are enabled to continue their strong core of scholarship while building the necessary multiple linkage structures nationally and on campus.
- Universities need to recognize the need to support area studies, social sciences, and the humanities since each one without the other two will atrophy and fail. This requires the maintenance (or the creation) of campus-wide leadership and support structures for international education.
- The links these centers on the campuses have to each other and to centers of transnational and global studies are assets to the intellectual quest for advancing knowledge about the world.

5.2. Language Education and Humanities Studies

Richard D. Lambert has often pointed out the special problems faced by the language teaching community. Most American students will receive at least some foreign language instruction at some point in their lives. Only rarely is this instruction sufficient to gain fluency. America as a society does not (yet) provide many incentives in the daily life of people to master a foreign language. Language education in the schools is generally weak. Little attention has been paid until recently to the special problems of undergraduate language instruction, even though impressive advances in defining standards and pedagogy have been made.

The main challenges in this area seem to be:

- How can we move the major task of basic language learning into the elementary and secondary schools?
- How do we increase advanced foreign language ability in undergraduate students not majoring in a foreign language?
- How will we train the teachers who can provide that instruction?
- How do we create viable structures and career lines for language teachers and researchers on campus?
- How do we create viable structures and incentives for deep humanistic scholarship on cultures and literatures without tying them exclusively to language teaching?
- How do we protect and expand the availability of instruction in rarely taught languages, such as Arabic, Serbo-Croatian, Ukrainian, and Indo-Malay?

It seems that resource scarcities in the universities and schools will force answers to these questions that may be very unsatisfactory. Attention to successful innovations needs to be cultivated so that improvements in the system can ultimately be realized. For further discussion of language education, see appendix A.4.

5.3. Comparative and Transnational Studies

This component of the IK system is peopled by many communities interested in advancing general scholarship by the comparative method,

pursuing transnational phenomena, such as the recent “waves” of democratization. The communities include the professional schools of international affairs, social science and humanities departments, and scholars of specialized transnational phenomena such as organized crime or technological competition.

The resources for this work nationally also come from a variety of agencies, including foundations, special organizations such as SSRC and ACLS, but also from the National Science Foundation and multiple government departments, including a component of HEA Title VI supported National Resource Centers in International Studies, and some undergraduate programs.

There is no doubt that this broad field will expand its activities, especially in policy related areas. In fact, the comparative study of public policy may well be an integrative, thematic effort on campuses linking area studies programs with the newly internationalizing professional schools.

5.4. Global Studies

The fact of globalization makes us confident that, ultimately, there will be a field of global studies—but it is only in its infancy and remains fractured. Global geography may indeed be the nucleus of this as yet disconnected, potential scientific and scholarly community. We group all intellectual endeavors that deal with the global habitat of human life into the category of global studies. It is therefore quite different from a focus on international studies. Global studies needs bridges between certain natural sciences (planetary science, geophysics, geology, oceanography, biology, chemistry, etc.) and all the social sciences and humanities disciplines.

Studies of the global environment are a good example for this domain of the IK system. Clearly, questions about the atmospheric dynamics and the chemistry of global warming require natural science expertise. Questions about the destructive results of human activities and their possible remediation require social science research and scholarly attention to ethical and religious as well as economic and political issues.

A current example of work in this vein is the effort led by Edith Brown Weiss and Harold K. Jacobson of the University of Michigan to prepare a large, cooperative study of national com-

pliance with international environmental treaties. There are many attempts on American campuses to establish academic programs addressing arrays of global issues, ranging from the environment to global health issues, migrations, threats to security, and resource depletions. Examples of federal support for research in this domain is the National Science Foundation's investment of resources in the Human Dimensions of Global Change since the late 1980s. The NSF effort on Global Perspectives on Socio Legal Studies began in the early 1990s.

This seems to be a time of experimentation. The lines for cooperation between natural science, social science, and humanities, and, importantly, with the health sciences, are not yet well established. This requires, in our judgment, policy development to encourage these cooperative endeavors not only on campus, but also among the relevant private and governmental agencies at the national level.

5.5. International Mobility of Students and Scholars

The movement of students from abroad to American campuses has been an impressive historical development. It is bound to have large consequences in many parts of the world. American students studying and traveling abroad have also increased in numbers, in spite of financial stringencies. The federally funded exchange programs (under serious threat) remain an important international education tool and instrument of a policy for cultural understanding abroad. Nevertheless, the great bulk of student and scholarly mobility occurs outside these programs.

The field of Study Abroad Programs faces these challenges:

- How to increase student participation in study abroad;
- How to diversify the content of study abroad programs to fit into diverse curricula;
- How to encourage students to study in non-Western countries and do so safely;
- How to maintain and increase faculty participation and leadership in these efforts.

Simultaneously, offices of international services on the campuses deal with substantial numbers of students from abroad. Their profes-

sional responsibility to deal with visa issues has involved them in public policy debates of major consequences. Challenges here include:

- How to integrate international students into the intellectual and communal life on campus;
- How to assure an appropriate level of participation and cultural mix among the international students on campus;
- How to deal effectively with the politics of the mobility of international students and scholars.

A question concerning even greater cooperation between the professionals caring for American students going abroad and those serving students from abroad on campus needs to be raised. The phenomenon of one-on-one exchanges within the framework of interinstitutional agreements is a pilot area for this cooperation. As universities begin to pursue strategies of articulation agreements, joint degree programs, bilateral and multilateral cooperative research projects, the organizational structures on campus will probably assess the opportunities for innovation through cooperation.

5.6. International Science, Technology, and Professions

We have pointed out before that globalization includes the growth of a complex global knowledge system. On America's campuses this means the internationalization of the professional schools and of the sciences. Many of these international activities in science have a long history and were not thought of as part of the international education enterprise of the institution. However, increasingly scientists seek help from area specialists as they work with colleagues in culturally distant countries. The establishment of the federally funded Japan Science and Technology Management Program is a case in point. There are indications that American industry, searching for a globally competitive edge through strategic international alliances has a demand for at least some people trained in technical fields as well as in area knowledge.

The internationalization of the professional schools became most visible in the field of business education through the establishment and funding of the Centers for Business Education

and Research under Title VI Part B. Area studies National Resource Centers have provided expertise and some resources to professional schools in the process of starting their internationalization.

The challenges in this area are both intellectual and organizational. The professional schools bring their own frames of reference to the arena of international education. For example, the rapidly growing importance of international law requires informed attention by area as well as transnational scholars. The organizational challenges are the building of appropriate linkage structures.

5.7. Support Sources for International Education

The multitude of professions and disciplines that are part of or impinge upon the international knowledge system draw on highly varied and extensive support structures. They are, to some extent, quite different for each of the five major components of the IK system. A chart summarizing this information is provided in Appendix B.

The support system for area studies and certain components of transnational studies relies heavily on HEA Title VI and on major foundations. Transnational studies include these, but also other sources such as the support sources for the particular disciplines or professions dealing with specific themes in transnational research and teaching as they relate to, for example, technology, health, or economic issues. The thematic of global studies appears to involve a growing, but not well structured, array of support sources for natural science inquiries as well as policy studies from foundations, government agencies, as well as from international organizations. The lead role for global studies seems to be in the hands of the National Science Foundation.

It is clear that HEA Title VI has its quite specific niche among the support sources for the IK system. It focuses on the area studies fields, language education, and closely related matters of advanced education in these fields. Part B of Title VI in support of international business education and research is an innovative foray into professional education for international business.

6. Internationalizing Institutions of Higher Education: The Strategy of Centers of Strength and Synergistic Networks

We have sketched directions of change in the IK system and outlined the major challenges to international education. Universities and colleges in the United States and elsewhere in the world are certainly responding. Two important publications have provided a good overview of the internationalization of higher education: Charles B. Klasek, editor, *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalizing Higher Education* (Klasek 1992), and Hans de Wit, editor, *Strategies of Internationalization of Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States of America* (de Wit 1995).

The general direction of change at the institutional level is very clearly toward pervasive internationalization of curricula—research programs as well as campus life. Increasingly this theme has become a major priority of the central institutional leadership, including of boards of trustees.

However, serious resource constraints, reductions in funds and personnel, as well as novel opportunities to create revenue through international activity make appropriate responses by individual units difficult. On an increasing number of campuses careful self-studies, reviews by external evaluators and consultants have been commissioned by the institutional leadership, taking a campuswide perspective.²

One major result is the pursuit of centrally coordinated, integrative strategies. They often involve the creation of a chief international education officer (with titles ranging from vice president for international affairs to vice provosts or deans or directors) with the mission to assist faculty, students, and administrators to create synergistic networks of cooperation and resource sharing for international work around existing centers of strength.

2. These include, but are not limited to, Duke University, the University of North Carolina, Michigan State University, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Florida, Harvard University, UCLA, etc. Note that this piece is in itself a good illustration of international cooperation in social and policy science.

Illustrations of such “synergy” are, for example, the integration of study abroad programs into curricula, cooperation between several schools and departments to conduct international training programs, curriculum cooperation between area studies faculty and faculty in professional schools, comparative and transnational research programs across several area studies centers, and more.

A further major responsibility of the international education administrator in this process is to be an effective advocate for the internationalization priorities as they compete for attention and resources in the institution. This requires alliances on campus and beyond. In many institutions partnerships with corporations and foundations have developed as these communities realize the need for cross-sector cooperation in their local responses to global change. All this requires strategic planning for the institution, carefully assessing the international dimension of all its activities.

The centers of strength for international education vary widely from institution to institution. In some cases the major strength may be the study abroad administration, in others it may be area studies centers or special international studies institutes. While the resource bases are thus very different, the strategies of pursuing synergy through cooperation are a common feature of the internationalization process as is the necessary partnership approach with corporations, community organizations, and local and state governments.

The centers and programs supported by Title VI have played a major role on the campuses of major universities and of colleges at all levels reached by some Title VI grants and outreach programs. They are an important, special component of the international knowledge system at the national level.

In section 4 of this paper (The IK System in the United States and Its General Challenges) we identified four challenges:

- The subject matter of international scholarship in all its forms is both changing and expanding;
- The demand for international education is expanding while at the same time new international education specialties are emerging;
- Pressure is growing, because of rapid global and local change, to increase the speed of knowledge flows;

- Resources in universities are becoming scarcer while support systems are becoming overloaded.

We concluded that this situation calls for a systemwide strategy of centers of strength and synergistic networks. We now turn to these topics at the national level with a focus on the special functions of Title VI in the national IK system.

7. Conclusions: Functions of Title VI in the International Knowledge System

It is by now abundantly clear that the IK system is large and involved in multiple changes. HEA Title VI addresses a fairly specific niche in this system. Our questions now are: what are the functions of Title VI and how strategic are they for the total IK system?

Under HEA Title VI the U.S. Department of Education was assigned the responsibility for several programs in support of international, foreign language, and area studies. These responsibilities were handled in the Center for International Education. They are now the domain of the International Education and Graduate Programs Service, which manages slightly more than a dozen programs, some of which are quite small. Most are under Title VI, some under the Fulbright-Hays Act. Programs under Fulbright-Hays include four conducted primarily abroad: the Group Projects Abroad Program, the Seminars Abroad Program/Bilateral Projects, the Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad Program, and the Faculty Research Abroad Program. These Fulbright-Hays programs add a critically important overseas dimension to the other international education programs. Without the overseas experience the mission of Title VI is not complete—we therefore treat Fulbright-Hays and Title VI as complementary.

Among the domestic programs under Title VI are the National Resource Centers and the Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships Program. National Resource Centers are recipients of competitively awarded grants that strengthen the capabilities of outstanding area studies programs in the various world areas. The

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship Program supports students in these fields. The purpose of these programs is, of course, to educate an adequate number of well-educated experts in these fields.

The Centers for International Business Education and Research program (CIBERs) is modeled loosely on the National Resource Center Program, but it is not world area specific. Its aims are to educate internationally competent professional managers and to internationalize business education. All these programs emphasize teaching and curriculum, but also public service.

The other domestic programs in the International Education and Graduate Programs Service include the International Research and Studies Program, the Language Resource Center Program, the Foreign Periodical Program and the Undergraduate International Education Program. Further programs are the American Overseas Research Centers, the Institute for International Public Policy and the International Business Education and Training Program.

The policy strategy of these programs has been extraordinarily effective. They have, in fact, provided strategic incentives for universities to commit their own resources to the pursuit of excellence in area studies and in international business education. They have helped to define the standards and priorities of American area studies fields and have supported the creation of strategic, integrative focal points for multidisciplinary, often universitywide, cooperation in international education. The partnership strategy between the Federal Government, scholarly, and professional communities and the institutions of higher education embodied in the legislation and its implementation is an effective model for the strategy of building synergistic networks on centers of strength that we advocate.

We see the functions of Title VI as central to the capacity of the IK system to adapt to its four major challenges since the education of large numbers of future area experts is an obvious *sine qua non* for meeting any of them.

At the same time, there is need to improve the system of the National Resource Centers and their related programs to become even more useful under the current conditions of change:

I. The National Resource Center strategy, including that of the Centers for Interna-

tional Business Education and Research, has proven its mettle and must be maintained.

- II. Universities have the central, institutional responsibility for establishing and maintaining effective linkage and coordination between their internationally active centers as well as support for them. Careful documentation of the institutional capacity and commitment to do this (not just support for each center) may well be a useful requirement for NRC awards under Title VI.
- III. Cross-area cooperative projects need to be encouraged, while maintaining the core strengths of each center.
- IV. The Fulbright-Hays dimension of support for overseas experience must be maintained.
- V. While funding for global studies research and instruction as defined in this paper is not a major responsibility (and should not be) under Title VI, efforts must be made to enable NRCs to establish effective cooperative linkages with projects or centers dealing with teaching and research on global themes. This point needs to be specified further: there is a strong and urgent need for scholarship on the global thematic requiring new scholarly cooperation arrangements between natural scientists, social scientists, and humanists. The main funding sources for these efforts will include the existing agencies supporting natural science research, policy studies of global scope, and so on. Title VI is far too small a program to try to cover these additional responsibilities. It should maintain its focus, while acquiring the capacity for effective cooperation with these developments.
- VI. The international knowledge system is undergoing change and faces serious challenges that, if met, can generate important new opportunities. This requires attention to policy development. Several conclusions follow from this point:
 - There is an urgent need for systematic data collection and research on international education. An agenda for such studies has been prepared under the auspices of the Association of International Education Administrators. The

capacity to fund such work under Title VI should be expanded.

- There is a need for coordinating the flow of information relevant to international education policy and program improvement. This should be a responsibility of the International Education and Graduate Programs Service in the U.S. Department of Education. The position of the Service in this department's table of organization should be enhanced. Its director should be a major participant in the strategic planning process of USDE.
- An interagency task force on international education broadly defined should be established, coordinated by the International Education and Graduate Programs Service. It should help define the necessary interaction between all components of the international knowledge system.

VII. One of the strategic challenges to international education is the need to reach large numbers of undergraduate students. A neglected tool for this purpose are college textbooks. Consideration should be given to effective ways to enhance the international dimension of disciplinary textbooks through the participation of area and international studies scholars.

VIII. Language education in America's schools and colleges needs new strategies and institutional forms, including career paths. Priority consideration might be given to programs that develop and institutionalize innovative partnerships for language teaching across different levels of institutions. The special attention to rarely taught languages remains necessary.

Our conclusions follow from our knowledge system perspective, which we have applied at both the institutional and the national levels. We believe that our recommendations address the strategic points of leverage for the improvement of the total IK system that are most appropriate for the programs under HEA Title VI. The historical record of these programs and their future strategic value amply justify continued support and, indeed, enhancement in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

References

- Arum, S. 1987. *International Education: What Is It?* Iowa City: University of Iowa, Occasional Papers Forum Series.
- Association of American Universities Research Library Project. 1994. *Report on the Task Force on the Acquisition and Distribution of Foreign Language and Area Studies Materials*. Washington, DC: Association of American Universities.
- Association of International Education Administrators Working Group. 1992. *A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States*. Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators.
- Bates, Robert. 1996. "Letter from the President: Area Studies and the Discipline." *APSA-CP Newsletter* (Winter): 1-2.
- Bobrow, Davis B. 1996. "Complex Insecurity: Implications of a Sobering Metaphor." *International Studies Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (December): 435-50.
- Cassing, James, and Steven L. Husted, eds. 1988. *Capital, Technology, and Labor in the New Global Economy*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Policy Research.
- de Wit, Hans, ed. 1995. *Strategies of Internationalization of Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States of America*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, in cooperation with the Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and the Association of International Education Administrators.
- Gareau, Frederick H. 1988. "The Long, Uncertain Road to Social Science Maturity." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 29, nos. 3-4: 175-86.
- Hamburg Institute for Economic Research, Kiel Institute for World Economics, and the National Research Council. 1996. *Conflict and Cooperation in National Competition for High Technology Industry*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Heginbotham, Stanley J. 1994. "Rethinking International Scholarship: The Challenge of Transition from the cold war Era." *SSRC Items* 48, no. 223 (June-September): 33-40.
- Holm, John D., Frank E. Vaughn, and D. Steven White. 1996. "A Greenfield Model for International Business Education." *International Studies Notes* 21 (Fall): 1-9.
- Holzner, Burkart. 1995. "The International Challenge to Education." In *Investigating Human Capital: Leadership for the Challenges of the 21st Century*. Edited proceedings of the Institute of International Education Forum. New York: Institute of International Education.

- Holzner, Burkart, and Davydd Greenwood. 1995. "The Institutional Policy Context for International Higher Education in the United States of America." In *Strategies of Internationalization of Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States of America*, edited by Hans de Wit. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Klasek, Charles B., ed. 1992. *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalizing Higher Education*. Carbondale, IL: Association for International Education Administrators.
- Kyvik, Svein. 1988. "Internationality of the Social Sciences: The Norwegian Case." *International Social Science Journal* 115 (February): 163–72.
- Lambert, Richard D. 1996. "Domains and Issues in International Studies." Paper based on an address delivered at the 25th Anniversary Meeting of the Research Council on International Education. Copy received from the author.
- McCaughey, Robert A. 1984. *International Studies and Academic Enterprise: A Chapter in the Enclosure of American Learning*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Merkx, Gilbert W. 1995. "Foreign Area Studies: Back to the Future?" *LASA Newsletter* (Summer).
- Richardson, James B. 1994. *People of the Andes*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Press.
- Robertson, Roland. 1992. *Globalization*. Sage: London.
- Shahidullah, Shahid M. 1991. *Capacity-Building in Science and Technology in the Third World: Problems, Issues, and Strategies*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Walzer, Michael, ed. 1995. *Toward a Global Civil Society*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Weber, Max. 1986. *Die römische Agrargeschichte in ihrer Bedeutung für das Staats-und Privatrecht*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr. Originally published 1891.
- World Bank. 1996. "Disparities in Global Integration—and in Growth." *World Bank Policy and Research Bulletin* 7 (April-June): 1–4.

Appendix A. Area Studies

A.1. Preamble

This appendix discusses the development of area studies as a portion of the international knowledge system of the United States. The following sections briefly summarize the history of area studies, discuss the problems currently facing area studies as an activity, list some of the major works in the area studies tradition, describe the major institutions that support area studies scholarship, and provide a selected bibliography of sources on area studies.

This section deals primarily with area studies departments and centers, research, scholarship, and teaching, and does not consider the entire international knowledge system, although much of this information may apply to a discussion of other elements of the system.

A.2. A Brief History of Area Studies

Area studies was a turn-of-the-century development at U.S. universities that was not fully institutionalized until after World War II (Heilbrunn 1996). Prior to 1900, U.S. “research” about other parts of the world consisted of four traditions: the “classical” tradition, which studied the ancient civilizations of Greece, Rome, and Egypt; the missionary movement, whose proponents traveled to other nations with the intent of encouraging conversion, but who were often anti-intellectual and explicitly limited the scope of inquiry into their host societies (McCaughey 1984); a “scientific racism” tradition that attempted to demonstrate the superiority of whites through comparison with and systematic examination of other races (Gould 1981, esp. chaps. 2–4); and, finally, an anecdotal “tradition” of relying on information about non-Western cultures from potentially unreliable travelers (Heilbrunn 1996, 50). Area studies developed as an alternative to these methods. In the early years

of this century, universities began to organize all fields of U.S. intellectual life. International studies was conspicuously absent from the academy until American missionaries began returning to the United States in large numbers during and immediately after World War I. These international experts formed a core of knowledge that provided a base for much of the subsequent academic interest in area studies (McCaughey 1984, 55–56). Area studies departments developed to incorporate all scholars of a particular area into one administrative center and to provide support for further training and research into their field. Area studies represented a considerable improvement over earlier manifestations of the U.S. international knowledge system.

Area studies was fully institutionalized in academia during the late 1940s and early 1950s. During World War II area studies experts were extensively mobilized. According to McCaughey, “With the possible exception of those physicists engaged in the Manhattan Project, no academics were so dramatically affected by the national mobilization following Pearl Harbor as were those in international studies” (McCaughey 1984, 114). Area studies experts were used in intelligence, analysis, propaganda, reconstruction of war-torn areas, and even covert operations. Despite their sterling service in the war effort many planners believed that the war could have been ended sooner if more experts were available. Furthermore, America’s postwar global commitments demonstrated an immediate need for area studies experts, both as potential resources during wartime as well as consultants to the government during peacetime to help maintain peace. The reconstruction period in Japan and Western Europe involved extensive reliance on studies of Europe and Asia, such as Ruth Benedict’s work on Japanese culture *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*. Often, however, reliable research on foreign areas was lacking, and the traumas of the “loss of China” and the Korean War underscored the need for information about the world.

The development of area studies was necessary because of two deficiencies: first, within the American population in general, often perceived as isolationist and parochial³; and second, within the established social science disciplines, which generally failed to incorporate international knowledge into their research and theories (Guyer 1996, 69–70). The disciplines, especially the “nomothetic” disciplines of economics, political science, and sociology, opted for more “scientific” research in that they emphasized the development of timeless and universally applicable methodology over comparative or “descriptive” research. In theory, this research would produce works of universal application regardless of geographic location. In practice, most such research tended to be ethnocentric and focus on the United States to the exclusion of other areas and as such was not terribly useful in the global situation the U.S. found itself in after the war. Thus, in order to give area-specific information a role in the academy, area studies was born.

Area studies, according to Robert Hall, one of its early proponents, was to be modeled on the already existing classical studies, which focused on the particular ancient civilizations of Greece, Rome, and Egypt (see Heilbrunn 1996, 50; Rafael 1995, 93). Hall wanted area studies to combine the classical emphasis on language proficiency and detailed site-specific knowledge with modern social scientific techniques to yield useful research on the world. Thus, Hall wanted area studies to act as a bridge between humanities (the languages and literatures, classics, arts, philosophy, history) and the social sciences. The former would provide in-depth knowledge about cultures and events, the latter, methods and theories. Thus, the humanities would become more

systematic, and the social sciences less parochial. The formation of the joint committees of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) and the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) would seem to be an important first step in this direction—these organizations represent large constituencies within both the humanities and social sciences, and their joint participation legitimated the union of their foci in area studies.

The epistemological underpinnings of area studies were extremely parochial, however. Vincente Rafael in a 1995 essay calls the area studies project one of Orientalism. He states:

One might think of them [area studies] as ensembles of knowledge and practices governed on specific linguistic competencies and formulated within, as well as across, disciplinary boundaries. [Area studies has] allowed the reproduction of a North American style of knowing, one that is ordered towards the proliferation and containment of Orientalisms and their critiques. (Rafael 1995, 91)

The division of international knowledge into regional categories is epitomized in the development of the SSRC/ACLS joint committees on area studies. The SSRC/ACLS joint committees form what Heilbrunn calls “the intellectual scaffolding of American scholarship about the outside world” (Heilbrunn 1996, 50). These committees, now disbanded, at their peak represented eleven world regions: China, Korea, Japan, South Asia, Southeast Asia, Africa, the Soviet Union, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, the Near and Middle East, and Latin America and the Caribbean (Szanton 1982, 58).

These committees, and their representative academic departments, divided the non-North American world into eleven discrete regions based mostly on American suppositions about the world and only in a few circumstances, such as China and Korea, applying to culturally homogenous civilizations or societies. These regions were intended to organize international knowledge into segments based upon civilizational or other fairly well-defined boundaries. However, these classifications often superimposed a wide variety of languages and cultures into categories with little more in common than geographical proximity.

The institutionalization of area studies, then, was a very major improvement over earlier ways of understanding the globe. However, its institu-

3. Jane Guyer (1996, 68) notes that concern about American parochialism and isolationism occurs in fairly regular waves. In the post-World War II period, these waves occurred: immediately after the end of the war, as Americans realized the need to continue to play a global role; after the Russian launching of Sputnik, which encouraged increases in federal funding in all academic endeavors, especially the natural sciences; during the late 1960s; during the late 1970s and early 1980s with the end of détente and a resurgence of the cold war; and since 1989, when the fall of Communism and the subsequent global turmoil coupled with processes of globalization have made international knowledge once again a premium.

tionalization facilitated an unnatural compartmentalization of the world into regions. More seriously, perhaps, the creation area studies failed to internationalize the disciplines.⁴ Given an institutional home for those members of their ranks who preferred the exotica of area studies, the disciplines largely continued on their parochial theoretical projects, focusing on issues of the functioning of market economies, political participation and voting patterns, and the maintenance of societal equilibrium, while neglecting global issues. The exceptions to this generalization are legion; the comparative work of Sidney Verba and Gabriel Almond,⁵ for example; but such studies tended not to influence the theoretical core of their respective disciplines. Such works may have been influential; however, the consensus in many disciplines, false as it may be, is that “area studies has failed to generate scientific knowledge” (Bates 1996, 1). As a result, the disciplines remain ethnocentric. U.S. social scientists as a group very rarely use internationally published materials. The vast majority of such material that is used is most often in English, originating in Canada or Great Britain.

The postwar development of area studies was supported by funds from two sources: major private foundations and the federal government. Foundations, especially the Ford Foundation, contributed generously to area studies programs during the 1950s. An unexpected windfall resulting from liquidation of their holdings in the Ford Motor Company gave the Ford Foundation hundreds of millions of dollars to spend. The vast majority of this largesse was bestowed on universities in a series of grants made in the 1950s and early 1960s. The 1957 Soviet launch of Sputnik prompted a massive federal investment in education at all levels. In 1958 the federal government began supporting higher education directly through the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). This act sponsored the

creation of the current National Resource Center (NRC) system.

Although most participants in area studies are motivated by a genuine curiosity about the world, such information has more than simple academic relevance. Funding of area studies, as part of the process of the United States collecting information about other societies, was essential to the demands of the cold war defense establishment. Robert Hall himself realized this, noting that an important mission of area studies was to “develop a body of elite scholars capable of producing knowledge about other nations to the benefit of ‘our’ nation” (Rafael 1995, 93). The United States needed information about four types of societies:

1. Its cold war adversaries, such as the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and China, in order to “know the enemy”;
2. Countries devastated by the war in order to help them rebuild, and also in order to track their progress in rebuilding;
3. Its cold war allies, in order to maintain such alliances; and
4. Regions such as Southeast Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, which served as areas of competition during the cold war.

These regions encompassed virtually the entire world. Furthermore, although area studies research and exposure tended to peak in areas of current importance, such as the Middle East during the oil crisis or Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War, it would be difficult to predict the next area of crisis. Furthermore, given the substantial time necessary to train area studies professionals it is unlikely that a crisis would endure long enough to allow time to train these experts. Area studies research was encouraged in all regions of the world in order to provide a comprehensive basis for national security. Along with area studies knowledge, a comprehensive reserve of specialists in less frequently taught languages (LFTLs) was also seen as necessary for defense purposes. A foreign intervention could be necessary at any time, and without American experts in, say, Swahili, Pashto, or Tegel, the U.S. forces could be at a disadvantage (Lambert 1984).

Thus, area studies has been traditionally based on:

1. The need to incorporate international infor-

4. Calling this a “failure” of area studies is perhaps too harsh. The disciplines themselves rejected internationalization, and the fact that the brand new departments of area studies had minimal influence says more about the inertia of academia and less about the robustness of area studies centers.

5. Here we are referring to such works as *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations* (Almond and Verba 1965) and *Political Culture and Political Development* (Verba and Pye 1965).

- mation into disciplinary scholarship;
2. The ethnocentric division of the non-American world into relatively arbitrary regions;
 3. The national security concerns (and funding) of the cold war defense establishment.

These bases have changed. The oft-mentioned processes of globalization have undermined the idea that the world can be meaningfully divided into regions; the end of the cold war incited the demise of one branch of area studies (Sovietology⁶) and undermined the basis of funding for all regions; and the international movements of people, goods, money, and services has called into question the division of area studies knowledge from studies of the United States

Area studies is currently under pressure from four directions:

1. Skeptics inside the field—who question the legitimacy of some area distinctions;
2. The social science disciplines—the representatives of many of which, as Robert Bates mentioned earlier, hold that “area studies has failed to generate scientific knowledge” (Bates 1996, 1) and worry about the “theoretical poverty” of the field;
3. Radical scholars, who note the links area studies has traditionally had with the U.S. defense establishment;
4. Fiscally conscious university deans, who need to make budget cuts and see the tumultuous area studies departments as vulnerable (Heilbrunn 1996, 50).

Area studies developed to counter the inadequacy of contemporary intellectual resources to deal with the international environment within which the United States must operate. This inadequacy has been largely addressed through the development of numerous specialized centers at dozens of universities focusing on the ten regions comprising the world. With its focus on language and culture, area studies has provided a base of international knowledge unequalled in the university establishment. No other part of the U.S. international knowledge system provides this sort of knowledge. The current crisis over the funding and mission of area studies too often overlooks its success in addressing its orig-

inal goals and the continued relevance of those goals to the security and economic health of the United States.

A.3. Support Institutions— Research Libraries⁷

Perhaps the most important institution supporting advanced research in international studies in the United States is the modern research library. An analysis prepared for the Andrew Mellon Foundation observes:

The library has traditionally been the most important of the university facilities supporting advanced scholarship, at least in the humanities and related social sciences, and its continued vitality has been seen as critically important to the vitality of Ph.D. programs in these subjects and to the ability of institutions to support distinguished programs. (Cummings et al. 1992, 2)

Corresponding with the growth in doctoral programs, the past century witnessed dramatic increases in the size and number of research libraries. Along with several notable private and governmental information sources, these resources comprise the most comprehensive system of information resources in the world, with collections from each global region often surpassing in breadth, quality, and accessibility the resources available in the respective regions themselves.

However, recent developments threaten the comprehensiveness of the U.S. library system. Problems ranging from unfavorable exchange rates to a global explosion in publishing have dramatically reduced the quality of virtually all American research libraries. Without coordinated, well-funded responses the U.S. library system, and the advanced research it supports, are in trouble.

A.3.1. Assets

The main elements of the U.S. information system consist of two parts: the member institutions of the Association of Research Libraries

6. For a description of the crises in Soviet studies in recent years, see especially Orlovsky 1995.

7. The authors would like to thank Phil Wilkin, West European Studies Bibliographer, University of Pittsburgh, for his help in preparing this appendix.

(ARL) and several federal information resources, most notably the Library of Congress. The ARL consists of major research libraries, 119 in all. These are located primarily at large private and public universities with extensive graduate, doctoral, and professional programs. Their combined resources include 356 million volumes, \$1.9 billion in annual expenditures, and 33,000 staff (Webster 1991). In addition to university-affiliated institutions several independent libraries are also ARL members, including such outstanding municipal systems as the New York City Public Library. The largest of the federal information services is the Library of Congress, which maintains 97 million pieces, including books, manuscripts, audio materials, talking books, manuscripts, maps, microfilms, visual materials, and print materials. These include government (U.S. and others) documents and foreign language collections as well as widespread domestic holdings. The Library of Congress is the most comprehensive single library in the nation and has traditionally served as the lender of last resort. Other federal information services include the National Agricultural Library, the National Library of Medicine, the National Technical Information Service, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

A.3.2. Current Challenges

The comprehensiveness of American collections has declined dramatically over the past two decades, especially in foreign acquisitions. Reasons for this decline include:

- **Unfavorable exchange rates.** The decline in the dollar since the mid-1980s has increased costs to American producers of foreign materials. Furthermore, the prior strength of the dollar did not yield a bonanza for American libraries in cheap foreign publications, as several European publishers adopted tiered or discriminatory pricing policies (Dorn 1992), charging American consumers more for the same product than European institutions.
- **Book costs.** Not all price increases are attributable to exchange rate fluctuations or discriminatory pricing. The real costs of publications have also been increasing dramatically. This is a general trend in academic publishing attributable in part to a rise in mergers and integration in the publishing industry as a whole.
- **Serial costs.** Costs of serials and journals have skyrocketed in recent years. According to a recent study, “data from the *Library Journal* suggest that a more than eleven-fold increase in the price of scientific and technical journals occurred between 1970 and 1990” (Cummings et al. 1992, 88). Furthermore, demand in serials is inelastic. Library administrators prefer to maintain full and complete journal runs, researchers wish to have access to the most up-to-date research, and journals are not substitutable; i.e., one cannot subscribe to either the *American Journal of Sociology* or the *American Sociological Review*—a research library must purchase both. The dramatic increase in serial costs coupled with the resistance to canceling journal subscriptions (although cancellations are also on the rise) forces subscriptions to consume a greater and greater share of a library’s budget.
- **Global publishing explosion.** Although enrollment in research universities has stagnated in recent decades (since 1970; but it has increased recently), global publishing of serials and books has continued to increase. Publishing increases have occurred in most segments of the globe (sub-Saharan Africa being the major exception) with Asia increasing by far the most.
- **Extra costs of foreign language materials.** Virtually every normal library cost is higher when dealing with foreign-language materials. Cataloging and indexing, postage and shipping, indexing non-letter-based languages, and so on all increase the per-unit costs of maintaining collections of foreign publications. Furthermore, foreign publications are more likely to use lower-quality paper. High acidity levels of wood-pulp books and serials—present in one-fourth to one-third of all library holdings in the United States—make these works brittle and necessitate large preservation expenditures. A disproportionately large portion of these threatened works are in foreign language collections.

- **Stagnating library budgets.** Unlike many other segments of the university, library budgets have proven to be surprisingly stable. Unfortunately, given the numerous problems research libraries now face, stable budgets are insufficient to address the breadth of problems discussed above.

A.3.3. Results

Trends in library acquisitions include:

- **Decrease in comprehensiveness of foreign language collections.** Table 1 shows the drop in foreign publication acquisitions of the Library of Congress in recent years:

Table 1. Library of Congress, Percent Change in Foreign Publication Acquisitions, 1988–93

Region	% Change
Africa	-33.28
Australia	-19.01
East Asia	-33.41
Eastern Europe	-50.25
Latin America	-28.60
Middle East	-35.89
South Asia	-36.90
Southeast Asia	-18.11
Western Europe	-32.30

SOURCE: Adapted from data presented in Reed-Scott 1996, 159.

Note that for all regions the percentage of acquisitions has declined dramatically, as much as fifty percent in the case of Eastern European publications. In a comprehensive assessment of this problem, Jutta Reed-Scott notes that between 1979 and 1989 “There was a steep decline in foreign language acquisitions, a decrease in the percentage of unique titles in many subject areas, and increased concentration on core materials” (Reed-Scott 1996, 53). Furthermore, the study observed that the decline in non-English, and especially non-Western-language, acquisitions has been the most dramatic, with the percentage of Russian, Chinese, and Japanese language publications declining the most.

- **Decline in monograph purchases.** Purchases of monographs, regardless of origin,

has also declined in recent years. Okerson and Stubbs observed that “ARL University libraries typically bought 5,000 fewer books in 1990-1991 than in 1976” (Okerson and Stubbs 1992, 22). This decline has been both in raw numbers and in the proportion of acquisitions to faculty. Okerson and Stubbs continue, “In 1986, ARL university libraries purchased 30 monographs and 14 serials for each faculty member. By 1991 the monographs had declined to 22 and the serials to 12 per faculty member” (ibid., 23).

The results of this trend are clear. The overall comprehensiveness of the American library system is declining dramatically. To use one example, the Yale University library, typically one of the most comprehensive, brought in about twelve percent of the world’s total publishing output during the 1970s. In the latter half of the 1980s, this percentage declined to approximately five percent (Reed-Scott 1996, 58).

A.3.4. Efforts to Meet This Challenge

The main challenge facing U.S. research libraries is their reduced comprehensiveness. From the preface to Reed-Scott’s study, Douglas Bennet, then the vice president of the ACLS, observed:

... there is a solution. (1) share the work and expense of acquiring foreign-published materials among a large number of research libraries, and (2) make these materials broadly available to scholars everywhere by the use of electronic networks. (Reed-Scott 1996, 58)

Many programs are currently in operation to implement these suggestions. Examples of these programs include:

- **Electronic libraries.** These programs focus on making library catalogs accessible via the Internet (currently very widespread) and the digitization of resources. A rough estimate suggests that about 100 or so digitization projects are currently underway nationwide.⁸

8. Personal conversation with Phil Wilkin, University of Pittsburgh bibliographer.

- **Coordinated purchasing.** Coordinated purchasing would address the issue of comprehensiveness. With library funds stagnating and likely to stagnate for the foreseeable future, shortages of library materials are unlikely to be successfully addressed through increased purchasing. To increase the comprehensiveness of the U.S. library system, coordinated purchasing and interlibrary loan has been suggested to maximize benefits of limited resources.

These efforts are not sufficient. Digitization of materials is limited due to intellectual property and copyright laws, and publishers' contracts with subscribers. Most current digitization projects are limited to archives or other noncopyrighted work. No widespread coordinated purchasing and loan systems exist, other than interlibrary loan (whose use has expanded greatly in recent years). Similarly, cooperation with foreign libraries is rare. Without further efforts in this area the comprehensiveness and quality of U.S. area studies collections will continue to decline. To maintain the quality and scope of the U.S. research establishment, especially in area studies, but also in other international studies fields, the issues presented in this paper must be addressed.

A.4. Support Institutions —Modern Languages

Modern language instruction is one of the key supporting elements to the area enterprise. Although there is no substitute for direct foreign experience, foreign language training in the United States enhances the preparation for and implementation of any period of foreign study. However, like other elements of the international knowledge system, the system of foreign language instruction is currently insufficient to meet the needs of their constituencies.

A.4.1. Assets

Three sorts of institutions engage in foreign language instruction in the United States. The first exposure most students receive to foreign language is through their elementary or second-

ary schools. These institutions focus on elementary language skills with little or no attention to literature or other advanced work. University language departments comprise the second set of institutions.

Like language instruction in elementary and secondary schools, these departments also focus on elementary language skills, with three major differences. First, universities typically offer a wider range of languages rarely found at the secondary level, including many non-Western ones such as Arabic, Swahili, Chinese, and Japanese. Second, university and college departments also typically offer a wider range of advanced classes, including literature and composition classes. Third, full-time and tenured (or tenure-track) faculty often do not teach the majority of introductory classes. These classes are instead taught by graduate students who are themselves often training to become full-time language instructors at the secondary or university levels. The third element of the national language training system is operated by the federal government. Several government agencies, such as the Department of Defense (primarily the Army), the CIA, and the Department of State, operate language training schools (Lambert 1984). These schools are characterized by intensive, full-time instruction with an emphasis on achieving fluency as quickly as possible.

A.4.2. Challenges.

Any foreign language program in the United States is going to be hampered by the fact that, with the exception of Spanish, few opportunities exist for the student to use a foreign language in daily activity. Thus, achieving fluency is neither seen as necessary nor possible by a great number of students. In addition to this obvious obstacle, a number of other challenges currently face foreign language instruction in the U.S.:

- **Redundancy between the secondary and university levels.** Most of the course offerings in secondary schools and universities are basic classes. Language instruction in secondary schools has many inadequacies. Students are often not required to take a foreign language at all in high school. Furthermore, existing instruction only rarely is accompanied by foreign study.⁹ Universities

Table 2. Enrollment Patterns for Selected Languages by Type of College, 1983–86

(in percent)

Language	University	Comprehensive	Baccalauterate	Two-year
Arabic	-18	-52	—	—
Chinese	+3	+80	+39	-44
French	-14	-25	+1	-29
German	-12	-28	-10	-12
Italian	-14	-41	-9	+17
Japanese	+2	+30	+73	+5
Russian	-2	-3	-16	+171

SOURCE: Lambert 1989, 53. For the purposes of this table, a *university* is a full-fledged research institution offering a full range of majors, numerous advanced degrees, and conducting research in several fields. A *comprehensive* college or university offers a wide range of majors, but focuses primarily on undergraduate education. A *baccalauterate* school offers a narrower range of majors and is unlikely to have a large faculty but still confers Bachelor's degrees.

are forced to offer basic classes to make up for these inadequacies, and typically employ graduate student instructors to conduct this work.

- **Declining overall enrollments in language study.** Foreign language instruction in the U.S. focuses primarily on three languages—Spanish, French, and German. These three languages represent more than 95 percent of all enrollments at all levels (Moore and Morfit 1993, 6). With the exception of Japanese and Chinese all other languages remain stagnant or are dropping in enrollments. Table 2 demonstrates changes in enrollment patterns for selected languages by type of college from 1983 to 1986:

Note that with the exception of Japanese and Chinese, the only significant enrollment increases occurred in two-year colleges, many of which have very small enrollments in any foreign language study whatsoever.

- **Minimal advanced study for nonmajors.** Most of the enrollments in all foreign languages are in basic classes. The attrition between years of study is high. In a 1989

survey of foreign language department heads, Richard Lambert observed that “The mean estimate by chairpersons was that 71.3% of students enrolled in the first term continued on into the second term, 49.4% went from the first year to the second, and 26.0% went from the second year to the third” (Lambert 1989, 59). Few students are receiving the sort of advanced training necessary to achieve fluency.

A.4.3. Needs

To develop the foreign language competency of the United States we suggest that the following are needed:

- **A firm national commitment to maintaining the comprehensiveness of the system of language instruction.** The demands of the global economy and U.S. security are placing Americans into a wider variety of nations and cultures. Currently, the country's position is buffered by the role of English as a de facto international language. As a nation we can not rely on this benefit indefinitely; nor can we presume that knowledge of other languages is unnecessary even today.
- **Incentives for advanced language study.** Too few students enroll in foreign languages at any level; of those who enroll, fewer still become fluent. Given the increasingly global nature of the economy and the

9. For example, foreign exchange programs at the high school level are underutilized, and some administrators note that “There's a lack of interest on the Americans' part to do that kind of thing” (Bob Persiko, USIA, quoted in Yamil Berard, “Schools say ‘no way’ to exchange students,” *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, October 1, 1995).

sciences (both social and natural), strong incentives must be created to encourage language study at all levels of the academic enterprise.

- **Reducing redundancy in language instruction.** Currently, secondary schools and colleges overlap considerably in their course offerings, both offering mostly introductory classes. This system is not without its benefits as many of the graduate students who teach introductory language classes go on to teach foreign languages at the high school level. Elementary and secondary school language instruction must be improved so colleges can focus on advanced study; yet this must not be done in a way to eliminate training opportunities for language instructors.

References Cited in Appendix A, Sections A.1–A.4

- Almond, Gabriel A., and Sidney Verba. 1965. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Co.
- Bates, Robert H. 1996. "Letter from the President: Area Studies and the Discipline." *APSA-CP: Newsletter of the APSA Organized Section in Comparative Politics* 7, no. 1 (Winter): 1–2.
- Benedict, Ruth. 1989. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cummings, A.M., et al. 1992. *University Bridges and Scholarly Communication*. A study prepared for the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries (November).
- Dorn, Knut. 1992. "Champagne Taste and a Beer Budget: The Problem of Increasing Scholarly Publishing in Europe and Decreasing Academic Library Budgets in North America." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Center for Research Libraries. Chicago, April 24.
- Gould, Stephen Jay. 1981. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.
- Guyer, Jane L., with Akbar M. Virmani and Amanda Kemp. 1996. *A Perspective on African Studies in the United States 1995: A Report Submitted to the Ford Foundation*. Atlanta, GA: African Studies Association Press.
- Heilbrunn, Jacob. 1996. "The News from Everywhere." *Lingua Franca* (May/June).
- Lambert, Richard D., with Elinor G. Barber, Margaret B. Merrill, Eleanor Jordan, and Leon I. Twarog. 1984. *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*. Washington, DC: Association of American Universities.
- Lambert, Richard D. 1989. *International Studies and the Undergraduate*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- McCaughey, Robert A. 1984. *International Studies and Academic Enterprise: A Chapter in the Enclosure of American Learning*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Moore, Sara Jane, and Christine A. Morfit, eds. 1993. *Language and International Studies: A Richard Lambert Perspective*. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center.
- Okerson, Ann, and Kendon Stubbs. 1992. "ARL Annual Statistics 1990-91: Remembrance of Things Past, Present . . . and Future?" *Publishers Weekly* (July 27).
- Orlovsky, Daniel, ed. 1995. *Beyond Soviet Studies*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- Rafael, Vincente L. 1995. "The Cultures of Area Studies in the United States." *Social Text* 49: 93.
- Reed-Scott, Jutta. 1996. *Scholarship, Research Libraries, and Global Publishing*. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries.
- Szanton, David L. 1982. "The Joint Area Committees of the Two Councils." *Items* 36, no. 4 (December): 58–89.
- Verba, Sidney, and Lucien W. Pye, eds. 1965. *Political Culture and Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Webster, Duane E. 1991. "Challenges Facing Research Libraries." An Association of Research Libraries publication from the president of the ARL (May).

A.5. Seminal Works in Area Studies

Area studies has been criticized for not producing scientific knowledge, or at least, not producing research of significance to the social science disciplines. Section A.5 is the result of a faculty survey intended to refute these claims. Area studies faculty at the University of Pittsburgh were asked to provide us with the names and significance of seminal works in their fields. The following list represents numerous works that have made significant contributions to social science theory, the natural sciences, and public policy. Synopses have been provided of some of these works.

* * *

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. Revised edition. London: Verso Press. 1991.

Synopsis: This book examines the global emergence of the concept and reality of nationalism, with special attention to its development in Latin America and Southeast Asia (his area of expertise). It is largely a general work on nationalism, but is rich with detail from Latin America, East Europe, and Asia.

Banfield, Edward. *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1958.

Synopsis: Banfield here offers his concept of amoral familism in his study of communities in southern Italy. This concept describes the family centered civic and economic life, where individuals trust and depend on fellow family members and shun all other people, institutions, and organizations as a rational reaction to the situation there. Amoral familism is an important explanation for Putnam's (below) observed absence of civil society in those regions.

Cardoso, Fernando Henrique, and Enzo Faletto. *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1979.

Degler, Carl N. *Neither Black Nor White: Slavery and Race Relations in Brazil and the United States*. New York: Macmillan. 1971.

Evans, Peter. *Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multinational, State, and Local Capital in Brazil*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1979.

Synopsis: Evans examines the role of multinational actors—corporations, financial organizations, commodities markets, and NGOs—on the modernization process in Brazil. He develops his model of “dependent development” suggesting that Brazil’s modernization process cannot be explained without accounting for the influence of these international actors.

Geertz, Clifford, ed. *Myth, Symbol, Power*. New York: Norton. 1971.

Gershenkron, Alexander. *Bread and Democracy in Germany*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1943.

Knight, Alan. *The Mexican Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1986.

Mesa-Lago, Carmello. *Social Security Systems in Latin America: Pressure Groups, Stratification, and Inequality*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press. 1978.

———. *Ascent to Bankruptcy: Financing Social Security in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press. 1989.

Synopsis: These two books are works constantly quoted by other authors specialized on social policy in the Latin America. The first was a powerful work that provided a new interdisciplinary approach to study the field (combining history, law, economics, politics, and sociology); it also developed a methodology to measure inequality of the system. The second book introduced a method to assess the development of social security systems in the region, based on eleven variables, and also showed the trend among the twenty Latin American countries, hence predicting future problems of social security.¹⁰

Morse, Richard M. *From Community to Metropolis*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press. 1958.

———. *Peripheral Cities as Cultural Arenas: Russia, Austria, Latin America*. Rio de Jan-

10. This synopsis is the result of communication from Dr. Mesa-Lago on November 11, 1996.

eiro: Instituto Universitario de Pesquisas do Rio de Janeiro. 1983.

———. *New World Soundings: Culture and Ideology in the Americas*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 1989.

O'Donnell, Guillermo. *Modernization and Bureaucratic Authoritarianism: Studies in South American Politics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Institute of International Studies. 1973.

Synopsis: O'Donnell, writing as an Argentinean political scientist in the early 1970s, challenges the prevailing view that economic development leads to a robust democracy. Rather, this work suggests that the failure of democratic institutions in South America was indeed a cause of their economic robustness, as increasingly powerful economic interests and their allies in the military and the government bureaucracies resisted democratic challenges to their dominance.

Polanyi, Karl. *The Great Transformation*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 1944.

Putnam, Robert. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1993.

Synopsis: Putnam examines the old question of the relationship between civil society and the effectiveness of democracy. Focusing solely on Italy, Putnam uses the Italian experiment with regional governments over the past twenty years to demonstrate with overwhelming evidence that the most effective and appreciated regional governments were in those provinces with the most developed civil society. His evidence also strongly suggests that this is a causal relationship, with the level of civil society making government more effective. This work informs his subsequent critique of American society, "Bowling Alone: The Decline of American Civil Society" (*Journal of Democracy* 6, no. 1 [January 1995]: 65–78), which received considerable attention in the popular press.

Pye, Lucian. *Asian Power and Politics: The Cultural Dimensions of Authority*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1985.

Synopsis: This book represents only one of Pye's numerous studies of Asia. Here Pye challenges the common international-rela-

tions assumption that the concept and manifestations of power are relatively universal—present in all societies in similar forms. Rather, Pye demonstrates that power is very different in Asia, and he suggests strong cultural links are important in these differences.

Richardson, James B. *People of the Andes*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Press. 1994.

Sandweiss, Daniel H., James B. Richardson III, Elizabeth J. Reitz, Harold B. Rollins, Kirk A. Maasch. "Geoarchaeological Evidence from Peru for a 5000 Years B.P. Onset of El Niño." *Science* 273: 1531–33. 1996.

Synopsis: The above two works were suggested by James B. Richardson III, a Pitt anthropology professor and the acting director of the Carnegie Museum of Natural History. These works use archeological evidence to prove that the El Niño weather catastrophe phenomena which influences global weather patterns is only 5,000 years old. Prior to this study El Niño was considered to be much older (Pleistocene Era). This research, conducted by an interdisciplinary team of anthropologists and geologists, reached three conclusions:

The deserts of northern Peru were well-watered grasslands and forested before 5000 B.P.;

The conclusion necessitates a complete reorganization of the ocean current systems of the Pacific.

The El Niño catastrophe may have been responsible for the rise, spread, and collapse of many of the great states and empires in Peru.

This work is important because it shows a major area studies contribution not to a social science discipline but rather to the natural sciences, specifically geology and climatology.

Scheper-Hughes, Nancy. *Death Without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1992.

Schonfield, Andrew. *Modern Capitalism: The Changing Balance of Public and Private Power*. London: Oxford University Press. 1965.

Schwartz, Stuart B. *Sugar Plantations in the Formation of Brazilian Society: Bahia: 1550–1835*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1985.

Soysal, Yasemin. *The Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1994.

Synopsis: This recent book discusses the debates over migration and citizenship in contemporary Europe. By examining the mechanisms of incorporation and assimilation of various European states (especially Germany and Sweden) Soysal demonstrates that the rates of assimilation of migrants are largely a function of political systems, and not due to the nature of the immigrants, value/civilizational differences, or nativism.

Tannenbaum, Frank. *Slave and Citizen: The Negro in the Americas*. New York: Vintage Books. 1963.

Tarrow, Sidney. *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action, and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1994.

Winn, Peter. *Weavers of Revolution: The Yaru Workers and Chile's Road to Socialism*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1986.

A.6. Area Studies Bibliography

Globalization

Alger, Chadwick F. "Perceiving, Analysing, and Coping with the Local-Global Nexus." *International Social Science Journal* 40 (August 1988): 321–40.

Arnason, Johann P. "National Globalization and Modernity." *Theory, Culture, and Society* 7 (1990): 207–36.

Bobrow, Davis B. "Complex Insecurity: Implications of a Sobering Metaphor." *International Studies Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (December 1996): 435–50.

Cassing, James H., and Steven L. Husted, eds. *Capital, Technology, and Labor in the New Global Economy*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Policy Research.

1988.

Chicago Humanities Institute. "Regional Worlds: Proposal to the Ford Foundation." Chicago: Chicago Humanities Institute, University of Chicago (grant proposal). 1996.

Hamburg Institute for Economic Research, Kiel Institute for World Economics, and the National Research Council. *Conflict and Cooperation in National Competition for High Technology Industry*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. 1996.

Hamm, Bernd. "Europe: A Challenge to the Social Sciences." *International Social Science Journal* 44, no. 131 (February 1992): 3–22.

Heintz, Peter. "Introduction: a Sociological Code for the Description of World Society and Its Change." *International Social Science Journal* 34, no. 86 (1982): 11–21.

King, Alexander. "The Holistic Path to a Global Society." *International Social Science Journal* 44, no. 131 (February 1992): 55–67.

Phillips, Adedotun O. "The World, Europe and the Social Sciences." *International Social Science Journal* 44, no. 131 (February 1992): 141–46.

Riggs, Frederick H. "A Conceptual Encyclopedia for the Social Sciences." *International Social Science Journal* 39, no. 111 (February 1987): 109–26.

Robertson, Roland. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage Publications. 1992.

———. "Mapping the Global Condition: Globalization as the Central Concept." *Theory, Culture and Society* (1990): 15–30.

Shahidula, Shalid M. *Capacity Building in Science and Technology in the Third World: Problems, Issues, and Strategies*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. 1991.

"Trade Agreements, Higher Education, and the Emergence of Global Professions: The Quality Dimension." Conference Summary: May 8–10, 1996. *QA USA. Newsletter of the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education* 2 (Summer 1996).

Walzer, Michael, ed. *Toward a Global Civil Society*. Oxford: Berghahn Books. 1995.

World Bank. "Disparities in Global Integration—and in Growth." *World Bank Policy and Research Bulletin* 7 (April–June 1996): 1–4.

———. "New Research." *World Bank Policy and Research Bulletin* 7 (April–June 1996): 5–11.

Individual Regional Studies

African Studies

- Guyer, Jane L., with Akbar M. Virmani and Amanda Kemp. *A Perspective on African Studies in the United States 1995: A Report Submitted to the Ford Foundation*. Atlanta, GA: African Studies Association Press. 1996.
- Staniland, Martin. "Who Needs African Studies?" *African Studies Review* 26, nos. 3-4 (September–December 1983): 77–97.

Asian Studies

- Boardman, Eugene P., ed. *Asian Studies in Liberal Education*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges. 1959.
- Cambell, John. Conference notes. Association for Asian Studies, Japan-USA Area Studies Conference, Tokyo, March 1995. (Unpublished, made available to the author by John Cambell.)

East European/Soviet Studies

- Cox, Michael. "The End of the USSR and the Collapse of Soviet Studies." *Coexistence* 31, no. 312 (June 1994): 89–104.
- Orlovsky, Daniel, ed. *Beyond Soviet Studies*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. 1995.

European Studies

- Hall, Peter. *The State of European Studies*. New York, NY: Social Science Research Council. 1996.
- Tarrow, Sidney. *Rebirth or Stagnation: European Studies after 1989*. New York: Social Science Research Council. 1994.

Middle East Studies

- Kazemi, Farhad. "Changes for Area Studies—Impact Could Be Great." *Middle East Studies Association [MESA] Newsletter* 18, no. 2 (May 1996): 1.
- Khalidi, Rashid. "Is There a Future for Middle Eastern Studies?" *MESA Bulletin* no. 29 (July 1995).

Internationalization of the Social Sciences

- Archer, Margaret S. "Presidential Address—Sociology for One World: Unity and Diversity." *International Sociology* 6, no. 2 (June 1991): 131–47.
- Brittan, Michael J., Toby E. Huff, Dina A. Zinnes, Franco Ferrarotti, G. L. Ulmen, and Ellsworth R. Fuhrman. "Commentaries: Is Information International?" *Society* 22, no. 5 (July–August 1985): 3–22.
- Damrosch, David. *We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the University*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1995.
- Evans, Peter, Bruce Cumings, Albert Fishlow, Peter Gourevitch, John Meyer, Alejandro Portes, Barbara Stallings, and Neil J. Smelser. "The Outlook for Comparative International Social Science Research." In *Leading Edges in Social and Behavioral Science*, edited by R. Duncan Luce, Neil J. Smelser, and Dean R. Gerstein, 549–68. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. 1989.
- Gareau, Frederick H. "An Empirical Analysis of the International Structure of American Social Sciences." *Social Science Journal* 21, no. 3 (July 1984): 23–36.
- . "Expansion and Increasing Diversification of the Universe of Social Science." *International Social Science Journal* 39, no. 114 (November 1987): 595–606.
- . "The Long, Uncertain Road to Social Science Maturity." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 29, nos. 3–4 (September–December 1988): 175–86.
- Genov, Nikolai. "National Sociological Traditions and the Internationalization of Sociology." In *National Traditions in Sociology*, edited by Nikolai Genov, 1–17. London: Sage. 1989.
- Groennings, Sven, and David S. Wiley, eds. *Group Portrait: Internationalizing the Disciplines*. New York: American Forum for Global Education. 1990.
- Holzner, Burkart. "Knowledge and Action in the Emerging World: Social Science, the Shocks of Global Structural Change, and Policy." *Knowledge and Policy: The International Journal of Knowledge Transfer* 4, nos. 1 and 2 (Spring/Summer 1991): 18–37.
- Holzner, Burkart, William Dunn, and Muhammed Shahidullah. "An Accounting Scheme for Designing Science Impact Indicators: The Knowledge System Perspective." *Knowl-*

- edge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization* 9, no. 2 (December 1987): 173–204.
- Holzner, Burkart, and John Marx, eds. *Knowledge Application: The Knowledge System in Society*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1979.
- Klausner, Samuel Z. “The Bid to Nationalize American Social Science.” In *The Nationalization of the Social Sciences*, edited by Samuel Z. Klausner and Victor M. Lidz, 1–39. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1986.
- Klausner, Samuel Z., and Victor M. Lidz, eds. *The Nationalization of the Social Sciences*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1986.
- Kyvik, Svein. “Internationality of the Social Sciences: The Norwegian Case.” *International Social Science Journal* 40, no. 115 (February 1988): 163–72.
- Lambert, Richard D. “Domains and Issues in International Studies.” Based on a paper delivered at the twenty-fifth anniversary meeting of the Pennsylvania Council of International Education, 26 April 1996. Copy received from the author.
- Lisle, Edmond A. “Validation in the Social Sciences by International Comparison.” *International Social Science Journal* 37, no. 103 (February 1985): 19–29.
- Nowotny, Helga. “A European Reflection on U.S. Social Science Funding.” *Items* (Social Science Research Council) 45, no. 4 (1991): 78–82.
- Parsons, Talcott. “Social Science: A Basic National Resource.” In *The Nationalization of the Social Sciences*, edited by Samuel Z. Klausner and Victor M. Lidz, 41–112. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1986.
- Riggs, Fred W. “Indigenous Concepts: A Problem for Social and Information Science.” *International Social Science Journal* 39, no. 114 (November 1987): 607–17.
- Riley, John W., Jr. “The Status of the Social Sciences, 1950.” In *The Nationalization of the Social Sciences*, edited by Samuel Z. Klausner and Victor M. Lidz, 113–20. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1986.
- Rokkan, Stein. “Cross-Cultural, Cross-Societal, and Cross-National Research.” In *Main Trends of Research in the Social and Human Sciences; Part 1: Social Sciences*, 646–89. Paris: UNESCO. 1970.
- Smelser, Neil J. “External Influences on Sociology.” *International Sociology* 4, no. 4 (December 1989): 419–29.
- Tiryakian, Edward A. “Sociology’s Great Leap Forward: The Challenge of Internationalisation.” In *Globalization, Knowledge, and Society: Readings from International Sociology*, edited by Martin Albrow and Elizabeth King, 63–78. London: Sage. 1990.
- Turner, Bryan S. “The Two Faces of Sociology: Global or National?” *Theory, Culture, and Society* 7 (1990): 343–58.
- Turner, Jonathan H. “Sociology in the United States: Its Growth and Contemporary Profile.” In *National Traditions in Sociology*, edited by Nikolai Genov, 220–42. London: Sage. 1989.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. “Should We Unthink Nineteenth Century Social Science.” *International Social Science Journal* 40, no. 118 (November 1988): 525–32.

Internationalization of the University

- Aitches, Marian, and Tom Hoemeke. “Education Abroad and International Exchange.” In de Wit 1995, 80–89.
- Arum, Stephen. “Innovations.” *International Education Forum* 16, no.1 (Spring 1996): 80–81.
- . “International Education: What Is It? A Taxonomy of International Education at U.S. Universities.” Iowa City, IA: Occasional Papers Forum Series, University of Iowa. 1987.
- Arum, Stephen, and Jack Van de Water. “The Need for a Definition of International Education in U.S. Universities.” In de Wit 1995, 191–204.
- Association of International Education Administrators Working Group. *A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States*. 22 pp. Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators. 1992.
- Back, Kenneth J., and Dorothy M. Davis. “Internationalization of Higher Education in Australia.” In de Wit 1995, 121–57.
- Blodgett, Steven A. “A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States: Some Thoughts on Next Steps.” *International Education Forum* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 37–41.

- Carter, Holly M. "Implementation of International Competence Strategies: Faculty." In de Wit 1995, 39–52.
- Davies, John L. "Developing a Strategy for Internationalization in Universities: Towards a Conceptual Framework." In de Wit 1995, 177–91.
- de Wit, Hans, ed. *Strategies of Internationalization of Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States of America*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education. 1995.
- de Wit, Hans, and Hilary Callan. "Internationalization of Higher Education in Europe." In de Wit 1995, 67–98.
- Flournoy, Mary Anne. "International Education: Public Service and Outreach." In de Wit 1995, 90–108.
- French, Eunice P. "Technical and Educational Development." In de Wit 1995, 129–42.
- Garvalia, Brian J. "The Private Sector/Educational Partnership for International Competence." In de Wit 1995, 142–64.
- Harari, Maurice. "Internationalization of the Curriculum." In de Wit 1995, 52–80.
- Heyl, John. "A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States: Comments on Research Categories." *International Education Forum* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 44–46.
- Hoemeke, Thomas. "A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States: Reaction and Comments." *International Education Forum* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 57–58.
- Holzner, Burkart, "The International Challenge to Education." In *Investigating Human Capital: Leadership for the Challenges of the 21st Century*. Edited proceedings of the Institute of International Education Forum. New York: Institute of International Education. 1995.
- Holzner, Burkart, and Davydd Greenwood. "The Institutional Policy Context for International Higher Education in the United States of America." In de Wit 1995, 33–67.
- Kanet, Roger E. "Internationalization, Constrained Budgets, and the Role of International Education Consortia." *International Education Forum* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 59–70.
- . "A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States: Why the Case Must Be Made." *International Education Forum* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 32–37.
- Klasek, Charles B., ed. *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalizing Higher Education*. Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators. 1992.
- . "Inter-Institutional Cooperation Guidelines and Agreements." In de Wit 1995, 108–29.
- . "University Ethos: The Spark, the Flame, the Fire." In de Wit 1995, 204–07.
- Knight, Jane. "A National Study on Internationalization at Canadian Universities." In de Wit 1995, 99–120.
- Knight, Jane, and Hans de Wit. "Strategies for Internationalization of Higher Education: Historical and Conceptual Perspectives." In de Wit 1995, 5–33.
- Kuhlman, Ann. "Foreign Students and Scholars." In de Wit 1995, 22–39.
- Lambert, Richard D. *International Studies and the Undergraduate*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education. 1989.
- . "Domains and Issues in International Studies." *International Education Forum* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 1–19.
- Merritt, J. Greg, and Michael G. Schechter. "Assessment and Internationalizing the Curriculum: A Faculty Perspective." *International Education Forum* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 71–80.
- Overton, Joseph L. "The Process of Internationalization at Minority Institutions." In de Wit 1995, 164–76.
- Petersen, John H. "A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States: A State and Local Perspective." *International Education Forum* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 41–44.
- Rahman, Tamaz, and LaMarr Kopp. "Administration of Higher Education." In de Wit 1995, 1–21.
- Thullen, Manfred. "A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States: Comments, Observations, Suggestions." *International Education Forum* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 47–50.
- Van de Water, Jack. "A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States: The AIEA Research Agenda." *International Education Forum* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 54–57.

Woodyard, George. "A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States: Comments on Three Initiatives." *International Education Forum* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 51–54.

International Student/Scholar Exchange

Bollag, Burton. "Alumni of the Fulbright Exchange Program Promise to Lobby against Cuts in Its Budget." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (September 6, 1996): A17–A20.

Burn, Barbara B. "Study Abroad and Foreign Language Programs." *International Education Forum* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 20–31.

Haug, Guy. "Student Mobility between Europe and the U.S." *European Journal of Education* 31, no. 2 (1996): 181–92.

Modern Languages

Lambert, Richard D., with Elinor G. Barber, Margaret B. Merrill, Eleanor Jordan, and Leon I. Twarog. *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*. Washington, DC: Association of American Universities. 1984.

Moore, Sara Jane, and Christine A. Morfit, eds. *Language and International Studies: A Richard Lambert Perspective*. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center. 1993.

U.S. President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. *Strength through Wisdom*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. 1979.

Organization and History of Area Studies

Bates, Robert [President, APSA section on Comparative Politics]. "Letter from the President." *APSA-CP Newsletter* 7, no. 1 (Winter 1996).

Bennett, Wendell C. *Area Studies in American Universities*. New York: Social Science Research Council. June 1951.

Hall, Robert. *Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences*. New York: Social Science Research Council. May 1947.

Heigenbotham, Stanley J. "The National Secu-

arity Education Program: A Review and Analysis." *Items* [Social Science Research Council] 46 (June–September 1992): 17–23.

Heilbrunn, Jacob. "The News from Everywhere." *Lingua Franca* (May/June 1996): 49–57.

McCaughey, Robert A. *International Studies and Academic Enterprise: A Chapter in the Enclosure of American Learning*. New York: Columbia University Press. 1984.

Merkx, Gilbert W. "Foreign Area Studies: Back to the Future?" *Latin American Studies Association [LASA] Newsletter* 24, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 7–8.

Oleson, Alexandra, and John Voss. *The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860–1920*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 1979.

Panetta, Leon E. "The Quiet Crisis of Global Competence." *Northeast Conference* [on the Teaching of Foreign Language] *Newsletter* (Fall 1991): 14–17.

Rafael, Vincente L. "The Cultures of Area Studies in the United States." *Social Text* 49 (1995): 90–111.

Riddle, Wayne C. *CRS Report for Congress: National Security Education Act of 1991: Summary and Analysis*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service. January 1992.

Wagley, Charles. *Area Research and Training: A Conference Report on the Study of World Areas*. New York: Social Science Research Council. June 1948.

White House. *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement*. Washington, DC: The White House. February 1995.

Research Libraries

Cummings, A. M., Marcia L. Witte, William G. Bowen, Laura O. Lazarus, and Richard H. Ekman. *University Libraries and Scholarly Communication*. A study prepared for the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries. November 1992.

D'Arms, John H. "Remarks to Presidents, Association of American Universities." Paper presented October 18, 1993.

Dorn, Knut. "Champagne Taste and a Beer Budget: The Problem of Increasing Scholarly Publishing in Europe and Decreasing Academic Library Budgets in North America."

- Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Center for Research Libraries, Chicago, April 24, 1992.
- Federal Library and Information Center Committee (FLICC). "Major Federal Information Services." List of major information services, their holdings, and activities. Washington, DC: Library of Congress. 1992.
- Holzner, Burkart. "Case Study: Building the Distributed North American Library Collection for Foreign Languages and Area Studies." Presentation at the conference Challenging Market Place Solutions to Problems in the Economics of Information, Washington, DC, September 18–19, 1995.
- National Coordinating Committee on Japanese Library Resources. *NCC News* 2 (Fall 1993). Discusses pilot program in purchasing of multivolume Japanese language publication sets.
- Okerson, Ann, and Kendon Stubbs. "ARL Annual Statistics 1990–91: Remembrance of Things Past, Present . . . and Future?" *Publishers Weekly* (July 27, 1992): 22–23.
- Pennsylvania Academic Library Connection Initiative. "Statement of Principles and Prospectus." June 23, 1996.
- Reed-Scott, Jutta. *Scholarship, Research Libraries, and Global Publishing*. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries. 1996.
- Schmidt, Nancy J., ed. *Proceedings: Future of Area Librarianship Conference, July 13–14, 1995, Indiana University, Indianapolis*. Bloomington: Indiana University Libraries. 1996.
- Streit, Samuel Allen. *The Higher Education Act, Title II-C Program: Strengthening Research Library Resources: A Ten Year Profile and an Assessment of the Program's Effects upon the Nation's Scholarship*. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries. 1991.
- U.S. President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. *Strength through Wisdom*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. 1979.

SSRC Programs

- Prewitt, Kenneth. "Presidential Items." *Items* [Social Science Research Council] 50 (June–September 1996): 2–3.
- . "Presidential Items." *Items* [Social Science Research Council] 50 (March 1996): 1.
- Social Science Research Council/American Council of Learned Societies (SSRC/ACLS). "Proposal to the Ford Foundation for a New Joint International Program." March 1996. Grant proposal.
- Szanton, David L. "The Joint Area Committees of the Two Councils." *Items* [Social Science Research Council] 36, no. 4 (December 1982): 58–65.

Appendix B. Organizational Fields of the International Knowledge System

Field	Mission/Activity	Funding Organizations	Coordination Organizations
Area studies	To acquire in-depth knowledge about specific places of the world, focusing on language and culture.	U.S. Department of Education HEA Title VI programs; area-specific foundations such as the German Marshall Fund, the Bosch Foundation, and the MacArthur Foundation; major U.S. foundations such as the Ford, Rockefeller, and Mellon Foundations; U.S. Information Agency; U.S. Agency for International Development; National Science Foundation (NSF).	SSRC/ACLS joint committees (disbanded) and the SSRC's proposed replacements for the same; area specific associations, such as the European Community Studies Association (ECSA), the Latin American Studies Association (LASA), the Middle Eastern Studies Association (MESA); Center for International Education (CIE).
Transnational studies	To acquire general knowledge about the behavior of states and other actors through the examination and comparison of several cases.	As above; with the departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, and Defense; the CIA and NSA, with other federal government agencies that utilize transnational knowledge playing an active role.	Council of Foreign Relations; International Studies Association; American Political Science Association (APSA); Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs (APSIA); Councils of World Affairs.
Global studies	To study processes using the entire globe as the unit of analysis, such as financial flows, communications networks, environmental and atmospheric studies, and human migrations.	NSF, National Institutes of Health (NIH), NASA; NGOs active in human rights, the environment, and other issues; certain United Nations departments and conferences, e.g., on the environment, population growth, women's issues.	The SSRC/ACLS new program on area-based knowledge; geography departments and their professional associations; UNESCO and other agencies collecting global statistical information.
Student exchange	To facilitate international study and research for scholars and students.	U.S. Information Agency (administers Fulbright Program); State Department; Council on International Education Exchange (CIEE); Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES); several others.	U.S. Information Agency; individual governments at the state and federal level; American Council on Education (ACE); Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA).
International scientific and professional activity	To conduct nonarea-specific activities (business, medicine, natural sciences) abroad.	National Science Foundation; Department of Education HEA Title VI grant-funded Centers for International Business Education and Research (CIBERs).	American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB); Department of Commerce; U.S. Agency for International Development; U.S. Information Agency; disciplinary organizations; international and intergovernmental projects.