CONTESTED IMAGINARIES OF GLOBAL JUSTICE

IN THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

by

SHARON STEIN

B.A., University of Virginia, 2008

M.A., The Ohio State University, 2013

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES

(Educational Studies)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

(Vancouver)

August 2017

Abstract

An emergent 'critical turn' in the study and practice of higher education internationalization has generated incisive analyses of the ethical and political implications of international engagements. This reflexive moment, however, also risks renaturalizing an imperial global imaginary, which I trace in this dissertation to the fact that higher education scholars and practitioners in the Global North have yet to substantively unpack the transnational colonial dimensions of the modern Western university. I argue that practitioners and scholars of internationalization have an obligation to face higher education's historical and contemporary complicity in empire, as well as our own. This is particularly necessary in the context of nation-states that were founded through conquest, and whose ongoing colonial entanglements have both local and global dimensions. Working from a decolonial orientation and an underlying commitment to denaturalize violent and unsustainable patterns of thinking, being, and relating, I ask how inherited frames of liberal justice and humanist theories of change operate in the mainstream study and practice of internationalization in the United States and Canada. In the areas of curriculum internationalization, international student mobility, and global citizenship, I identify a tendency to reassert as universal what are in fact situated, partial, and often Euro-supremacist epistemological and ontological assumptions about the world and the purposes of higher education. Further, these assumptions often calibrate even critical scholarship, which largely remains enframed by what is possible and desirable within the frames of colonial modernity and its promises of security, prosperity, and universality. By identifying the limits of justice within these frames, there is an opportunity to think, be, and relate differently, but at these moments of possibility there is also a tendency to seek out the old comforts and assurances promised by

imperial frames. To interrupt this circular tendency requires tracing both the immediate symptoms and the root causes of global injustice, attending to our enduring attachments to the promises offered by the colonial architectures of modern existence, and making a commitment to wrestle with the complexities and difficulties of learning from past mistakes, disinvesting from harmful systems and subjectivities, and experimenting responsibly with alternative possibilities.

Lay Summary

The internationalization of higher education has became a central strategy in U.S. and Canadian efforts to prepare globally-minded graduates, produce useful knowledge, and generate solutions for proliferating challenges in a highly interconnected world. This dissertation argues that internationalization could also support the development of more equitable local and global relations, and more ethical engagements with diverse knowledge systems. However, it argues that in order to enact these changes, it is necessary to understand how higher education is embedded within larger political, economic, and social systems, whose histories have colonial roots and transnational effects. If we do not address these issues, then internationalization could lead to the reproduction of unequal relationships, simplistic understandings of inequality, and Eurocentric ideas of justice, responsibility, and change. Thus, this dissertation explores the difficulties and complexities of changing international educational dynamics, and risks and possibilities of trying to address the underlying causes of global injustice.

Preface

This dissertation is composed of original and independent work by the author. Chapter 4 is forthcoming as "Internationalization for an Uncertain Future: Tensions, Paradoxes, and Possibilities" in the *Review of Higher Education.* Chapter 5 was published in 2017 as "The Persistent Challenges of Addressing Epistemic Dominance in Higher Education: Considering the Case of Curriculum Internationalization" in the *Comparative Education Review.* Chapter 6 was previously published as "National Exceptionalism in the 'EduCanada' Brand: Unpacking the Ethics of Internationalization Marketing in Canada" in *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* in 2017. Chapter 7 was published as "Mapping Global Citizenship" in the *Journal of College and Character* in 2015 (reprinted by permission of NASPA – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education). Where necessary, permission has been received to reproduce these works here. I am the sole author of these texts. Finally, I have made some modifications to the texts to ensure smoother incorporation into the dissertation.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

A dissertation is meant to be a wholly original work by the author. In the formal sense this dissertation is indeed an original work: it is composed of my writing, and my ideas. In another sense, it is absurd that I should claim sole authorship over the product of a process of learning, thinking, and being-with that was, in so many ways, collective. On the question of authorship, poet and scholar Fred Moten said in an interview with Fitzgerald (2015), "To the extent that I said anything or that I have something to say, that's because a whole bunch of people, a whole bunch of history, a whole bunch of things sent me to say it" (http://lithub.com/an-interview-with-fred-moten-pt-i/). I am inclined to agree with Moten, especially because this was not the dissertation that I meant to write. So although I did write it, a whole bunch of people, history, and things must have "sent me to say it," my own plans be damned. While it would be impossible to fully account for the many intellectual, affective, and physical labours and layers that went into this text, it is necessary to at least try. The dissertation itself contains one account of these labors, through its citational trail. Below, I provide another.

Thanks must go first to my dissertation committee, who also became mentors and collaborators. This work would not have been possible without the patience, guidance, and consistent support of my advisor, Dr. Amy Metcalfe. Amy, I am grateful to have you as a co-conspirator in the efforts to push and play at the edges of what is possible within the field of higher education studies. Had I not encountered Dr. Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti three years ago, I might still be spinning my wheels, certain that there was *something* that needed to be said, but uncertain what it was, or how to say it. And my sincerest thanks to Dr. Donald Fisher, whose smiling encouragement and sincere interest in my work helped to keep me going in those

moments when I wasn't convinced that what I was doing was worthwhile. Thank you, also, to the other UBC faculty whose wisdom, intellectual generosity, and razor-sharp critiques have deeply shaped my own thinking about coloniality, and the 'otherwise' possibilities that always exceed it – in particular, Dr. Cash Ahenakew and Dr. Denise Ferreira da Silva. Incalculable thanks is also owed to my Masters thesis supervisor and mentor, Dr. Tatiana Suspitsyna, who has also been an influential 'absent presence' throughout my doctoral studies.

I also want to express my appreciation to the many wonderful Ethical Internationalism in Higher Education (EIHE) Project collaborators, including Jani Haapakoski, Rene Suša, Hongxia Shan, Karen Pashby, Su-ming Khoo, Lisa Taylor, Kumari Beck, Elisa Thiago, Paul Tarc, Shibao Guo, Lynn Mario de Souza, Vivienne Anderson, Juliana Martinez, Clarissa Jordao, Tania Ramahlo, Fran Martin, Judy Bruce, Fatima Pirbhai-Illich, Meeri Hellsten, Dalene Swanson, Lynette Shultz, Momodou Sallah, Allyson Larkin, and especially the late Michelle Nicholson.

I had the great luck of entering my doctoral studies with a remarkably kind and intellectually sharp cohort: Kari Grain, Ashley Pullman, Neila Miled, Jennifer Moule, Claudia Diaz, and Jeong-Ja Kang. While at UBC, I have encountered many other brilliant and generous thinkers, who happen to all be great people as well: Sereana Naepi, Lisa Brunner, Dale McCartney, Kristi Carey, Stephanie Glick, Joanne Ursino, Sonia Medel, Yuko Ikegami, Ali Sutherland, Rabia Mir, Ashenafi Alemu, Renato Pereira, and Bernard Chan. I also appreciate those who thought alongside me, often from afar – Annabelle Estera, Johanna Sitomaniemi-San, Roxana Chiappa, Tricia Shalka, Daniel Newhart, Sonali Balajee, Sheeva Sabati, and Dina Bataineh. And then there are the other faraway friends who helped keep me afloat, even if they didn't know that's what they were doing: Chelsea Colby, Ryan McElveen, Paul Shoemaker, Jessica Begans, Sophie Tullier, Katie Dean Williams, and Danyelle Reynolds.

Dedication

To all the decolonial thinkers, feelers, dreamers, and doers – past, present, and future.

Chapter 1: Introduction

In the past three decades, internationalization has become increasingly central to the institutional strategies of many colleges and universities in the Global North (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Brustein, 2007; Stromquist, 2007). Although Knight's (2004) definition of the internationalization of higher education as "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" has become ubiquitous (p. 11),[1] more recently, Knight (2014) suggested that in the current conjuncture "it may behoove us to look back at the last two decades of internationalisation and ask ourselves some questions" (p. 86). In particular, she argues, "internationalisation has become a catch-all phrase used to describe *anything* and *everything* remotely linked to the global, intercultural or international dimensions of higher education and is thus losing its way" (p. 76, emphasis added). In response, she proposes not a revised definition of the term, but rather reconsideration of "the fundamental values underpinning it" (p. 76). Knight is not alone in her call for increased reflection, as de Wit (2014) also argues "internationalisation in higher education is at a turning point and the concept of internationalisation requires an update, refreshment and fine-tuning taking into account the new world and higher education order" (p. 97; see also: Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Madge, Raghuram & Noxolo, 2015).

Apart from rethinking internationalization itself in this 'new world and higher education order,' others have specified the need to rethink approaches to analyzing it. As internationalization has expanded (Albatch & Knight, 2007), so too has the study of internationalization policy and practice (de Wit & Urias, 2012). Kehm and Teichler (2007)

---

[1] Others resist a fixed definition, and instead highlight the conflicting ideologies and investments that surround it and its implementation (e.g. Callan, 2000; Hughes-Warrington, 2012; Stier, 2004; Turner & Robson, 2007).

identify seven themes in this work in their review of research from 1997-2007: mobility; mutual institutional influence; internationalizing curriculum; institutional strategy; knowledge transfer; cooperation and competition; and different geographic layers of policy. While they also noted an "increase of theoretically and methodologically ambitious studies" (Kehm & Teichler, 2007, p. 263), according to de Wit (2014) the bulk of internationalization research is still applied rather than academic, and Huisman (2007) suggests much is "light on theory" (p. 4). Reflecting on the state of global education research, Rizvi and Lingard (2010) argue, "the older theoretical and methodological resources are no longer sufficient and that new tools are needed" (p. 3).

Responding to this reflexive moment in the area of internationalization studies, in this dissertation I argue that indeed there is much work to be done with regard to rethinking and reimagining both the study and practice of internationalization in higher education. Today's pressing global political, economic, and ecological challenges require that we engage more thoroughly and thoughtfully with the ethical complexities, risks, and possibilities offered by different approaches to internationalization, including critical approaches. While critical perspectives about internationalization are hardly dominant in either the academic or popular literature, this work and its impact is nonetheless growing (e.g. Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Dolby & Rahman, 2008; Khoo, 2011; Johnstone & Lee, 2014; Rhee, 2009; Suspitsyna, 2015; Stier, 2004; Unterhalter & Carpentier, 2010; Vavrus & Pekol, 2015). Many consider the less celebratory elements of internationalization and have expressed concern that the growth of global engagements are motivated by the pursuit of individual gain, institutional revenues, and national economic advantages (Bolsmann & Miller, 2008; Brandenberg & de Wit, 2011; Stier, 2004). Concerns about approaches organized by an economic bottom-line are heightened given that the growth of internationalization has often coincided with public funding cuts that prompt

institutions to seek new sources of revenue (Gaffikin & Perry, 2009; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Several scholars note the risk that if the global higher education landscape becomes increasingly interconnected but power and resources are not redistributed within it, it may reproduce and expand already uneven geo-political relations and increase the unequal global distribution of wealth (Dixon, 2006; Khoo, 2011; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Shahjahan, 2013; Tikly, 2004). Others note that, notwithstanding this risk, internationalization offers possibilities for the development of alternative, non-exploitative, and solidarity-based global relations (de Lissovoy, 2010; Mohanty, 2003; Rizvi, 2009; Stein, Andreotti, Bruce & Suša, 2016).

Many concerns about the practice of internationalization are articulated out of recognition of persistent local and global power imbalances at both epistemic and material levels. However, if, as Bolsmann and Miller (2008) suggest, internationalization is "a continuation of former imperial and political connections that have evolved into financially beneficial markets and sources of income for western universities" (p. 80), then we need to situate the contemporary moment within a much longer history of global entanglements organized by colonial, capitalist relations, rationalities, and subjectivities. Proposed solutions or alternatives to existing problems and arrangements of internationalization will reproduce old patterns if they fail to fully account for, *and transform,* the epistemological frames, material conditions, and colonial desires that produce these patterns in the first place. That is, critical approaches to internationalization will be haunted by the following paradox: the same Euro-supremacist and capitalist categories and commitments that reproduce the uneven global higher education landscape will shape our efforts to address these injustices. It is this paradox that I seek to untangle in this dissertation.

Critical Higher Education Scholarship

Though interest in higher education as an object of study continues to grow (Tight, 2014), there remains a dearth of what Barnett (2014) describes as "meta-thinking about higher education" (p. 9). He suggests, "Thinking about higher education is characteristically hedged in" (p. 21). This may be particularly true with regard to theory. Malcolm Tight, who earlier pointed to the a-theoretical tendencies of higher education research (Tight, 2004), has recently documented an increase in the field's explicit use of theory, but argues, "the theories being developed and applied may often be fairly low level in terms of their sophistication" (Tight, 2014, p. 107). Martínez-Alemán, Pusser, and Bensimon (2015) also suggest, "The mass of postsecondary research and scholarship increasingly relies on functionalist, rational, and normative theories and models" (p. 6). However, increasingly, higher education scholars have advocated for more theoretical rigor (Tight, 2014), especially with regard to critical perspectives.

In their recent edited volume, *Critical Approaches to the Study of Higher Education,* Martínez-Alemán et al. (2015) note "an emerging body of research that argues that critical frameworks can position scholars to effectively analyze inequities in organizations, social relations, and actions in higher education in ways that traditionally functionalist, rational, and increasingly neoliberal approaches do not" (p. 4). They advocate for approaches that unveil hidden truths and question underlying assumptions about higher education. Brennan and Teichler (2008) advocate for "future research which is prepared to ask critical, difficult, and sometimes even *dangerous* questions" (p. 264, emphasis in the original), while the recent inauguration of the *Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs* also indicates expanding interest in this kind of research. I welcome this growth of critical perspectives, yet reflexivity about the normative assumptions built into the 'dangerous questions' we ask remains

rare. That is, even many critical accounts fail to account for higher education's own "disciplinary unconscious," which Wiegman (2012) describes as the taken-for-granted things a field can "*not afford to know in order to guarantee its reproduction*" (p. 17, emphasis in the original).

According to Barnett (2014), "thinking about higher education, if it is to work in favour of a full realisation of its possibilities, has to take account of the deep structures within which higher education is placed" (p. 21). I suggest that decolonial theories offer an important supplement to current critical approaches to higher education and the examination of "deep structures" within which both the university and critique operate. In particular, decolonial critiques indicate the need to examine the original and ongoing colonial conditions of possibility for modern higher education, as well as higher education scholars' and practitioners' own complicity in reproducing colonial relations, considerations that are often missing even in critical accounts in the field. Such critiques may overlap with but are irreducible to and not exclusive of important work already being done about race and racism in higher education, much of it using critical race theory (e.g., Cabrera, 2014; Harper, 2012; Harper, Patton, & Wooden, 2009; Patton, 2016; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Santos, Cabrera, & Fosnacht, 2010). Decolonial critiques can also be fruitfully put into conversation with existing literature about social justice in higher education (e.g. Brennan & Naidoo, 2008; Gale & Tranter, 2011; Malaney, 2006; Osei-Kofi, Shahjahan, & Patton, 2010; Phillips, 2014; Schoorman, & Acker-Hocevar, 2010; Singh, 2011).

Decolonial Critique

Taking Byrd's (2011) question, "How might the terms of current academic and political debates change if the responsibilities of that very real lived condition of colonialism were prioritized as a condition of possibility?" (p. xx), as my guide, in this dissertation I read existing internationalization scholarship and practice from a decolonial orientation in order to address

their relationship to the palimpsestic histories and expansive, violent, and unsustainable architectures of what can be termed "global colonial capitalist modernity", or "colonial modernity" for short. As Lowe (2015) suggests, colonial modernity is not a single event or even an historical era, but rather an enduring set of contested categorical divisions, social relations, and extractive processes, which "governs and calibrates being and society in an ongoing way, through spatial and temporal operations of inclusivity and exclusivity, and through both geographical and historical differentiation and connection" (pp. 92-93).

There is no singular definition or lineage of decolonial critique. In one sense it is based in traditions of resistance that are as old as European empire/colonial modernity itself, and is informed by epistemologies, values, and sensibilities that well predate it (Gandhi, 1998; Maldonado-Torres, 2011; Moten, 2013; Nichols, 2010; Young, 2001). In another, related sense, decolonial critique can be traced to several divergent and incommensurable but broadly overlapping genealogies of theory and criticism, including post-colonial, Indigenous, Black, and modernity/coloniality studies. I review each of these genealogies in more detail in Chapter 2, but broadly, decolonial critiques identify European colonization and slavery in the 15th century as modernity's epistemological and ontological genesis (Wynter, 2003). The resulting racial/colonial division of the world between white/European-descended subjects and the "others of Europe" (Silva, 2007) is highly contested but enduring, and has been reconfigured many times, often reshaping itself in response to organized resistance, as well as to the changing demands of capital and other shifting political interests (Biccum, 2010; Melamed, 2006).

Decolonial critiques contest the hegemony of liberal accounts of the world. As Toukan (2017) suggests, "While there is no single liberalist tradition, liberalism is generally understood

to share a common set of values that includes individual autonomy, liberty, property, democracy, and equality" ("Liberal Social Justice: Conceptions, Contestations, and Complications", para. 1). Liberal theories of justice tend to define injustice as undue exclusion from access to the category of the abstract, autonomous, self-possessing, individual person, i.e. the 'universal' subject of colonial modernity. However, according to decolonial critique, liberalism did not simply exclude pre-existing populations from the category of those deserving equal rights and respect. Rather, liberal logics actually sought to productively reorder the world into rigid, and differentially valued, categories of existence. Lowe (2015) asserts, "Universalizing concepts of reason, civilization, and freedom divide humanity according to a coloniality of power, affirming freedom for modern man while subordinating the colonized, enslaved, and dispossessed whose material labors and resources were the conditions of possibility for that liberty" (p. 91). Thus, the violence of racial subjugation and colonial expropriation were/are not *exceptions to*, but rather the very *conditions of possibility for*, modern existence, including Euro-supremacist 'universal' knowledge, modern nation-states, and the rise of global capitalism (Lowe, 2015; Silva, 2014).

Because, as Leroy (2016) notes, liberal justice's "hinge of inclusion/exclusion both misnames that violence [of slavery and colonialism] and narrows any sense of possibility for how it can be redressed" (para. 3), liberal justice – whether premised on representation, recognition, re/distribution, utilitarianism, or otherwise – has no mechanism by which to substantively address the constitutive, population-level violences of liberalism itself (Mills, 2015; Silva, 2013). The question then becomes: Does the paradigm of liberal justice offer adequate "conceptual tools fully to understand, critique and remedy global injustices" (Mckeown & Nuti, 2016, p. i)? The answer to this question from a decolonial orientation is a resolute "no." Silva (2015c) indicates that much decolonial work is therefore oriented toward

naming, cataloguing, and exposure of colonial and racial violence—against

claims of innocence and apologies for the failures of universal claims and

projects, against the colonial, juridical, economic, and symbolic mechanisms and

architectures of the past, but also against their reverberations and redeployments

in the global present. (para. 8)

Importantly, decolonial critiques are not 'about' subjugated populations, but rather about the

colonial dynamics that relationally produce the supposedly universal (white/European) liberal

modern subject, and the supposedly particular racialized and Indigenous "other." These critiques

not only denaturalize colonial violence, but also commit to unlearning and dismantling its

organizing architectures of knowing, being, and relating, and to experimenting with, nurturing,

and creating genuine alternatives that often appear impossible from within colonial frames.

However, colonial architectures are often reproduced precisely in the moments when

people start to recognize the need to expand existing frames of reference. In these moments,

rather than identifying and addressing the limits of, and harms affected by, these narrow frames

and imagining, encountering, or incorporating new or different ones, there is a tendency to

simply expand the content of already dominant frames. That is, there is a tendency to believe the

problem is that modern frames are not encompassing *enough*, rather than consider the possibility

that their universalizing and accumulation-oriented impulse is actually the source of the problem.

When this happens, the frames engulf new content, but only to the extent that it can be made to

align with, and not threaten, the underlying colonial architecture. Instead of condemning this

circular tendency, or charting a linear path out of it, I suggest that it is necessary to *stay with* the

difficulty of transforming these frames, lest we seek an easy, simplistic, and immediate exit that

would very likely lead us right back to the very same loop.[2] Each of the chapters in this dissertation represents a sustained effort to identify and denaturalize colonial patterns as they relate to internationalization and the global dimensions of justice in higher education.

As Byrd (2011) writes, "Our contemporary challenge is to theorize alternative methodologies to address the problems imperialism continues to create" (p. xxvi). Efforts to conceptualize the ethical and political dimensions of internationalization that do not centre questions of empire, and do not question the imperial frames in which internationalization is imagined, will not meet this challenge. Yet, as Coloma (2013a) notes, "empire as an analytical category has not been fully developed and mobilized in educational research" (p. 640). Thus, throughout this dissertation, I employ and experiment with different vocabularies in an effort to trace the imperial relationships, practices, and subjectivities of internationalization, and to foster spaces in which deeper conversations and different collective imaginaries of justice can emerge. In all of this work, I operate from a decolonial orientation that is broadly concerned with:

- *Challenging narrow ideas of the 'public good,'* by thinking more broadly about who is affected (and in what ways) by a particular approach to framing public higher education, and asking which populations are imagined to constitute 'the public' and why, and who has the power, authority, and resources to decide what is 'good';
- *Problematizing uneven flows of knowledge*, by historicizing and challenging Euro-supremacist categories, knowledge systems and modes of knowledge production, as well as interrupting the tendency to narrowly limit what is considered knowledge;
- *Resisting paternalistic, universalistic, and unlinear notions of human progress and development,* by acknowledging that there are multiple, viable desired futures, many of

---

[2] Or, as Haraway (2016) describes it in a book of the same name, "staying with the trouble."

which do not align with ideas of liberal democracy and capitalist development and in fact
would require their dismantling in order to be fully realized;

- *Denaturalizing the highly uneven global distribution of wealth,* and the ethically and
  environmentally unsustainable processes of its production, including the racialized and
  gendered processes of capital expropriation, exploitation, extraction, circulation, and
  accumulation, both as this operates today and as it relates to the origins of capitalism; and

- *Fostering (self-)reflexivity and transnational critical literacies around the complexities,
  complicities, and difficulties of social change,* by denaturalizing often invisibilized power
  relations and systems of harm, tracing and historicizing different theories of social
  change, identifying points of tension and competing investments in relation to a shared
  concern, and interrupting circular patterns of problem solving and critique.

These areas of emphasis are just some of the many that might be developed on the basis of
decolonial critiques. Although I bring this decolonial orientation to the whole of the dissertation,
each chapter emphasizes somewhat different theoretical formulations, traditions, or
conceptualizations of decolonial scholarship, which again are reviewed at the beginning of each
chapter. I examine the nuances of decolonial critique in more detail in Chapter 2.

What the Dissertation Does

In more concrete terms, this dissertation does three things. First, it identifies recurrent
patterns and absences in the critical study of internationalization, and higher education more
generally, in particular as these reproduce uneven power relations and reify Euro-supremacy and
the notion of a single story of human progress and development through capitalism (Introduction,
Chapter 3). Second, it addresses in detail the contours of the complexities, paradoxes, and
possible circularities of efforts to interrupt and make visible these patterns and absences (Chapter

4), specifically in relation to curriculum internationalization, international student mobility, and global citizenship (Chapters 5, 6, and 7). Finally, it seeks to learn from these patterns and complexities in order to propose future scholarly and practical engagements and experiments with alternatives that might not repeat the same mistakes (Conclusion).

Throughout this dissertation I argue that what is needed is not simply new answers to old questions about internationalization, but also the historicization of old questions, and the posing of questions that many of us have previously not thought to ask. As Coloma (2013a) suggests, "Mobilized by itself or in complementary or intersectional ways with the prevailing ones, the analytic of empire can enable new questions to be asked and persistent problems to be addressed differently" (p. 640). By examining the attachments and assumptions that ground and animate internationalization scholarship and practice in the present, I ask how we arrived here, how we are defining justice (whether explicitly or not), and why it is that we keep making many of the same mistakes over and over again, especially given how harmful and unsustainable these earlier mistakes have often proven to be. The overall task is to provide a critique of the present composition of the world, to illuminate the edges of what it is possible to imagine and desire from within that world, and to invite cautious, ethical encounters and experiments with other possibilities at (and potentially, beyond) those limits. However, if in fact the currently sanctioned current matrix of meaning, material architectures, and constellations of desire enable people to see, hear, and search for some things and not others, thereby circumscribing the apparent horizons of possibility, then efforts to imagine and create otherwise are fragile, consistently viewed with suspicion, and potentially co-opted, undermined, and grafted back into the sanctioned matrix. The process of instead denaturalizing, deconstructing, and disinvesting from attachments to colonial promises entails a difficult, extended, nonlinear, frustrating, but

necessary process. This dissertation is therefore only one small part of the work that those most harmed by colonial modernity's violence have already been doing for a very long time.

Locating the Study

While colonial modernity is by its nature a globalizing project, it is necessary to situate any analysis within a particular context and history. This dissertation broadly emphasizes internationalization initiatives that are located in or driven by Western, Anglophone colleges and universities, as many similar patterns have emerged in these institutions (EIHE Project, 2013; Pashby & Andreotti, 2016). While this focus risks recentering the English-speaking West, there is also an ethical-political imperative to respond to the challenges raised or exacerbated by the rapid growth of internationalization efforts in these institutions. This imperative is only further intensified given that the Western university is frequently, though not universally, taken as a model for the development and transformation of universities elsewhere (Marginson, 2008; Nandy, 2000; Rhoads, 2011), as well as the fact that three of the top five destinations for international students are predominantly English-speaking Western nations: the US, UK, and Australia (UNESCO, 2014b). Having recognized the Euro-supremacy and global hegemony of these institutions, we need to ask why these patterns continue to persist despite powerful deconstructive critiques, and practical efforts to disrupt and reimagine them.

While keeping these larger trends in full view, in this dissertation I specifically emphasize the Canadian context, where this dissertation was conceived and completed, and the U.S. context, where I was born and raised. Although the U.S. and Canada have different histories and thus different variations on modernity's overarching racial regimes and modes of governance (Day, 2015), both countries are organized by histories and ongoing material and epistemological structures that have naturalized Indigenous colonization, Black subjugation, racialized

12

im/migrants' exploitation,[3] imperial engagements abroad, white supremacist knowledge, and a

single, capital-centric story of human progress and development. Further, as Marker (2011)

notes, the U.S./Canadian border is a relatively recent construction that has forcibly and violently

divided human and other-than-human kin in the service of securing settler state sovereignty.

Risks and Responsibilities

Wiegman (2012) argues that many critical scholars continue to believe, "if only we could

only find the right discourse, object of study, or analytic tool, our critical practice will be

adequate to the political commitments that inspire it" (p. 3). This belief tends to short-circuit the

messy process of transformation by papering over the difficulties, complicities, and complexities

that characterize peoples' uneven material positionings, and differently situated psychic,

affective, and intellectual investments in, the architectures and subjectivities of colonial

modernity. With this in mind, in writing about the patterns of injustice in higher education, I do

not claim to be outside of them. By examining existing internationalization scholarship, and

tarrying at its edges, I do not disavow my attachments to it. Situating this dissertation as an

immanent critique, I am interested not in dismissing my objects of study (neither

internationalization, nor the field of higher education more generally), but rather in inhabiting

their internal logics, dominant frames of reference, and paradoxes, so as to engage and trace their

limits (Spivak, 1990). Although Pease (1990) argues one cannot critically engage the contours of

a field of study and at the same time operate from within it, I concur with Wiegman (2012) that

those operating from within a field can nonetheless offer important contributions to its critique,

as they are both familiar with the internal rules of the field and sensitive to its contradictions.

---

[3] Here, and throughout the dissertation, I borrow the term "im/migrant" from Abu El-Haj and Skilton, who in turn borrow it from Arzubiaga, Nogeuron, and Sullivan, as a means to "denote the variety of people included in the category of immigrant (for example, immigrant, transnational migrant, and refugee)" (p. 77).

Apart from my socialization within the field of higher education, my analysis is also informed by a commitment to self-reflexivity about my own implication in harm, *as well as* a recognition of the limits of self-transparency, and by the dangers that accompany the desire to distance oneself from that which one critiques in order to claim a position of innocence (Ahmed, 2012; Tuck & Yang, 2012). I therefore constructed the dissertation with an acute awareness that am deeply imbricated and in many ways invested in the systems I critique, which in turn strongly shapes the knowledge and social relations I (re)produce, as well as the obligations that accompany my structural positions and individual choices. As Mitchell (2015) suggests, "Our theories of intellectual work…are problematically incomplete if they do not open onto a practice of confronting the extent to which we are made by that which we seek to oppose" (p. 91).

Thus, while the ethical-political possibilities that might be opened through a decolonial orientation to current issues in the internationalization of higher education are many, this work is neither without risk nor beyond critique. This was reinforced for me in the feedback that I received from the reviewer of a conference paper proposal in which I had sought to theorize the relevance of decolonial theories to higher education scholarship. The reviewer wrote:

> I hope this paper is accepted, and this would be my challenge to you: how will you, while 'sitting' with these ideas, not perpetuate colonial systems? Is it even possible? Does your uptake of the discourse inadvertently do just that? I hope you will address some of these thoughts in a self-reflexive manner in the final paper. This is a much needed conversation in higher education - and I think the benefits outweigh the risks.

There are several relevant layers to this comment. The first is the basic, and welcome, suggestion that I remain hyper-self-reflexive of my own structural complicities within systems of racial and

14

colonial violence (see Kapoor, 2004). This is also an indication of the limits of approaches that

position the critic outside of their critique, in the search for an impossible space of ethical-

political purity. Thus, I engage this work with caution, and vigilance, while recognizing that even

this is not enough.

The second issue this reviewer's response raises is around the (unintended) effects of my

"uptake of the discourse" of decolonial critiques, particularly at this specific moment. Why has it

taken a sense of increasingly generalized precarity and vulnerability to the ravages of capitalism,

state/state-sanctioned violence, and environmental destruction for mainstream/white-stream

scholarship to take note of what has been disproportionately affecting racialized and Indigenous

communities since the onset of colonial modernity? What are the ethical, political, and practical

implications and responsibilities of me, as a white settler scholar, taking up the critiques most

powerfully and forcefully produced by racialized and Indigenous scholars, students, and activists

(King, 2016; Lee, 2015; Snelgrove, Dhamoon, & Corntassel, 2014; Tuck & Gaztambide-

Fernández, 2013)? This question is particularly significant given the fact that I came to these

critiques largely by way of my academic study, rather than from the experience of material

struggle, and given that my engagement with these critiques is often rewarded, professionally

and otherwise, whereas these critiques are often articulated at a high personal and professional

price for those who offer them. These questions do not have simple answers, but issue a demand

that I hold them and be accountable to the ethical and political imperatives to which they gesture.

Beyond all of this, the reviewer perceptively pinpoints the difficulty, if not the

impossibility, of engaging in critique of colonial representations and histories without in some

way or another, reproducing them. This is a topic of some interest for decolonial scholars. In

particular, critical Black and Indigenous scholars have noted the tendency in scholarship to

15

reproduce, naturalize, and sensationalize anti-Black and colonial violence even within efforts to interrupt this violence (Hartman, 1997, 2008b; McKittrick, 2014; Tuck, 2009). As Silva (2015) points out, critique itself does not necessarily lead to a dismantling of the violence that is identified, particularly if it is represented and consumed within the same epistemological frames that produced the representations under critique. She suggests that one way to avoid this circularity is to refuse modern frames and enact a confrontation that 'cracks' them. In this dissertation, I offer a different answer, but I appreciate and take inspiration from this line of thought, and perceive the necessity to interrupt the consumption of violence and its easy incorporation into existing ethical-political frameworks. There is no guarantee that I have achieved that interruption within this dissertation, especially given that this intention is quite possibly foreclosed by the very nature of the scholarly dissertation and of doctoral education more broadly as artefacts and enablers of institutionalization within a larger colonial system.

Precisely because of the difficulty of doing this work, and its entanglement with existing architectures of power, this dissertation is not intended as a guide for 'decolonizing internationalization.' Rather, it is an effort to consider the paradoxes and persistent challenges that arise in efforts to do this work. Denaturalizing the existing politics of knowledge can bring us to the limit of what is possible within the dominant global imaginary of colonial modernity. However, at this limit-space there is a common desire to quickly mend, escape, or replace that imaginary so as to regain the sense of certainty, categorical clarity, and moral redemption that was lost after the realization of complicity. The effect of this desire tends to be the reproduction of colonial relations, but under the guise of transformation. Indeed, many decolonial critiques document a persistent failure to adequately address the effects of colonialism and its afterlife. As Barkan notes, even in radical work "the attempt to resolve justice ends up framing and limiting

the types of claims that can be made," and in the process, "justice often get translated into forms that unwittingly reinvest the very powers they seek to subvert" (in Barkan & Pulido, 2017, p. 36). If this is so, then rather than rushing to determine a way out or new path forward, rather than trying to make long-dismissed knowledges and possibilities immediately intelligible, we may need to consider what political, methodological, and pedagogical questions still need to be asked if increasing numbers of people are dissatisfied with this imaginary, yet remain deeply embedded and invested in the promises it offers. How can we frame and pursue justice in ways that do not reproduce more of the same, and that avoid the traps of either enacting "preemptive closure" or remaining "forever inconclusive" (Bauman, 2000)? The expansion of internationalization presents an ambivalent opportunity and ethical imperative to undertake this questioning.

Structure of the Dissertation

This introductory chapter of the dissertation is followed by six subsequent chapters, and a conclusion. In Chapter 2, I examine in detail the four primary bodies of scholarship that inform my decolonial orientation in this dissertation, including Black, Indigenous, postcolonial, and modernity/coloniality studies. After reviewing each of these, I consider some of the parallels, complementarities, and disagreements between them, and summarize their critiques by offering a framework of three pillars of the global architecture of colonial modernity: the modern nation-state; global capital; and the Euro-supremacist category of humanity and its modern subject. I also consider some of the tensions, paradoxes, and contradictions of decolonial critique, which may be viewed variously as gifts and/or potential limitations. Finally, I conclude by considering how different genealogies of decolonial scholarship might ethically inform efforts to critique and reimagine internationalization in the context of anti-Black, settler colonial nation-states.

In Chapter 3, I elaborate the contemporary context in which, and in response to which, this dissertation was produced. Specifically, I review the history of internationalization in Western universities so as to link present dynamics to the colonial past of higher education as well as the more recent post-World War II iteration of international higher education exchange and collaboration. I then contrast how current formations of internationalization have been theorized as practical responses to globalization with more critical efforts to link these formations to the imperatives of neoliberalization. Having introduced the growing number of critical perspectives on internationalization, I identify three key areas of research that critical scholars have emphasized, including internationalization of knowledge, international student mobility, and global competition, cooperation, and convergence. Having established some of the content areas, I then consider the implications of divergent approaches to and imaginaries of (social/global) justice in relation to internationalization. I identify several tensions that arise in the pursuit of global justice in higher education contexts, including the paradoxical expansion of Western universalism and ethnocentrism that occurs in some efforts to think more globally, the complexities and competing interests that arise in efforts to translate once exclusively national-level promises of 'equal access' to a global scale, and the potential contradictions between popular efforts to enact economic and epistemic justice in the context of internationalization. Many of these tensions are taken up and expanded in greater detail in the subsequent chapters.

Having established some of the basic critiques about internationalization in Chapter 3, I consider the nuance of these critiques by offering a social cartography of critical approaches to internationalization in Chapter 4. As a methodology, social cartography illustrates how difference, complexity, and uncertainty are contained even within a shared perspective. I

specifically identity three approaches to "critical internationalization studies"[4] (soft, radical, and liminal), which share concerns that predominant approaches to internationalization will reproduce colonial relations and amplify the harms of capitalism, but differ on their diagnoses of the problem and their theories of change. To illustrate the logics of each approach, I consider how they would differently address questions about international student mobility. By mapping and historicizing these different approaches, I complicate existing analyses, interrupt the prescriptive tendencies of critique, and gesture toward alterative possibilities. I engage this work not out of pursuit of a new and improved approach to internationalization, but rather to illustrate that engaging different perspectives without expecting consensus can instructively identify the limits of all available approaches, and open up strategic, previously unimagined interventions.

In Chapter 5, I continue my exploration of the limits of existing possibilities in the context of curriculum internationalization, with the intention of learning from the successes and shortcomings of past experiments in addressing epistemic dominance. This chapter explores the difficulties and tensions that arise in efforts to enact epistemic justice within Anglophone Western higher education institutions in general, and specifically in the context of internationalization. To do so, I review the colonial history of knowledge production and the resulting imperial global imaginary, which has been contested and continuously reformul ated but persists in its basic character. Having established this historical context, I consider four different existing approaches to disrupting epistemic Euro-supremacy: thin inclusion; thick inclusion; institutionalizing interdisciplines; and alternative institutions. After reviewing the character and contributions of each of these approaches, as well as their shortcomings or

---

[4] I credit Amy Metcalfe with coining this term (see Metcalfe, Stein, & Chauhan, 2014).

limitations, I then consider how lessons learned from them might inform the practice of curriculum internationalization, emphasizing three primary considerations, including the need to: trace and denaturalize the colonial politics of knowledge; identify and address not only the *content* but also the *framing* of Western knowledge systems; and recognize that undoing five hundred years of epistemic colonization is a ongoing process and not a singular event.

Chapter 6 mobilizes the conceptual work elaborated in the previous chapters to examine the complex entanglements of local and global formations of colonial power in the context of marketized approaches to higher education internationalization. I examine Canada's recently revamped international education brand, "EduCanada," to consider how national exceptionalist and 'othering' narratives are reproduced in the recruitment of international students. Specifically, I engage in a colonial discourse analysis of the EduCanada website, and find a strong emphasis on the benevolent and multicultural character of Canada and the career benefits and immigration possibilities that may result from international study in Canada. From these findings, I ask how internationalization relates to the overlapping and ongoing legacies of Indigenous colonization, and racialized regimes of personhood, citizenship, and immigration. I consider the complex position of the international student in this context, and how international recruitment rhetoric is constructed so as to conditionally invite them into the position of an 'exalted' Canadian subject (Thobani, 2007). The effect of this rhetoric is to offer false assurances about post-graduation job prospects, and to white-wash histories and ongoing realities of Canadian racism and colonialism. Finally, I argue that international higher education marketization risks foreclosing opportunities for the critical examination of empire precisely when such examinations are needed most.

In Chapter 7, I revisit the social cartography approach of Chapter 4 to produce a map of global citizenship. I suggest that although global citizenship is an increasingly prominent

institutional goal in higher education, there is little discussion about its variant meanings and theoretical and conceptual groundings. In an effort to support deepened conversations on this topic, I identify four available global citizenship positions (entrepreneurial, liberal humanist, anti-oppressive, and otherwise), and trace their normative, existential, and aspirational elements. I also ask how each scripts the relationship between "Self" and "Other", and what this reveals about who is imagined to properly inhabit the position of "global citizen" and who is imagined to be the object of their global intervention, whether economic, humanitarian, or otherwise. I suggest there is a marked break between those approaches that account for the role of an imperial global imaginary in conceptualizing "the global", and those that do not. Ultimately, I emphasize the value of approaching global engagements with humility and respect for provisionality, as well as considering the limits of global citizenship as a concept.

In the conclusion, I begin by reviewing some of the frameworks that I employed throughout this dissertation, and emphasize their partial and provisional nature. Then, I review the themes and patterns that emerged throughout the dissertation, namely: 1) the reproduction of a liberal imaginary of justice that effectively naturalizes colonial frames; 2) higher education's failure to address its own colonial foundations higher education; and 3) the risk that, unless we attend denaturalize these frames and excavate these foundations, then the same colonial assumptions that reproduce the highly uneven global higher education landscape will also inflect many of our efforts to address these uneven relations. I also offer some brief reflections on the ethics of my own position as 'knowledge producer' in the area of decolonial critique in the context of this dissertation and beyond. Finally, I lay out three areas for future research and practice. First, scholarship to examine the social foundations of higher education, drawing on insights from decolonial critique to read higher education histories 'against the grain' in ways

that challenge our own attachments to the notion of higher education as a force for social good, in order to face the full range of its impacts, including its role in the reproduction of local and global harms and inequities. Second, developing practical tools for engaging with the complex issues that inform internationalization, and for fostering critical literacy around different approaches to global justice. And finally, learning from further research and engagements with educational communities committed to imagining and practicing global justice differently.

Chapter 2: Complexities of Decolonial Critique

In this chapter I provide an overview of some of the primary arguments as well as the common threads shared across each of the following traditions of decolonial thought: Black studies, Indigenous studies, modernity/coloniality studies, and postcolonial studies. In addition to their commonalities, there has been significant conversation across each of the four areas, some more so than others. After briefly reviewing the challenges of summarizing decolonial critique, I offer an overview of each of the four traditions of decolonial thought. Next, I consider the complex, often generative, and at times contentious, relationships between the different bodies of thought. After doing so, I describe three pillars of colonial modernity that the different theoretical traditions collectively identify and problematize: 1) 'universal' European humanity and the 'modern subject'; 2) modern nation-states; and 3) global capital. Then, I consider some of the tensions and complexities of a decolonial analytic, before concluding by considering how each of the different bodies of thought might inform a multi-dimensional, transnational decolonial orientation to internationalization research within the context of the U.S. and Canada.

Framing Decolonial Critique

As Melamed (2011) points out, modern categories of knowledge and existence, and the colonial frames in which they are embedded, do not merely

> arrange human beings along a pregiven scale of value. Instead, they are at once
> productive and symptomatic of the total value making (such as political value and
> economic value) that secures specific historical configurations of personhood,
> human organization, and relations to the natural world as possible, imaginable,
> and sustainable. Differently stated, racialization [and colonization]'s trick of

displacing and disguising differential value making within world-ordering

systems of difference reifies and ensures a baseline for social possibility and

legitimate violence. (p. 12)

As is indicated by my parenthetical insertion in Melamed's otherwise precise account of the

productive effects of modern epistemology and ontology, I emphasize here and throughout this

dissertation that different formations of racial and colonial subjugation operate according to

distinct though often parallel logics, and operate in complex, lateral relation to each other. As

Day (2015) suggests, there is a "problem in any totalizing approach to the heterogeneous

constitution of racial difference in settler colonies" like the U.S. and Canada (p. 101).

Byrd (2011) points out the need for precision when referring to the intertwined but

distinct processes of racialization and colonization, which "have worked simultaneously to other

and abject entire peoples so they can be enslaved, excluded, removed, and killed in the name of

progress and capitalism" (p. xxiii). While noting that these processes should "be understood as

concomitant global systems that secure white dominance through time, property, and notions of

self" (p. xxiii), Byrd also notes that the tendency to collapse them "risks leaving those very

colonial structures intact on the one hand and allowing all experiences of oppression within

settler colonialism to step forward as colonized on the other" (p. 54). This is particularly the case

within the currently hegemonic mode of neoliberal multiculturalism, which purports that the

proper remedy to structural subjugation is to finally fulfill the promised 'universal' rights and

protections of the nation-state, even as many subjugated peoples continue to put forth alternative

horizons of justice (Leroy, 2016; Melamed, 2006; Simpson & Smith, 2014; Spade, 2011).

All of this has led to demands for greater analytical precision and specificity regarding

different modes of racial and colonial domination, their interrelation, and theories of change.

Recognizing this, the decision to review these four traditions of decolonial critique together (without privileging one analytic account over the others) is an effort to balance the need for conceptual distinction with the need to account for the continued, underlying racial/colonial division between Europe and its Others (Silva, 2007). The choice of these particular intellectual traditions as prisms through which to view this relation is based on my own understanding of significant synchronicities and productive intersections of their underlying conceptual foundations.

However, any effort to summarize the breadth and depth of decolonial theories is bound to have significant limitations. First, there are numerous other scholarly and activist traditions I could have potentially canvassed, or umbrella terms I could have employed (e.g. critical ethnic studies). Further, my decision to use "decolonial" as a unifying term for these traditions, while not unprecedented (e.g. Silva, 2014; Walcott, 2014b), is also not without contestation and complications (Byrd, 2011; Sexton, 2016; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Relatedly, I have tried to do justice to these traditions as distinct bodies of knowledge with their own intellectual and disciplinary histories that well exceed their place in the larger project of decolonial critique, and which have their own internal diversity and disagreements. However, in summarizing each tradition I highlight lines of inquiry within them that emphasize enduring racial/colonial formations, an interest which undoubtedly shapes my representation of the fields as a whole. Finally, I note that these traditions are rooted in theories, intellectual traditions, political and economic orders, and social movements that well predate and continue to exceed their relatively recent institutionalization as academic fields in the Western academy (Mitchell, 2015).

Black Studies

Black studies, which may also be called African(-)American, African Diaspora, or Africana studies (Mitchell, 2011), was institutionalized as a field around half a century ago, along with other "interdisciplines," including Indigenous studies (Ferguson, 2012).[5] As is the case with many interdisciplinary fields, its boundaries are contested (Wynter, 2006). According to Sexton (2010a), "The general interpolation of African American studies renders practitioners inevitable partisans in a series of overlapping debates and contests, but it does not render a strict intellectual and political divide...There are radicals and liberals, moderates and conservatives... employing a range of analytic approaches" (p. 213). The literature reviewed here emphasizes a particular strain of study, largely (though not exclusively) rooted in what is called the Black radical tradition (Kelley, 2002; Robinson, 1983), as well Black feminism, and the more recent articulation of critical Black studies. These approaches interrogate the formulation of Blackness as a foundational element of global modernity, which means that the field has a much broader relevance than to Black/African-descended peoples alone (James, 1969/1993; Sexton, 2015).

In addition to intellectual labor in Black studies dedicated to the study of slavery itself, there is growing attention given to theorizing what Hartman (2008a) has termed the "afterlife of slavery," that is, the contemporary context wherein "black lives are still imperiled and devalued by a racist calculus and a political arithmetic that were entrenched centuries ago," affecting "skewed life chances, limited access to healthcare and education, premature death, incarceration, and impoverishment" (p. 6). Silva (2014) argues that the economic value that was expropriated through slavery remains a primary condition of possibility for the global capitalist present.

---

[5] Of course, Black intellectual life and social thought predates and exceeds what was eventually institutionalized as "Black Studies" (Moten, 2013).

Indeed, many Black studies scholars have argued that Black enslavement, other forms of Black subjugation were and continue to be foundational to global capitalism (rather than 'merely' a form of what Marx called primitive accumulation), given the immense wealth that this created (Silva, 2014; Walcott, 2014b). As well, many modern economic architectures originated in the context of the transatlantic slave trade and plantation economics, including common insurance and investment practices (Kish & Leroy, 2015). Further, as Moten (2013) notes, "the financialization of everyday life was a plantation imposition" (p. 240).

Black studies also identifies the modern Western nation-state as always already a racial state, specifically, an anti-Black state that frames white citizens as the only fully legitimate political, and thereby human, subjects, and Black people as their antithesis (James, 2013; Rodríguez, 2014; Silva, 2009; Walcott, 2014a, 2014b; Wilderson, 2010). Wilderson (2003) argues that normative codes of the U.S. subject – rights, entitlements, sovereignty, immigration – are unavailable to Black subjects, even when they are technically guaranteed access to them by law. Thus, Sexton (2016) clarifies that some Black studies critiques of the state are articulated not out of a desire to reform it, but rather a desire to ultimately abolish it; however, he asserts, this does not mean that Black people do not or should not make strategic demands on the state.

Even as Black studies scholars critique the pathologized representations of Blackness in modernity that undergird claims of white sovereign subjecthood, they also emphasize what Silva (2014) describes as the "two faces of Blackness" (p. 85). That is, at the same time as Blackness is "always already a reference of commodity, an object, and the other" (p. 81) within modern epistemological and ontological codes, it also hosts possibilities outside of the confines of these and other modern categories and modes of social life (King, 2016b). Thus, Walcott (2011) argues, in addition to narratives of brutality that "unmask" the true basis of modernity,

"Black/African diaspora narratives are also about the making of meaningful lives within the context of Euro–Western Enlightenment and modernity" (p. 347). These scholars suggest that not in spite of but rather in many ways because Blackness is positioned as the excess of the modern subject, it also signals the possibility of existence (thinking and being) otherwise (Alexander, 2005; Moten, 2013; Silva, 2013, 2014). Following C.L.R. James, Silva argues (2014), "the task of black studies is the dismantling of Western thought" (p. 91), that is, denaturalizing and disrupting given epistemological and ontological categories of existence.

Indigenous Studies

Indigenous studies, also sometimes known as Native studies, is rooted in a concern for the defense and flourishing of Indigenous peoples' lives, lands, and communities (Simpson & Smith, 2014).[6] Moreton-Robinson (2015) describes the beginnings of institutionalized Indigenous studies as being informed by "the global Indigenous movement for self-determination and sovereignty" (p. xiv), and suggests that since then the field has produced knowledge "primarily concerned with expressing and theorizing the specificities of our cultural differences in multiple forms in order to stake our claim in the production of knowledge about us" (p. xv). Indigenous studies is a diverse field, however, and in this chapter I specifically emphasize its more critical strands. Byrd (2011) argues "indigenous critical theory" exists "in its best form when it centers itself within indigenous epistemologies and the specificities of the communities and cultures from which it emerges and then looks outward to engage European philosophical, legal, and cultural traditions in order to build upon all the allied tools available" (p. xxix-xxx). Many in the field argue that it, and Indigenous thought more generally, challenges

---

[6] As is the case with Black studies, Indigenous studies incorporates knowledges, critiques, and social movements that well pre-date (and continue to exceed) its institutionalization as a field (Byrd, 2011).

and holds the potential to diagnose, disrupt, and even dismantle, Western liberal humanist

political and social norms and knowledge, as well as settler states' sovereignty, and their

exploitative and extractive political economic practices (Brown, 2014; Byrd, 2011; Povinelli,

2011; Simpson & Smith, 2014).

"Settler colonialism" is a primary animating concept within Indigenous studies.[7]

In this dissertation, I rather narrowly focus on the colonization of Indigenous peoples in the U.S.

and Canada, although there are many other settler colonial contexts.[8] Settler colonialism in these

contexts is premised on the displacement and replacement of Indigenous peoples from their

lands, so as to enable permanent European (and later, non-European) settlement and sovereignty

claims. Tuck, McKenzie, and McCoy (2014) contrast the primacy of land expropriation,

settlement, and the extraction of 'natural resources' in settler colonial contexts to the dynamics

of 'exploitation colonialism,' which is premised on the exploitation of colonized peoples' labor

and resources by a foreign polity. However, Indigenous peoples have also been subject to the

exploitation of their labor, and even enslavement in several cases. Colonial access to

"land/water/air/subterranean earth" (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 5) is achieved through varied

"interrelated discursive and nondiscursive facets of economic, gendered, racial, and state power"

(Coulthard, 2014, pp. 6-7). In particular, Western heteropatriarchal logics of gender and

sexuality inflict significant harm on Indigenous women, Two Spirit people, and non-nuclear

kinship relations (Arvin, Tuck, & Morrill, 2013; Belcourt, 2016; Simpson, 2011).

---

[7] There is also a distinct, if sometimes overlapping, field of settler colonial studies (SCS). SCS, which is dominated by non-Indigenous scholars, has been critiqued for potentially co-opting, overshadowing, and displacing much older genealogies of Indigenous critiques of settler colonialism (Snelgrove, Dhamoon, & Corntassel, 2014), and Indigenous and Black critiques of conquest (King, 2016a).
[8] These include not only New Zealand and Australia, which are often grouped alongside the U.S. and Canada, but also settler colonial contexts in Africa (Kelley, 2017), Asia, and Nordic countries with Sámi populations.

Because the continued presence and sovereignty claims of Indigenous peoples threaten the ontological security of settler societies' claims to legitimacy and land ownership, settler colonialism is organized by a logic of elimination. Per this logic, the elimination of Indigenous peoples is sought through physical violence, policies of hyperdescent, and forcible assimilation (Arvin, Tuck, & Morrill, 2013). This logic seeks to impose on Indigenous peoples the norms of liberal individualism, and the objectification of land as private property against Indigenous understandings of land as a living entity and reciprocal relation (Ahenakew, Andreotti, Cooper, & Hireme, 2014). In sum, Tuck and Yang (2012) argue, "the disruption of Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence" (p. 5).

Critical Indigenous studies scholars identify the foundational and ongoing role of Indigenous colonization in capitalism. According to Coulthard (2014), "For Indigenous nations to live, capitalism must die. And for capitalism to die, we must actively participate in the construction of Indigenous alternatives to it" (p. 173). The nation-state is also a primary object of critique, as the settler nation-state is understood to be an occupying power. Simpson and Smith (2014) argue, "The state is not only repressive; it is also educative – shaping common sense through ideological state apparatuses (such as the academy)" (p. 6). Through this education, non-Indigenous people develop a possessive investment in the settler state form and citizenship, and thus, in Indigenous dispossession (Moreton-Robinson, 2008; Rifkin, 2013). Indigenous feminists in particular have decentred the nation-state in decolonial projects (Simpson, 2011; Smith & Kauanui, 2008; Trask, 2004), though Arvin, Tuck, and Morril (2013) clarify that this does not mean that the immediate pursuit of civil rights is unimportant, but rather that there is a need for visions of justice that do not presume the inevitability of the state.

Indigenous peoples challenge colonial domination through various means. Resurgence efforts seek to strengthen Indigenous modes of existence that are not bounded by the dictates and drives of the nation-state, capital, or heteropatriarchy (Aikau, 2015). For Simpson (2011), "Building diverse, nation-culture-based resurgences means significantly re-investing in our own ways of being: regenerating our political and intellectual traditions; articulating and living our legal systems; language learning; ceremonial and spiritual pursuits; creating and using our artistic and performance-based traditions" (p. 18). Many also emphasize the importance of decolonization, though there is no singular vision of what decolonization entails (Andreotti et al., 2015; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Furthermore, just as settler colonization is understood to be an ongoing structure rather than a single event (Wolfe, 2006), Smith (2012) suggests, "Decolonization, once viewed as the formal process of handing over the instruments of government is now recognized as a long term process involving the bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic, and psychological divesting of colonial power" (p. 101). For Million (2009), "To 'decolonize' means to understand as fully as possible the forms colonialism takes in our own times" (p. 55), given that these forms take shape within a "constantly morphing colonial system" (p. 55).

Postcolonial Studies

Postcolonial studies is driven by the basic contention that, despite the formal political decolonization of much of the world, many elements of colonialism have not been supplanted but have rather taken on new, often more insidious imperial formations (Mendoza, 2013). Hence, decolonization is understood to be "an unfinished project" (Kapoor, 2004, p. 630). The roots of postcolonial scholarship are often traced to mid-20th century anti-colonial scholars and activists, but postcolonial studies itself is largely identified with the academic discourse produced by

diasporas from the Global South living in the Global North beginning in the late 1970s/early 1980s. While some critique postcolonialism for what they argue is its temporal suggestion that "colonialism is now a matter of the past" (Shohat, 1992, p. 105),[9] others argue just the opposite: that theories of postcolonialism are efforts to conceptualize how and why even refigured global relations (social, economic, political) reproduce colonial hierarchies and hegemonies. Thus, according to Hall (1996), "It is precisely the false and disabling distinction between colonization as a system of rule, of power and exploitation, and colonization as a system of knowledge and presentation which is being refused" (p. 254) in postcolonial theorizing.

Although Gandhi (1998) notes there is "little consensus regarding the proper content, scope, and relevance of postcolonial studies" (p. 3), one of its primary animating critiques is a suspicion of Western universals and "grand narratives," as well as a concern for how the non-West figures within these narratives as the deviant, underdeveloped "Other." This view is strongly associated with Said's (1978) influential text, *Orientalism*, which emphasizes the epistemological and cultural dimensions of colonial domination, and, with a notably Foucauldian influence, illuminates the tight relationship between colonial knowledge and power (Gandhi, 1998). Some have critiqued Said in particular and the field of postcolonial studies more generally for emphasizing critiques of Western theory and giving inadequate consideration to colonial resistance and material relations (Hall, 1996). Indeed, this signals a larger divide in the field, that between materialist and poststructuralist emphases.

According to Gandhi (1998), more poststructuralist approaches offer a "critique of Western epistemology and theorisation of cultural alterity/difference" (p. ix), while the

---

[9] This is of particular concern in light of the ongoing political colonization of Indigenous peoples in settler-colonial nations like the U.S. and Canada (Byrd, 2011; Shohat, 1992; Stam & Shohat, 2014; Tuck & Yang, 2012).

materialist approach emphasizes political economic critique and seeks emancipation through struggle by the oppressed. The poststructuralist approach critiques the materialist approach for being too rationalist and teleological, and thus, Eurocentric, while the materialist approach critiques the poststructural approach for an inadequate critique of capital and insufficient commitment to political struggle (Nichols, 2010). Yet, the distinction between the two may be somewhat specious, as Loomba notes (2005), "In any colonial context, economic plunder, the production of knowledge and strategies of representation depended heavily upon one another" (p. 85). Indeed, many postcolonial critiques emphasize how colonial logics continue to orient global political economic relations, for instance through development policies of supranational organizations like the IMF and World Bank (Biccum, 2010; Kapoor, 2014; Spivak, 2004).

Notably, one of the most well known figures of postcolonial studies, Gayatri Spivak, employs both poststructural and historical materialist traditions, but declares her allegiance to neither and offers critiques of both. Like Said, Spivak (1988) is highly concerned with Western representations of the non-Western Other. Instead of emphasizing how Western representations denigrate the Other, she critiques how 'well-meaning' Western (or Western-educated) intellectuals celebrate the Other in ways that actually re-subjugate them. Warning against the tendency to romanticize and homogenize subaltern experiences (Loomba, 2005), she suggests that there is no possible innocent or transparent representation, even as efforts to centre colonial subjects have liberating potential as disruptive counterstories to narratives of Western benevolence. Spivak argues that because the non-West is the constitutive outside of the West, the former cannot be incorporated into Western frames without reiterating the initial violence. Hence her famous question about whether the subaltern can speak, which suggests not that they cannot speak, but that what they have to say is unintelligible within Western frames of reference.

In short, the West's colonial efforts to affect "the worlding of the world on supposedly uninscribed territory" (Spivak, 1990, p. 1) are not easily dismantled. Spivak and many other postcolonial scholars wrestle with persistent paradoxes, or what she describes as "double binds." In particular: on the one hand modernity's conceptual categories – especially those that presuppose "rule by modern institutions of the state, bureaucracy, and capitalist enterprise" (Chakrabarty, 2000, p. 4) – continue to organize life in the present, in both the West and non-West. On the other hand, even the most earnest efforts to escape or replace Western categories tend to reproduce them (Jazeel, 2011; Scott, 2004). What's more, strategic use of these same concepts can serve as a means of resistance (Chakrabarty, 2000). What is therefore demanded is not only the historicization and critique of colonial dominance but also self-reflexive historicization and critique of anticolonial thought itself, including its potential complicity in reproducing structures of violence (Kapoor, 2004; Loomba, 2005; Roy, 2006). If, as Chakrabarty (2000) suggests, "European thought is at once both indispensable and inadequate" (p. 16), then rather than a search for innocence or purity, postcolonial critique calls for what Spivak (1994) describes as "a persistent critique of what one cannot not want" (p. 278).

As a field, postcolonial studies puts many concepts up for "dispute and debate." For instance, Bhabha (1985; 1994/2004) theorized the ambivalent, hybrid, interdependent identities of both colonizer and colonized, suggesting that efforts to identify their 'essential' nature was a feature of colonial rule. While some suggest that emphasizing heterogeneity may unsettle colonial power premised on sharp dualisms, as well as challenge the denial of the West's constitution through the imperialist project (Spivak, 1988), others lament that it blurs the clear distinctions that are strategically necessary for effective resistance (Dirlik, 1994). Still others

suggest that it is necessary to hold in tension the recognition of both repressive and liberatory uses of binaries and essentialist notions of identity and difference (Hall, 1996; Spivak, 1990).

Regarding the relevance of postcolonial theory to the U.S. and Canada, in addition to the Indigenous critiques that these countries continues to operate as settler-colonial states and are therefore not *post*colonial (e.g. Byrd, 2011; Tuck & Yang, 2012), Sharpe (1995) has argued that postcolonial studies is inadequate to the task of addressing state racisms, and flattens histories of racial oppression in colonization and immigration. However, postcolonial theory offers invaluable tools with which to trace the continued hegemony of Western nation-states and corporations in global economic and geopolitical relations.

Modernity/Coloniality Studies

Modernity/coloniality studies, also sometimes known as the Latin American modernity/coloniality research program, emphasizes that colonial violence serves as the constitutive underside of modernity, which is captured by the concept of *coloniality*. Within this approach, coloniality is distinguished from the temporally bounded historical project of colonialism, as the former has long outlasted formal instantiations of the latter. According to Maldonado-Torres (2007), coloniality "refers to long-standing patterns of power that emerged as a result of colonialism, but that define culture, labor, intersubjective relations, and knowledge production well beyond the strict limits of colonial administrations" (p. 243). Thus, much as it is argued by many postcolonial scholars, modernity/coloniality scholars reject the notion that political decolonization is tantamount to decolonization (Grosfoguel, 2007; Mignolo, 2011).

Mignolo (2011) argues that modernity and coloniality are two sides of the same coin: "one [modernity] constantly named and celebrated (progress, development, growth) and the other [coloniality] silenced or named as problems to be solved by the former (poverty, misery,

inequities, injustices, corruption, commodification, and dispensability of human life)" (p. xviii).

Eurocentric narratives of modernity are critiqued for claiming that Europe was a preconstituted

global capitalist power rather than birthed through colonial violence, as well as for falsely

projecting provincial European ideals and ideas as if they were universal (Lugones, 2007;

Mignolo, 2011). Dussel (2000) therefore argues the need to clarify "between abstract universality

and the concrete world hegemony derived from Europe's position as center" (p. 471).

One of the constitutive elements of the modernity/coloniality dyad is the notion of race.

According to Quijano (2000), the idea of Europe is founded on the premise of human

development as linear and unidirectional, and the idea that the Others of Europe are behind on

that linear trajectory. Non-European peoples, located geographically elsewhere, were also

characterized as temporally elsewhere, evolutionarily behind Western peoples in their progress

toward universal humanity (Mignolo, 2007). This narrative continued in the development

projects of the Cold War era, though it was adjusted to appear less overtly racist (Castro-Gómez,

2007). Racial inferiority has continued to be utilized as a justification and organizing principle

for exploiting the labour and resources of racialized peoples (Grosfoguel, 2007). Yet, race in

modernity/coloniality studies is more than a means of economic instrumentalization. There is

also, according to Maldonado-Torres (2007), an "imperial attitude" endemic to Western

philosophy, which entails "a fundamentally genocidal attitude in respect to colonized and

racialized people. Through it colonial and racial subjects are marked as dispensable" (p. 246).

Apart from offering an analytic that captures the violence endemic to/constitutive of

modernity, modernity/coloniality scholarship emphasizes the importance of reconstructing

subjugated knowledges, and the need to shift away, or "delink," not only from Western

epistemologies but also from Western political, ethical, and philosophical perspectives as well

(Mignolo, 2007). Dussel (2000) emphasizes a need not to 'transcend' modernity, but to rethink existing attachments to it, as even the desire to transcend may be premised on a dialectical negation that presumes antagonism, transformation, and synthesis *within* a system, as opposed to affirming that which has been made exterior to it. Because colonialism affects both colonizer and colonized, albeit with significantly uneven effects (Mignolo, 2007), modernity/coloniality scholars also understand decolonization to be a project for both. However, they emphasize that the insights from those on the subaltern side of the divide should lead the process of transformation, as Western knowledge cannot adequately address the problems it has created.

Despite its frequent reference to "the Americas," modernity/coloniality studies is largely focused on the Latin American context. Although this may limit somewhat its applicability to the U.S. and Canadian contexts, it has much to offer through its conceptual contributions.

Relationships Between Different Genealogies of Decolonial Critique

In reviewing each body of decolonial thought, I have sought to at least gesture toward some of the contested issues within the traditions themselves. There are also discussions between and amongst the traditions that are worth noting. In this section I briefly review some of these.

Byrd (2011) writes about the hesitancy on the part of some Indigenous studies scholars to use postcolonial theory, particularly when the 'post-' is taken as a marker that decolonization has been achieved. Relatedly, it is argued that postcolonial studies has largely failed to engage with the histories and ongoing situation of Indigenous peoples in settler colonies (Smith, 2012), and that its analytics remain inadequate for theorizing settler colonialism (Shohat, 1992; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Stam and Shohat (2014) further argue that several elements of postcolonial theory itself are challenged by Indigenous critiques; for example, the notion of hybridity has been a means to dismiss the claims of Indigenous people of mixed heritage. Notably, in many cases the

critiques of postcolonial theory by Indigenous studies relate to issues that are contentious within the field itself, as indeed is the case regarding the question of hybridity.

There is little engagement between modernity/coloniality studies and Indigenous studies, at least when the latter is conceptualized as being predominantly focused on Indigenous peoples within Anglo settler colonies. Despite modernity/coloniality studies being nominally largely concerned with colonization of 'the Americas', it primarily emphasizes the Latin American context with which most of its authors identify, while, according to Cusicanqui (2012), not always ethically engaging Indigenous communities and their critiques. Modernity/coloniality studies also largely does not engage with the work of contemporary Black studies, although it does draw on some earlier Black scholars, such as Fanon and Césaire. Though it does reference the role of slavery in the construction of the modern world, it does so with less emphasis than it does with the role of colonization, and attends less to ongoing anti-Blackness. There is a more significant engagement by modernity/coloniality studies with postcolonial studies, including claims by the former that the latter is insufficient for theorizing the Latin American context. Mignolo (2011) suggests the two fields "are grounded in a different genealogy of thoughts" (p. xxiii), but both "strive to unveil colonial strategies promoting the reproduction of subjects whose aims and goals are to control and possess" (p. xxvi). According to Grosfoguel (2007), "Post-colonial studies conceptualize the capitalist world-system as being constituted primarily by culture" (p. 218) and thus does not adequately theorize political economic concerns; however, this captures a tension within the field of postcolonalism itself.

One of the more active conversations between the reviewed bodies of thought is that between Indigenous studies and Black studies. For instance, Sexton (2016) suggests the need for a clearer distinction between "[Black] struggles for abolition and reconstruction, on the one

hand, and [Indigenous] decolonization and resurgence, on the other" (p. 584). Indeed, some might contest my inclusion of Black studies under the broad umbrella of decolonial critiques; meanwhile, some scholars have done so (e.g. Silva, 2014; Walcott, 2014; Wynter, 2003). Tuck and Yang (2012), too, emphasize the specificity of decolonization for Indigenous peoples and the need to distinguish between different, even incommensurable, social justice projects.

Although many have emphasized how the expropriations of slavery and colonization were both necessary conditions of possibility for modernity more generally and for the U.S. and Canada as nation-states specifically (e.g. Byrd, 2011; King, 2013, 2015, 2016a; Silva, 2014; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Wilderson, 2010), according to Leroy (2016), "the field of black studies has not fully reckoned with the historical intimacy between colonialism and slavery" (para. 6). Conversely, he notes, "There has not yet been sufficient theorization of how to integrate non-indigenous, non-settlers – primarily the enslaved – into a theory of colonialism without subordinating the dispossession they experience to that of indigenous people" (para. 10). He nonetheless gestures toward significant analytical convergences of the two fields, and the mutually constitutive nature of the processes of anti-Blackness and settler colonialism. King (2016a) also emphasizes, "Black and Indigenous protest against conquistador ways of life have already been talking to one another in ways that exceed certain forms of humanist narrativity and intelligibility available within discourses of settler colonialism" (para. 31).

As is often the case, these cross-field conversations are complex, contextual, and contested. Rather than signal the weakness of a broadly decolonial approach that spans multiple fields, I suggest that this attests to the indispensability of each tradition of thought, the importance of attending to dynamic tensions and incommensurablities between different claims

for decolonial justice, and the false promise of devising a single, universalizing theory of racial/colonial violence, let alone transformational possible responses to it.

Three Pillars of Colonial Modernity

To synthesize insights from these four bodies of decolonial scholarship, below I review three foundational 'pillars' that constitute the basic architecture of colonial modernity: 'universal' European humanity and the modern subject; modern nation-states; and global capital.[10]

'Universal' European Humanism and the Modern Subject

One of the most significant contributions of decolonial critique is its examinations of the "modern subject" and the attendant racial hierarchization of humanity. In colonial classificatory logics, the modern subject (white/European-descended, middle class, college educated) claims to be the head of humanity, which presumes a linear, universal path of progress, premised on a racial/civilizational categorization of human collectives that positions white people as both masters of universal reason (who deploy timeless categories, measurements, and classifications to predict and control the world) and sovereign, self-determined individuals (who act independently except for those constraints that are agreed upon through the social contract). Beginning in the 15th century, European conquest and enslavement provided the material and conceptual conditions through which to assert this vision of the world, and for constructing the other pillars of global capital and nation-states that serve the modern subject's interests.

According to Silva (2007, 2014), the modern subject understands themself as rightfully enacting their self-determined will on the world through the instrumental application of

---

[10] For more extended discussions of these elements and their origins and contemporary implications, see: Stein & Andreotti, 2017; Stein, Hunt, Suša & Andreotti, 2017.

knowledge. In order to claim self-determinedness, interiority, and transparency, however, the modern subject must deny that their existence was and is only made possible in exteriority, in particular, through relationships of violence enacted through the initiation and ongoing reproduction of racial and colonial difference (Silva, 2014; see also Byrd, 2011; Lowe, 2015; Sharpe, 2016; Walcott, 2011; Wynter, 2003). In turn, Indigenous and racialized peoples are imagined to be 'outer-determined,' as their minds and bodies are thought to be shaped by inferior geographic origins and a lower position in humanity's supposedly linear development.

As Europe's Others were forcibly incorporated into its narrative conception of the world and its material circuits of accumulation (Spivak, 1990), a diversity of actually existing ways of thinking and being and relating were deemed illegible, illegitimate, or even threatening. Because European humanism both requires and is threatened by the very subjugated peoples it produces, and in order to minimize the threat that this might be revealed, the spatial and temporal separation of the modern subject (as *here and now*) and the racial and colonial subaltern (as *there and then*) is continually asserted (Silva, 2007, 2014). Yet, though never fully admissible to its ranks, racialized and Indigenous peoples are nonetheless judged according to the norms of European humanity, and some have adopted for themselves this narrative of human progress (Wynter & McKittrick, 2015). Even those who contest this imposition, and strive to create and keep alive other possibilities for existence may be compelled to at least partially adhere to these expectations in order to ensure their immediate survival (Ahenakew et al., 2014).

The Modern Nation-State

Particularly within Western liberal political theory and philosophy, the modern state is imagined to be the result of a social contract in which rational individuals freely decide to give up certain freedoms for the promise that the state will secure and protect their life, liberty, and

private property (Mills, 2015; Silva, 2016). This social contract grants authority for states to use violence in order to fulfil these promises and to ensure their own self-preservation domestically (through the police), and internationally (through the military). Despite the promised universality of the social contract within Western liberal democracies, in the case of both the United States and Canada, Indigenous, Black, and other racialized populations were initially – and arguably in many ways continue to be – *subjected to* rather than *subjects of* this social contract. Meanwhile, the modern idea of the nation presumes a homogeneous and bounded ethical community (Anderson, 1983); articulations of "ethno-nationalism" specifically attempt to limit the proper imagined national community to a single race or ethnic group (Hage, 2012).

Within Western liberal democracies there is also a promise of popular sovereignty and equality before the law. However, Hong (2014) notes the paradox that the state produces and promises to protect citizens according to abstract (humanist) principles of political equality, while at the same time protecting the right to economic inequality and its highly racialized and gendered formations. Further, in practice, formal political equality is itself also highly organized and circumscribed by race and gender, as non-white and non-gender-normative populations are positioned as, at best, incomplete citizens, and at worst, as moral and material threats to the security of full/proper citizens and therefore are subject to state violence out of the perceived 'necessity' to preserve order (Silva, 2009; 2016). In the US and Canadian contexts, the cruel irony of this formulation is that these nation-states were made possible through the violence they inflicted on Indigenous, Black, and other racialized populations, and it is these same populations who are deemed to be threats and subject to further violence. Modalities of nation-state violence include: militarized borders, imperialism, incarceration, policing, and other 'population

management' efforts justified in the name of nation-state sovereignty and safety; racialized regimes of citizenship; and police protection of (white) private property (Walia, 2013).

Further, it is not only Western nation-states that are implicated in decolonial critiques, as Alexander (2005) suggests, "both neo-imperial state formations (those advanced capitalist states that are the dominant partners in the global 'order') and neo-colonial state formations (those that emerged from the colonial ''order' as the forfeiters to nationalist claims to sovereignty and autonomy)" engage in state and state-sanctioned violence (p. 4). There is a need for nuance, nonetheless, when addressing the schema of the 'nation-state' as a whole. For instance, some decolonial critiques emphasize the nation as a problem, with some even arguing for the de-nationalization of the state (Spivak, 2014), while others emphasize that nationalism is not necessarily tied to the state and can operate in more relational and ethical forms than when it is paired with the modern state form (Byrd, 2011; Moten, 2003; Simpson, 2011, 2013).

Global Capital

In decolonial critique, global capitalism is understood as a foundational and fundamental element of modernity, and racial/colonial violence is viewed as foundational and fundamental to global capitalism. Even as some have sought to harmonize contemporary capitalism with meritocratic promises of a prosperous and diverse middle class, capital accumulation requires unequal outcomes, being premised on the accumulation of value through the exploitation and expropriation of labor, lands, and resources from some in order to enrich others. Capital was both a global and racial/colonial formation from the outset, and it has perpetually sought to eradicate other modes of organizing social relations (unless those relations can serve to subsidize capitalism through unwaged labor) (Silva, 2014). Roy (2006) identifies the "interlocking of capitalism and imperial strategy, such that empire is not an originary phase of capitalism but in

fact is an omnipresence" (p. 14). Today, neoliberal capitalism has disproportionately negative effects on Indigenous and racialized populations (Chakravartty & Silva, 2012; Goldstein, 2014).

Capitalism requires continuous growth and has thus far been structured on the unlimited consumption of natural resources and externalization of ecological harm in ways that significantly contribute to global climate change (Coulthard, 2014; Klein, 2015). Apart from environmental limits, others have suggested that capitalism today is also approaching an unprecedented crisis of accumulation from which it may not recover (Harvey, 2014; Moore, 2015; Streeck, 2014). However, for now it remains essentially impossible to simply "opt out" of participation in capitalism, given that capitalism has done such a thorough job of eradicating or destabilizing other modes of production, and given the (uneven) effects of its now-global hegemony. As Cheah (2006) notes, "exploitative development in contemporary globalization operates not by racist techniques of exclusion and marginalization, but precisely by including, integrating, and assimilating every being into the circuit of the international division of labor" (para. 11). Capitalism's subsequent abandonment of certain populations also often has its own devastating effects. Thus, often the only way to escape or avoid material poverty is to follow what is expected of a proper, utility-maximizing economic subject of the 'free' market, even as this subject position is unavailable to most (Silva, 2007), and even as many seek viable means through which to refuse its ethical terms and conditions (Ahenakew et al., 2014).

Thinking the Three Pillars Together

Given the entanglement of modern colleges and universities with each of these three pillars of colonial modernity, I suggest that higher education *as we know it* would not be possible without the violence that they instantiate and reproduce. This means that not only are colleges and universities conditioned by colonial logics and material architectures, but that the study of

44

higher education is too, including the study of internationalization. The ethical-political implications of these entanglements are considerable, and oblige us as scholars and practitioners to consider the full extent of higher education's complicity in all of its local and global dimensions, and to conceptualize how we might act in recognition of that complicity, informed by our own subject positions and relative social power. However, because our institutions, imaginaries, desires, perceived entitlements, and frames of intelligibility tend to be organized by the very same colonial relations of global modernity that need to be denaturalized, it can be difficult to trace the dynamics that normalize these relations. This dissertation is in part an effort to sketch the ethical and political limits of internationalization scholarship in consideration of these pillars.

Tensions, Complexities, and Paradoxes of Decolonial Critique

As with any critical interventions, decolonial efforts have many complexities and potential limitations that accompany their gifts. I review and contextualize some of these below.

Disrupting or Reproducing Dualisms

Perhaps one of the most significant limitations of a decolonial approach is that it at times relies on a monolithic, homogenous, and even ahistorical depiction of "the West" (or "Europe" or the "Global North" or "white civil society"). There may also be concern about the oversimplification and reproduction of binarisms between West and Other/non-West. Colonial divisions of the planet into bounded categories or geographies are neither natural nor timeless but rather are continuously (re)produced through highly uneven global power relations. Over time, these planetary divisions have been given many names with slightly different and contested meanings, including: developed/developing countries, First/(Second/)Third World,

majority/minority worlds, and now commonly the Global North/South, the latter of which I use often throughout this dissertation (McGregor & Hill, 2009; Mohanty, 2003).

Yet, as Mohanty (2003) notes in the case of the terms Global North and South, though they "are meant to loosely distinguish the northern and southern hemispheres, affluent and marginal nations and communities obviously do not line up neatly within this geographical frame" (p. 505). To uncritically employ such categorizations is therefore a fraught exercise that papers over innumerable heterogeneities on each side of any categorical divide. Any analysis that employs these terms must therefore attend to their internal complexity and to shifting configurations of local and global power, including in the context of higher education. Thus, I emphasize heterogeneity within any particular context so as to ensure analytic precision, and avoid reductionist critique or simplistic solutions to confoundingly knotted problems.

There is also potential for decolonial approaches to reproduce a kind of romanticism about those populations most subjugated by colonial modernity, which can enact the mirror opposite of efforts to demonize them, through the unjust expectations that they will (and should) 'save' the entirety of humanity. Apart from projecting an undue burden onto already marginalized populations, this approach erases internal conflicts or oppressions (Cheah, 2006), and denies the complexity that characterizes all people. According to Gordon (1997),

> complex personhood means that people suffer graciously and selfishly too, get
> stuck in the symptoms of their troubles, and also transform themselves. Complex
> personhood means that even those called "Other" are never never that. Complex
> personhood means that the stories people tell about themselves, about their
> troubles, about their social worlds, and about their society's problems are

entangled and weave between what is immediately available as a story and what

their imaginations are reaching toward. (pp. 4-5)

Attending to this complexity is crucial, particularly in response to representations of subjugated populations that are frequently one-dimensional and premised on racist stereotypes. However, respecting the richness and nuance of individuals' lived experience need not come at the expense of critically examining the larger structures and technologies of subjectification and subjugation that are lived and navigated by those individuals and their communities.

Thus, despite the risks and limitations of deploying binaristic colonial terms, in this dissertation I tend to follow Said (1978) in his suggestion that:

No one can escape dealing with, if not the East/West divide, then the North/South

one, the have/have-not one, the imperialist/anti-imperialist one, the white/colored

one. We cannot get around them by pretending they do not exist; on the contrary,

contemporary Orientalism teaches us a great deal about the intellectual dishonesty

of dissembling on that score, the result of which is to intensify the divisions and

make them both vicious and permanent. (p. 327)

These divisions do reference enduring uneven power relations that need to be named *and* subsequently denaturalized, lest they continue to be understood as inevitable.

The Doubleness of Critique

Given that colonization and racialization are themselves understood to be the externalized costs of the promises offered by colonial modernity, decolonial critiques are often critical of theories of change that are limited to increased access to/inclusion in those promises. Anticolonial and antiracist demands and other shifts have resulted in transformations that have expanded access to colonial modernity's 'gifts', even though those demands often far exceeded

the concessions that were subsequently enacted within the liberal multicultural frame of justice (Melamed, 2006). On the one hand, the project of full inclusion is hardly complete, as the distribution of resources and power remains highly racialized. Further, inclusion of Indigenous and racialized peoples into mainstream institutions remains conditionally premised on the 'benevolence' of those doing the including and the willingness of those who are being included to adhere to existing institutional norms (Ahmed, 2012). At the same time, there is a notion that, apart from remaining unfulfilled, the promise of inclusion itself reproduces colonial hegemony, as it does not substantively transform or expand the available possibilities for organizing social, political, and economic life. This creates a double bind for resistance to subjugation, as Byrd (2011) suggests:

> As civil rights, queer rights, and other rights struggles have often cathected liberal
> democracy as the best possible avenue to redress the historical violences of and
> exclusions from the state, scholars and activists committed to social justice have
> been left with impossible choices: to articulate freedom at the expense of another,
> to seek power and recognition in the hopes that we might avoid the syllogisms of
> democracy created through colonialism (p. 58)

Given that the promises of modernity are understood to be dependent on colonial violence, there is a tension in decolonial critique as many seek to ultimately dismantle existing systems, but in the meantime negotiate the possibility of strategic, harm reducing gains from within them.

Idealism (in Two Senses)

It is possible to argue that at least some strains of decolonial critique are idealist, in the sense of being inadequately concerned with material realities. There is an element of what Cheah (2006) describes as "logocentrism of power", prompting him to ask: "Is the link between

modernity and coloniality primarily epistemic in character?" (para. 7). This concern echoes debates in postcolonial studies and other fields, and there is no singular answer, but many scholars have indeed emphasized the interdependency between ideological and material, or discursive and material, or epistemological and ontological, dimensions of colonial modernity.

Others might critique the idealism of decolonial critique with a different meaning of the word – that is, the notion that the horizon of decolonial justice is 'unrealistic.' There are a number of possible responses to this critique. The first is that, broadly, decolonial critiques rarely dismiss the importance of immediate transformations that offer an important amelioration of violent conditions and patterns of harm. Rather, they tend to suggest that these efforts are important but insufficient for transforming the structuring conditions of colonial modernity, and further caution that some 'short-term' efforts might reproduce the very violence they seek to repeal, and/or unwittingly generate new forms of violence. The second response is that many decolonial approaches paradoxically see possibility in what appears to be an *im*possibile within dominant frames of intelligibility, though there is a radical indeterminability about what lies at and beyond the edge of known possibilities. Finally, in light of global climate change, one might also pose the question: to what extent is it "realistic" (ethical or sustainable) to continue the unfettered resource extraction and commodification of both human and other than human life?

Ignorance or Disavowal?

There are limits to decolonial approaches that identify "revealing the truth" or "speaking truth to power" about hidden power relations as the primary means for interrupting colonial architectures' productive force. As Mitchell (2015) suggests, critical scholars often "narrativize the power of knowledge through individual and collective transformation, onto scenes in which the intellectual knowingly moves away from complicity in order to adopt, knowingly, once

again, a position of oppositionality to dominant modalities of power" (p. 91). This analytical move enacts a disavowal of scholars' own roles in structural harm, the power relations that we inhabit and often reproduce, and the continued investment in the idea of a "pure" outside of complicity, whether rooted in an imagined better past or progressively improved future.

These approaches also address violence as a problem of ignorance that can be resolved with the dissemination of more and better information. However, others emphasize that the role of racial and colonial violence in maintaining the existing structure of the world is actually an open secret. That is, many people are at least tacitly well aware of these things, but they must disavow them in order to continue believing in the promises of modernity, including their own benevolence and entitlement to those promises. Fletcher (2012) calls this "imperialist amnesia," which he describes as "the fetishistic disavowal of the legacy of European colonisation within contemporary postcolonial societies" (p. 423). Others have described this as "colonial unknowing" (King, 2016; Vimalassery, Pegues, & Goldstein, 2016). A disavowal is not an absence or a simple lack of information, but rather a productive foreclosure in which the individuals and institutions engaged in the disavowal tend to be firmly invested, because it benefits them in some way (whether psychically, affectively, materially, or even libidinally).

According to Bruyneel (2013a), "With disavowal, knowledge is present, but acknowledgement is absent" (p. 315). Through disavowal, elements of racial or colonial violence may be recognized, but only if safely placed in the past as something that has been overcome, or projected onto a few 'bad apples' who fail to align with the norms of liberal tolerance. If disavowal is indeed a primary means by which modern/colonial logics are reproduced, then this disavowal may need to be either bypassed or disrupted in order to shift conversations. However, even at that point there is no guarantee of transformation, only the opening of a possibility.

Grafting

Given the emphasis in many decolonial critiques on the need to affirm possibilities for existence outside of what appears possible within the architecture of colonial modernity, there are a number of potential risks to consider. One is the risk of tokenizing, or commodifying non-Western peoples and their knowledges in the process. Alcoff (2007) cautions that broadening interest in non-Western knowledge may recreate the initial colonization if these knowledges are accessed through, and incorporated into, Western epistemological norms. When subjugated knowledge is deracinated from ways of knowing and being, non-Western ways of knowing may be "grafted" onto Western ways of being (Ahenakew, 2016). In the process, the gifts of other knowledges and possibilities for relating and existing otherwise are lost and disrespected (Kuokkanen, 2008), problematically romanticized or essentialized (Cheah, 2006; Paris & Alim, 2014), or cynically instrumentalized for profit or for political or other personal gain (Castro-Gómez, 2007; Nandy, 2000), including as a means for "postmodern white introspection" (Broeck & Junker, 2014, p. 10) that ultimately recentres and reaffirms whiteness.

Escobar (2007) asks: "can the subaltern woman speak through MC [modernity/coloniality] theorizing? If not, what is the cost of this silence? What sort of translations and mediations are at stake?" (pp. 195-196). This line of questioning points to the risk of dematerializing the visceral experiences of colonial violence into abstract theories, but also of decontextualizing embodied non-Western knowledges in the process of translation (Watts, 2013). Spivak's (1988) foundational postcolonial question of whether the subaltern "can speak" also remains relevant: of course the subaltern subject *can* speak. The question is whether they can be *heard* within the frames of modern Western knowledge, and specifically, whether people are willing to bear the cost of what they would have to give up in order to truly listen.

Conclusion

Walcott (2014b) summarizes many of the concerns of decolonial scholarship in his assertion that, "those diverse but interconnected colonial trajectories continue to frame our relationships to the 'happy story' of an egalitarian, democratic West and its unfolding possibilities of assumed rights and identities must continually be called into question" (p. 96). With its existing critical arsenal, higher education as a field of study and practice largely lacks the conceptual tools that would equip it to adequately address the possibility that the seamless progress promised by Western liberal democracy may be neither feasible nor desirable. By bringing decolonial critique to the study of internationalization, I seek to generate new conversations and collective examinations that expand the questions deemed to be worth asking.

However, for decolonial critique to expand our thinking about the "deep structures" of higher education in Barnett's (2014) sense, it need not be understood as a replacement for the important work already being done (both "critical" and not), but rather as supplemental to it (Spivak, 2004). Much existing critical work about internationalization has been both vital to enhancing our understanding of the present, and strategically useful. Decolonial critiques are not *the* solution to addressing contemporary problems, nor do they provide one prescription for a singular, predetermined alternative vision of justice. The use of decolonial critique does not necessarily require a pledge of allegiance to any particular theory of change or of power, nor does it foreclose the use of other conceptual approaches alongside it. Thus, I take not an *either/or* approach, but rather a *both/and more* approach that seeks to reckon with the possibilities and limitations of, and the productive synergies, tensions, and incommensurabilities between, all efforts to wrestle with the challenges of internationalization and possibilities for different futures.

Conceptualizing internationalization from the U.S. and Canadian contexts requires drawing on multiple genealogies of decolonial critique, which prompts questions that might otherwise be unthinkable were I only to think from one of these traditions, such as: What would ethical internationalization look like in settler colonial countries that were founded through conquest (King, 2016), where the forced removals and continued colonization of Indigenous peoples serve as the conditions of possibility for others' arrival, and indeed have served in many ways as the template for subsequent imperial endeavours (Byrd, 2011; Moreton-Robinson, 2015)? What would theories and practices of internationalization look like that took into account how the enduring afterlife of the kidnapping, forced migration, and enslavement of Black peoples continues to shape racialized and gendered regimes of personhood (Hartman, 2008a), and socializes both citizens and im/migrants into the logics of anti-Black racism (Nopper, 2011; Sexton, 2010b)? And how is contemporary internationalization in these countries linked to their longer histories and ongoing legacies of white supremacist and capitalist-oriented domestic immigration policies, and military, political, and economic imperial interventions abroad (Boggs, 2013; Coloma, 2013b; Thobani, 2007)? To ask these questions, one cannot rely on simple or linear spatial and temporal binaries of "here and there" or "then and now" (Alexander, 2005). Instead, it requires attending to the overlapping, non-linear, and entangled patterns of "local settler colonialism" and "global settler imperialism" (Bazinet, 2016). In Chapter 6, in particular, I address some of the ethical and political complications that arise where different racial and colonial histories converge in a single context.

In the following chapter I begin to elaborate the contemporary context of internationalization, and the ethical and political questions and challenges to which it gives rise.

In doing so, I raise some of the questions and tensions that I will address throughout the remainder of the dissertation from the decolonial analytical orientation I have established.

Chapter 3: Review of the Contemporary Context of Internationalization

Although a growing number of scholars have raised ethical questions about the study and practice of internationalization (e.g., Adnett, 2010; Naidoo, 2010; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Suspitsyna, 2015), there remains a widespread consensus about its positive benefits and a reluctance to engage with the more difficult and unsettling paradoxes and challenges that arise in its enactment (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Teichler, 2010). The intention of this dissertation is to both trouble uncritically positive characterizations of internationalization, and at the same time, to attend to the foreclosures and hierarchies of humanity and knowledge that may be reproduced even within critical perspectives. In this chapter, I establish the context and further develop the rationale for the dissertation and review the existing internationalization literature so as to begin to identify gaps, absences, assumptions, and value judgments that I will explore and problematize in more depth throughout the remainder of the dissertation.

I begin the chapter by providing some broad historical and contextual background about the internationalization of higher education. I then briefly frame the current landscape, including the intersections of internationalization with globalization and neoliberalization, before providing a review of some of the critical literature about internationalization. Following this review, I explore how the normative assumptions that undergird these critiques, particularly their approaches to justice, give rise to a set of uneasy tensions and paradoxes that complicate simplistic or heroic solutions to the dilemmas and problems raised in the current conjuncture.

A Brief History of Internationalization

According to de Wit (2002), in order to understand the internationalization of higher education today, it is important to consider its roots in earlier iterations of the university.[11] Against the popular claim that universities have "always" been global (Altbach, 2004; Bolsmann & Miller, 2008; Kerr, 1991), Scott (2000) argues, "The contemporary University is the creature of the nation-state – not of medieval civilization" (p. 5). As well, de Wit (2002) points out that even the medieval universities that existed prior to nation-states primarily engaged within the area now known as Europe. According to de Wit, from the end of the Western European Renaissance to the beginning of twentieth century, an era during which higher education was characterized by an emphasis on its national purpose, the primary international elements were individual mobility, research exchange, and the export of European academic systems elsewhere.

Instead of being a neutral export of prefabricated European knowledge and culture to colonies, however, the growth and replication of modern Western universities were facilitated both economically *and* epistemologically through European conquest and enslavement (Hong, 2008; Mignolo, 2003). Dolby and Rahman (2008) describe colonialism as "a significant historical factor in the internationalization of higher education, as the European university model was imposed on colonial subjects in Asia, South America, and Africa beginning in the 18th century and extending through the present" (p. 684). In these places, Indigenous knowledges and systems of education were characterized as inferior, and forcibly suppressed and supplanted by European ones. European empires also brought non-European students from their colonies to study in the metropole with the idea that this would benefit imperial interests (Walker 2014).

---

[11] However, the term "internationalization" itself only came into popular use during the 1990s, with "international education" having been the previously preferred term (de Wit, 2014).

Colleges were established early in the settlement of the United States and Canada, primarily to educate clergymen and later, colonial elites (Scott 2000; Wilder 2013). Some of these colleges (including Harvard, William & Mary, and Dartmouth) also established programs to convert and 'civilize' Indigenous youth. Later, the U.S. also established universities in its extracontinental imperial acquisitions, such as Puerto Rico, Hawai'i, and the Philippines (Bascara, 2014).

The colonial roots of contemporary internationalization can be illustrated by briefly tracing the example of U.S. land grant institutions. Land grants were proposed by Senator Justin Morrill in the mid-19th century, inspired largely out of his and others' concerns about low national productivity and its effect on the nation's competitiveness (Cross, 2012; Williams, 1991). Rarely remembered, however, is the fact that the lands that were sold as scrip to fund the 1862 Morrill Act were all acquired (much of them quite recently) by the U.S. government through the displacement of Indigenous peoples. One hundred and fifty years later, the threat of global competition is again deployed, this time to argue for the internationalization of land grants, or their transition into "global" or "world grant" institutions. For instance, Michigan State University President Lou Anna Kimsey Simon (2009) suggests, "There is national urgency in creating a more educated population…The World Grant institution pursues a vision to work in innovative ways, both in creating jobs for economic development and in increasing the educational attainment of its citizens" (pp. 6-7). For Simon, there is no apparent contradiction in evoking a "World Grant" moniker to argue for U.S. national advantage because she conceptualizes *the world* as a flat, open terrain through/in which the U.S. citizen is entitled to educate, advance, enrich herself, thereby reiterating the same ideologies of colonial expansionism, exceptionalism, and self-actualization that initially made the land grants possible. In this sense, U.S. higher education has always unfolded within a global horizon premised on an

imperial imaginary of inevitable expansion and dominance, and motivated by the imperative to successively open up new spaces and populations for the ends of capital accumulation.

Notwithstanding these colonial origins, today's iteration of internationalization is often discussed in contrast with the more recent post-World War II era of international education (Scott, 2000). According to Vestal (1994), an international dimension was amplified in U.S. higher education institutions at that time largely through the external influence of both private foundations and the federal government, that is, not primarily as a result of universities' own interest and initiative. The international dimensions of U.S. higher education were strongly affected by World War II itself as well as the post-War transition to the U.S.'s position of unparalleled geopolitical influence and economic power (de Wit, 2002; Goodwin & Nacht, 1991). Geopolitical concerns were heightened in the context of the Cold War struggle for global hegemony between the U.S. (and its allies) and the U.S.S.R. (and its allies) (Cumings, 1993), including the contest for influence in non-aligned countries (Kapoor, 2014). According to de Wit (2002), "North-South relations dominated internationalization strategies in higher education in the period from 1950-1985" (p. 12).

In this context, U.S. federal interests rather than institutional strategies often drove internationalization efforts. For instance, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) was passed in response to the Soviet launch of Sputnik, justified with the claim that "the security of the nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women" (as cited by Trilokekar, 2015, p. 3). Not only did the NDEA fund the sciences as well as area studies centers for the study of language and culture in 'strategic' global regions, but federal agencies such as the Pentagon and CIA also funded social science research in fields such as sociology and geography (Kamola, 2014; Kay, 2009).

In Canada, post-War international education policy was one element of an approach to global relations known as "humane internationalism," which according to Pratt was premised on "an acceptance that the citizens and governments of the industrialized world have ethical responsibilities towards those beyond their borders who are suffering severely and who live in abject poverty" (as cited by Trilokekar, 2015, p. 4). As the Canadian narrative of humane internationalism suggests, in both the United States and Canada many post-War international education efforts took place under the benevolent and benign heading of international development assistance. This involved sending faculty to institutions in the Global South to provide "technical assistance" (Gonzalez, 1982; Goodwin & Nacht, 1991), as well as hosting international students from the Global South (Johnstone & Lee, 2014; Knight, 2014; Kramer, 2009; O'Mara, 2012; Trilokekar, 2010). While the latter practice began earlier in the 20th century, it intensified significantly after World War II (O'Mara, 2012; Trilokekar, 2015). This rather unidirectional flow of students in some cases reproduced colonial-era mobility patterns (Walker, 2014),[12] although some students from the Global South preferred to travel to the United States or Canada rather than to their former colonizers (Kramer, 2009). International students during this time often came from elite families, "in pursuit of technical, policy, and institutional frameworks suited to the building of modern, robust nation-states" (Kramer, 2009, p. 792).

For their part, Western nations positioned themselves as generously imparting international students with what they believed to be universal knowledge and technical expertise, so that the students might lead their home countries on the linear path of human development toward economic and political modernization. Apart from perpetuating a Eurocentric politics of

---

[12] A notable, large-scale exception is the Fulbright Program, which sent over 70,000 Americans abroad from 1946 to 1996, which was nonetheless still fewer than the nearly 130,000 non-Americans who came to the US through the Fulbright Program during this time (Groennings, 1997).

knowledge and a single story of development, this framing disavowed the West's ongoing responsibility for colonialism, and failed to account for how international students from Global South countries were also understood as a means to foster international trade relations, to spread liberal capitalism (if not governance) to their countries, and to expand Western geopolitical power and market reach (Bu, 2003; McCartney, 2016; Sidhu, 2006). However, the students did not always align with their host nations' intentions, and some became disillusioned with the contrast between their expectations and their actual experience abroad (Kramer, 2009).

On the whole, the role of higher education institutions in the Global North in the development of higher education in the Global South during the Cold War has been the object of praise (Levy, 2005), critique (Gonzalez, 1982; Rhee, 2009; Sidhu, 2006), and calls for deepened examination (Naidoo, 2010). Some argue that these developmentalist patterns of educational 'exchange' continue today, both in terms of nation-to-nation relations as well as with regard to the involvement of supranational organizations like the World Bank, OECD, and the UN in education policy and practice (Lee, Maldonado-Maldonado, & Rhoades, 2006; Naidoo, 2010; Nandy, 2000; Rhee, 2009; Shahjahan, 2013; Tikly, 2004). Most, however, direct their critique toward what is characterized as a post-Cold War move from "aid to trade" in international educational exchange (Cudmore, 2005; Knight, 2014; Marginson, 2006; Trilokekar, 2010). While foreign relations and national security concerns remain important strategic drivers of internationalization, emphasis on global economic competition has indeed come to the fore (Kerr, 1991; de Wit, 2002; Ruther, 2002; Trilokekar, 2015). At the same time, geopolitical and economic aims are hardly mutually exclusive considerations (de Wit, 2002; Groennings, 1997).

Internationalization in the Current Conjuncture

By the end of the Cold War, internationalization started to become more of a strategic institutional process (de Wit, 2002), but internationalization trends cannot be adequately understood as the outcome of institutional strategy alone; the desire to host international students and scholars and initiate partnerships must be matched by desire on the part of potential students, scholars, and partnering organizations or institutions to participate. Indeed, this interest is strong and appears to be growing. For instance, in 2013 over 4.5 million students studied tertiary education outside of their country of citizenship, with the majority traveling from the Global South to study in the Global North (OECD, 2015). This flow of students, which is expected continue growing, can be situated within larger transnational mobility trends often associated with globalization. The present era of internationalization is in fact frequently associated with changes attributed to globalization. Specifically, although it is not uncommon to hear the two terms used interchangeably (Scott, 2000), the internationalization of higher education is often framed as a response or reaction to post-Cold War processes of globalization (Kalvemark *&* Wende, 1997). For instance, Altbach (2004) describes globalization as the "broad economic, technological, and scientific trends that directly affect higher education and are largely inevitable" (p. 5), while he suggests, "[i]nternationalisation includes specific policies and programmes undertaken by governments, academic systems and institutions, and even individual departments or institutions to cope with or exploit globalization" (p. 6).

However, others have questioned this framing of globalization as inevitable and internationalization as merely a reaction to this inevitability (Cantwell & Maldonado-Maldonado, 2009; Matus & Talburt, 2009; Rizvi, 2009a; Sidhu, 2006). Gaffikin and Perry (2009) warn that when globalization is understood as a neutral descriptor of a self-evident

phenomenon, global capitalism may also be understood as both "inevitable and benign" (p. 118), while Blanco Ramírez (2014) argues, "Globalization has been used to euphemize, negate or justify geo-political relations that are imperialistic in nature" (p. 124). Further, globalization may be invoked as a means to justify unpopular policy or funding changes in higher education contexts (Dodds, 2008; Dudley, 1998). Rhoads and Rhoades (2005) found that graduate student union organizers "tied increased corporatization to globalization and its influence on the academy" (p. 258), while Dodds (2008) and Kamola (2014) suggest universities are not merely victims of globalization but actively reproduce its logics. However, Stier (2004) also notes that strategic instrumentalization of internationalization can also serve as "a powerful tool to grasp and debate [globalization's] effects – positive and negative" (p. 94).

Notwithstanding these critiques, the formulation that globalization is a politically neutral process while internationalization is in turn a natural and even noble response to globalization continues to be a dominant understanding in both the study and practice of internationalization (Kehm & Teichler, 2007). As Matus and Talburt (2009) argue, **"**Within this logic of globalization-as-cause and internationalization-as-effect, some argue that internationalization is necessary, productive, and beneficial for institutions, citizens, and nation" (p. 515). Brandenburg and de Wit (2011) similarly observe, "internationalization has become the white knight of higher education, the moral ground that needs to be defended, and the epitome of justice and equity" (p. 16), while Teichler (2010) finds a "strong positive undercurrent" about internationalization in Europe, where "[i]t is expected to serve peace and mutual understanding, quality enhancement, a richer cultural life and personality development, academic quality, technological innovation, economic growth, and societal well-being" (pp. 265-266).

In alignment with these positive sentiments and high expectations, much internationalization scholarship sets out to answer practical questions about *how* to internationalize (more and better) rather than to ask probing questions about *what* is driving internationalization in the first place, *why* this is the case, *who* benefits/*who* pays the costs, etc (Rhee, 2009; Stier, 2004). This orientation also reflects the fact that the study of higher education internationalization developed initially as an applied field of study, and so the primary audience for the research was practitioners (Dolby & Rahman, 2008). The continued impact of these applied origins, according to Dolby and Rahman, is that a significant subset of the internationalization literature takes an "uncritical stance toward both its own internal practices and the structures in which it operates" (p. 688). However, more critical perspectives have begun to arise and articulate concerns about the potential for internationalization efforts to reproduce colonial patterns of dominance, exploitation, and harm. Notably, the response of many critics to an unqualified celebration of the relationship between internationalization and globalization has been to problematize the relationship between internationalization and neoliberalization.

Bolsmann and Miller (2008) argue neoliberal logics position "higher education as both an investment in human capital which will enhance competitiveness and rewards to the individual, corporations and the national economy" (p. 78). Higher education's economic role is emphasized, according to Dodds (2008), in "the direct production of technology, often in combination with business; and the training of workers for the new global economy" (p. 512). Despite significant and often under-examined regional differences in the localized effects of neoliberal transformation in higher education (Ortiga, 2017), in the West there are many shared elements, including an increased tendency to frame higher education as an individual commodity, rather than as a public good (Johnstone & Lee, 2014) or a social right (Robertson,

Bonal & Dale, 2002), as it was supposed to have been in the post-War era. According to Nokkala (2006), "national and international level developments around higher education all share significant similarities, namely the emphasis on increasing the competitiveness of national and regional economies and the increasing convergence of national higher education policies around the new public management measure in governance of higher education" (p. 175).

Thus, at the same time that higher education is increasingly framed as an important means of national competition (George-Jackson, 2008), nation-states are also investing fewer public monies in higher education, instead calling upon citizens to invest in their own human capital (Robertson, Bonal, & Dale, 2002). This has also prompted some to voice concerns that internationalization efforts, in particular international student recruitment, is being treated by institutions and nation-states as a means to generate revenues as public funding declines (Adnett, 2010; Enslin & Hedge, 2008; Haigh, 2008; Johnstone & Lee, 2014; Turner & Robson, 2007). Whether understood as the result of globalization, neoliberalization, or both, in the current conjuncture internationalization generates a number of complex, contested, and contradictory problems and dilemmas. In the section that follows, I review some of these key issues.

Key Issues in Critical Internationalization Studies

The following review of critical internationalization studies research has been grouped into three areas of focus: internationalizing knowledge; international students; and global competition, cooperation, and convergence. While this is in no way a comprehensive review of all critical studies of internationalization, it captures many of the primary topical concerns that will be addressed throughout the remainder of this dissertation.

Internationalizing Knowledge

A decade after Kelly (2000) argued that, in Western institutions, "many current approaches to internationalization of the curriculum in higher education are ad hoc, tokenistic, and inadequate" (p. 163), Svensson and Wihlborg (2010) and Clifford (2009) both noted a continued dearth of curricular considerations. More recently, Sawir (2013) found that internationalization of the curriculum has been emphasized as important for international and domestic students alike, as a means to prepare "students to be global citizens who can operate in a globalized world" (p. 361). However, efforts to integrate international or global issues and contexts into the curriculum do not necessarily translate to a diversification of epistemic perspectives. 'Internationalizing' one's approach to issue or discipline can simply mean the application of purportedly universal Western theories or philosophies to global contexts (Stone-Mediatore, 2011). These efforts, rather than disrupt existing academic hierarchies, may actually reproduce the same Euro-supremacist politics of knowledge (Stier, 2010).

As well, internationalizing the curriculum might mean incorporating non-Western knowledges into existing frameworks of Western knowledge and disciplines. The process of translating marginalized knowledges into mainstream contexts raises a number of challenges and ethical questions (Andreotti, Ahenakew, & Cooper, 2011). Incorporating select elements of epistemological difference into existing structures can facilitate institutional 'management' and even commodification of difference, without conceding structural changes or including more disruptive elements (Nandy, 2000). Difference that cannot be subsumed or translated into sameness by Western knowledge frameworks may therefore be excluded (Kuokkanen, 2008; Spivak, 1990), and non-Western knowledge is often measured according to Western standards.

These deficit-based approaches to non-Western knowledge may be projected onto international students as well (Doherty & Singh, 2005). Hence, Haigh (2008) suggested higher education curricula should "not rely on local prior knowledge or prejudice the ways of knowing of particular groups, but provide an inclusive learning environment that grants all equal opportunities to comprehend their personal responsibilities as planetary citizens" (p. 433). Madge et al. (2015) also problematize the common tendency to frame international students "as a metaphor of absence (lacking the knowledge, failing in the classroom, emblematic of the problem of immigration, depicted as marginal victims) against which the 'development' and intellectual advances of western education and knowledge can be pictured" (p. 4). They argue international students should instead be recognized as important generators of knowledge in their own right at their host institutions (see also: Doherty & Singh, 2005; Sawir, 2013).

In addition to curriculum and international students, the internationalization of knowledge also affects research. Many have critically examined the effects (potential or actual) of global knowledge economy discourse on the production and politics of knowledge (Altbach, 2004; Dodds, 2008; Metcalfe & Fenwick, 2009; Nokkala, 2006). Briefly, the knowledge economy framework positions higher education as vital to national economic growth and global competitiveness through preparation of graduates and production of profitable research and invention. In this context, certain fields, such as science, technology, engineering, and medicine (STEM) are prioritized over humanities or social sciences (Boden & Epstein, 2006). Apart from divides in prestige within Western disciplines, Western knowledge traditions are largely valued above other knowledge traditions. Because of this, despite the potential for internationalization to diversify what constitutes legitimate knowledge, the effect can be just the opposite and narrow it.

According to Stehr and Ufer (2009), "normative visions, promising business plans, decrees of global worlds of knowledge and first empirical observations are often exposed as Eurocentric prejudices that deny non-western actors the ability to govern themselves successfully, to create notable cultural artefacts or to produce enduring contributions to rational discourse" (p. 13). In this sense, "global" becomes yet another means to claim European universalism. The framing of knowledge within a more globalized context has been critiqued for its potential to threaten non-Western knowledges through the very process of their incorporation into the Western-dominated global research and development enterprise (Busingye & Keim, 2009). Thus, 'globalizing knowledge' may enact a continuation of the treatment of non-Westerners as objects of knowledge for the West, rather than as producers of knowledge and knowers themselves (Blanco Ramírez, 2014). The purportedly benevolent and neutral 'diffusion' and 'flow' of Western knowledge and expertise operates through many avenues. For instance, Shahjahan (2013) critiques how assessment tools are imported from the Global North to the South, often through supranational organizations like the OECD. These measurements are presented as universally applicable, but in fact measure norms that are calibrated to Euro-American knowledge and experience. Suspitsyna (2015) further points out that Western academics benefit from this arrangement, as it "positions them at key nodes of global networks and endows them with the power to shape the flows of expertise and technology" (p. 33).

Paik (2013) identifies another critical concern, which is that the current era of internationalization will reproduce problematic relationships between state power and knowledge. Many nation-states in the Global North have historically deputized academia to construct the Global South and its inhabitants as objects of imperial study in the service of political and economic strategy (Roy, 2006). This pattern has colonial roots (Marker, 2011; Said,

1978; Smith, 2012; Spivak, 1999; Willinsky, 1998), continued during the Cold War (Bu, 2003; Cummings, 1993; Dolby & Rahman, 2008; Goodwin & Nacht, 1991), and proceeds today (Bachmann, 2014; Campbell & Murrey, 2014; Kay, 2009; Sidhu, 2006). Most recently, government interest in internationalization for 'national security' interests intensified after 9/11 (American Council on Education, 2002; Chatterjee, & Maira, 2014; Kay, 2009; Paik, 2013; Peterson, 2011; Ruther, 2002; Stevens & Miller-Idriss, 2009; Wainwright, 2013). For instance, Campbell and Murrey (2014) note that the contemporary production of social science knowledge for U.S. national security departments, "and the use of such knowledge to refine and inform intelligence missions on the African continent" (p. 1461), is effectively a continuation of strategic research interests in the region since the Cold War era of decolonization.

International Students

Many have offered critical analyses of various aspects of the growing number of students enrolled in higher education institutions outside of their home country. In 2013, over 75% of international students were studying in OECD member countries (OECD, 2015). Over 50% of international students came from Asia, with China and India sending the first and second highest number of students, and the United States and United Kingdom receiving the first and second highest number, respectively. Shifts in international student recruitment rationales, from development based to income-generation based, began to occur toward the end of the Cold War (Cudmore, 2005). O'Mara (2012) describes this shift as one in which "leaders considered foreign students not merely future presidents but future CEOs as well" (p. 601). Today international student tuition and fees are unregulated in many Global North countries, and are often many times higher than domestic students' tuition and fees at public institutions (Bolsmann & Miller, 2008; Ziguras, 2016). Thus, growing the number of international students, and specifically

increasing their representation in the total student composition, may be understood as an appealing source of institutional revenue growth (Bolsmann & Miller, 2008; Lee, Maldonado-Maldonado, & Rhoades, 2006). However, given uneven global recognition, not all institutions can equally attract international students, or, as Cantwell (2015) put it, "while some universities appear to be able boost revenue by enrolling international students, international students may not be cash cows for all universities in the US" (p. 521). Furthermore, those institutions that do not already have a global reputation may actually lose money overall from their efforts to attract more international students.

The governments of many host countries also emphasize the importance of recruiting international students to their countries or regions, given that they bring non-tuition spending, tax revenues, and job creation (Altbach, 2004; Chellaraj, Maskus, & Mattoo, 2008; DFATD, 2014; Marginson, 2006; Owens, Srivastava, & Feerasta, 2011). For instance, in 2015, international students brought over $10 billion in revenues to Canada, and $35.8 billion to the United States (Global Affairs Canada, 2016b; Institute of International Education, 2016). In addition to direct income, international students may be understood to offer a more indirect economic benefit by contributing to innovation in their host institutions and nations as student researchers, postdoctoral scholars, and potentially, future im/migrants (Chellaraj, Maskus, & Mattoo, 2008). This is particularly relevant within a "knowledge economy" framework in which countries compete to either retain or attract highly skilled persons in what Gibb and Walker (2011) describe as a "global war for talent" (p. 389). This "war" may contribute to brain drain, the term for the migration of highly educated students from Global South to North, which extracts human capital (understood to be a national resource) from their home countries (Adnett, 2010; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Although Lee and Kim (2010) argue for the need to look beyond the static idea

of "brain drain," theorizing instead processes of "brain gain," "brain circulation," and "brain adaptation," Altbach and Knight (2007) nonetheless suggest that "developed" countries are the primary beneficiaries of current patterns in the global flow of students.

In response to these trends, Adnett (2010) expresses concern that the West is subsidizing its higher education with foreign students' tuition, while Enslin and Hedge (2008) argue "there is a serious ethical tension between, on the one hand, universities' declared commitment to social justice and, on the other hand, regarding those students as paying customers to whom we can sell our education as a traded high premium commodity" (p. 108). Others emphasize that international students themselves are also primary beneficiaries of acquiring a degree abroad, often pursuing class mobility (or retaining an already middle or upper class position) in ways that may reproduce or exacerbate inequality and elitism within their home nations (Dixon, 2006; Rhee & Sagaria 2004; Tannock, 2009, 2013; Waters, 2006). This concern is heightened by the fact that international tuition is often very costly, which may largely limit access to members of a global (aspiring) middle/upper class (Lee, Maldonado-Maldonado, & Rhoades, 2006). This may feed a cycle of perception in which it is assumed that all international students are wealthy and do not need economic support or scholarships, so little is provided, and then indeed it is only wealthier students who can afford to attend. In this vein, Luke (2010) cautions against the tendency to uncritically apply theories originally produced to understand the educational experiences of domestic minorities in the West to international students, arguing that the latter, "come from diverse but often middle and upper social class backgrounds, with varied educational histories, and equally diverse motivation, aspirations, and goal structures" (p. 52).

There is also a growing body of critical work that addresses the racism directed at international students (Lee & Opio, 2011; Lee & Rice, 2007; Rhee & Sagaria, 2004; Stein &

Andreotti, 2016; Suspitsyna, 2015). For instance, Brown and Jones's (2013) study of

international graduate students in the UK found that over a third of those surveyed had some

experience with racism, including swearing and being told to return to their home country.

Racism extends to international postdoctoral scholars as well, as Cantwell and Lee (2010) found

that compared to their peers, postdoctoral researchers from Asia "clearly experienced the greatest

sense of alienation and discrimination and the most pressure to perform" (p. 509).

Yet, at times critiques of racism and neoliberal logics converge, as when anti-racist

analyses are framed as part of an imperative for institutions to attract and retain international

students or scholars for economic income and institutional prestige they are perceived to bring

(Park, 2010). That is, the fact of racism toward international students is concerning to some at

least in part because it threatens to lessen steady enrolment streams. For instance, Brown and

Jones (2013) note, "it is important that there is a clear understanding of issues facing

[international students] if an optimum service is to be delivered, so that student retention is

improved and positive word-of-mouth helps to increase student recruitment" (p. 1004).

Marginson (2012), in contrast, uses a human rights framework to critique the "uncertain,

vulnerable and de-powered existence of mobile international students" (p. 498), arguing "their

Othering ha[s] both official and unofficial dimensions" (p. 505). He also suggests that

protections put into place for international students will ultimately benefit refugees as well,

because "Human rights, such as the right to vote and gender equality are first extended to middle

class populations and become progressively universalised to all" (p. 511).[13]

---

[13] The veracity this claim remains dubious, and requires further consideration. Notwithstanding guarantees of their universality, human rights were and continue to be systematically denied to racialized and Indigenous peoples, lower economic classes, and other marginalized populations – that is, those deemed to be less than fully human, and therefore perceived to have no viable or compelling claim to *human* rights (Dussel, 2013; Mignolo, 2006).

Global Competition, Cooperation, and Convergence

According to Marginson (2006), "Global higher education is produced and consumed within a world-wide university hierarchy in which inequality between research universities, and between nations – and the often uni-directional flows of people, capital and knowledge associated with those inequalities – are necessary to global competition" (p. 35). Further, this competition tends to be strongly biased in favour of institutions with international high prestige and a comparatively robust resource capacity, most of which are located in the Global North (Marginson & Sawir, 2005). For instance, Wende (2007) argues that global university rankings, such as those produced by Shanghai Jiao Tong University, emphasize and reward research productivity, STEM fields, and the English language (see also Stack, 2016). Certain countries and institutions, then, have a clear, accumulated advantage in the competitive global higher education landscape, which tends to reproduce existing patterns of stratification.

There are different perspectives about the most appropriate means to address this global stratification. For instance, Marginson (2006) suggests, "the development of higher education capacity in the emerging nations, especially research capacity, can modify global asymmetries and uni-directional transformations" (p. 35). Marginson's approach seeks to improve a country's relative position within the existing global system through "educational imports such as the 'brain return' of 'foreign trained nationals' and attracting 'diasporic investment'" (p. 37). This approach does not challenge the assumptions about the superiority of Western education as the basis for 'emerging nations'' higher education capacity development. Indeed, by posing capacity building facilitated by Western influence and education as a solution to inequality, it reproduces an educational developmentalism that, as Matus and Talburt (2009) describe it, privileges

"universities in industrialized nations as models for those in what are called nations 'in transition', developing nations, mid-sized economies, or small countries" (p. 517).

Apart from its application in the context of addressing unequal grounds for global competition, this developmentalist ethos can be found in many collaborative internationalization programs as well. Internationalization has entailed a growth of multinational academic programs. For example, students in joint-degree programs, also known as "twinning programs", are educated in and receive their degree from two institutions, usually one from the Global North and another from the South. Altbach (2004) suggests these partnerships are often highly unequal, as curricular models of the former tend to prevail. Blanco Ramírez (2014) offers a similar critique of cross-national quality assurance projects, arguing that even when collaborations claim to be "multidirectional," they are often driven by "the assumption that higher education systems in the Global South require assistance and guidance" (p. 129). Thus, he argues, "Higher education systems in the Global South face the choice of either accepting Global North quality ideas and standards or becoming isolated" (pp. 126-127). Ortiga (2017) identifies another phenomenon in which universities in the Philippines closely calibrate their curricula to align with the anticipated labor demands of wealthier countries like the United States and Canada.

In addition to the disciplining effects of both competition and collaboration, some have expressed concern about increased institutional standardization, isomorphism, or convergence (Matus & Talburt, 2009), particularly in alignment with pursuit of the "world-class university" model (Blanco Ramírez, 2014; Salmi, 2009). According to Ramírez and Meyer (2013), the idea of a world-class university "implies global recognition and global significance. So indicators like the presence of international students and faculty increase in importance, as do measures of international recognition – citations, international publications, rankings, and ratings" (p. 267). In

this context, Deem, Mok, and Lucas (2008) suggest the need to pose critical questions with regard to higher education in Asia, such as:

> [C]an the standards and practices commonly available in the West be coherently adapted to Asian traditions and cultures? Would the adoption of such western practices be distorted especially without properly contextual analysis? Most important of all, would there be only one 'international standard' as defined solely by or even dominated by, the Anglo-Saxon paradigm? Who should be involved in defining the 'international benchmarks'? (p. 94)

Also common are critiques of the global hegemony of the U.S. research university model in particular (Rhoads, 2011). Marginson (2008) catalogues "four aspects of US [sic] hegemony: research concentration and knowledge flows, the global role of English, and American universities as people attractors and as exemplars of ideal practice" (p. 308). This influence is not limited to the Global South, as Rhoades and Sporn (2002) argue that its effects can be witnessed in Europe as well. According to Marginson (2008), this hegemony manifests not necessarily in a top down manner, but is rather accumulated in global networks, while Altbach (2004) suggests a centre-periphery model in which (with some exceptions) the major, resource-rich English-speaking research universities of the Global North constitute the centre and universities in the Global South constitute the periphery.[14] Others note the outsized influence of supranational organizations like OECD and the World Bank in setting the higher education agendas of the

---

[14] At the same time, there is also a centre-periphery dynamic internal to countries within the Global North and South. As Altbach (2004) notes, "Even within countries at the centre of the world academic system in the early 21st century – the United States, Britain, Germany, France and, to some extent, Australia and Canada – there are many peripheral institutions" (p. 7).

Global South in alignment with the Global North's epistemological norms (Shahjahan, 2013),

and economic interests (Bolsmann & Miller, 2008; Collins & Rhoads, 2010).

Tensions of Global Justice

Having reviewed some of the existing concerns about internationalization, I now consider

the normative positions from which these critiques are articulated, particularly with regard to

their approaches to justice. Rizvi and Lingard (2010) argue that there is no universal definition of

justice, but while justice "does not refer to a single set of primary or basic goods, conceivable

across all moral and material domains….injustice does have a material reality that is readily

recognized by those who experience it" (p. 157). This injustice "points to something real and

tangible, and represents a moral blight on communities that do not attempt to do their best to

mitigate its worst effects" (p. 157). Meanwhile, according to Singh (2011), "The idea of social

justice has its roots in theological, political, philosophical, ethical and jurisprudential conceptions

about the nature of a fair and just society" (p. 483). The question of colleges' and universities'

role with regard to the pursuit and achievement of justice, in particular 'social justice' (and

closely related concepts and terms), has been addressed in a small but growing subset of higher

education scholarship (e.g. Brennan & Naidoo, 2008; Gale & Tranter, 2011; Jorgenson & Shultz,

2012; Malaney, 2006; Osei-Kofi, Shahjahan, & Patton, 2010; Schoorman, & Acker-Hocevar,

2010; Singh, 2011), especially in certain specialization areas, such as service-learning (Baillie

Smith & Laurie, 2011; Butin, 2007; Mather & Konkle, 2013).

Recently, Patel (2016) has suggested the need for more critical reflexivity about what

exactly is meant by the term 'social justice' in educational contexts, especially given its growing

popularity:

When a platform is so ubiquitous, the chances are strong that it may actually be holding untenable positions within its wholesale sweep. When so much of societal structures are facilitated by widely held narratives, such as meritocracy, the narrative itself should be routinely and lovingly scrutinized for what it might be facilitating, intended or not. (p. 89)

I concur with Patel that the term 'social justice' is often conjured without much specificity about its intended meaning, let alone the conflicts, complexities, and incommensurabilities that are involved in actual collective efforts to negotiate different justice projects. More bitingly, Yang (2008), writing about the U.S., problematizes the provincialism and notable absences in "current research on social justice," which "draws selectively, it erases selectively, and remembers selectively from a hybrid genealogy of efforts within and without the United States" (p. 456).

Beyond those that explicitly emphasize or employ the concept of justice, many higher education scholars write about various subjects – e.g. race, inequality, access, community engagement – on the basis of assumptions drawn from *implicit* theories of justice that have been inherited and reproduced without the benefit of the kind of 'loving scrutinization' Patel describes. These implicit assumptions often become clearer in moments of tension, and internationalization provides many such moments, in particular because it often complicates existing theories of justice that presume a bounded nation-state. The purpose of this section is to gesture to how these normative ideals of justice operate in these moments of tension, in order to see the aporias of each, that is, the constitutive contradictions that make them possible and at the same time signal their limits. By asking about the limits of different approaches to justice, I examine the desires, investments, and imaginaries that often reproduce those limits even in earnest efforts to breach them. Many of these tensions will be elaborated in subsequent chapters.

The Imperative to Globalize Justice

While De Lissovoy (2010) suggests that the "transition to the global represents a moment of opportunity, as familiar frames of reference, organizational structures, and orders of intelligibility weaken" (p. 279), he also notes that there is a need for caution about the ease with which many efforts to expand and decolonize Eurocentric frames of reference slip back into the very same imperial global imaginings they set out to critique. In order to interrupt this tendency, it will help to develop greater clarity around competing scales and norms of justice. As Toukan (2017) suggests, "The possibilities [and, I would argue, the necessities] of engaging in social justice as a global community…will require a broader range of principles, practices, and relationships than has yet been contemplated" ("Beyond Liberalism", para. 6).

According to Rizvi and Lingard (2010), "In the past few decades…policy thinking around the notion of social justice in most Western countries has revolved around three distinct philosophical traditions: liberal-humanism, market-individualism, and social democratic" (p. 157). They note that even as these traditions vary in content they are all three largely premised on the idea of a nation-state that would answer and adjudicate justice-based claims and enact transformations accordingly. I would further suggest that these all fall under the broad heading of liberal justice that was critically elaborated in Chapter 1. However, Rizvi and Lingard observe that these formulations of justice are "no longer sufficient to capture the complexities of global interconnectivity and interdependence on the one hand and of contemporary identity politics on the other" (pp. 159-160). Similarly, in their useful critique of methodological nationalism (MN) in higher education, Shahjahan and Kezar (2013) argue, "the social processes involving HEIs can no longer be reduced or confined to social forces exclusively within the nation-state (which is what MN focuses on), but increasingly derive from forces outside the national container" (p. 20).

Finally, according to Miyoshi (2005), "the world, the globe, the universe, and all living things must constitute the base of our studies and investigations, in fact, of consciousness itself. The university – and the world that contains it – could be a happier place, if it were reorganized around this idea of planetary commonality and totality" (p. 34).

The notion that a nation-state-centric framework is inadequate for organizing and conceptualizing higher education in the era of globalization is shared across multiple political perspectives about internationalization (Agnew, 2012; Marginson & Rhoades, 2002). However, expanding justice to a global scale does not necessarily result in different imaginaries. Indeed, many formulations of global justice continue to be predominantly shaped by liberalism (Mckeown & Nuti, 2016), and neoliberal approaches to internationalization are often shaped by both recognition of the economic implications of global interconnectedness, and a desire to shift financial responsibility for higher education from the nation-state to individuals, whether domestic or international. Furthermore, international education is often framed as necessary in order for Western nations to continue their global advantage (Beck, 2013; George-Jackson, 2008; Swanson & Pashby, 2016; Tannock, 2007). Even if Shahjahan and Kezar (2013) are right that the effect of assuming the national boundedness of higher education is to naturalize "unequal power relationships and reduced responsibility for human suffering tied to national boundaries" (p. 27), there is nonetheless no guarantee that relationships will be more equal nor that responsibility to others will be more readily affirmed when the scale is globalized. As Hartmann (2010) cautions, "we should be careful in our analysis of internationalisation not to substitute too hastily methodological globalism for methodological nationalism as a new normative orientation" (p. 170). Tensions between local (particularly, national) and global conceptions of justice in higher education can be found within many layers of internationalization.

Tension 1: Expanding Existing Imaginaries

Both a critique of nationalism as well as a sense that the power and influence of the nation-state is waning have led some to address educational justice claims for, about, and to what is conceived as a 'global community' (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). However, the West has always been produced in reference to 'global' Others, while at the same time it has claimed the universal worth of its own 'local.' For this reason, Jazeel (2011) cautions that even revised global imaginings "necessarily bear the burden of European thought and history – the (self-denying) centre – that will continue to measure, recognize and arbitrate on difference through the very categorizations it has conjured into existence" (p. 85). To project liberal Western imaginaries of educational justice abroad, as would indeed be in accordance with the universalizing premise of Western justice, would continue (rather interrupt) earlier arrangements of justice, and may further marginalize already marginalized non-Western imaginaries and knowledge systems.

Yet many internationalization efforts do indeed presume that the values and ideals of Western liberal political philosophy are universal (or at least, universally desirable) (Killick, 2012). According to Rhoads and Szelényi (2011), "a major organizing principle" of global citizenship is "the notion of greater or lesser degrees of ethical responsibility toward human rights and other individual and community rights" (p. 23). However, the Western notion of a singular set of human rights universalizes the idea of humans as secular, self-determining, and rational individuals who are subjects of a state or other polity that can grant and guarantee rights in the first instance (Fregoso, 2014). Relations and responsibilities can be conceived in many other ways than through a liberal rights framework, and even 'human rights' have been critiqued for being "based on an imperial idea of humanity" (Mignolo, 2006, p. 313) in their implicit naturalization of the Western subject of rights. In one example, Nussbaum's (2002) makes the

following argument in favour of expanding global citizenship education: "Citizens who cultivate their humanity need, further, an ability to see themselves as not simply citizens of some local region or group but also, and above all, as human beings bound to all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern" (p. 295). What Nussbaum suggests is that one's humanity is not a given, but something that must be cultivated in a particular way and according to particular ideals (which are nonetheless supposed to be universal as opposed to rooted in a less important local particular). In general, it is Western subjects who are positioned as exemplars of this type of cosmopolitanism, which disavows their actual particularity and the particularity of this vision of humanity. The result of this deracinated, universalizing vision, even if unintended, is that through it some can be deemed less human, or at least, lesser humans, than others, thereby potentially reproducing patterns of imperial dehumanization (for more on this, see Chapter 7).

In another example of the trap of liberal universalism in balancing the local and the global, Agnew (2012) argued that internationalization efforts are often impeded by "participants' false dichotomy of serving *either* the local *or* the global contexts" (p. 477). Yet, presuming that local and global interests will be commensurable or complementary can preclude examination of actually existing tensions and competing investments. As Stier (2010) suggests, contrary to the intention of those who envision internationalization as an opportunity to encourage students to "think and act 'globally'", in the service of global solidarity, "'acting globally' may instead fuel ethnocentrism, where international cooperation takes the shape of a one-way flow – an 'instrument to educate the uncivilized' – and much of the world is victimised and the competencies of people from these areas are devalued" (pp. 345-346). Similarly, the "democratic global civil space" to which Rivzi and Lingard (2010) advocate addressing educational justice concerns is vulnerable to being formulated according to already existing structures of uneven

political, economic, and epistemic power (Spivak, 2004), as is often the case with national civic spaces (Suspitsyna, 2012). Indeed, if we consider supranational organizations like the United Nations as representatives of global civil society, we can already see that they are hardly free from the uneven power relations that characterize national contexts. In short, the tensions and paradoxes of internationalization may arise not only from the trappings of the nation-state framework, but also how 'the global' itself is predominantly (re)imagined (Jazeel, 2011).

For those who already see guarantees of justice from nation-states as hollow, the universalizing global projection of liberal nation-state-centred ideas of justice is even more fraught. Toukan (2017) argues, "while liberalism has provided a compelling philosophical rationale to harness public and political will around the claims of equality and democracy in the West, it has not proved adequate to informing the emergence of the kinds of education needed for social change and justice on a global scale" ("Introduction," para. 3). However, within the context of the West itself there are many who contest the suggestion that liberalism has provided a sufficient imaginary of justice up to this point. This is an issue of significant concern for scholars and activists who note that the law-instituting and law-preserving violence of the state rationalizes the ongoing subjugation of Black, Indigenous, and other racialized populations (Harney & Moten, 2013; Silva, 2009; Tuck & Yang, 2016; Walia, 2013). If the "colonization of indigenous lands…cannot be ended by further inclusion or more participation" (Byrd, 2011, xxvi), and anti-Black racism is not a contingent conflict but rather built into state logics (Wilderson, 2010), then the nation-state can never grant true justice (Tuck & Yang, 2016). Yet general questions about the credibility of the state as an arbiter of justice are rarely considered within discussions of justice in higher education research. Somewhat ironically, it is precisely these critical voices who may see the most promise in the possibility of reframing justice through

a more global scope (eschewing nation-state authority), but who also might be the most disturbed by efforts that globalize nation-states' already-limited formations of justice.

Tension 2: The Issue of Access

Local and global justice tensions in higher education are well illustrated through the example of a concrete issue: access. While democratized access to higher education has increasingly become a ubiquitous value around the globe (in theory if not always in practice) (Goastellec, 2010), according to Lee, Maldonado-Maldonado, and Rhoades (2006), "considerably more research and new theoretical frameworks are needed to understand college access on the global scale" (p. 551). For instance, it is not yet clear how globalizing commitments to access will function in the nation-state contexts within which most colleges and universities still operate. When the pool of potential applicants exceeds nation-state boundaries, it gives rise to potential contradictions and ethical dilemmas. Enslin and Hedge (2008) posit, "If widening access to higher education is a necessary response within the nation state, it is an equally compelling goal internationally" (p. 116). However, the implications of this claim are ambiguous, particularly if, as Brown and Tannock (2009) argue, **"**there are no political or moral (social justice) frameworks at the global level that provide an alternative way of re-imagining equality in educational opportunity as a global project" (p. 386).

If indeed everyone should have the opportunity to access higher education, does that mean every institution is ethically obliged to open up that opportunity for every person in the world, and if so, what would that look like and how would it be best achieved? While these questions exaggerate the actual issues at hand, scholars have expressed concern that when institutions open access to their programs globally, they may undermine public-good oriented equity efforts at a more local or national level. According to Marginson (2006),

It is difficult to monitor equality/inequality of opportunity among the citizens of

national education systems when there are leakages to foreign providers abroad

and growing numbers of non-citizens at home. How can national equity be

established between students attempting to access scarce places in national

universities (e.g. in professional training in Medicine or Law) and other students

who 'queue jump' by accessing such programs offshore? What is the equitable

balance between foreign and local students in the same high demand courses and

institutions? (p. 29)

Brown and Tannock (2009) also note that when the pool of potential students is expanded from a

national to a global scale, it may weaken demands to provide opportunities for socially

marginalized domestic students, subsidize tuition, and support the interests of the local

communities in which institutions are situated. Lee, Maldonado-Maldonado, and Rhoades (2006)

predict that institutions will increasingly pursue "the most privileged international students" (p.

567) and concurrently "experience a decline in the enrolment of in-state students and students

from the local community" (p. 568). Finally, Wanyenya and Lester-Smith (2014) advocate that

internationalization "efforts and strategies must not lead to further marginalization of [local]

Indigenous and racialized low-income communities within academe" (p. 99). Concerns about

these possibilities are heightened for those who believe that international recruitment is being

driven primarily by the institutional pursuit of revenues (Turner & Robson, 2007), and that

international students are often driven by the pursuit of social mobility (Waters, 2006).

Particularly in the context of a "global war for talent" between nations seeking to enhance

their 'human capital stock' (Brown & Tannock, 2009), it is unclear what kind of international

higher education admissions policies would be considered more or less just – and according to

which/whose notions of justice. Policies based on the idea of meritocracy on a national scale, already a dubious standard of justice according to some,[15] are further compromised by their extrapolation to a global sale, given that existing social, economic and educational inequities as well as epistemological differences skew any pretense of achieving justice through a universal and transnational measure of 'ability and effort.' That is, it is likely that most international students who would meet admissions requirements would be from middle or upper class families or otherwise have had access to Western-style secondary schools, and/or extensive extra-curricular English language and other educational resources. For this reason, Tannock (2009) argues that the idea of global meritocracy "is a transparently elite project" (p. 202).[16]

Instead of globalizing meritocracy, therefore, Tannock (2013) proposes the need to globalize equality of opportunity. He suggests "national-level ideals of educational equality can and should be extended outward, as part of a broader push for the equitable treatment of international students worldwide" (p. 450). Enslin and Hedge (2008) also advocate for countries and institutions to globalize their commitments to social justice. On this basis they critique the fact that in the UK, non-European students' fees are more than double that of their UK and European counterparts. They suggest that if it is indeed the case that "national sovereignty no longer carries 'intrinsic moral weight' (Singer 2002, 164), and that states 'should not be thought

---

[15] That is, even on a national scale, the potential for meritocracy to achieve social equity is not undisputed, as actually existing systems premised on meritocratic principles tend to reproduce intergenerational privilege, and the emphasis on equal opportunity as opposed to equal outcomes can limit imagined possibilities for redistribution (e.g. Johnstone, 1992; McNamee & Miller, 2004; Alvarado, 2010).

[16] At the same time as this is viewed as an issue of concern (Rhee, 2009; Tikly, 2004; Walters, 2006), it should be acknowledged that it is not a phenomenon exclusive to internationalization, as on a national level in the West students from middle- and upper-class families also attend higher education (and the more elite institutions) at disproportionately higher rates than their lower-class counterparts. Regarding this, Lee, Maldonado-Maldonado and Rhoades (2006) suggest, "While the reputation of institutions lure domestic and international students alike, status and prestige become even greater incentives when committing to study outside one's home country" (p. 553).

of as ontologically privileged' (Held 2002, 26–7), radical implications follow for a reading of issues concerning justice and the distribution of educational goods" (p. 111).[17]

'Educational goods,' however, are no less ontologically prior than nation-states. Today, perhaps more than ever, university degrees are given value and import within a highly uneven global political economy of knowledge and human capital. Thus, even policies that might 'equalize' opportunity of access on a global scale still presume the desirability of Western higher education and legitimizes the pursuit of that education as a normative and even progressive ideal. Although this approach differs somewhat from the framing of international student opportunities in the Cold War era as a form of international aid and development, it nonetheless implicitly reaffirms the West as the global epistemic centre by conceptualizing justice as expanded access to *its* institutions of higher education. Thus, international students are understood to be legitimately seeking "superior opportunities for education, work and migration" (Marginson, 2012, p. 498), and access to "degrees from world-renowned institutions, state-of-the-art facilities and equipment, training with top researchers in the world, as well as the elusive opportunity to stay and work in the U.S" (Lee & Rice, 2007, p. 405).

Many of the arguments in favour of globalizing equality of opportunity (implicitly if not explicitly) envision justice as a more equal global distribution of the benefits of the existing capitalist world system, administered by nation-states, and the expansion of access to Western knowledge. Thus, critiques of brain drain are concerned not so much that students are attending and being trained at Western institutions but specifically if they attend Western institutions *and then stay*, which may then compromise the ability for their home countries to gain from their

---

[17] There is of courses an added layer of consideration here, which is the UK's betrayed commitment to a Eurocentrism that exceeds UK nationalism, given that EU members pay the same as UK students – although, it remains to be seen whether this will remain the case in the post-Brexit era.

Western education and better compete in a global economy (Adnett, 2010). Concerns about the dangers of brain drain complicate the call for equality of opportunity of access to Western higher education as a move toward justice. Even as it is articulated out of concern for less powerful polities, the notion of brain drain implicitly reaffirms a global economy premised on competition, affirms the nation-state as the primary organizer and mediator of social relations, and legitimizes the notion of human capital as an adequate (and just) measure of human value. For instance, Rizvi and Lingard (2010) consider "how to support international mobility of skilled people without leaving poorer countries bereft of talent and expertise they need to ensure sustainable development" (p. 182), which implies a narrow recognition of skill, talent, and development. Similarly, in Adnett's (2010) lament that through mobility "one country's stock of human capital is increased at the cost of a reduction in another country's stock" (p. 631), he implicitly affirms a narrow measure of human worth as human capital that "does not include the innate value of a human being apart from acquired productive skills" (McMahon, 2009, p. 41).

Tension 3: The Issue of Knowledge

Several questions arise around epistemic justice in the context of an increasingly globalized higher education. For instance, Roshanravan (2012) notes that efforts in U.S. universities to seek epistemic diversity through global programs often disavows the wealth of non-Western knowledges that have been suppressed domestically, while according to Marker (2004), "Academics often know a great deal more about the work of their international colleagues than they know about the history and ecology of the land that the university is sitting on" (p. 107). Thus, there may be tensions between different approaches to, and priorities for, the incorporation of non-Western knowledges into Western institutions. While the possible options clearly exceed an either/or formulation, and in many ways the local/global non-Western

knowledge divide is artificial, difficult questions may nonetheless arise in the present era of constrained resources and in contexts where Western knowledges continue to be prioritized above all others. This is then the epistemic version of the concern that institutional economic resources that would go otherwise to serving marginalized domestic students are now being diverted to international students. Yet, as long as approaches to epistemic diversity are premised on tokenism rather than substantive, structural challenges to Western epistemic supremacy, there will remain limited, contested spaces for non-Western epistemes in Western universities.

Regarding international students, even efforts to affirm their knowledge contributions can reproduce problematic norms and assumptions. For example, Sawir (2013) found that professors recognized the potential for their international students to serve as "an excellent cultural resource for teaching and learning" (p. 365). Handa (2010) also found that international students could be an important "intellectual resource" in the classroom. While such recognition is preferable to the deficit narratives often recited about international students, it may be an unwelcome imposition to expect them to serve as content experts for faculty and domestic students, for example on the topic of their nation's history, and their own learning may be compromised in the process. Furthermore, framing students as "resources" can be dehumanizing in that it reduces their value to that which can be utilized and even exploited by others. Finally, important efforts to centre and affirm international students as knowledge producers may unwittingly obscure the fact that in some cases, non-Western students are actively seeking Western knowledge and educational qualifications in the pursuit of academic and/or social capital for themselves and/or their nations in a global knowledge economy (Nixon, 2006; Rhee & Sagaria, 2004). Thus, in certain contexts visions for economic justice and epistemic justice in internationalization may be in conflict with each other, as well as potentially with international students' own motivations and desires. This

is particularly the case when economic justice is conceptualized as social mobility within the existing global capitalist reward system premised on 'winners' and 'losers.'

Others address global epistemic justice from the question of access, and advocate that knowledge produced by colleges and universities should be treated as 'global public goods'; this can, but does not necessarily, contradict the global knowledge economy emphasis on knowledge as an economic driver. Global public goods may be understood under narrow neoclassical economic interpretations as non-rivalrous and non-excludable goods (Menashy, 2009; Stiglitz, 1999). However, more often when people describe global public goods in the context of higher education, they mean more broadly that benefits of university activities (particularly knowledge production) should be globally shared, e.g. climate change research. In yet another approach, Marginson (2007) suggests "Building national capacity in higher education in the developing world" itself is a global public good (p. 332), while Enslin and Hedge (2008) also frame education as (ideally) a global public good, and lament that current, revenue-driven approaches to internationalization undermine this possibility. Yet these two approaches may also imply that only certain kinds of knowledge and education contribute to the global public good – in particular, that which is produced and transmitted in Western universities.

Conclusion: Different Scales of Justice

In this review, I sought to provide context for contemporary calls from the field of higher education to rethink the practice and study of internationalization. After detailing some background, I reviewed some prominent critical perspectives on internationalization, and then considered how these critiques (like all critiques) are calibrated by normative assumptions premised on particular notions of justice. In particular I highlighted the danger that Western conceptualizations of justice will be presumed and projected as universals, thereby repeating the

very Eurocentrism that many critiques of internationalization purportedly seek to disrupt. It is for this reason that efforts to address what have been identified as clear injustices in the current study and practice of internationalization may unintentionally create new harms, exacerbate existing harms, or at the very least, leave other harms untouched. I therefore suggest that rather than, or perhaps in addition to, identifying and addressing the gaps between taken for granted theories or ideals of justice and the current practice of internationalization, it is (also) important to reconsider how our institutions and taken-for-granted concepts and terms (such as the capitalist market, human capital, the nation-state, and the university itself) frame and thereby also limit our approaches to and imaginaries of justice and higher education.

In this chapter I also identified some of the notable tensions and paradoxes where different approaches to justice meet in the context of a single issue. For instance, although some draw attention to the contrast between "idealist" (or justice-oriented) and "instrumentalist" (or economic-oriented) approaches to internationalization (Agnew, 2012; Clifford & Montgomery, 2014; Stier, 2004), at times these approaches paradoxically converge, such as when justice is imagined as the opportunity to pursue social mobility within a global knowledge economy, or when efforts to address racism against international students are motivated by a desire to secure income from their continued enrollment. At other times, contradictions arise when the same basic idea of justice, such as equal opportunity of access, is applied at national and global scales. That this may be the case does not mean the pursuit of justice is futile, but rather that the growing commitment to globalize our imaginaries of justice in higher education requires further nuance, which indeed I grant it in the chapter that follows. In that chapter, I employ a social cartography methodology to trace how different intellectual and activist communities have imagined the role of higher education in relation to contemporary global challenges, and how

this in turn informs their divergent critical approaches to internationalization. As more reflexive and critical approaches to internationalization have grown, it remains vital to distinguish between their contrasting investments and theories of social change. Putting different critical approaches to internationalization into conversation is a crucial task because there is more than one way to conceptualize a shared problem of concern, and how we do so will affect the solutions or subsequent actions we propose. I theorize these internal differences of critical internationalization studies so that we might work together more constructively in collective efforts without requiring the resolution of difference or the arrival at consensus.

Chapter 4: Cartography of Critical Internationalization Studies

The internationalization of higher education has been deemed instrumental to preparing students, producing useful knowledge, and generating solutions for proliferating challenges in an ever more interconnected world (Teichler, 2010). However, the growing area of critical internationalization studies problematizes and complicates the overwhelmingly positive and often depoliticized nature of mainstream approaches to internationalization by attending to the risks of reproducing uneven global power relations and resource flows (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; de Wit, 2014; Dolby & Rahman, 2008). In this chapter I offer a meta-analysis of different critical approaches to internationalization using Rolland Paulston's (2009) social cartography methodology, which maps diverse perspectives issues of shared concern. Addressing these different critical perspectives is crucial given that, as Scott (2004) suggests, "the way one defines an alternative depends on the way one has conceived the problem. And therefore, reconceiving alternatives depends in significant part on reconceiving the object of discontent and thus the longing that stimulates the desire for an alternative" (p. 6). In mapping various critical approaches to internationalization, I ask how internationalization is understood as an "object of discontent" by each approach, and how these situated perspectives "stimulate the desire for an alternative." That is, how does the understanding of internationalization offered by each approach shape the futures they envision and possibilities for justice they imagine?

Because social cartographies honor complexity, emphasize context, and attend to partiality and uncertainty, they can denaturalize and displace normalized modes of academic realignment in which one universal truth is simply swapped for another, or in which the content shifts but the frames remain the same (Andreotti, Stein, Pashby, & Nicholson, 2016). Turning

away from prescription does not mean embracing "anything goes" relativism, but instead emphasizes opportunities to expand available referents for thought and action, develop new lines of inquiry, and collectively re-imagine ways forward that do not require consensus around a single model of change. I begin the chapter by introducing social cartography, and then introduce the need to explore a diversity of critical approaches to internationalization. Next, I use social cartography to map and explore three critical approaches to internationalization: soft, radical, and liminal. To conclude the chapter, I suggest that higher education's existing efforts to anticipate the future need to be interrupted so that new horizons might be imagined.

Social Cartographies for Engaging Difference

Paulston (2009) developed social cartography as a means to visualize divergent perspectives around shared concerns within a given scholarly community. The maps produced through social cartography are not timeless, but rather depict a "provisional unity" of positions in a particular moment (Paulston, 2009, p. 980). Instead of providing a fixed, totalizing, or idealized depiction of meaning, social cartography "seeks to open up meanings, to uncover limits within cultural fields, and to highlight reactionary attempts to seal borders and prohibit translations" (p. 977). Similarly, in bringing together various positions around a shared concern, maps are not meant to summarize or synthesize these positions, but rather to enable "a new way of looking at the world and, equivalently, a new aspect of the world at which to look" (p. 977).

By making explicit the political and theoretical assumptions and investments that orient a perspective and might otherwise remain only implicit, cartographies can deepen engagement, name sources of tension, and generate new possibilities (Paulston & Liebman, 1994). The mapping process is done through textual exegesis, which, according to Paulston (2009), includes selecting the issue to be mapped, selecting a range of texts that substantially address that issue,

identifying the positions of each text and the ways that they intersect and overlap with other texts, and finally, testing and adjusting the map in consultation with those communities that are affected. Thus, mapping different perspectives on a particular issue is only one part of the social cartography process; bringing the resulting map to relevant communities and inviting their responses is equally important, and will likely result in multiple readings and rearticulations.

In order to remain contingent and multiply possibility, social cartography balances a commitment to identify distinctions between existing and emergent narratives that circulate within a particular field, with a commitment to challenge, deconstruct, and pluralize those narratives (Suša, 2016). Beyond mapping what is present, Yamamoto and McClure note (2011), social cartographies also map absences, making it "well suited for analyzing gaps in policy research, both to situate them and to reveal negative spaces" (p. 157). Thus, Paulston and Liebman (1994) suggest maps can serve as "a point of departure for new research, as well as for new maps resulting from the knowledge generated by that research" (p. 223). In this way, maps can effectively dislodge existing circular patterns of theorizing and responding to a problem.

Paulston (2009) specified that this approach to mapping contrasted with modernist and positivist approaches that claimed to capture objective truth and reality. In this chapter, I employ a post-representational approach that is informed by post-structural and post-colonial critiques of representations that attempt to comprehensively map (represent) their object of interest. A post-representational approach creates a situated map that intentionally emphasizes particular tensions and defamiliarizes what is taken for granted (Suša, 2016). Hence, mapping in the tradition of social cartography is an act of creation and translation rather than an act of faithful or authentic description. The goal is not to provide a portrait of the truth but "cognitive art" (Paulston & Liebman, 1994, p. 223). This approach invites those who engage the map to loosen rather than

fix meanings, to recognize the partiality of any perspective, and to encounter incommensurabilities without expecting or imposing reductive order (Andreotti et al., 2016). In this chapter I specifically identify and highlight distinctions between varied critical approaches to internationalization that might otherwise be overlooked or collapsed into a uniform critique (e.g., distinct conceptualizations of colonialism; different degrees of critique of capitalism).

For the above reasons, social cartography methods are not meant to be 'replicable' in the way other forms of research might be. Yet as Yamamoto and McClure (2011) suggest, what is lost in non-replicability is balanced by the insights gained from the mapper's strategic juxtaposition of different perspectives to make visible what might otherwise be taken for granted, and therefore create opportunities for moving existing readings into new realms of understanding or experimentation. Thus, the contribution of a map is measured not by how 'accurately' it captures an issue, but rather by the extent to which it facilitates deepened analysis. Because this also hinges significantly on the choices of the person producing the map, it is crucial to explicitly acknowledge and situate their particular investments (Paulston, 2009). For this purpose, my mapping practice in this chapter was organized by a concern that the pursuit of consensus or thickly prescriptive conclusions in the critical study of internationalization might short-circuit deeper inquiry and discourage difficult or ambivalent questions about how we think about education and its relation to global justice and social change. Enhancing critical literacy around these differences can help us to reconsider or reframe problems from different angles and ultimately respond in more nuanced, strategic, and socially accountable ways. It can also preempt the frustrations when people believe they are in agreement, yet conflicts arise.

Critical Approaches to Internationalization

Internationalization offers many opportunities, but it also generates a number of complex, contested, and contradictory political and ethical questions, problems, and dilemmas. For instance: What would need to be in place in order for institutions in the Global North and South to enact ethical collaborations, given their often highly uneven positioning (Collins, 2012; Dixon, 2006)? How does the rush to engage globally affect institutional commitments to address epistemic and economic justice in local contexts (Beck, 2012; Lester-Smith & Wanyenya, 2014; Roshanravan, 2012)? On what grounds can universities justify receiving public support without reproducing nationalistic entitlements and exclusions (Brown & Tannock, 2009; Shahjahan & Kezar, 2013)? In addition to such questions, a growing number of voices have also expressed concern that the rapid expansion of internationalization in higher education is largely organized by neoliberal market-driven and income-seeking motives at individual, institutional, and national levels in the Global North (Bolsmann & Miller, 2008; Brandenberg & de Wit, 2011; Stier, 2004).

As higher education scholars and practitioners increasingly attend to the ethical and political questions and dilemmas that arise in the context of internationalization, there is no perfect or unproblematic approach to doing so – each response or proposed solution offers certain possibilities, and comes with inherent limitations. In this chapter, I use social cartography to consider the diversity of approaches within critical higher education literature about internationalization, and the enriching complexities and contradictions that arise where these perspectives meet. Below I describe the social cartography of critiques of internationalization: soft, radical, and liminal (summarized in Table 4.1). Importantly, in creating this map individual papers or authors were not categorized as embodying one of the three approaches; rather, I compiled and read the critical literature as a whole, and mapped the distinct contributions,

tensions, and limitations that emerged as significant. Thus, a single paper or author often had elements of all three approaches, although I do at times cite particular examples for the purposes of illustration. Further, there is significant overlap: all three approaches assert the dangers of neoliberal capitalism and share a general consensus that internationalization is often "far less innocent" than Knight's oft-cited definition would suggest (Suspitsyna, 2015, p. 24). Finally, these tentative distinctions that I map are themselves open to critique and reframing as part of a necessarily ongoing and collaborative effort to rethink the ethics and politics of how we study and practice the internationalization of higher education.

To further clarify the distinctions between the different critical approaches, I also consider how each approach addresses the issue of international student mobility, particularly because so much of the effort around internationalization centers on this element. As is the case with internationalization research more generally, more critical analyses of international student mobility are appearing (see Chapter 3). However, in this chapter I primarily reference this literature in order to illustrate the different critical approaches; a more comprehensive review of international student mobility, while important, is beyond the scope of this cartography.

Soft Critique

Soft critiques of dominant tendencies in internationalization are calibrated by a normative aspiration that a more civic-oriented model of the university should be reclaimed in the Global North, and expanded globally. This model of higher education arose concurrently with the birth of modern nation-states in Europe, and arguably reached its apex during the post-World War II era. In this approach the democratization of access to higher education is highly valued, as is higher education's role in producing citizens and funding research and development in the service of a collective good (Collins, 2012; Shaker & Plater, 2016). This approach identifies

significant shortcomings in a narrowly neoliberal approach to internationalization, but it remains supportive of higher education's role in expanding national economic growth in ways that will be sustainable and have broad benefits rather than being concentrated in the hands of a few.

In part because strong universities are believed to have been primary contributors to the social and economic development of the Global North, soft critiques emphasize that Northern countries should contribute education, training, and technical assistance to Southern countries, so that they may achieve similar success. Supranational organizations have also increasingly emphasized the role of higher education in development, after their support for higher education reached an infamous nadir during the 1980s/90s, when global lending targeted primary education (Collins & Rhoads, 2010; Peters & Besley, 2006; Roberts & Ajai-Ajabe, 2013). As Grenier (2013) notes, "Scholars and international organizations have emphasized how universities have become strategic actors in fostering economic development and in reducing poverty around the world" (p. 356). As a result, this approach is critical of the shift to profit-oriented international exchange. Knight (2014) points out that competition-driven and income-generation projects and programs have increasingly replaced more collaborative and capacity building development initiatives that drove international educational partnerships during the Cold War, while Johnstone and Lee (2014) lament, "since the 1990s there has been a shift in Canada's policy from a pursuit of world peace and social justice to the imperial 'center and periphery' dichotomy that characterizes neocolonial globalization with monopolies of wealth, knowledge and power" (p. 212). For Marginson (2006), declining international aid for higher education in "developing nations" is concerning given that "Higher education and research are integral to nation-building and to modernised national strategies able to secure purchase in the global setting" (p. 36).

Though some soft critiques problematize the ideological motivations underlying development aid for higher education in the post-World War II era (e.g., Altbach, 2004), a firm distinction is maintained between North-South educational relationships premised on aid and those oriented by income, with a noted preference for the former. From this perspective, colonialism is not ongoing; it was an historical era that is periodically revived in neo-colonial iterations (Altbach, 2004; Knight, 2014). More so than coloniality, a primary concern is inequality, for instance, the unequal global positioning and power of higher education systems (Marginson, 2006). Concern for equality also aligns with a commitment for higher education to generate global public goods whose benefits exceed national borders. Marginson (2007) asserts, "Global public goods in higher education are *the* key to a more balanced, globally-friendly, 'win-win' worldwide higher education environment" (p. 331, emphasis in the original).

In line with the idea of shared prosperity and exchange, soft critiques of internationalization are generally committed to revitalizing non-economic dimensions of international engagement, such as cross-/inter-cultural learning and international diplomacy (Trilokekar, 2010; Ziguras, 2016). This includes strong support for programs that educate for the rights and responsibilities of citizenship beyond national boundaries, i.e. global citizenship. Global citizenship is framed as a more humane, cosmopolitan contrast to the pursuit of international engagements for more narrowly economistic ends (Baillie Smith & Laurie, 2011; Nussbaum, 2002). However, the two may also work in tandem, and the democratic presuppositions of global citizenship may mask the uneven power relations that striate 'the global' and one's place within it (see Chapter 7). In sum, the soft critical approach assumes that it is possible to achieve a better balance and greater understanding between local and global interests and populations in order to broadly share the benefits of higher education. However, in

emphasizing the potential for collaboration, this approach may not always thoroughly address the contradictions and uneven power that shape these interests and situate these populations within a global system that is largely organized around the imperatives of capital accumulation, and the preservation of existing architectures of Western advantage, wealth, and power.

With regard to international students, soft critiques of trends in recruitment might express concern about the potential for brain drain, which is understood to extract human resources and exacerbate disparities between countries (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Yet soft critiques also emphasize the importance of Global South students studying in the North, as in Marginson's (2006) suggestion that it is possible to improve a country's relative position within the existing global system through "educational imports such as the 'brain return' of 'foreign trained nationals' and attracting 'diasporic investment'" (p. 37). Emphasized from this position is also a concern that Western host institutions are dedicating insufficient resources to serving international student needs (Forbes-Mewett, 2013; Marginson, 2012; Roberts and Dunworth, 2012). In addition to addressing direct, interpersonal racism experienced by international students, particularly given the generally high cost of their tuition (e.g. Brown & Jones, 2013; Lee & Rice, 2007; Lee & Opio, 2011), there is also concern that the students are a vulnerable population with insufficient protections. For instance, Marginson (2012) argues international students should have the same rights and responsibilities as local citizens, although he stops short of advocating for them to have voting rights or domestic-level tuition fees (see also the "International Student Mobility Charter" from the European Association for International Education, 2012). Orienting questions about international student mobility from the soft critical approach might be: How can we ensure that both local and international students have access to adequate resources and opportunities to succeed? How can we better ensure that

international student mobility is mutually beneficial for students' host and home nations? How can the growing presence of international students support the development of local students' self-conceptualization as collaborative, cosmopolitan global citizens?

Radical Critique

Radical critiques of internationalization are oriented by the idea that universities not only tacitly reproduce but also actively contribute to the reproduction of global inequality and harm. This critique is premised on concerns that the internationalization of higher education often serves as pretence for extending Western nations' economic power and/or global cultural and political hegemony. For instance, Tikly (2004) argues, "discourses around education and development have the effect of rendering populations economically useful and politically docile in relation to dominant global interests" (p. 174). Because radical critiques view capitalism, imperialism, and liberalism as tightly linked systems, this results in a more foundational political economic critique and more substantial demands for institutional transformation and resource redistribution than are offered by soft critical approaches (Roy, 2006).

Radical critiques of internationalization problematize how educational institutions contribute to the highly stratified global division of labor and uneven distribution of resources; this includes universities as well as supranational institutions that are involved in higher education policy, like the World Bank (Brown & Tannock, 2009; Collins & Rhoads, 2010). This approach also articulates concerns about the colonial politics of knowledge, which not only devalues non-Western knowledges but also produces colonial representations of the non-West that rationalize Western exceptionalisms and justify Western political and economic intervention (Santos, 2007; Shahjahan, 2013). At the same time, within this approach universities are understood as potentially important spaces from which to resist dominance and "contribute to a

more equitable global order" (Enslin & Hedge, 2008, p. 114). Thus, there is critical hope in the subversive potential to "reimagine the university as a site where different kinds of epistemological, methodological, and intellectual projects" can be enacted (Hong, 2008, p. 107).

Radical critiques of internationalization today can be said to have a predecessor in critiques of militarism in higher education during the Cold War offered by traditional disciplines (Kamola, 2014), then emergent ethnic studies departments (Hong, 2008), as well as student movements (Chatterjee & Maira, 2014). Radical critiques draw on these traditions of protest and resistance, and from analyses offered by transnational, Indigenous, Black, and Women of Color feminisms, (critical) ethnic studies, and anti-/post-/de-colonial studies, and varied social movements in which injustice is identified along intersecting and often-mutually constituting dimensions of domination and discrimination: race, Indigeneity, gender, sexuality, class, language, citizenship, and ability (e.g., Alexander, 2005; Arvin, Tuck, & Morrill, 2013; Chakravartty & Silva, 2012; Charania, 2011; Crenshaw, 1991; Grewal & Kaplan, 2001; Mignolo, 2011; Mohanty, 1984, 2003; Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1981; Spivak, 1988). As well, some radical critiques point out that in British settler-colonies that later became nation-states, including the United States, Canada, Australia, and Aotearoa/New Zealand, a contemporary global colonial reach is only made possible through ongoing colonialism 'at home' (Byrd, 2011).

Thus, the radical approach not only offers a much more detailed and comprehensive critique of Western and white global dominance than the soft approach, it also identifies the complex and at times contradictory entanglements of local and global racial and colonial injustices. For instance, Brown and Tannock (2009) express concern that when the pool of potential students expands from a national to a global scale it may weaken the force of demands to guarantee more opportunities for minoritized local students, publically subsidize tuition, and

support the interests of the local communities in which institutions are situated (see also Wanyenya & Lester-Smith, 2014). Overall there is a recognition and strong commitment to address the multiple vectors of oppression that variously implicate or subjugate people in structures of harm in the context of internationalization, not only between but also within the Global North and South (Alexander, 2005; Byrd, 2011; Charania, 2011). Radical critiques are committed to identifying these structures, subjecting them to in-depth analyses, and responding with proposals for reorganizing and reorienting institutions toward the pursuit of greater justice. There is also a commitment for these proposals to centre and be led by those most harmed by social injustice.

With regard to international students, radical critiques question whether what they view as ultimately arbitrary nation-state borders justify differential access to higher education and higher tuition costs (Enslin & Hedge, 2008). There is concern that international students are being treated as financial and symbolic resources for powerful nations to fight over, which in turn contributes to marginalization on their host campus and in their host nation (Rhee & Sagaria, 2004). For instance, Johnstone and Lee (2014) characterize the recruitment of international students in Canada as a kind of "conquest…achieved through the market" that "contributes to Western nation-building and hegemony" (pp. 211-212). It is also a concern that because international tuition is often quite high, and few scholarships and grants are available to international students, this may limit access for less wealthy potential students from abroad (Lee, Maldonado-Maldonado, & Rhoades, 2006; Rhee, 2009; Waters, 2006). Orienting questions about international students from a radical position might be: What would affirmative action look like on a global scale (Tannock, 2013)? How can we ensure that incoming international students come from a more diverse array of countries, genders, ethnicities and socioeconomic

backgrounds (Tannock, 2013; Ziguras, 2016)? How does the presence of international students

offer potential opportunities for transnational anti-racist solidarity (Indelicato, 2015)?

Liminal Critique

A liminal critical approach to internationalization is still emerging, and for this and other

reasons it barely registers within the internationalization literature.[18] Often drawing from the

same theories and frameworks as radical critiques, including those rooted in anti-/post-/de-

colonial, feminist, Indigenous, Black, and ethnic studies literatures and social movements,

liminal critiques come to somewhat divergent although potentially complementary conclusions.

This approach emphasizes that historical and ongoing processes of racial and colonial violence

are not exceptions to or betrayals of the West's purportedly universal modern promises of

progress, security, economic growth, and individual autonomy. Rather, this work suggests that

these ongoing processes of subjugation are precisely what enables the production of the symbolic

and material value that is necessary to fulfill those modern promises – in other words, they are

the conditions of possibility for colonial modernity (Dussel, 1998; Mendoza, 2013; Mignolo,

2011; Silva, 2007; Spivak, 1988; Wynter, 2003). These processes include dispossession,

displacement, enslavement, incarceration, exploitation, and resource extraction. This offers a

significant challenge the soft critical notion that it is possible and desirable to universally extend

the promises of Western liberal democracy to the whole world, given that the white West's

prosperity, power, and stability are understood to largely be a product of subjugation.

---

[18] My use of liminal bears no direct relation to its use by Homi Bhabha (1994) in his famous theorization of hybridity. I selected the term to indicate a commitment to examining and inhabiting the limits/edges of justice in existing ethical and political frameworks, critiques, subjectivities, and economic and political relations. It does have some (unintended, but felicitous) resonances with Ladson-Billings' (1998) evocation of liminality in the conclusion of her path-breaking article on the use of critical race theory in education.

Not unlike the truism that critical race theorists assert about racism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012), empire is understood to be embedded in everyday life. Thus, for example, the potential harms of internationalization, such as Northern universities taking advantage of Southern partners, exploitation or objectification of non-Western international students, or the reproduction of colonial paternalism through volunteer abroad programs, are understood not as exceptional acts but rather as normalized within the ongoing condition of colonial modernity. However, liminal critiques also point out that in order to assert its place as the benevolent leader of humanity, the white West continuously disavows its imperial entanglements (Spivak, 1988).

Like the radical critique of internationalization, the liminal critique challenges the centering of Western knowledge in higher education but goes a step further than problematizing epistemological dominance to identify ontological dominance as well. The liminal critique expresses concern that many existing internationalization programs, partnerships, and community engagements naturalize and uncritically expand colonial and capitalist modes of schooling, knowledge production, and social, political, and economic organization. This in turn contributes to the reduction of alternative possibilities for existence by erasing, invalidating, or actively destroying those ways of knowing *and* being that do not adhere to and/or offer significant challenges to modern educational promises and imperatives. Specifically, liminal critiques suggest that modern institutions, including universities, tend to activate and amplify particular investments and desires, including: accumulating knowledge that describes the world in an effort to control it; pursuing a single, linear story of human progress; and centering the autonomous individual and their pursuit of autonomy and affluence (Andreotti, 2014). Often these norms are assumed to simply be embedded in 'human nature,' but in fact they emerge out the specific history of the modern West and are asserted as universal (Wynter, 2003).

This problematization critiques both capitalism (neoliberal and liberal) and nation-states. The critique of the nation-state extends beyond a challenge to exclusionary nationalisms to a critique of the bounded, sovereign nation-state as a violent form in itself, in that it requires the commodification and enclosure of land for its founding and continued territorial security, the militarized defense of borders, and the racialized and gendered management, containment, and ordering of internal populations in perpetuity (Spade, 2011; Walia, 2013). Arguing that the modern university would be unimaginable without both capitalism and the nation-state, and that it was founded within the same entanglements of empire (Alexander, 2005; Andreotti, Stein, Ahenakew, & Hunt, 2015; Mignolo, 2003; Nandy, 2000; Wilder, 2013), this position demands a serious rethinking of higher education 'as we know it,' and asks whether or not justice can be found within it, even as immediate harm reduction measures must be sought. At the same time, liminal critiques recognize the contradictions and even impossibilities of dismantling existing systems, institutions, and conceptual frames. This is the case not only because of the difficulty of challenging accumulated architectures of power, but also because even those who desire something radically different are embedded and complicit in these same social architectures (Andreotti et al., 2015; Mitchell, 2015). Thus, this approach explores the edges, paradoxes, and limits of what is imaginable and what appears impossible – hence, liminal.

In one example of inhabiting the contradictions of a liminal critical space, Agathangelou et al. (2015) consider the possibility of "disinvesting" from higher education by changing one's relation and attachments to it, without preemptively exiting it:

We distinguish *divesting from* empire (that is, removing our lives, labor, and

bodies from institutions of violence and war) from *disinvesting in* empire.

Disinvesting in empire is an active project of building up alternative institutions

and social relations so as to "crowd out" empire, much like prison abolitionists speak of the "positive abolition" of slavery that remains to have been completed (Davis 2003). (p. 142)

Those offering a liminal critique of internationalization are similarly examining the contradictory possibilities of remaining within a harmful system, while also rethinking their attachments to it, and exploring and experimenting with alternatives.

Like radical critiques, liminal critiques of current trends in international student recruitment attend to stratification within and between the North and South and consider how this reproduces differential life chances and vulnerabilities both locally and within international students' home countries, and often serves to expand Western influence and strengthen the reach of capitalist norms. The concern is to meet the immediate needs of international students while at the same time examining the conceptual frames and political forces that shape their recruitment and reception, and that also shape the students' own motivations for pursuing higher education abroad. Questions that might orient liminal critical approaches about international students are: What are the reasons for, and implications of, the globally growing desire to access Western higher education? What intersecting contexts and histories contribute to the production of the international student subject position as potentially both privileged *and* vulnerable? Why are the primary possibilities for institutional relationships to international students limited to treating them as customers, or as recipients of the West's benevolently granted knowledge, and what would be required to think beyond these two narrow possibilities?

Summary of Critiques and Their Contrasts

The soft critical perspective articulates a critique of neoliberalism and emphasizes the need for a better balance between the power of the market and the nation-state. It is likely that

critiques of internationalization articulated from this perspective are the most numerous, as well as the most widely intelligible. The concerns they articulate draw on commonsense notions that the West has reached a certain level of progress and development, and that it has a duty to share its experience and knowledge with others. While there is some critical recognition of the possibility of resurgent colonial or imperial relationships, these terms are narrowly understood and not thought to be endemic to ongoing geopolitical relations or to capitalism in general. This can obscure the violent histories and relational dynamics in which Western prosperity is, and has been, achieved. This perspective also works from a normative ideal of formal equality between all nations, and meritocratic global economic equality of opportunity. The non-West is not presumed to be equal yet, but it is thought that it can 'catch up' with Western assistance. In this way, while the soft critical approach importantly contests the shift toward income generation-driven internationalization practices, it may also contribute to the reproduction of paternalistic, depoliticized narratives about Western altruism (Jefferess, 2008).

Radical and liminal critiques also contest income-generation driven practice, but resist what they view as the repackaging of developmental logics in soft critique. The often explicitly antagonistic stance of radical critiques demand the affirmation of difference and the substantive redistribution of material and other resources. This approach critiques both the nation-state and capitalism, and calls for their significant transformation if not their dismantling. Although these demands may be unpalatable to some, they are fairly legible in that they offer a direct and principled refutation of existing values, ideals, or practices. Radical critiques demand that marginalized voices be centred within curricula, and that international partnerships operate on the basis of solidarity with oppressed peoples and in contestation of Western and/or capitalist

power. If such demands are met, the result can be an opening or renewed protection of important spaces for pluralizing perspectives and speaking back to harmful practices.

Yet while radical critique offers an important contestation of how neoliberal approaches and even some soft critiques maintain the West as the economic centre, it may suggest that once we have identified, and disidentified with, harmful structures we are no longer a part of them (Moallem, 2006). According to liminal approaches, no matter how much we oppose or disrupt capitalist and colonial relations this does not mean that we have ceased to be embedded in them as subjects constituted within larger structures (Lee, 2014). The liminal perspective might therefore ask of the radical perspective: What assures us that the incorporation of subjugated knowledges and peoples will lead to generative institutional disruption and transformation, instead of institutions instrumentalizing them as a means to relegitimize themselves and thereby enable continuation of the status quo? To what extent is it possible to transform institutions whose foundations and ongoing maintenance are so intimately entangled with empire?

Liminal critiques suggest the need to not only identify and address the gaps between ideals of justice and the current practice of internationalization, but also to consider how attachments to modern promises and institutional imperatives continue to frame even our most critical approaches to higher education, and thereby circumscribe what it is possible for us to imagine, including how we imagine the future of the university and justice itself. Like radical critiques, liminal critiques problematize both the nation-state and capitalism, and support immediate ameliorative measures. However, liminal perspectives emphasize the need for critical self-reflexivity about our shared but unevenly distributed vulnerability and complicity in violent and unsustainable systems and structures. This perspective is committed to experimenting with

alternative educational forms (the likely failure of which is understood to be an important learning experience), rather than channeling all energies into transforming existing institutions.

From the soft critical perspective, the liminal perspective may appear impractical, particularly when it remains at the level of abstraction. In response, however, the liminal might suggest that existing systems are manifestly unsustainable and harmful, and in that sense, no more 'practical' than their own perspective. At the same time, it is important to remember that grappling with the limits of what is possible is not an end in itself, and does not preclude targeted and self-consciously imperfect actions to demand redress, mitigate existing harms, or try new experiments. Rather, a liminal critical approach encourages that, in imagining new possibilities and choosing any particular intervention, we take seriously the ways in which we (and our choices) are constituted relationally, in the context of (global) ethical-political structures that we have inherited and inhabit, even as we are critiquing them.

Table 4.1: Summary of critical approaches to higher education (HE) internationalization

	Primary frameworks, concepts	View of the state, capitalism, and their relationship	View of colonialism	Desired changes
Neoliberal norm	*Global knowledge economy:* human capital; 'the world is flat'	Favor free markets, limited state welfare services and regulations	Firmly in the past	Growth in global HE market, competition, entrepreneurialism
Soft critique	*Global public good:* political economy; brain drain; liberal pluralism	Critique of *neoliberal* capitalism; need a better balance of power between state and market	Historical event, at risk of being reproduced (i.e. neo-colonialism); primarily political and economic dimensions	Return to aid model, and civic/ public good approaches to HE internationalization
Radical critique	*Global solidarity*: anti-/post-/de-colonial; multiple feminisms; ethnic studies	Critique of capitalism (liberal *and* neoliberal) and of the state	Ongoing; foundational to current social order; political, economic, epistemological; defeat through direct confrontation	Instigate major institutional change in HE; centre oppressed voices; redistribution
Liminal critique			Condition of possibility for Western power and wealth; political, economic, epistemological *and* ontological; multiple means to challenge	Balance immediate harm reduction efforts with new horizons of possibility for HE and global justice

Conclusion: Engaging Difference for Proliferating Alternatives

Scott (2004) suggests academic research often becomes unwittingly trapped in a cycle in which we continuously provide new answers to the same questions without pausing to historicize those questions, or asking what might have changed and what new kinds of questions are begged by the current context. In this chapter, by mapping the different political and theoretical commitments that animate critiques of internationalization in a dynamic and relational format, I have sought to generate discussions that, rather than merely proliferating alternatives within the

same frames, rethink the frame itself. Engaging difference without demanding a commitment to any one approach can open up strategic interventions inspired by any one or more than one of the three critical possibilities (along with other possibilities not mapped here), depending on what is possible within and demanded by a particular context. In the chapter that follows, I extend this commitment to identify and distinguish different possible approaches to critical internationalization efforts by considering how Western universities might interrupt epistemic dominance through divergent approaches to curriculum internationalization efforts. I consider the complicated task of challenging and decentring the epistemic dominance of modern Western knowledge, and of incorporating other knowledges, particularly in the context of institutions that were constructed around reproducing the former and eradicating or appropriating the latter.

Chapter 5: Epistemic Dominance and the Case of Curriculum Internationalization

Bauman (2000) observed a widening gap between the kinds of challenges that the modern university was designed to address, and the challenges we face in today's uncertain, complex, and rapidly changing world. He suggested, "The present educational crisis is first and foremost the crisis of inherited institutions and philosophies," which are "meant for a different kind of reality" (p. 31). The most common way of addressing this predicament in the context of higher education is to suggest that institutions and organizations need to develop a revised approach to teaching and research that will better prepare students and societies for unprecedented ecological, economic, educational, and other systemic global changes and crises (e.g., Barnett, 2017; Cobo, 2013; Douglass, King, & Feller, 2009; Duderstadt, 2010; Jones, 2002; UNESCO, 2013). This response is generally framed by the modern, instrumentalist imperatives to engineer seamless progress and prosperity, minimize uncertainty, and guarantee better futures through rational planning and utilitarian management of populations and resources. These imperatives have largely become naturalized in many educational contexts (Clarke & Phelan, 2015). Increasingly, internationalization is understood as a primary means through which higher education can help ensure rational consensus and enact social improvements at a global scale.

Yet, tellingly, these modern imperatives are produced within the very same ethical and political frames that produced many of the problems we now face. As Bauman (2000) suggests, "Coordination…between the effort 'to rationalize' the world and the effort to groom rational beings fit to inhabit it, that underlying assumption of the modern educational project, no longer seems credible" (pp. 41-42). Some have therefore argued that what is needed are not new solutions posed within the same conceptual frames, but rather new ways of framing problems,

asking questions, and envisioning and enacting different horizons of possibility (e.g., Harney &

Moten, 2013; Morin, 1999; Nandy, 2000; Santos, 2007; Scott, 2004; Toukan, 2017; Wynter,

2003). In this chapter, I highlight the importance of these efforts by examining the limits of the

modern educational project through an examination of curriculum internationalization.

Specifically, I address contemporary curriculum internationalization as it relates to longer

histories and larger ethico-political questions about the colonial politics of knowledge. If

internationalization is not to become yet another means of economic expansion and epistemic

erasure, then further work is needed to interrupt the imperial tendency to instrumentalize

difference, assert mastery, and seek national advantage at the very moment the international is

evoked as an ethical concern. I begin the chapter by reviewing the colonial history of Western

knowledge production, and the dominant, imperial global imaginary within which it is situated. I

then review the challenges and paradoxes that arise from existing efforts to disrupt epistemic

dominance in higher education, which I categorize as thin inclusion, thick inclusion,

institutionalizing interdisciplines, and alternative institutions. Finally, I ask how lessons learned

from these important efforts can inform the practice of curriculum internationalization, focusing

on three primary considerations: identifying and historicizing the political economy of

knowledge production and circulation; emphasizing the limits of the *frames* of Western

episteme, which assert its universal relevance; and commiting to the lengthy, messy, non-linear,

contradictory, and unsettling process of epistemic decolonization.

Curriculum Internationalization and Global Cognitive Justice

Leask (2015) defines internationalization of the curriculum as "the incorporation of

international, intercultural, and/or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as

the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods, and support services of a program of

study" (p. 9).[19] According to Santos (2007), "The struggle for global social justice must…be

a struggle for global cognitive justice as well" (p. 53). For Santos, current patterns of cognitive

*in*justice are premised on the invalidation and erasure of non-Western knowledge systems. The

Western epistemic dominance that is critiqued in internationalization theory and practice today is

premised on the universal and superior value of Western knowledge, and the particular and

inferior value of all other knowledges and ways of knowing. This is the continuation of a

colonial division of the planet in which, according to Mignolo (2003), "Asia, Africa, and Latin

America became the providers of 'natural' resources…These three continents were also placed in

the role of providing information and culture, but not knowledge" (p. 109).

However, notions of justice around knowledge and epistemic difference are as complex

and equivocal as they are with other areas of justice, which raises a number of questions: To

what extent can alternative epistemes be made legible and legitimized within these Anglophone

Western higher education institutions, and what might be lost – or gained – in the process? What

kinds of transformations are and are not possible as long as these institutions, and the imaginaries

of individual subjects within them, remain enframed by the imperatives of the nation-state and

global capital? Is it cognitive/epistemic justice to assert that non-Western knowledges are of

equal (or greater) value to Western knowledges, or rather to question the existing metrics and

measurements of epistemic 'value'? In refusing the position of objects of knowledge, must

marginalized peoples position themselves as subjects of knowledge, in the style of the

autonomous Western subject of *universal* knowledge with a view from nowhere? How else can

---

[19] Some argue that critiques of Western knowledge tend to imprecisely represent it as monolithic or homogenous, belying its internal diversity (e.g. Phillips and Ruitenberg 2012; Siegel 2006). Yet, as Alcoff (2007) points out, broad commentaries on Western knowledge may be appropriate in response to the historical ease with which 'non-Western knowledge' has been portrayed in similarly broad strokes.

we imagine knowledge production beyond the modern subject/object binary? In this chapter I consider these questions, emphasizing the need to consider the contrast between the 'content' of knowledge versus the frames of knowledge and knowledge production.

The Colonial History of Western Knowledge Production

As discussed in Chapter 3, modern Western universities were not autonomously formed in Europe and then simply exported to settler colonies; rather, colonial conquest and enslavement were integral to the formation and growth of these institutions in both locales. The effects were simultaneously economic and epistemological. Regarding economics, the value expropriated from colonization and slavery (and the associated triangle trade) helped to fund modern higher education institutions (Wilder, 2013), while epistemologically, claims about the universalism of Western knowledge could only become meaningful through the violent production of racial and colonial difference in colonial contexts (Grosfoguel, 2013). Claiming the exclusive right to police, produce, and possess knowledge was, according to Willinsky (1998), all part of the need to "make the whole of the world coherent for the West by bringing all we knew of it within the imperial order of things" (p. 11). The modern university helped to institutionalize the practice of preserving and producing certain knowledges, while eliminating others (Hong, 2008).

In many cases, knowledge was also extracted from non-European peoples and then framed as having been "discovered" by Western researchers. According to Smith (2012), these knowledges were treated as raw materials and subsequently "commodified as property belonging to the cultural archive and body of knowledge of the West" (p. 64). Thus, much of what is now claimed as 'Western thought' was stolen from others without due acknowledgement, and deracinated from its contextual, place-based meanings. As white/Euro-descended people asserted themselves as the only viable knowledge creators and arbiters of legitimacy, non-Euro-

descended peoples were deemed to be objects of knowledge that could only be legitimated by the subjects of knowledge – European peoples.

This colonial politics of knowledge may be summarized as an imperial effort (always incomplete), to capture and contain the threat that other knowledges and ways of knowing pose to the modern Western episteme and its ordering of the world, given that these other knowledges both signal the limits of mastery, and continue to hold possibilities for worlds otherwise. In this sense, Western knowledge is characterized as much by its particular *content* as it is by its *organizing principles* of progress, possession, universalism, certainty, and neutralization of difference (either through incorporation, erasure, or elimination) (Silva, 2007, 2013). Uncertainty, contradiction, and unassimilable difference are then treated as a problem. If this is the case, then critiques of epistemic Eurocentrism that articulate the issue as one of ignorance that can be solved through more information may be insufficient. That is, if epistemic dominance is not (only) caused by a lack of knowledge but rather (or also) by the very imperative to accumulate knowledge and police the categories of meaning by which modern existence is (epismteologically and ontologically) organized, then a solely additive approach that "celebrates" difference but ultimately operates within the same frame will fail to adequately address the problem (Bhambra, 2013). To further develop how the racialized framing principles of Western knowledge systems are deeply embedded not only in educational institutions but also in the ontological and material organization of modern life, in the following section I consider how this relates to the global imaginary that was born with the rise of colonial modernity.

The Imperial Global Imaginary

Gaonkar (2002) describes a social imaginary as "an enabling but not fully explicable symbolic matrix within which people imagine and act as world-making collective agents" (p. 1).

According to Taylor (2002), social imaginaries instantiate "a moral or metaphysical order, in the context of which the norms and ideals make sense" (p. 107). Neither purely ideological nor material, social imaginaries circumscribe what is deemed possible or legitimate to think, act, and know, thereby linking present conditions to future aspirations at a collective level (Rizvi & Savage, 2015). Because social imaginaries both produce and are (re)produced by individual subjects, efforts to resist and/or enact alternative imaginaries are complex and contradictory.

The currently dominant global imaginary was/is distinctly modern *and* colonial, with conquest and enslavement providing the basis of the material and symbolic matrix of the modern world as we know it (Silva, 2014). Although this imaginary has since been contested and reformed, its basic structuring logics endure as it continues to produce individuals and communities within a racialized ordering of humanity. Differential valuation of life is required for the imperial global imaginary to function, because fulfilling the promises of affluence, universal knowledge, state-ensured security, autonomy, progress, and freedom for the white/Euro-descended 'modern subject' necessitates that certain individuals be deemed, by their nature, morally and intellectually inferior, which also marks them (and the places where they live) as exploitable, expropriable and expendable (Silva, 2007). However, in order to perpetuate investments in this imaginary and justify its continuation, any relation between its promises and violences must be disavowed. Thus, social violence is cast as exceptional or as evidence of modernity's incompletion, rather than as its conditions of possibility. There is also a parallel at the level of knowledge: the violence affected by the Western epistemic frame is understood to be the result of insufficient inclusion of difference, rather than as an effect of its totalizing mode of knowledge production, and instrumental uses of epistemic difference.

While the framing of this imperial imaginary remains in place today, its particulars have shifted significantly over time, due to periodic changes in the dominant formations of capitalism (from merchant to industrial to financial), but also due to the resistance by those on and against whom this imaginary has inflicted the greatest violence, as well as counter-responses to these resistance efforts (which have taken the form of direct retaliation, cooptation of critique, and everything in between). For instance, in the post-World War II era, the imaginary shifted to incorporate official refutations of racism and colonialism, in particular as "cold war politics demanded the construction of a strong and irreproachable West" (Kapoor, 2014, p. 1127). Far from being cast aside, however, colonial logics were recast, for instance through development projects framed as a means to help the non-West 'catch up' to the West and progress toward perfected 'humanity' (Wynter & McKittrick, 2015). As Silva (2015b) points out, these development projects tended to leave "unexamined the cumulative economic effects of colonial power, that is, of the still-working mechanisms of dispossession, displacement, and death" (p. 35). Yet Western powers continued to define themselves favorably against their Others by 'benevolently' promoting universal progress, while at the same time asserting the West's universal epistemic value and securing their continued economic advantage (Biccum, 2010).

With the rise of the present era of globalization in the 1990s, following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the supposed vindication of liberal capitalism, another important shift in the imaginary of colonial modernity took place. Concurrent with the expansion of free trade and the financialization of capitalism was many nation-states' official embrace of multiculturalism and the depoliticized celebration of increased global interconnection, which obscured ongoing and even intensified modes of domination and dispossession (Melamed, 2006). Although some assert the novelty of today's global interconnectedness, it is difficult to disentangle invocations of the

global from its colonial origins (Jazeel, 2011). Hence, global relations were and are hardly horizontal by default (Silva, 2015b; Spivak, 2012). This is all significant in the context of higher education's internationalization, given that it is often positioned as an inevitable and apolitical response to globalization, which in turn is positioned as a positive or at least neutral development (Altbach, 2004; Gaffikin & Perry, 2009). As a result, it can be difficult to challenge popular narratives about countries' and institutions' benevolent motives for internationalization, and to link internationalization to colonization and capital accumulation (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011).

The globalizing reach of this imaginary over the past six centuries has meant that wherever one is situated within its colonial divisions, it is difficult to simply refuse its unevenly distributed repressive, disciplinary, and biopolitically productive effects. However, this imaginary is neither totalizing nor inevitable, and it has prompted a range of responses, including various modes of embrace, ambivalence, and resistance. These have taken the form of: outright rejection of the imaginary; shifting its terms and expanding its borders in order to demand inclusion or access to the promises of modernity; strategically appropriating its terms to serve alternative ends; and/or asserting imaginaries premised on other, alternative modes of existence. However, these efforts can also create contradictory and unexpected outcomes, especially when some elements of the imaginary are affirmed while others are resisted. Selective resistance is not only due to the practical difficulty of challenging every element of an imaginary at once, but also to the fact that doing so might make an intervention unintelligible to those within it.

In the next section I consider how different efforts to challenge the dominance of the imperial global imaginary of colonial modernity in the context of higher education curriculum have prompted important changes, but have also generated new challenges and contradictions that can be instructive for contemporary efforts to internationalize the curriculum. These earlier

efforts make plain the difficulties, limits, and double binds of disrupting a deeply entrenched mode of world-making. These difficulties affect even the most critical or marginalized of students and scholars, as long as we remain tethered to the very institutions and subjectivities that are constituted to normalize the imperial imaginary. As Mitchell (2015) suggests, "There is nothing about our position in the academy, however marginal, that is innocent of power, nor is there any practice that will afford us an exteriority to the historical determinations of the place from which we speak, write, research, teach, organize, and learn" (p. 91).

Disrupting Epistemic Dominance

Intervening in structures of epistemic dominance requires generating sufficient dissatisfaction with the current ordering of the imaginary and its promised futurities so as to bypass its sturdy structures of denial and spark the desire or demand for (self-)reflexive examination and substantive change. This dissatisfaction that can lead to the creation of new possibilities, while at the same time it also generates new ethical and political paradoxes and questions, particularly when doing this work in the context of Western higher education institutions. Challenges arise in balancing practical action *with* the need for persistent and reflexive critique of the impact (and limits) of these actions *with* the need to attend to diverse and sometimes-conflicting responsibilities to students, administrators, governments, and various other communities. Questions also arise about whether it is indeed possible to know, imagine, and be 'otherwise' from within institutions that are so tightly oriented and organized around a particular (Western) form of knowing, and funded by particular interests (of state and capital) that are also deeply invested in naturalizing that way of knowing (Roy, 2006).

This section is oriented around these and related challenges, with the intent of learning from existing successes and mistakes. Below, I describe four distinct (though in practice, often

overlapping) approaches to addressing Western epistemic dominance in higher education, emphasizing the gifts and challenges of each approach (summarized in Table 5.1). This is not meant to be a comprehensive representation of all existing or possible efforts to do this work. Rather, this is an invitation for further, in-depth conversations and examinations of the complicities and tensions in which these efforts operate, and for these conversations to in turn consistently inspire, enrich, and learn from experiments at the limit of what appears possible. Such conversations would fruitfully inform any effort to conceptualize new, or improve existing, efforts to internationalize the curriculum in Anglophone Western universities.

Thin Inclusion

Thin inclusion (of epistemic difference) is a common approach to addressing Western epistemic dominance through the selective incorporation of 'diverse' scholars and texts into mainstream institutions and courses. While this may affect some important changes in Eurocentric curricula, it does not entail significant transformation of structures or policies that would reorder the knowledge that is valued or rewarded, or reorient research support structures to accommodate different modes of knowledge production. This approach is exemplified by efforts to designate one day or week of a course term as the time to discuss race or gender, while the rest of the syllabus remains much the same and issues of racialization, colonization, or heteropatriarchy are not addressed in relation to the other weeks' topics. Further, this approach may emphasize the consumption of knowledge *about* marginalized countries or populations, rather than facilitate the creation of spaces to ethically engage the knowledge produced *by* those populations. Knowledge 'about' has also been weaponized against those populations, including through its use in state-sponsored occupations or counter-terrorism efforts both domestically and

abroad (Campbell & Murrey, 2014; Chatterjee & Maira, 2014; Paik, 2013; Wainwright, 2013), and in scholarly efforts to naturalize the existence of racial hierarchies (Wilder, 2013).

In this way, thin inclusion can become an exercise in examining 'global issues' from a Western epistemological framework that ultimately reproduces Euro-supremacy. For instance, in a critical review of global ethics curricula Stone-Mediatore (2011) documents that scholarship and pedagogy in the field continues to emphasize "almost exclusively" white and Western authors, which can "reinforce the message that discussions about how to address transnational moral problems are the prerogative of white people in the global North…[and] teach white global-North readers that they have nothing to learn from thinkers in other cultural and geographic communities" (p. 47). If Western concepts, categorizes, and logics are premised on a disavowal or absorption of difference, then efforts to access non-Western ways of knowing from within them may silence difference yet again, either through 'mishearing' or selectively hearing only less threatening aspects of marginalized knowledges. The harm is then redoubled as the epistemic violence is reproduced at the very moment that it is purportedly transcended.

Thus, the thin inclusion approach is additive and does not substantively attend to the uneven, historically accumulated institutional power of different knowledges and knowledge communities. Incorporating often superficial, tokenistic elements or areas of non-Western knowledges into existing curricular structures can be cynically treated by institutions as a way to appease critics and manage difference (Nandy, 2000). Rather than create substantive opportunities to engage potential conflicts, contrasts, or incommensurabilities between different knowledge systems, these are largely avoided. Despite its limitations, however, because of the broad appeal of this approach, it is often important as a basic starting point or springboard from which to push existing conversations to new places of inquiry and experimentation.

Thick Inclusion

The thick inclusion (of epistemic difference) approach is more deeply committed to addressing the colonial foundations of Western knowledge. Rather than merely sprinkling non-Western texts and theories into the curricula, more questions are asked about how knowledge is produced and about the cumulative power and resource differentials between epistemes, disciplines, and communities of knowledge producers. The implicit universalism of existing courses and canonical texts comes under question. With adequate reform, it is assumed that these foundations can be deconstructed and subsequently reconstructed to support greater global epistemic justice. An example of thick inclusion is Gale's (2012) assertion of the value of incorporating Southern Theory (as theorized by Connell, 2007) into higher education. He calls for "the creation of space in HE not just for new kinds of student bodies but also for their embodied knowledges and ways of knowing" (pp. 254-255). Thus, inclusion is not limited to numerical difference, or to expanding *what* is known, but also *how* things can be known.

In another example, Handler et al. (2016) write about their experience creating an undergraduate global development studies program, emphasizing the challenges of creating a curriculum that encourages students to deeply and critically examine their own 'good intentions,'[20] and to situate their desire to 'help' those who they deemed to be 'underdeveloped' within larger systems and histories of Western colonization, economic exploitation, and political marginalization. Further, they sought to ensure that this suspicious orientation toward the benevolence of development would not be limited to a single course or class session, but rather be embedded throughout the program, including practical engagements.

---

[20] See Angod (2015), Gaztambide-Fernández and Howard (2013), and Patel (2016) for critical analyses of "good intentions."

One of the biggest limitations of the thick inclusion approach is that even when inclusion of other epistemes is nominally more substantive, open, and democratic (i.e. less conditional, selective, and additive than in thin inclusion) these epistemes may nonetheless be affected by their insertion into Western university contexts. Ahenakew (2016) points to the risks that bringing non-Western knowledges into the academy can result in them being transplanted onto Western ways of knowing. These knowledges may also be deracinated and instrumentalized toward the pursuit of mainstream institutional goals. Such goals include preparing marginalized students to become 'proper' subjects of the state and the market (Ahenakew et al., 2014), creating a marketable product or intellectual property (Castro-Gomez, 2007), or legitimizing institutional claims to be benevolent, multicultural, and anti-racist (Ahmed, 2012).

Thick inclusion may therefore reorder the curricular canon such that different knowledge content is directed toward the same ends: namely, utility-maximizing mastery of knowledge as a means to legitimize the assertion of one's will on the world. This instrumentalization betrays the possibility that non-Western knowledges do not simply offer a variation of the dominant global imaginary, or a new formation of state power, but actually signal other modes of organizing social, political, and economic life (Ahenakew, et al. 2014). Further, as Watts (2013) points out, even when Euro-Western academics engage with Indigenous knowledges to challenge imperial knowledge production in the service of the state and/or capital, these knowledges may still be grafted as "an abstracted tool of the West" (p. 28). Such uses may signal a desire for redemption without redress, and a continued attachment to colonial futures that promise security and control.

Thus, while thick inclusion approaches importantly acknowledge the limits of the imperial global imaginary, there is a strong pressure to turn back toward the centre with a reaffirmed commitment to 'fix' and redeem the institutions that the imaginary supports.

Institutionalized 'Interdisciplines'

After World War II, Western universities continued the colonial tradition of producing and deputizing knowledge about the non-West through the creation of "area studies" centers and other military- and defense-funded research projects for national security (Bu, 2003; Cummings, 1993; Paik 2013; Rafael, 1994). However, Kamola (2014) also notes, "As evidence of university-military collaborations came to light within the context of anti-war and civil rights protests," they also inspired "creation of 'bottom-up' studies of the world's poor and marginalized" (p. 527). This led to some self-reflexive reform of existing area studies, but was also paralleled by an even more significant curricular change within the West itself. Desegregation of higher education in this era meant for the first time Indigenous and racially minoritized students could access colleges and universities in significant numbers, though still nowhere near proportionally to their white counterparts. However, the courses of study that they could access once enrolled remained highly white/Euro-centric. Particularly in the US, frustrations with this curricular racism culminated in demands to make space for marginalized knowledges as a central element of community self-determination: institutionalization of what Ferguson (2012) has described as "interdisciplines", including Black studies, Indigenous studies, Latinx studies,[21] Asian American studies, and Women's and Gender studies.

The demands for relatively autonomous spaces within existing institutions shifted the existing politics of knowledge in Western universities, and Western societies more generally. Notwithstanding the ongoing importance of these fields, some have asked about the paradoxical

---

[21] Regarding the term "Latinx," Reichard (2015) notes, "The 'x' makes Latino, a masculine identifier, gender-neutral. It also moves beyond Latin@ – which has been used in the past to include both masculine and feminine identities – to encompass genders outside of that limiting man-woman binary. Latinx, pronounced 'La-teen-ex,' includes the numerous people of Latin American descent whose gender identities fluctuate along different points of the spectrum, from agender or nonbinary to gender non-conforming, genderqueer and genderfluid" (para. 1-3).

conditions and effects of their institutionalization on the production of knowledge and its politics (Ferguson, 2012; Grosfoguel, 2012a; Mitchell, 2015; Wiegman 2012). Mitchell (2015) suggests that no matter how marginalized, interdisciplines are affected by their positioning within the institutions they so firmly critique. Institutionalization should therefore not only be understood as the result of purely oppositional grassroots organizing, but also as an instance of "racial capitalism's capacity to renovate itself by way of the strategic valorization of the marginal" (p. 91). He argues for the need to consider the paradoxical fact that intellectuals in these fields are "interpellated at once as a representative of the university and a representative of organized resistance to it" (p. 87), and to question what underlies the presumption that the critical knowledges they produce will lead to social transformation. Wiegman (2012) also notes the ambivalent effects of linking epistemological authority about a subject matter to one's embodiment of/identification with it; to do so is to not only place impossible demands on individuals to 'represent' an entire, heterogeneous population or set of experiences, but it also "threatens to strip subjects of epistemological authority over everything they are not" (p. 7). At the same time, there is a risk of divorcing knowledge from embodied experiences, and/or of assuming that all knowledge is universally accessible (Watts, 2013).

Another dimension of interdisciplines' institutionalization is that it did not necessarily affect the status quo in other areas of the university. By granting conditional inclusion without also substantively redistributing resources, decentering whiteness, or shifting other disciplines' curricula, universities largely left in place existing institutional hierarchies of knowledge and indeed of humanity (Ferguson, 2012). Today these fields consistently face de-/underfunding, forced consolidation, or even termination, such as the recent attempted closure of the US's first and only College of Ethnic Studies, at San Francisco State University (Asimov, 2016).

Finally, as universities increasingly make 'diversity' or 'multicultural' courses a general education requirement for all students, there is ambivalence around whether scholars in these fields should lead this work or remain more internally focused on their own students and research (Flaherty, 2014). This also raises larger questions about the just distribution of pedagogical labor in addressing epistemic dominance. There is a risk that marginalized individuals will always be tasked with the role of explicating that marginalization and/or of serving as 'representatives' of marginalized knowledge communities (Ahmed, 2012). This is further complicated when their instruction meets student resistance to course content – not unlikely in the context of mandatory course that brings attention to and calls for the transformation of structures of power that many would prefer remain in place (Taylor, 2013). All of this is ironic given the fact that the presence of marginalized faculty in the academy is often celebrated as evidence that their marginalization is 'over' (Ahenakew & Naepi, 2015; Ahmed, 2012)

Alternative Institutions

In addition to efforts to transform mainstream institutions, there are a handful of "alternative" higher education organizations with more grassroots or autonomous origins and structures that are experimental efforts to reach beyond the edge of the dominant imaginary and immerse participants within alternative epistemes. This approach is premised on the idea, as Ahenakew et al. (2014) suggest, that "[I]f we try to provincialize Western thought within the institutions (e.g. nation-states, universities, schooling, etc.) that were created to naturalize it, we will need to remain within its language, epistemology and ontology" (p. 217). This approach focuses on fostering and revitalizing non-Western epistemes outside of mainstream Western or Western-style institutions. Examples of alternative institutions include Swaraj University in India

(Akomolafe & Jain, 2016), or Universidad de la Tierra (Unitierra) in Mexico (Teamey & Mandel, 2016). The Tobago Center for the Study and Practice of Indigenous Spirituality in the Caribbean is another example. The Center "is dedicated to the trans-generational preservation of ancestral knowledge and indigenous spiritual traditions through study, practice and reflection", and hosts activities including meditation, the study of sacred texts, ceremonies, and sustainable food and medicine cultivation (Tobago Center, 2015). It does not offer degrees, nor is it formally affiliated with any mainstream higher education institutions. Emphasizing Indigenous knowledges, it treats the land itself as a living being and teacher, enacting an alternative to the anthropocentrism, logocentrism, and egocentrism of mainstream educational institutions.

The price for the relative independence enjoyed by institutions like this may be that they lack access to the kinds of political and economic resources held by their mainstream counterparts, no doubt in part because they contest the terms on which such resources are pursued and allocated. In fact, educational institutions rooted firmly in non-Western knowledges and ways of knowing are often contesting the dominant global imaginary by exploring or amplifying possibilities for existence beyond what is offered by the logics of colonial modernity. In the case of some autonomous universities, particularly those that largely spurn engagement with mainstream governments or markets, this creates an interesting challenge: while the intention may be to ultimately create institutions that support alternative, sustainable forms of sociality, in the meantime these universities may not adequately prepare students to thrive within existing mainstream social institutions. Further, because they do not want to be beholden to the state or capital, these institutions may not only struggle financially or need to compromise on funding sources, but they also may be inaccessible to students, for instance those who cannot obtain a student loan because the school has not been formally accredited.

128

Thus, alternative institutions may also engage in 'hacking' mainstream institutions and resources for their own ends, such as the Dechinta Bush University Centre for Research and Learning in northern Canada. Dechinta was founded with the vision of "a land-based university that would address critical northern issues rooted in Indigenous knowledges and values" (Ballantyne, 2014, p. 75). Elders, university professors, and community leaders serve as course teachers, students bring their families to the site, no student is turned away for lack of funds, and curricula address topics such as hunting, and Indigenous law and arts (Luig, Ballantyne & Scott, 2011; What Dechinta Offers, 2015). For now, Dechinta significantly relies on and "repurposes" tools and resources produced through capitalist modes of production, and on the academic credits granted by the mainstream institutions with which it partners (Ballantyne, 2014).

In these alternative institutions, emphasis is on learning from and with (rather than about) communities, and producing and transmitting locally relevant knowledges. The gift of these institutions is that they engage the necessary challenge of experimenting with and (re)building something different in ways that are relevant to their own communities. In doing so, they also illuminate the limits of mainstream institutions, and signal that something else is possible. A limitation of alternative institutions is that they can leave untouched the mainstream institutions that continue to affect those within and outside their walls in significant ways.

Table 5.1 Addressing epistemic dominance in relation to the imperial global imaginary

	Theory of change	Limitations/risks
Thin inclusion – expand to include more things into the imperial global imaginary	*Add difference* (e.g. spend one week reading diverse authors); *expand scope* (e.g. study different populations through Western frameworks/theories)	Tokenism; treats knowledge as information or content, and thus does not address the coloniality of modern frames of knowledge/knowing
Thick inclusion – transform the imperial global imaginary to address hegemony, affirm other knowledges	*Transform politics of knowledge production* (e.g. value the knowledge of diverse student populations); *contextualize the history of Western knowledge production* (e.g. consider how power relations shape the way certain populations are framed)	Decontextualizes/abstracts non-Western knowledge by bringing it into a Western institution; includes different ways of knowing, but not necessarily different ways of being; question about extent of possible transformation
Institutionalized 'interdisciplines' – take/repurpose space inside the imperial global imaginary	*Institutionalize relatively autonomous spaces in which non-white populations produce, reclaim, and transmit knowledge*	The politics of knowledge in other institutional spaces may remain unchanged; co-optation /depoliticization through institutionalization
Alternative institutions – experiment at the edge of the imperial global imaginary	*Create/foster more fully autonomous, locally-rooted spaces for learning from/with, creating, and reclaiming non-Western knowledges*	Difficult to secure steady resources; not generally widely accessible; does not necessarily lead to transformation at a larger scale

In both their successes and complications, each of the four above reviewed efforts to address Western epistemic dominance in higher education offers important lessons that can fruitfully inform contemporary efforts to internationalize curriculum. In particular they underscore the need to: disrupt and transform the politics of knowledge in the curriculum internationalization process; address not only knowledge content but also the frames of knowledge; and attend to the necessarily processual and multi-dimensional nature of this work.

Curriculum Internationalization

Even as it receives growing attention from universities, professional organizations, and individual scholars, internationalization of the curricula is very much a process in progress that demands further conceptualization. Leask (2015) argues, "to discuss the internationalization of a university education without discussing the internationalization of the curriculum and student learning is nonsensical. However, internationalization of the curriculum as a concept is poorly understood and developed in practice" (p. 4). Foster and Anderson (2015) affirm this position, suggesting, "We are on the journey of our understanding of internationalised curriculum where the complex nature of [curriculum internationalization] is only just beginning to be grasped by theorists and practitioners" (para. 1). If both the study and practice of curriculum internationalization are only just beginning, then this is an opportune time to consider the possibilities, contradictions, and challenges of this work from the outset.

On the one hand, any effort to internationalize curricula will be heavily shaped by what is possible and desirable in a given context. Thus, offering a one-size-fits-all 'how to' guide would be of very little practical use, and would reproduce the dangerous epistemic arrogance that characterizes any claim to universal relevance. However, based on the literatures reviewed above – that is, the colonial history of international higher education, the basic features of the shape-shifting imperial global imaginary, and lessons learned from existing efforts to interrupt Western epistemic dominance – in this penultimate section I outline three things to keep in mind when engaging in this work.

Depoliticization

Perhaps the most basic challenge in the task of not reproducing Euro-supremacy in the context of curriculum internationalization is adequately addressing the history of the present, and

considering the deeply embedded power differentials that have structured Western universities'

curricula, and indeed Western social, political, and economic life, up to this point. These

structures need to be accounted for and substantively addressed in their full complexity.

However, much of the curriculum internationalization literature offers descriptive accounts of

internationalizing efforts and the practical challenges of implementation; for instance, around

faculty resistance to interventions perceived to threaten their autonomy (Smith & Kruse, 2009),

or strategies for shifting organizational and/or discipline-specific cultures (Clifford, 2009). In

this sense, existing curriculum internationalization literature can be said to be largely concerned

with a certain institutional politics at the level of practice. While no doubt important, these

concerns tend to foreclose examination of the wider socio-historical processes that shape existing

curricula, and that drive the apparent imperative to rethink those curricula in the present. The

politics of knowledge production itself, the differential valuation of knowledges, and the

historical and ongoing ways in which Western universities have contributed to local and global

harm also need to be acknowledged. Even as increased international engagements offer valuable

opportunities to rethink harmful patterns, these possibilities are often circumscribed by the fact

that internationalization efforts are frequently motivated by the institutional pursuit of (financial

and symbolic) resources (Naidoo & Jamieson, 2005; Sidhu, 2006), and the national pursuit of

political and economic advantage (Brown & Tannock, 2009; Tannock, 2007).

Evidence of these motivations comes through in common descriptors of the need to

internationalize curriculum to ensure Western students' competitive advantage within an

increasingly 'global knowledge economy', and/or prepare Western students to act as global

citizens and leaders. For instance, in their review of OECD, UNESCO, and American

Association of Colleges and Universities' curriculum reform documents, Matus and Talburt

(2015) identified an "economic logic of the so-called 'knowledge society' at the level of individual institutions and student-citizens, who are to be educated to become economic globalisation's next agents" (p. 227). Similarly emphasizing the need to respond to a new global era, Leask, Beelen, and Kaunda (2013) note, "The rationale for internationalisation of the curriculum has been repeatedly associated with preparing graduates to live and work locally in a 'globalised' world" (p. 188). Further, while preparation for global citizenship may be compared favorably to a narrow emphasis on economic or professional advancement (Leask, 2015), the common presumption of Western students' entitlement to and unique qualification for global leadership also suggests a troubling reproduction of Western supremacy and presumptive benevolence (Spivak, 2004) (for more on this, see Chapter 7).

This raises a number of questions that might be asked about any effort to enact or assess curriculum internationalization efforts, such as: Who or what is considered to be 'international' and why? Who is internationalization of the curriculum meant to benefit, who actually benefits, and according to what/whose set of values and norms are these 'benefits' defined? Why is internationalization of the curriculum deemed to be so important in the current moment in a way that it wasn't previously? What different kinds of investments and intentions do different individuals and communities bring to curriculum internationalization efforts, and how do these converge or conflict? Without addressing these larger contexts and questions, curriculum internationalization may reproduce rather than interrupt Western dominance, even as it may be celebrated as evidence that we have arrived at a post-colonial global moment.

Thinking Differently About Epistemic Difference

Tracing the history of the modern Western episteme indicates that its framing and the colonial context of its constitution is as significant as its actual content. In particular, this

framing is oriented toward the pursuit of universal reason and totalizing accounts of reality, and treats knowledge production, accumulation, and mastery as a means of describing/containing the world in order to control/determine it (Andreotti, 2014; Silva, 2013). Thus, despite its claim to autonomy and universality, the modern episteme is also highly relational, given that it was/is produced in part by policing epistemic difference. This distinction between knowledge content and framing also highlights the need to distinguish between knowledge produced *about* a community/group from knowledge produced *by* that community/group. In particular, the former tends to reproduce the epistemic dominance of the external knowledge producers.

If this is the case then simply adding epistemic difference (as in the thin inclusion approach) may be insufficient, given its failure to ask about who maintains the epistemic authority to determine the frames of meaning and terms of inclusion. In contrast to these approaches, we might engage in socio-historical systemic analysis of the politics of knowledge, asking such questions as: What historical and ongoing processes facilitate the invisibility of certain knowledges and ways of knowing? How are knowledges differentially valued within existing pedagogical and research structures? What interests and attachments drive the desire for knowledge to classify, measure, predict, and explain? How do these desires affect (and limit) the kinds of relationships that are possible? What disjunctures, complications, and (im)possibilities arise where epistemes meet? What is it about our currently dominant episteme naturalizes that seemingly demands the eradication or sublimation of difference, contradiction, and incommensurability? Conversely, how can we trace the ways in which knowledge systems are neither autonomous nor homogenous but rather interdependent, heteronomous, and internally diverse? What kinds of pedagogies would support students to encounter epistemic difference without immediately encoding it back into their own existing frames of meaning? Asking such

questions could be part of an effort to build critical literacy around the colonial framing of knowledge, not only in the university but also more generally.

One possible guide for this work of reframing comes from Santos's (2007) call to develop an "ecology of knowledges," wherein different knowledges would be valued for the interventions that they enable within a particular context, rather than for their ability to 'objectively' or 'authentically' represent reality across all contexts. Within this ecology, multiple knowledges might co-exist without a battle for hegemony or a demand for synthesis, because each is understood to offer context-specific, partial, and provisional gifts, just as each has attendant limitations and ignorances of other knowledges that it must bracket in order for its internal logic to work. What Santos suggests is that even as we enact this bracketing, we must remember our own partiality, affirm the indispensability of the knowledges we have bracketed, and recognize the need for "constant questioning and incomplete answers." Such an approach also affirms that different knowledge systems are not autonomous but rather interdependent.

An ecology of knowledges approach therefore does not propose to entirely replace Western knowledges. However, it does consider that because the global imaginary of colonial modernity presumes Western epistemic universality, in order to practice an ecology of knowledges it would be necessary to reconfigure existing power relations and redistribute "material, social, political, cultural, and symbolic resources" (Santos, 2005, p. 29). This approach may recognize the need for both immediate institutionalized inclusion of often delegitimized knowledges and knowledge holders *as well as* long-term efforts to construct "various protocols of dialogue between different epistemic perspectives" (Carvalho & Flórez-Flórez, 2014, p. 127). It also raises practical questions, for instance, what kinds of departmental infrastructures could substantively (rather than tokenistically) include non-Western knowledges in ways that honor not

only in *what* is taught but also *how* it is known, and *who* (or *what*) can serve as a teacher? For instance, Marker (2004) notes, many Indigenous knowledges place "animals, plants, and landscapes in the active role of teacher" (p. 106). How can knowledge-holders from radically diverse traditions be recruited, retained, and substantively supported – and what if these individuals do not wish to be a part of the Western university at all? Is it possible to incorporate different knowledges without grafting them into the commodifying demands of the 'knowledge economy'? How can different disciplines (including STEM and professional disciplines) responsibly and reflexively examine and address their historical and ongoing disciplinary entanglements with colonialism?[22] Is it even possible to disentangle modern Western thought from histories of colonialism, and if not, what then? As internationalization grows, and yet resources remain strained, how can universities remain (or become more) accountable to local knowledge communities as well, rather than looking toward the global as a means to disavow those responsibilities (Marker, 2004; Roshanravan, 2012)? How should we balance the need to recognize all knowledges are situated (rather than universal) without assuming that all non-white/Western faculty or students are 'experts' in non-Western thought, or that the mere presence of international students 'internationalizes' a classroom (Leask, 2015)?

There are significant questions around the feasibility of doing this work in mainstream Western institutions. However, if we do not attend to these challenges, curriculum internationalization may ultimately expand rather than dismantle the Western episteme if efforts to include what was previously 'outside' of the dominant imaginary become efforts to categorize and contain more and more things inside it (Alcoff, 2007).

---

[22] See Bhambra (2013) for an instructive example of this work in the discipline of sociology.

An Ongoing, Messy, and Multi-Part Process

Addressing nearly six centuries of Western epistemic violence and its material effects is a messy, contested, non-linear, and ongoing process. There is no single event, policy, or practice that can adequately address the full scale and complexity of this task. Any single effort to do so will inevitably be partial and limited and likely bring about its own set of new problems. Further, there are also multiple tasks involved in this work, which often overlap, and are both interdependent and contradictory. Below, I theorize these as four 'levels' of intervention in the context of curriculum internationalization, placing them in relation to the dominant imaginary: denaturalization; seeking practical solutions; addressing contradiction; facing complexity.

At the first level, denaturalization, the basic challenge is coming to understand the effects of the imaginary in framing what, whose, and which knowledge and ways of knowing are deemed legitimate and legible – that is, generating dissatisfaction with the fact that the dominant imaginary affirms certain knowledges while it delegitimizes and devalues ways of knowing that fall outside its limits. There may be significant resistance here, which manifests as denial that there is a problem, or dismissing the depth of the problem. At the second level, seeking solutions, there is a search for practical answers and material interventions that will address immediate and accumulated harms produced by the dominant imaginary. These interventions may be at the level of institutional policy changes, cross-cultural pedagogies, or diversification of disciplinary canons. This work repurposes existing resources and strategically engages with what appears to be possible in pursuit of clear and tangible outcomes. This is important work, and scholars, practitioners, and institutions have started to develop useful tools, case studies, theories, and practical resources for engaging it, although much work remains to be done (e.g. American

Council on Education, n.d.; Glasgow Caledonian University, n.d.; Griffith Institution for Higher Education, 2011; Haigh, 2002; Jones & Killick, 2013; Joseph, 2012; Leask 2015; NAFSA, n.d.).

The third level examines the paradoxes and tensions that inevitably arise in the process of interventions made in the second level: What new challenges and contradictions emerge? What violences are reproduced? What still appears impossible? How are current limits on institutional change best addressed? What can we learn from these experiments and how can we avoid reproducing them, and instead try something different? From level three, one may either return to level two and try a new and/or revised intervention, and/or engage at level four: facing the discomfort and uncertainty about the full depth and complexity of the problems, without needing to immediately return to what is practical or foreseeable (level two).

It is at level four that we might learn to surrender to, and be taught by, the false promise of Western mastery and control. Rather than accumulate new knowledge, what may take place here is unlearning, unknowing, and unowning what was once held with certainty. We might ask what we would need to unlearn (or at least bracket) in order to face the world in its full complexity, uncertainty, and provisionality without trying to classify and contain it. It is also here that we might ask, as Silva (2015a) does, "whether or not justice can be imagined from within the available modalities of knowledge" (p. 103). And if the answer to this question is deteremined to be no, then a whole other set of questions may arise. In this space there may be a willingness to suspend (even if only temporarily) attachments to a promised futurity premised on continued security, autonomy, and control through knowledge (or anything else). From here, something different may be possible, though it is never guaranteed.

Ultimately, all four levels of engagement are necessary and are likely occur simultaneously rather than linearly or following any recognizable pattern.

Conclusion: Imagining With/out

In this chapter, I have contextualized and denaturalized contemporary patterns of epistemic dominance that inhere in the curricula of Western universities. By situating the deep Euro-supremacism of the existing political economy of knowledge production and valuation in Western, Anglophone higher education (and beyond) within historical and ongoing patterns of colonial/racial violence, higher education scholars and practitioners may gain a deeper understanding of the complex challenges that accompany any effort to intervene and enact curriculum internationalization. In the following chapter I continue these efforts to critically trace enduring patterns of colonial/racial violence, but instead of curricula I consider how they shape ethics of internationalization marketing as this relates to international student mobility.

However, I also note that, despite its many gifts, critique cannot in itself transform, or prescribe how to transform, higher education curricula. At best, it can anticipate the arrival of something different by signaling the limit of what appears to be possible, which is often only the limit of what appears possible at the edge of the dominant global imaginary; as such, it can affirm the imperative for imaginaries and responsible, self-reflexive experiments of internationalization otherwise (Silva, 2013). At this limit-space, there is both significant risk and possibility. It is perhaps the space where it is most crucial to be suspicious of one's 'good intentions.' Once the security, certainty, and futurity that was previously promised by the dominant imaginary has lost its shine, it is tempting to seek security and alternative guarantees elsewhere. In particular, when we are still seeking fulfillment of the imaginary's promises, there is a risk of appropriating difference from outside and then recuperating it back into existing frameworks, betraying and instrumentalizing its gifts. This approach may shift the content but not the framing of the imaginary. The extent of the challenge of critiquing and transforming an

139

imperial global imaginary without reproducing it is captured in the following invitation to

experiment at the imaginary's edge (Silva, Andreotti, & Stein, 2016):

> How can we experience…
> ethics with/out the modern subject?
> politics with/out the nation-state?
> education with/out modern institutions?
> survivance with/out capitalism?
> imagination with/out the intellect?
> being with/out separability?

Chapter 6: Local and Global Colonialisms in Internationalization Marketing

As higher education increasingly functions as a global industry (Ball, 2012; Sidhu, 2006), growing attention has been given to institutional and national marketing efforts (Gibbs & Murphy, 2009; Osei-Kofi, Torres, & Lui, 2013; Gottschall & Saltmarsh, 2016; Lomer, Papatsiba, & Naidoo, 2016; Wæraas & Solbakk, 2009). The Canadian federal government's recently (re)launched "EduCanada" initiative, the country's "new education brand," offers a rich illustration of these recent developments and the ethical questions that arise at the intersections of internationalization and marketization in a settler colonial context.[23]

Several important studies have examined how international students are 'othered' through discourses and practices of internationalization, reproducing uneven power relationships between the student and host country/institution. Specifically, these relationships tend to be ordered by a racialized and Western-centric politics of knowledge production and valuation (Brooks & Waters, 2013; Rhee & Sagaria, 2004; Sidhu, 2006; Stein & Andreotti, 2016; Suspitsyna, 2015). In these studies the figure of the international student has often been the primary focus. However, less attention has been paid to how internationalization discourses also produce representations of the host nation, and the possible effects of these representations on shaping international student expectations. This is significant, given that evidence suggests a mismatch between international student expectations and experiences (Guo & Guo, 2017; Trilokekar & El Masri, 2016). A growing number of critiques importantly identify the neo-colonial, neo-racist, and neo-nationalist elements of internationalization in the context of higher education in the

---

[23] EduCanada was originally launched in 2008 (Trilokekar & Kizilbash, 2013), but as Trilokekar (2016) notes, in consultations between federal and provincial governments, there were significant disagreements about who should determine the message of the brand and how it would affect provincial jurisdiction to develop their own strategies.

West (Lee & Rice, 2007; Lee, 2017; Rhee & Sagaria, 2004; Suspitsyna, 2015). At the same time, there is much work yet to be done to identify all of the complex, nuanced links between the racialized framing and treatment of international students and the historical and ongoing colonization of Indigenous peoples and racialized regimes of citizenship and immigration in host nations (Bazinet, 2016; Indelicato, 2015; Naepi & Stein, 2016). This work is especially necessary given that three of the most popular international student destinations are white-supremacist settler colonial countries: the United States, Canada, and Australia.

In light of these gaps, this chapter endeavours to link internationalization branding discourses with Canadian national(ist) narratives, guided by three questions:

1) How is the national image of Canada constructed within the EduCanada brand, and related materials for and about internationalization?

2) To what extent does the EduCanada brand's image of Canada acknowledge the country's colonial and racialized past and present?

3) How might educators address the challenges of interrupting exceptionalist narratives in the context of marketized international higher education?

To answer these questions, I conduct a colonial discourse analysis of the EduCanada brand. To begin, I review the marketization of higher education and its relationship to internationalization. Next, I consider the context of Canadian internationalization, and then review the critical literatures that orient the chapter. After introducing the methodology, I describe my findings and consider the effects of nationalist internationalization narratives with regard to the educational imperative to denaturalize and interrupt colonial social relations, both local and global. I conclude by reflecting on the potential effects of branding efforts on the ability for universities to serve as sites of critical inquiry that interrupt, rather than reproduce, colonial harm.

The Marketization of Internationalization

The marketization of higher education over the past several decades has become a significant subject of interest (Davies & Bansel, 2007; Gaffikin & Perry, 2009; Pusser, 2014; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). As Altbach and Knight (2007) note, in the context of international education specifically, "Market forces increase the importance of the profile and reputation of providers and their courses. Institutions make major investments in marketing and branding campaigns to earn name recognition and to increase enrolments" (p. 301). Higher education has become an enormous and profitable international industry, and continues to grow at steady rates, particularly as the demand for higher education in many countries outpaces the available spaces for students who then seek education abroad. The current global higher education industry remains highly uneven and Eurocentric (Brooks & Waters, 2013; Sidhu, 2006), with the majority of students coming from the Global South (in particular, China, India and South Korea) to study in the Global North (in particular the U.S., U.K., Australia, France, and Germany) (UNESCO, 2014b).

This flow of people is generally paralleled by global flows of knowledge, which produces what Kim (2011) describes as a "geopolitics of knowledge-degree production and consumption" (p. 111), premised on the presumption that the West holds the most advanced knowledge, and the closely related presumption that studying in the West opens up important opportunities that would otherwise be largely unavailable to those in the Global South. These perceptions are held by many in both the Global North *and* South (Fong, 2011; Kim, 2011; Nandy, 2000; Rhee, 2009; Shahjahan et al., 2017), and even those who critique this developmental presumption recognize that it significantly orders the global higher education landscape.

Marketing efforts from institutions and countries located in the Global North tend to capitalize on existing global hierarchies in promoting themselves as desirable study locales (Stack, 2016). However, concurrent with the growth in international student mobility has been growth in competition between potential host nations, and is likely to become even more intense as new countries seek to be a part of the education industry (Kondakci, 2011; UNESCO, 2014b). Institutional or national branding is one possible means for a host country to establish a positional market advantage in relation to competing destinations (Lomer et al., 2016). As Sidhu (2006) points out, "The logic of marketing and public relations that thrives on uncomplicated and unambiguous images also requires a selective imagination…national and global, as well as urban and rural, relations are seamlessly sutured together without any hint of contradictions" (p. 215). These 'seamless', idealized images tend to foreclose unflattering representations, presenting "an idealized vision of the [higher education] sector" (Lomer et al., 2016, p. 12), and making significant promises about the various kinds of capital that international students can derive in the pursuit of social mobility. For instance, Gottschall and Saltmarsh (2016) found that university promotion videos in Australia "draw on idealised norms of gender, sexuality, class, race/ethnicity, age, and ableism to construct university participation and success primarily as a means of accessing the 'good life' characterised by pleasure and leisure" ("Promoting the university in the education marketplace," para. 2).

The potential effect of these representations is two-fold: to fortify proud narratives about the host nation that rarely take account of systemic inequities or violence, but also to produce uniformly positive expectations among international students that may either go unmet and/or make it difficult to later challenge in educational contexts that seek to address these inequities. Concern about the expectations that are produced (or affirmed) through branding falls under a

larger set of concerns about ethical challenges related to universities' role in the reproduction, critique, or interruption of existing local and global social relations (Unterhalter & Carpentier, 2010). In Canada, some perceive the recent shift in rationales and approaches to internationalization as a betrayal of the country's earlier approach and values (Johnstone & Lee, 2014; Trilokekar, 2010). I consider and contextualize these shifts below.

The Canadian Internationalization Context

Unlike many other nations, Canada has no federal education ministry; instead, individual provincial governments organize and administer their own education systems. Thus, the role of the federal government in international education has historically been indirect, through the realms of international relations and foreign trade (Trilokekar, 2016). It is generally perceived that Canada's post-World War II international education was a "soft power" means to support "a just and equitable world order" (Trilokekar & Kizilbash, 2013, p. 2), and dispense aid and knowledge so as to help "improv[e] economic and social conditions in the developing world" (Cudmore, 2005, p. 47). This framing undergirds a narrative of exceptionalism and benevolence, in which Canada is positioned as having no imperial past or present (Trilokekar, 2010).

During the post-War era, international students were either funded by the Canadian government and/or they paid the same as Canadians (Sharlandijeva, 2015). Things had already started to shift in international education by the early 1980s toward a more trade-based focus, (Cudmore, 2005), and by the mid-1980s most provinces had implemented different tuition fees for international students (Trilokekar & Kizilbash, 2013). In the early 1990s, the Minister of International Trade declared, "Education is now an industry. Canada needs to approach the international market place for education services with the same discipline and commitment that we bring to other sectors" (as cited by Trilokekar, 2016, n.p.). Around this time, the Department

145

of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT)[24] also established an educational marketing unit and opened several (now closed) Canadian Educational Centres to market education products and services abroad (Trilokekar & Kizilbash, 2013). Even as the federal government started to more explicitly emphasize the marketization of international education and its role in Canada's "global knowledge economy," federal involvement remained ad-hoc until the early 2000s saw growing concern about Canada's international recruitment rates (Trilokekar, 2015). In 2008, DFAIT launched the EduCanada brand (Kizilbash, 2011). Since that time, several provinces developed their own international education strategies, but it wasn't until 2014 that Canada produced its first-ever federal international education plan, "Canada's International Education Strategy: Harnessing Our Knowledge Advantage to Drive Innovation and Prosperity." According to this document "international education is at the very heart of [Canada's] current and future prosperity" (DFATD, 2014, p. 4).

A 2014 Universities Canada survey found that nearly 135,000 full-time international post-secondary education (PSE) students (undergraduate and graduate) were enrolled in Canadian universities, and that the number of international undergraduates had more than tripled since 2000. This made Canada the 8th most popular destination for students pursuing PSE outside of their home country (UNESCO, 2014b). The 2014 federal strategy provides a recruitment target of over 450,000 international students by 2022 (DFATD, 2014). These numbers includes all international students, not just post-secondary students. For comparison, there were 336,000 international students at all levels in 2014 (CBIE, 2014). Today, most international students pay three or more times the tuition fees that domestic students do, and these numbers continue to rise

---

[24] DFAIT was later known as the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD), and is now known as Global Affairs Canada. When citing documents throughout this chapter, I use the name by which the ministry was known at the time it was produced.

(Anderson, 2015). Some have therefore suggested that international students are being charged exorbitant tuition fees in order to effectively subsidize the education of domestic students (Brunner, 2016b). Apart from tuition, international students also spend money on accommodation and discretionary costs and, if they work during their studies, pay taxes. Global Affairs Canada (2016b) reports, "in 2015, 357,000 international students collectively spent more than $10 billion in Canada and generated employment for some 90,000 Canadians" (para. 4). Beyond direct income, international students are also understood to serve Canada's geopolitical and economic interests abroad, as is evident in the fact that the 2014 federal strategy targets international students from "developing and emerging economies," including "Brazil, China, India, Mexico, North Africa and the Middle East, and Vietnam" (DFATD, 2014, p. 10).

The 2014 national international education strategy notes concern over "looming skills and labour shortages" (DFATD, 2014, p. 4), and emphasizes the role of immigration in future net workforce growth. Thus, at the same time that they are pursued for their immediate economic impact and their potential for smoothing global trade relations, international students are framed by the Canadian government as "ideal immigrants" (Scott et al., 2015), and were recently described by the Federal Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship as "a premium category of people from which to draw" the "best future Canadians" (as quoted in Shen, 2016, para. 2). The website of the Post-Graduation Work Permit Program (PGWPP) for international graduates of Canadian post-secondary institutions notes, "If you are a foreign student who recently graduated in Canada, you likely have the qualities to make a successful transition from temporary to permanent residence. You are familiar with Canadian society and can contribute to the Canadian economy" (CIC, 2016, para. 6). In addition to the PGWPP, the "Canadian Experience Class", starting in 2008, eased the permanent residency application process for those

with Canadian degrees and work experience. Prime Minister Justin Trudeau's government has also implemented changes to further ease the Express Entry immigration process (Shen, 2016).

In sum, international education in Canada has become: an important export industry with a customer-oriented, revenue-driven model; a means of extending Canada's global political and economic reach; and finally, a mode of recruiting preferred, high-skill immigrants. As is stated within the 2014 federal policy, "Attracting the best and the brightest students through a robust international education strategy will help secure Canada's long-term prosperity and economic success" (DFATD, 2014, p. 9). Concerns about the potential harms and ethical challenges of Canadian internationalization efforts have grown in reaction to this approach, prompting at least two major public responses in 2014: a document by the Association of Canadian Deans of Education (ACDE), and a statement of principles issued by the biggest non-profit organization dedicated to international education in Canada, the Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE). Both documents problematize the tendency to emphasize the financial benefits of internationalization without giving due consideration to questions of ethics and equity.

However, if at one level contemporary marketization represents a significant shift from Canada's post-War approach to international education, it is also necessary to consider to what extent these earlier approaches were indeed more benevolent. McCartney (2016) argues that the international student policy of this era was tightly bound up in the government's concerns about "Canada's changing place in the world," specifically, its "role in the Cold War and its emergence as an international economic power" (p. 4). The welcoming of international students was also rooted in an anti-communist desire that students would return to their home countries as vectors to spread capitalism, and promote Canada's economic interests (McCartney, 2016). Even the stated aims of treating international students as aid recipients, which has been characterized as

evidence of Canada's commitment to "humane internationalism" (Trilokekar, 2010), belie a paternalistic presumption of colonial *noblesse oblige*. Yet, critiques of contemporary concerns often foreclose or overshadow these more nuanced histories.

As Beck (2012) suggests, in Canada there is a need to link the present to "the colonial antecedents of international education both 'here' and 'there'" (pp. 139-140). Thus, to understand the contemporary position of international students, there is a need to consider the larger context of Canada's colonial character, including its historical and ongoing highly stratified, racialized, and economically-oriented immigration system, and the structural reproduction of white setter colonial supremacy. Making these connections is necessary, particularly given that with the growth in the number of international students has also come growing resentment from local students, often shaped by the perception that these students are taking 'spots', resources and jobs believed to be rightly reserved for Canadians (CBC News, 2014; Coloma, 2013b). This resentment is often highly racialized, articulating anxieties about the loss of white national entitlements (Coloma, 2013b; Rhee & Sagaria, 2004; Stein & Andreotti, 2016). The racial element is all the more evident given that few direct their resentment toward international students from France or the US, the second and third top sending countries – although certainly not all international students from these white majority countries are white.

Colonial Contexts and Decolonial Critiques

In this section, I draw on critiques from Indigenous, Black, and postcolonial studies scholars who write about Canada, in order to consider how patterns and histories of marginalization are elided in Canada's self-constituting nationalist narratives. These narratives are in turn reproduced in international education branding efforts. According to Rankin (2012), "nation branding is not only for foreign consumption," but also has subject-producing effects

within the nation itself (p. 258). A national brand is often organized around national mythologies that emphasize a country's benevolence rather than its financial or military power. Beyond simply positive representations, these exceptionalist narratives are made up of disavowals that enable an exclusively affirmative national image through omission.

While there is no singular national representation of Canada (Howell, 2005), exceptionalist narratives tend to reproduce a uniform image of a multicultural, liberal democracy at home, and a benevolent, peacekeeping 'middle power' abroad. In these discourses, Canada is constructed as tolerant, open, and inclusive, often explicitly in contrast to the US, which is positioned as more racist and militant than Canada's "kinder, gentler, and more pristine land" (Razack, 1999, p. 177). Indeed, on a recent visit to the U.S., Prime Minister Trudeau stated that in its international dealings Canada doesn't have "the baggage that so many other Western countries have – either colonial pasts or perceptions of American imperialism" (as cited by Fontaine, 2016). Many celebrated the recently ended reign of Stephen Harper, which entailed increased global aggression, explicit Islamophobia, and aggressive violation of Indigenous sovereignty. However, this response belies a belief that Harper was an anomalous betrayal of Canadian values; decolonial histories of Canada significantly complicate this framing.

The narrative of Canadian exceptionalism entails a series of erasures of the country's historical legacies and persistent patterns of racial and colonial violence. This includes the ongoing colonization of Indigenous peoples, which was not a one-time event but is rather an ongoing effort to "replace Indigenous peoples with settlers who are discursively constituted as superior and thus more deserving over these contested lands and resources" (Saranillio, 2015, p. 284). Settler colonialism remains necessary for the Canadian nation-state to assert its territorial sovereignty and reproduce a capitalist economic system premised on enclosure of collectively

held Indigenous lands and their commodification into private property, and the extraction of 'natural resources' (Coulthard, 2014; Simpson, 2014). In addition to settler colonialism, Canada has an often-disavowed history of Black enslavement in Canada, and significant entanglements with the slave trade (McKittrick, 2002). The ongoing legacy of anti-Black laws, practices, ideologies, and erasures extend not just domestically, to the practice of "carding" in Toronto and the overrepresentation of Black people in Canadian prisons, but also in its global relations with the Caribbean and its reception of im/migrants from Africa (Hudson, 2010). Indeed, Canada has a long tradition of white supremacist immigration, employment, ownership, and voting laws, and other policies and legislation implemented to establish and maintain a white monopoly on political and economic power, and to exploit, disenfranchise, and incarcerate Indigenous peoples and racialized minorities and im/migrants (Coloma, 2013b; Stanley, 2016; Walia, 2013). Finally, Canada has been involved in imperial global geopolitical interventions, forcible financial dependencies, and resource extraction since the early 20th century, activities that continue to the present (Jefferess, 2009; Gordon & Weber, 2008; Hudson, 2010; Razack, 2004; Wagner, 2007).

Recently, Canada was critiqued by the UN Human Rights Committee (2015) for its treatment of Indigenous peoples, immigration policies, and the activities of Canadian firms abroad, particularly in the mining industry. This is ironic given Canada's self-positioning as a global human rights leader (Global Affairs Canada, 2016b), but aligns with what Thobani (2007) describes as "exalted subjecthood", a particularly Canadian form of national exceptionalism. According to Thobani (2007), exalted subjecthood "takes as its point of departure the essentially law-abiding character of its enterprising nationals, who are presented (for the most part) as responsible citizens, compassionate, caring, and committed to the values of diversity and multiculturalism" (p. 4). Despite positioning himself as autonomous and 'self-made', the figure

of the exalted Canadian is constituted relationality, that is, in reference to the figure of

dangerous, intolerant, and less developed 'others' over whom he triumphs.[25] These 'others'

include Indigenous peoples as well as racialized citizens and im/migrants, and foreign threats

from abroad. Canadian citizens are therefore produced through a colonial/racial relation.

Apart from material dependence on Indigenous land and cheap racialized labor, the

exalted Canadian requires the figure of the degenerate 'other' as a means to affirm his own

supremacy, universal rationality, and autonomy (Thobani, 2007). Although non-white 'others'

may be accepted as part of the Canadian nation if they adhere to norms established by the

white/Euro-descended settler citizenry, their inclusion remains highly conditional and

circumscribed (Simpson, James, & Mack, 2011). For instance, this conditionality was evident in

the 2015 passage of the Strengthening Canadian Citizenship Act, through which those with dual

citizenship in Canada and elsewhere may have their Canadian citizenship revoked if convicted of

certain crimes (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2015). However, now that discourses of

benevolent liberal multiculturalism have become hegemonic within Canada, white colonial

supremacy also functions in less overt ways (Suša, 2016).

Formalized in official federal policy, Canada's celebratory embrace of multiculturalism

paradoxically recentres white settlers' interests and affirms their moral goodness through

narratives that require racial othering for the characteristics of benevolence and tolerance to be

legible. Gestures of inclusion can only register as 'good' if the positional distinctions between

the insider and outsider are maintained; that is, white Canadians are positioned as 'good' because

they generously welcome and offer guidance and knowledge to less developed 'others'

---

[25] I intentionally employ the male pronoun here to indicate the gendered aspects of this exalted subject (Howell, 2005), even as I recognize that it is not only men who (seek to) embody this position.

(Gaztambide-Fernández & Howard, 2013; Thobani, 2007; Walcott, 2014a). Multicultural discourses presume Canadian benevolence, collapse the positions of differentially racialized peoples, and presume that arrival at a harmonious, integrated, and *post*colonial liberal ideal has either been achieved or is well on its way to being achieved. In addition to depoliticizing more radical anti-racist, anti-colonial, or abolitionist critiques, liberal multicultural discourses elide the ongoing context of contested settler colonial relations and the centrality of land/property in the ordering of the Canadian nation. Within liberal multiculturalism, Indigenous peoples are at best framed as ethnic minorities deserving of equality within the nation-state; Indigenous sovereignty and political orders are generally invisibilized (Byrd, 2011; Simpson et al., 2011).

Thobani (2007) argues that notwithstanding the various modes of racialized and gendered economic and political marginalization to which citizens and im/migrants to Canada have historically and continue to be subjected, racial subjugation and colonization are irreducible processes in settler colonial contexts. She suggests, "although the suffering of im/migrants cannot be minimized neither can their participating in (and benefiting from) the ongoing cultural and material domination of Aboriginal peoples" (p. 17). However, the question of racialized peoples' complicity in settler colonization remains a contested one (Byrd, 2011; Charania, 2011; Day, 2015; Dhamoon, 2015; King, 2015; Lawrence & Dua, 2005; Sharma & Wright, 2008). For example, given the history and ongoing legacies of forcible migration through processes of enslavement in Canada and throughout the Americas, there is a need to consider the position of Black Canadians distinctly from the history of European settlers (King, 2015, 2016; McKittrick, 2002; Walcott, 2014b). Others have historically arrived to Canada under highly compromised circumstances. For instance under the Chinese Immigration Act of 1895, all Chinese im/migrants to Canada were forced to pay a "head tax" in order to immigrate (Coloma, 2013b). Finally, many

people who migrate to Canada are fleeing unliveable conditions created in whole or in part by the activities and interventions of Canadian state or corporations abroad, or Canada's allies/other imperial powers, including those im/migrants who are fleeing the cumulative effects of global climate change on their homelands, and those displaced because of toxic resource extraction projects (Coloma, 2017; Walia, 2013). Moreton-Robinson (2015) argues that while non-white immigrants in settler colonial nation-states may feel a sense of national belonging, "they cannot possess," as "whiteness is the invisible measure of who can hold possession" (p. 6). However, she also emphasizes that racialized minorities' national sense of belonging "is tied to the fiction of terra nullius and the logic of capital because their legal right to belong is sanctioned by the law that enabled dispossession" (p. 6). In other words, the limits of justice defined as equality within the settler nation-state is evident when the colonial context is considered, and the relationships between Indigenous and racialized peoples are complexified: all are subjugated to white settler supremacy and capitalist logics, but this subjugation takes different forms.

This means that, notwithstanding the importance and possibilities offered by solidarity, Indelicato's (2015) suggestion about "the necessity of establishing alliances between international students, non-white migrants and Aboriginal people in order to question the epistemological assumptions underpinning Australian universities and their authority overseas" requires further nuance (p. 13). She suggests, "If these alliances are established, international students in Australia will be more likely to escape the stigma of epistemic inferiority and enjoy equality beyond any tokenistic appreciation of their diversity" (p. 13). Yet, it is not entirely clear that demands for equality made to/within the nation-state would interrupt (and indeed might even reify) what Byrd (2011) describes as "a settler colony's national construction of itself as an ever more perfect multicultural, multiracial democracy" (pp. 122-123). Any effort to make sense of

154

the numerous analytical and political complexities arise from entangled racial and colonial historical processes, geographies, and ongoing local and global relations that operate in the context of internationalization would be enriched by Byrd's suggestion that "understanding colonialism as a cacophony of contradictorily hegemonic and horizontal struggles offers an alternative way of formulating and addressing the dynamics that continue to affect peoples as they move and are made to move within empire" (p. 53).

These dynamics manifest in complicated and hierarchical ways, even amongst those who share the general experience of subjugation under white supremacy. For instance, in one study by Ritter (2016), East Asian international students expressed racist attitudes toward Black, Southeast Asian, and Latinx American students. Conversely, Coloma (2013b) found that some Asian Canadians made ethno-nationalist claims distancing themselves from Asian non-citizens in Canada, in an effort to rebuff white nationalism and claim their own position as rightful citizens. He suggests, "The political bargain struck by the ethno-national is their strategic alignment and identification with the dominant-national, and the rejection of the foreign-national, in order to assert what they deem as their rightful place in the nation-state" (p. 592). This "bargain" not only polices the external boundaries of the Canadian nation, but it also reproduces the myth of Canadian multicultural democracy, and naturalizes Indigenous colonization.

Thus, conceptualizing justice in the context of the "cacophony" of colonial structures requires that we address not only potential solidarities, but also the tensions, complicities, complexities, and contradictions of what Walia (2014) describes as the "interlocking struggles for the freedom to stay, move and return" (para. 55). Within the context of these struggles, the same individual may be simultaneously positioned as vulnerable to subjugation and a beneficiary of someone else's subjugation. As Alexander (2005) asserts, "empire makes all innocence

impossible" (pp. 3-4), and thus, "decolonization is a project for *all*" (p. 272, emphasis in the original). However, what this looks like in practice, and how this looks different for different individuals and communities, in general and specifically in the context of internationalization, remains an open question, and it remains imperative to emphasize the unrivalled scale of violence affected by the specifically *white* ethno-nationalism of Canadian exceptionalism.

Sources and Methodology

In February 2016, Canada announced "EduCanada," as the revision of an earlier international education branding effort launched in 2008 (Trilokekar & Kizilbash, 2013). According to the official press release, "The new logo and name were developed in collaboration with the provinces and territories to help attract the best and brightest international students to Canada." The primary source of data for this analysis were the web pages from the recently launched "EduCanada" website. This site is largely made up of information and guidance texts for prospective or already accepted international students.

Following its growing use in the study of international higher education (e.g. Blanco Ramírez, 2014; Sidhu, 2006; Suspitsyna, 2015), I employed a colonial discourse analysis. According to Young (as cited by Loomba, 2005) "colonial discourse analysis...forms the point of questioning of Western knowledge's categories and assumptions" (p. 45). This methodological approach has its basis in postcolonial theory and Foucault's study of discourse. Most trace its origins to Said's *Orientalism* (1978). Following the Foucauldian tradition, discourse in colonial discourse analysis is thought to operate as a productive force, reproducing sedimented social relations and practices while at the same time providing opportunities for their disruption and resignification. Discourse is understood as central to the material and symbolic processes by which both subjects and objects of knowledge are produced. However, colonial discourse

analysis differs from post-structural Foucauldian discourse analysis in that it specifically emphasizes how representations of West/Western subjects are not produced by/within a self-contained West, but rather produced in/through colonial violence and ongoing rearticulations of colonial difference (Spivak, 1988).

Narratives of Canadian exceptionalism are neither timeless nor inevitable, but rather are continuously reproduced through particular discursive and disciplinary practices. Thus, I consider how they may be reproduced in the contemporary context of internationalization – and ask how they might be interrupted. I understand the discourses of the EduCanada brand as part of the processes of 'subjectification' in and through which the ideal Canadian national subject (Thobani's [2007] "exalted subject") and the ideal international student subject are produced, *as well as,* even if at times only by implication, those perceived as their morally and intellectually degenerate 'others.' My colonial discourse analysis centres on the large set of subsections/pages included under the two EduCanada website sections: "Study in Canada" and "Explore Canada." These sections offer guidance for those considering studying in Canada, as well as those who have already been accepted to a Canadian university and are preparing for their study experience. I analyzed all the pages under these two headings, attending to the rhetorical construction of "Canada," and paying close attention to the attributes that were ascribed to the Canadian national character and narratives of Canadian history. In addition to analyzing the discourses present in the EduCanada materials, my anti-colonial approach prompted a further layer of analysis in which I sought to identify the absences or silences with regard to patterns and histories of racial/colonial relations.

Findings

I understand racialization and colonization as central to the production of Canada both as an idea and a material place. In this analysis, rather than seeking to prove this as fact, I take it as a given, and instead seek to undercover specifically how and in what ways the naturalization of these social relations are discursively reproduced and/or potentially interrupted in the context of international education. My intention is also not primarily to highlight the distance between Canadian exceptionalist narratives and the actually existing Canadian context, but rather to ask about the productive effects of obscured violence with regard to international recruitment. Though it is important to implement consumer protections for students being sold false promises about their international study experiences (Marginson, 2012; Trilokekar & Kizilbash, 2013), this is not my primary concern here. Rather, I am interested in understanding how EduCanada materials prepare international students to encounter Canada, and asking what this indicates about the ethical paradoxes and limits of contemporary formations of global higher education.

Below I review my primary findings. I note that much of the text reviewed offered logistical or practical information that I did not code in my analysis.

Marketing Canadians' "Good Character"

The release of a revised Canadian education brand was foretold in the 2014 federal strategy document, which stated, "Canada's brand is one of the most trusted in the world," and noted the success of the earlier EduCanada program as well as the need to "refresh" it in order to "further Canada's brand as a leading destination for study and research" (DFATD, p. 10). To this

end, the EduCanada site emphasizes positive elements of Canada's global reputation as 'selling points' for potential customers:[26]

- Canadians are widely regarded as friendly, polite, well-educated, interesting and healthy. We enjoy a very high standard of living—Canada has consistently ranked among the top 10 countries in the United Nations Quality of Life Index since 2004. (Student Guide – Canada: The Basics)

- Canada is also known as a modern, progressive nation with open-minded citizens. We are a multicultural society with two official languages, English and French, and are proud of our ethnic diversity. (Student Guide - Canada: The Basics)

These statements itemize Canada's good characteristics, and are implicitly contrasted with its opposites. That is, if Canada is a modern, progressive, open-minded nation, then it must be *more* evolved than 'pre-modern' or underdeveloped/non-progressive nations – potentially including those countries from whence Canada's international students hail. Similarly, Canada's well-educated, healthy and friendly citizens are positioned as superior to less educated, unhealthy, and unfriendly peoples in other nations. In this sense, the text invites students to enroll under the tutelage of superior Canadian values.

Related to this celebratory global leadership, Canada is also positioned as "a country that leads by example/Engineering the future" (Imagine Studying in Canada). Similarly celebratory sentiments are echoed in EduCanada materials around Canada's safety, stability and welcoming

---

[26] All quotes in this and the following sections are from EduCanada webpages; the specific page/subsequent referenced is listed after each quote, unless otherwise noted.

nature – again implying its advantage over countries that implicitly lack these characteristics (and, justifying actions taken to protect them):

- Worldwide surveys show that Canada is a peaceful, safe and orderly country. (Living in Canada)

- Stable parliamentary democracy. High quality of life that is safe and secure. (Highlights About Canada)

Beyond the international othering effects of this nationalistic narrative of superiority, the language attributes a false coherence to "Canadians"/Canadianness (Howell, 2005). This excludes from the Canadian body politic those that do not adhere or subscribe to these normative characteristics, including undocumented im/migrants and low-income temporary foreign workers (Walia, 2013), both of whom often lack access to the "higher standard of living" that the EduCanada brand touts. Questions are therefore begged about for whom exactly Canada is experienced as 'safe,' and at what cost its peace and 'orderliness' were achieved and are maintained. This includes the costs imposed on Indigenous peoples through the ongoing occupation of land and imposition of Canadian governance on Indigenous peoples (Coulthard, 2014). In fact, Indigenous peoples are almost entirely absent from the EduCanada website, with a few exceptions, including one mention that follows a review of historical/geographical immigration patterns: "Canada also has a diverse aboriginal population, which consists of First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples" (Canada: The Basics). In this text, Indigenous peoples are framed as falling under the umbrella of the Canadian state, and Indigenous national sovereignties are collapsed and erased. Indigenous land title and treaties with Indigenous nations are absent from the section that reviews the Canadian "Political system" (Canada: The Basics).

The uniformly positive images of Canada on the EduCanada website also included repeated references to Canada's inclusive, harmonious multiculturalism:

- Known for tolerance and our welcoming nature, Canada is characterized by a vibrant, inclusive culture that draws strength from the many immigrant groups that have made our country their home. (Student Guide – Introduction)

- [T]he metaphor that's used here is the "Mosaic." Everyone comes from the same different walks of life, from the same different corners of the world and that's what's beautiful about it. There are no homogenized Canadian identities, that we are all a part of society as one. (International Students in Canada Testimony)

- Canada is a place that is safe and multicultural, where people are respected and taken care of…Canada is a country where your voice is heard and your opinion counts. (International Student Testimonials)

These excerpts represent Canada as a tolerant society that accepts difference; however, absent from these images are the power relations that determine where the bounds of tolerance begin and end. In general in these contexts the burden and responsibility for transformation almost always falls on minoritized peoples, as Povinelli (2011) suggests they are "called to present difference in a form that feels like difference but does not permit any real difference to confront a normative world" (p. 30).

Indeed, EduCanada materials suggest that the Canadian embrace of 'difference' is limited: "With almost all of the world's ethnic groups represented in Canada, it's hard not to find ethnic foods and recreation activities associated with specific cultures" (Why Study in Canada). This is a noticeably depoliticized definition of culture wherein political or economic differences disappear from view, as they cannot be easily absorbed into a liberal multicultural frame.

161

Because multiculturalism is central to Canada's exceptionalist image, it not only places limits on the kinds of difference that are welcomed, it also requires that the complicity of the exalted subject in historical and ongoing architectures of racial, colonial, and economic violence be disavowed. There are some cracks in EduCanada's celebratory representations, such as a sub-section under "Personal safety" about "Homeless people," that warns, using pejorative language, "Street people will occasionally ask for money." However, this is quickly papered over with the assurance that Canada provides adequate resources for these individuals: "There are many community agencies throughout Canada that help panhandlers by offering free meals, shelter, and counselling" (Living in Canada).

What are the effects of marketing a white-washed, conflict-free image of Canadian society to international students? It is promised that "As an international student in Canada, you'll enjoy all of the same freedoms which protect Canadians – respect for human rights, equality, and a stable and peaceful society" (Top Reasons to Study in Canada). Canadian exceptionalism is inherently exclusionary but does make itself available to outsiders in conditional ways. For instance, international students are encouraged to adapt to their Canadian context, as in the recommendations to "Adopt the right mindset" and "Try to find similarities, not just differences, between your culture and the new one" (Make the Most of Your Experience), as if were just an issue of having the right mindset. Despite the provisionality of this welcome, international students may be understood as desirable beneficiaries of Canadian exceptionalism in a different way than most temporary foreign workers, undocumented im/migrants, and (non-student) refugees (Tannock, 2011; Walia, 2013). After all, they have already 'proven' their worth through the fact of being admitted to a higher education institution (Brunner, 2017). By inviting international students under the umbrella of Canadian benevolence,

exceptionalist discourses like those reproduced in EduCanada materials become conditionally available to those students. Indeed, in interviews with Chinese international students, Li (2016) quotes a student who, in comparing Canada to China, erases the dispossession of Indigenous lands that remains necessary in order for Canada to exist:

> [T]he family of one of my friends has a piece of rural land in China. The local government told his family that their land would be expropriated, and then it happened very quickly....I felt very shocked…I think the local government here in Canada would not do things that way (p. 109)

Finally, international students are not only being sold a falsely placid image of Canada, racialized international students in particular are also being ill prepared for the racism they themselves might face (Coloma, 2013b; Guo & Guo, 2017; Stein & Andreotti, 2016). For instance, Houshmand, Spanierman, and Tafarodi (2014) found that East and South Asian international students in Canada experienced a variety of racial microaggressions, including being ridiculed for having an accent, and being ascribed a lower level of intelligence. The authors specifically speculate that microaggressions were more common than direct racial confrontations at least in part because, "as a consequence of multiculturalism, Canadians often deny their own racism" (p. 378). A 2014 CBIE survey of international students found that while over 80% perceived Canada to be "welcoming and tolerant", many – particularly those from outside of the United States or Europe – reported having few Canadian friends. Scott et al. (2015) found high levels of international student satisfaction with their experiences in Canada, but some students reported experiencing communication difficulties, disconnection from local communities, and "prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behaviours of employers when faced with prospective [international student] employees" (n.p.). International students are also affected by the abiding

racial and colonial structure of Canadian educational institutions more generally. As Henry and Tator (2009) point out about the Canadian higher education context, "access and equity are often denied to both racialized faculty and students through the everyday values and norms, discourses, and practices within a dominant White Anglocentric, Eurocentric, and racialized culture" (p. 3; see also Dua & Lawrence, 2000; Henry et al., 2017.).

Yet, the closest reference to potential challenges faced by international students in the EduCanada materials was in a depoliticized discussion of potential "culture shock." This section locates the shock and related anxieties with the individual student, suggesting, "culture shock occurs as a result of the absence of familiar signs and symbols of social interaction" (Before You Leave). What this representation erases is that many of the challenges that international students face are not merely a result of being in a different place, but specifically in a place that may be racially or nationally hostile to international students, at both institutional and interpersonal levels. Although this section does mention that students should consult institutional support services, the primary responsibility for addressing these challenges is assumed to lie with the individual student and the power relations and possible racial or xenophobic hostility that contribute to the student's experience of 'culture shock' are absent from view. Ironically, then, the EduCanada materials bring international students into Canada's exceptionalist fold in a way that prepares them for the potential outcome of exceptionalist discourse itself: that is, even if they experience racism they may be unwilling to articulate it; or if they do, their concerns might be met with an exceptionalist response: 'you could not possibly be experiencing racism, because Canadians are good people' (see Suša, 2016).

Career Benefits and Immigration Possibilities

A significant deal of space in the EduCanada materials was devoted to identifying the future professional benefits of a Canadian degree. Lomer et al. (2016) argue that national marketing efforts are crafted to appeal to international students' desires to obtain educational capital, and ultimately, positional advantage within the global labour market. This is evident in the following examples from "International Student Testimonials":

- The degree that I received in Canada has been highly regarded throughout my career. I acquired practical skills that were useful in the workplace, and collaborated with teams on solving real problems with actual companies.

- My time in Canada has allowed me to professionally serve my diverse customer base in India today, and my education has helped me stay current at work.

- Back in Brazil, my Canadian diploma was recognized by employers as Canada has one of the best educational system in the world. I work today for a big company from São Paulo and I believe my Canadian diploma, my English skills and my experience abroad helped me in getting hired.

Certainly some of these testimonies and descriptions noted the high quality and rigorous academic standards of the Canadian curriculum as well, but significantly more space was devoted to detailing the benefits of a Canadian education for students' future careers. In this sense, the professional advantages that can be derived from the *perceived* value of the Canadian education receives considerably more attention in the campaign than the *actual* content, quality, or character of the education itself.

There is also significant emphasis on Canadian education as an affordable investment, particularly in comparison to other popular destinations. For instance: "you can pursue your studies in a globally recognized program of your choice at one of Canada's top universities for nearly half of what it would cost to attend an equally reputable program at a private U.S. university" (Cost of Studying in Canada). Canada also tries to set itself apart from its host nation competitors through consistent emphasis on post-graduation immigration possibilities. For instance:

- Did you know that some international students with Canadian credentials and Canadian work experience may apply for permanent residency without having to leave Canada? (Top Reasons to Study in Canada)

- Working in Canada can go a long way towards helping you establish business contacts for the future and can even help you immigrate after graduation. (Work and Study In Canada)

There are subsections (Working After Graduation, Returning to Canada) dedicated to future immigration possibilities in both of the two primary content areas of the EduCanada website, "Study in Canada" and "Explore Canada." These sub-sections also link directly to the website of Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) (formerly Citizenship and Immigration Canada [CIC]).

This emphasis on immigration aligns with the federal international education strategy (DFATD, 2014), and the possibility of future immigration is likely a significant draw for many international students to Canada, with higher education, as Brunner (2017) put it, being understood as "a passport to Canada's labor market" (p. 17). A CBIE (2015) survey of international students found that more than half intended to apply for permanent residency after

graduation, and over two thirds said that the possibility of post-graduation work opportunities in

Canada influenced their decision to study there. However, Brunner (2016b) notes that the

number of students that actually achieve permanent residency in Canada is significantly lower

than the number that plan to do so; she notes that numbers are hard to confirm but that in recent

years they have ranged from, at most, 5-25%. In one study of those who sought employment in

Canada after graduation, former international students "noted key struggles not only in finding a

job but in showcasing themselves to potential employers," even as most were still resolute to

remain in Canada (Arthur & Flynn, 2013, p. 34). Furthermore, the IRCC recently noted in an

internal report that "the majority of those [former international students] employed through a

work permit are in low-skilled jobs in the service sector, and have median earnings that are less

than half of other recent university and college graduates" (Chiose, 2016). Thus, the promise of

permanent immigration is held out to students without significant nuance surrounding the

potential challenges involved in this process. Brunner (2016b) argues that the gap between the

immigration-related promises made to international students and the challenges they actually

face in seeking post-graduation immigration, "creates a potentially exploitative situation where

higher educational institutions – seeking students with economic capital – are able to capitalize

on (and in some cases, advertise) the potential of immigration without accountability" (n.p.).

Apart from the ethical questions surrounding international students' ability to obtain jobs,

residency, or citizenship after graduation, some, like Johnstone and Lee (2014) express concern

that Canada's intensified international recruitment and retention efforts produce a "neo-imperial

pattern of moving human resources from non-Western economies into Western knowledge

economies" (p. 210), thereby "reducing the capacity of the sending countries to build their own

knowledge economy" (p. 212; see also Adnett, 2010; Brown & Tannock, 2009). Coloma (2013b)

argues that this is part of a long history in Canada whereby a certain group of racialized im/migrants, in particular from Asian countries, "are recruited and welcomed as workers, investors and students, and become wanted as desirable im/migrants and citizens when they serve the economic priorities and objectives of the nation-state" (p. 588). Yet, the same people "become unwanted when they are perceived as threats to the normalized sociocultural order and take away positions and resources from 'rightful' Canadians" (p. 588).

These scholars identify a pressing concern about the need to critically attend to the effects of a highly uneven global flow of people, as well as the racialized backlash. However, there is also a need to complicate the positioning of international students as agency-less victims of the internationalization and immigration process. Analyses of Canadian policy should be accompanied by questions about international students' own complex reasoning for pursuing education abroad, in the context of always circumscribed choices. Moving beyond functionalist 'push-pull' accounts of international students' decisions, in a study about Korean graduate students attending U.S. universities, Kim (2011) found that the students

> pursue advanced degrees in the United States in order to succeed in the global
> positional competition within Korea as well as in the global job
> marketplace…Korean students internalize US [sic] hegemony as it reproduces the
> global hierarchy of higher education, but at the same time Korean students see US
> [sic] higher education as a means of liberation that resolves some of the inner
> contradictions of Korean higher education…(p. 109)

Fong (2011) found similar motivations around mobility and the pursuit of advantage abroad in her study of Chinese international students. She notes that the students:

wanted to study abroad not because they wanted to move closer to a geographic

center but because they wanted to make the leap from a trajectory that they feared

would lead them to the life of a janitor onto a trajectory that they hoped would

lead them to the life of a manager. (p. 15)

Finally, in interviews with international students in Canada Arthur and Flynn (2011) found that

the "primary reasons prompting international students to consider staying in Canada after

graduation were better job opportunities (than in the home country) and the high quality of life

afforded" (p. 227). While this is no doubt an incomplete representation of different students'

diverse rationales for pursuing education abroad, the understanding that international students are

pursuing social mobility by studying abroad is widely held in higher education research. The

pursuit of opportunity and desire to escape domestic barriers is celebrated by some, and may be

understood to foster, as Arthur and Flynn suggest, a "symbiotic relationship between the

students, institutions, and the Canadian government" (p. 232).

However, others have voiced concern that international mobility streams may

compromise national-level equity in both sending and receiving countries, particularly given the

zero-sum structure of now-global competition for jobs and resources (Lee, Maldonado-

Maldonado, & Rhoades, 2006; Marginson, 2008; Rhee, 2009; Rhee & Sagaria, 2004; Tannock,

2013; Wanyenya & Lester-Smith, 2014; Waters, 2012). At the same time, social mobility has

long been a celebrated function of higher education in Canada. Thus, in the absence of a more

general critique, to critique *only* international students for their pursuit of social mobility may be

less oriented by a concern for ensuring greater equity and more oriented by a defense of white

and/or nationalist entitlements to colonially secured resources and opportunities.

Nonetheless, social mobility as it is generally imagined in Canada remains premised on the continued colonial occupation, exploitation, and expropriation of land, labour and resources, both locally and abroad. Internationalization may point to the limitations of social mobility as a horizon of educational justice, particularly as national borders become more porous for those possessing desired characteristics and qualifications. As Canada increasingly offers provisional inclusion to international students, we must consider the uneven entanglements of empire that encompass both the desire to study in Canada and the conditions that make it a desirable place to stay, study, or move: What are "the ongoing conditions of colonialism that continue to make [Canada] a desired state formation within which to be included" (Byrd, 2011, p. xvii)?

As scholars and activists increasingly advocate for incorporating critical perspectives about Canadian settler colonialism, racism, and imperialism into higher education contexts and curricula (e.g. Andreotti et al., 2015; Henry et al., 2017; Marker, 2004, 2011; Pidgeon, 2016; Simpson et al., 2011; Thobani, 2016; Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015; Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013), there is a need to ask what this means in relation to the current push for internationalization, and vice versa (Bazinet, 2016; Naepi & Stein, 2016). These efforts can be complementary or contradictory, or both, depending on how they are conceived and enacted. Although there is growing institutional recognition of the need to address histories and present formations of power and inequality, substantive curricular changes are often hard won and it is difficult to ensure that content and critical frames are incorporated with adequate nuance and complexity in ways that do justice to our entangled social realities.

International students, as with all students, are negotiating a complex set of transnational relationships and responsibilities, and higher education scholarship has often neglected to consider the implications of "responsibility in mobility" (Tran & Vu, 2016). In particular,

international students, who bring with them histories and sets of familial and community relations and obligations from their home countries, and are often navigating their own positions of marginalization, inhabit an ambiguous position with regard to histories of violence and discourses of decolonization produced within their host countries. To expect that they should simply adopt the ethical norms imagined by Canadian educators, even anti-racist/anti-colonial ones, would be to potentially reproduce the very exceptionalism under critique and assert a singular framework of ethical norms. For instance, Marginson (2012) argues international students should have similar rights to citizens in their host nations but that this should in turn require that they "exercise the responsibilities of citizens – not just conformity with law, regulation and convention, and norms of social politeness, but the practice of prevailing notions of collective good" (p. 510). In his effort to 'protect' international students, Marginson gives no consideration that students' own social values, beliefs, or personal priorities might contradict the norms and values of their host institutions and countries. On the other hand, to simply ignore the question of responsibility altogether would potentially naturalize the structures of colonial and racial violence within which international students, like all students, are already positioned.

Efforts are beginning to emerge that take more nuanced approaches to situating international students within transnational colonial histories and power relations, although more work is needed in this area of pedagogy, research, and practice. For instance, prompted by their desire to reimagine assimilative "America 101" orientation courses for international students, Owens and Boggs (2016) designed courses that brought together international and domestic students and took "a critical and reflective approach to the study of the United States" (p. 385). Meanwhile, Brunner (2016a) argues that international student advisors "need to support students

in coming to terms with one's place in an entangled and unjust world – and then, if they are ready, guide them to dive deeper, embrace the complexities, and keep asking questions" (n.p.).

Conclusion: Education for Interrupting Exceptionalism

In the turn to the international, all too often the figure of the nation disappears from analytical view. This is ironic and troubling, given that the motivations for internationalization are often linked to the pursuit of national(istic) goals. In this chapter I have argued that the desire to profit from the growing global higher education industry incentivizes settler colonial countries like Canada to reproduce white-washed exceptionalist narratives. Apart from the epistemic violence of the resulting erasures, these narratives may make international students reluctant to engage in critical analysis of how a uniformly positive image of Canada ignores various social violences, particularly if the image and its promises align with their own rationales for pursuing education abroad. At the same time, discourses of exceptionalism may fail to prepare non-white international students for the racial hostility they might encounter during their time in Canada, and may even pre-emptively invalidate those experiences. I therefore suggest the need to address how universities' and nations' global branding and marketization compromises the ability for higher education institutions to fulfill their ethical and educational role of supporting local and international students to develop critical literacies that deconstruct the mainstream discourses that contribute to the reproduction of local and global injustices – both those to which they are subject, and those in which they are complicit (Malaney, 2006; Sidhu, 2006).

Naidoo and Williams (2015) argue that the marketization of higher education encourages consumerist, transactional relationships and student subjectivities that make it challenging to foster pedagogical environments rooted in intellectual collaboration and robust inquiry. In this chapter I have argued that if internationalization is not to lead to the universalization of the

172

colonial premise that "ownership of the globe can be actualized by acquiring a certain kind of education" (Rhee, 2009, p. 64), then there is an urgent need to not only denaturalize the dispossessions that produce Canada as a desirable destination in the first place, but also to ask why it is so difficult to imagine or enact forms of education that do not require the reproduction of colonial harm. In the chapter that follows, I continue this discussion of how our imagined visions of education in a global context can either interrupt or reproduce an imperial imaginary by examining divergent discourses and practices of global citizenship in higher education.

Chapter 7: Mapping Discourses of Global Citizenship

While the need to cultivate "global citizenship" is frequently invoked as a key driver of Global North colleges' and universities' internationalization efforts (Braskamp, 2008; Lee, 2006), the concept of global citizenship remains undertheorized in the context of higher education. Given that "global citizenship has no legal or political basis for legitimacy" (Zemach-Bersin, 2007, p. 21), it is potentially more versatile, flexible and open to resignification than notions of national citizenship. Yet Roberts, Welch and Al-Khanji (2013) note a "lack of coherence about what we understand to be the qualities of global citizenship" (p. 86), while Jorgenson and Shultz (2012) suggest that the term has become "both an empty signifier and an overflowing container of discourse, practice, and policy" (p. 2).

Among other things, global citizenship has been used to justify the affirmation, reform, refusal, critique, and comprehensive reimagination of existing possibilities for cohabitating the planet. In an effort to assist higher education practitioners in navigating these diverse possible approaches to global citizenship, in this chapter I examine common global citizenship positions in the form of a social cartography. In particular, I consider how each position draws on and replicates patterns of meaning and frames of reference, thereby enabling and foreclosing different possibilities for *knowing*, *being*, and *relating* within an imagined global context.

Global citizenship is frequently talked about both as a *goal* toward which educational institutions should aspire, and an *attribute* of individual graduates (Jorgenson & Shultz, 2012). In contrast, while the positions I articulate are often used to specify particular goals or support the development of individual attributes, each position is not meant to represent a one-to-one, fixed stance or identity that an individual or an institution might adopt or embody. In some cases,

different positions might overlap in ways that contradict or complement each other, and the same people or programs might enact different positions depending on the context. Thus, while it is possible to consider these positions as offering tools for context-dependent use toward strategic ends, my intention in articulating them is instead to offer a partial and provisional map that higher education researchers, practitioners, and students might use to identify, and possibly interrupt and reimagine existing possibilities for global citizenship. Rather than 'put to rest' conversations about global citizenship, this chapter seeks to extend and deepen them. In the pluralistic spirit of social cartography itself, I note that this map just one of many possible representations; there have been other useful efforts to conceptualize possibilities for global citizenship (see e.g. Andreotti, 2006; Shultz, 2007), and many maps still to be drawn. I also reiterate that social cartographies are self-consciously situated, and are not meant to be objective or universal. Thus, I establish at the outset that the map of global citizenship I produce is informed and guided by the decolonial orientation of this dissertation.

I begin the chapter by providing a brief overview of the role that global citizenship plays in the internationalization of higher education in the Global North. From there, I map four global citizenship positions. The first position emphasizes global citizenship as a means for rational economic actors to better compete in a global knowledge economy – for their own benefit, and/or for the benefit of their nation; I term this the entrepreneurial position. The second position seeks to make existing systems more inclusive, and predicates concern across difference in recognition of a universal humanity, and in the service of an imagined path of linear progress; I call this the liberal humanist position. After outlining these two positions, which I characterize as "mainstream" approaches to global citizenship, I consider their resonances by considering how their orienting assumptions are both rooted in Enlightenment traditions of ethics and economics.

This sets the scene for the remaining two global citizenship positions: the anti-oppressive global citizenship position, which is often articulated in direct refutation of the first two positions and premised on solidarity against all forms of domination, and global citizenship otherwise, which seeks to denaturalize and disrupt colonial frames of reference toward the creation of something new and not-yet-known. I conclude by asking how we might engage these and other existing positions for global citizenship while also remaining open to alternative possibilities, and at the same time, considering the limits of citizenship as an organizing relational frame itself.

Global Citizenship and Internationalization

While internationalization is distinct from global citizenship education (Jorgensen & Shultz, 2012), the former is frequently understood as offering important opportunities to foster the latter (Deardorff, 2006; Gacel-Ávila, 2005; Khoo, 2011; Weigl, 2009). As an object of higher education research, global citizenship has been understood as an outcome of studying or volunteering abroad (Dolby, 2008; Tarrant, 2010: Wynveen, Kyle, & Tarrant, 2012), virtual learning (Patterson, Carrillo, & Salinas, 2012), and curriculum internationalization (Hanson, 2010). Others develop scales through which to measure and assess students' "global citizenship competencies" (Morais & Ogden, 2011), and conceptualize the transformational processes of students' "global citizen learning" (Lilley, Barker, & Harris, 2014). Authors of global citizenship studies in higher education tend to focus much of their efforts on pedagogical and/or experiential interventions to foster and measure it in various contexts. As such, research on global citizenship mirrors scholarship in the field of internationalization more generally, which according to de Wit (2014) "is still predominantly applied" (p. 91). Such research has the benefit of clarity and guidance for practitioners who work in the area of internationalization, but it can also limit opportunities for deeper engagement with and exploration of possibilities offered (or foreclosed)

by the concept. Similarly, although many campus programs reference global citizenship as a desired goal for their internationalization efforts, the term's history and its epistemological and ontological underpinnings are not often examined.

According to Dower, approaches to global citizenship tend to contain three components: "a *normative* claim about how humans should act, an *existential* claim about what is the case in the world and an *aspirational* claim about the future" (as cited by Shultz, 2007, p. 49, emphasis added). I identify how each of these claims appears in the four positions. In doing so, I note how each position tends to reproduce certain institutionalized "scripts," or established patterns of thought, action, and social organization, each of which facilitate and foreclose certain possibilities. I also recognize the weight of these scripts' accumulated and naturalized discursive-material effects, such that they cannot merely be sloughed off or transformed through individual will. Nonetheless, reading global citizenship scripts from a decolonial orientation, it is necessary to consider, as Andreotti (2014b) suggests, the potential that they might "capture/trap existence into given signifiers of identity, citizenship and hierarchies of humanity/development" (p. 142). Indeed, there is a growing recognition for the potential of global citizenship theories and practices to reproduce existing colonial patterns (e.g. Abdi & Shultz, 2011; Andreotti, 2006; Angod, 2015; Jefferess, 2008, 2012; Lee, 2014).

As part of an effort to consider the potential coloniality of global citizenship, I ask of each position: What are the frames of reference within which global citizenship is conceptualized? And who inhabits the position of the global citizen, and who does not? In answering these questions, I emphasize how each global citizenship position conceptualizes proper (and improper) ethical and political obligations and relationships within a global imaginary. In particular, I trace the imagined relation between the presumed global

citizen/student as "Self" and their "Other," a relational framing that is popularly deployed in theorizations of relationships and subjectivities constituted by and through difference, and which carries with it various power differentials at the level of individuals and groups (Nayar, 2013).

The Entrepreneurial Position

Given the importance placed on the internationalization of higher education as an economic imperative (Bolsmann and Miller, 2008; Stier, 2004), global citizenship is often framed as a means for students to develop financial acuity and invest in their own human capital in order to make them more competitive in an increasingly global labor market. As Tarrant (2010) argues, "Most institutions of higher education in the United States acknowledge that the future workforce of America depends on a citizenry that is sensitive to, and aware of, global issues" (p. 433). Combined with a more general shift toward neoliberal citizenship that shifts the bulk of risk and responsibility from institutions to individuals, the aspirational claim of this position is that all people – whether from the Global North or South – should become self-reliant, autonomous entrepreneurs, whose accumulated capital and cost-benefit calculations will benefit both themselves and their nations (Brown, 2003; Foucault, 2008; Suspitsyna, 2012).

One example of this position, from a University of Wisconsin-Madison document entitled "Preparing Global Citizens and Leaders of the Future" (2008), states:

> There are a diminishing number of professional career opportunities that will function in isolation or ignorance of global customers, markets, suppliers, and competitors. We all need to acquire skills to cope with a global economy in which expansion of employment opportunities and markets is accompanied by global replaceability of [the] work-force through outsourcing and migration of labor. (p. 3)

Here, the aspiration of global citizenship for economic prosperity is undergirded by an existential claim that the economy has moved away from manufacturing and industry, and toward "knowledge intensive production and services" (Nokkala, 2006, p. 176). The knowledge economy is assumed to be global, because knowledge is framed as universal, deterritorialized capital within an unencumbered global flow of wealth and ideas (Gibb & Walker, 2011). Thus, the world is imagined as an open space and the individual global citizen is imagined to be as freely mobile as capital itself – borderless and rootless.

The emphasis on growing competition within an increasingly "flat" global economy is coupled with the normative neoliberal claim that "human well-being can be best advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (Harvey, 2005, p. 2). The entrepreneurial position normatively scripts everyone as equally morally obliged to make utility-maximizing choices in all areas of their life, and suggests that one's ability to succeed in this is unaffected by one's raced, gendered, and classed social positions. However, it can only do so by ignoring how accumulated discursive-material architectures actually affect the unequal distribution of life chances, opportunities, and mobilities. In fact, it is precisely through the fact of having access to and/or inhabiting particular social positions – in particular, being middle to upper class, being of a nationality that makes international travel relatively hassle-free, having the ability to shift domestic responsibilities to other family members or paid employees, and

often, being white or, or being in proximity to whiteness[27] – that enables some to more easily

inhabit the position of an entrepreneurial global citizen than others. It is perhaps for this reason

that Rizvi (2008) describes global citizenship as "inherently contradictory, since on the one hand,

it opens up the possibilities of genuine interaction among people from different cultural

traditions," while, "[o]n the other hand, it fails to problematise its bases in economistic

modernising imaginaries, within which subject positions are formed" (p. 26).

These economistic modernizing imaginaries are also highly individualistic. As Caruana

(2014) suggests, for those who enact global citizenship solely as a means to advance their own

global economic mobility, there is often no "sense of responsibility to humankind that prompts

activism" (p. 90). The scripts of this position are, for example, unlikely to account for the fact

that every student is, regardless of their individual choices, already imbricated in countless

transnational political, economic, and affective relations, many of which, as currently organized,

have destructive consequences for both human and non-human life. Impoverished racialized and

Indigenous communities, both near and far, tend to be the biggest targets of new and ongoing

forms of capitalist exploitation and expropriation of their labor, land, and resources (Silva,

2015b). These communities are compelled to provide the economic value that fuels the

entrepreneurial global citizens' ability to reproduce themselves and accumulate wealth, yet they

are not considered to be global citizens. Further, in the entrepreneurial position, there is no

perceived collective obligation to reformulate these extractive relations, because the workings of

the capitalist market are presumed to be neutral, and the uneven division of power and resources

---

[27] Not all who aspire to global citizenship are white. Yet, the organizing discourses of mainstream global citizenship approaches often implicitly presume that those who occupy the position of the "Self" in the Self/Other binary are white, and those who seek to inhabit that position are often compelled to signal their ideological proximity to whiteness, or at least, to not be perceived as threatening its hegemony (Angod, 2015). Too significant of a deviation from this may lead to one's forcible shift into the position of the "Other," and disqualification from the category of global citizen.

is understood to be the natural product of differential individual abilities and efforts, and impoverished countries' and communities' lack of development, rather than a result of centuries of colonization, enslavement, and ongoing forms of racialized extraction (Silva, 2015b).

Imagining global relationships as abstract rational economic transactions significantly limits the kinds of engagement that are deemed possible and desirable. Yet it is also not necessarily the case that this position entirely excludes consideration of the Other. Rather, in the entrepreneurial position, relationships to the Other may manifest as a commitment to ensure that people in the Global South "catch up" to the abstract and supposedly universal ideals of Western development – especially free market capitalist competition. This ignores that these populations remain at a structural disadvantage, and that they often have their own, divergent visions of desired transformation. However, from the entrepreneurial position one might view obligations to the Other as little more than recognition of their right to compete (and succeed or fail) in an inevitable global free market system (Harvey, 2005). One example of this is the micro-finance clubs or programs initiated by entrepreneurial student groups (such as those at St. John's University, Loyola University and the University of Pennsylvania), which make small business loans to individuals in the Global South. In another example, organizations like Brighter Investment sell "social impact bonds" through which investors fund the higher education costs of students in "developing countries," with the promise of a return on that investment. They state,

> We are a for profit investment fund because we believe the combination of being
> both ethically responsible and financially interesting will result in more investors
> which in turn will enable us to help more underprivileged people get their
> university degree. We also think it is fair that both investors and students share in
> the benefits of their partnership. (FAQ)

These examples suggest that the commitment to the Other's ability to compete is generally pursued only in ways that: ensure the continued benefit to the Self; lead to growth in capitalist markets; and continue to define proper global citizens as those who not only pursue but also successfully achieve the accumulation of capital (Chakravartty & Silva, 2012).

The Liberal Humanist Position

Scripts of the liberal humanist global citizenship position are also frequently evoked in higher education, often either as an alternative or supplement to the perceived limitations of the entrepreneurial position. Nussbaum's (2002) work is one of the most widely cited sources of this position. Critiquing market exchange as the basis for human connection, Nussbaum suggests that existing liberal education for national citizenship should be expanded to global contexts. Specifically, she posits three essential capacities, which can be understood as aspirational claims for global citizenship: 1) critical self-examination; 2) recognition of ties to other humans; and 3) the ability to imagine oneself in another's shoes. As Nussbaum's work suggests, a liberal humanist global citizenship position is premised on the existential claim that humanity has universal experiences, strivings, and values. Because of this shared humanity, difference can be overcome and the Other can be understood or made accessible through acts of "concern," "recognition", and "imagination." Therefore, the aspirational claim of the liberal humanist position is to cultivate greater understanding, empathy, and appreciation between individuals than may be capacitated by entrepreneurial approaches. This increased understanding is thought to be the key to more harmonious global relations and to fostering deepened commitments to a shared vision of social change and human development that will benefit all people.

The liberal humanist approach has broad appeal, and characterizes much global citizenship programming and curricula in higher education, and more generally. For instance, a

document produced by UNESCO (2014a) as part of the UN Secretary-General's Global

Education First Initiative, suggests that global citizenship education should foster "an attitude

supported by an understanding of multiple levels of identity, and the potential for a 'collective

identity' which transcends individual cultural, religious, ethnic or other differences," as well as

"a deep knowledge of global issues and universal values such as justice, equality, dignity and

respect" (p. 9). This document exemplifies the liberal humanist emphasis on shared values and

universal knowledge toward the development of "more just, peaceful, tolerant and inclusive

societies" (p. 5), and the selective celebration of "cultural, religious, ethnic" difference – in other

words, difference is tolerated as long as it does not compromise transcendent human values.

Efforts to implement a liberal humanist approach to global citizenship often centre on the

development of intercultural understanding and/or competency (Caruana, 2014; Deardorff,

2006). Yet, depending on how they are organized and understood, intercultural engagements can

either reproduce or disrupt colonial dynamics (Gorski, 2008). Simply bringing different groups

together does not in itself mitigate unequal power relations or conflicts, particularly when such

engagements are organized by the presumption that wealthy, white, Western students are entitled

to access and consume the (local and global) Other's difference for their own personal

enrichment, moral development, and 'mastery' (Angod, 2015; hooks, 1992; Jefferess, 2011).

Angod (2015) characterizes this as a process through which the "elite subject is consolidated

through multicultural, and especially humanitarian, encounters with racial others" (p. 137).

Meanwhile, Roshanravan (2012) points out that although racialized and Indigenous students'

"daily encounters with racism and ethnocentrism make them painfully competent in issues of

diversity and cross-cultural difference," this knowledge is rarely valued as intercultural

competence, because competency is reserved as the "domain of white/Anglo knowers" (p. 9) while "Others" are positioned as objects of that knowledge.

Efforts to foster global citizenship through Global North students' participation in development projects in the Global South, whether through research, international service learning (ISL), or other engagements, are often framed through liberal humanist scripts. Bryan (2013) describes how global humanitarian narratives, like those that often animate ISL or voluntourism programs, "present citizens of the global South as objects of pity and benevolence, serve to obscure global power relations and prevent individuals from seeing how they themselves are implicated in sustaining such relations by participating in, and deriving benefits from, harmful global economic institutions and practices" (p. 21). For example, the Pennsylvania State University Office of International Programs' Strategic Plan (2008) argued for the need to embed service projects into study abroad programs, because students "possess the skills, knowledge, and drive to alleviate some of the world's most pressing concerns…their talent and passion should be harnessed and put to good use" (p. 12). Possible service areas are listed as: "providing disaster relief services, building houses in economically challenged areas, teaching at community schools, providing aid at health clinics, working to empower women, spreading a message of AIDS awareness" (p. 13). ISL students are framed here as generous purveyors of proper knowledge, skills, and enlightened values to host communities that implicitly lack these (Bryan, 2013; Jefferess, 2011; Khoo, 2011). There is no follow-up discussion about the ethics or politics of community engagement, nor any consideration of the host community's existing knowledge and skills, or their ongoing efforts to enact desired change within their own context. Furthermore, because the problems outlined are framed as easily fixable through the interventions of caring individuals (and within the two week or two month timeframe of their

visit), more complex, structural causes of problems are not identified – particularly not those that would implicate the visiting students themselves.

When students understand themselves as benevolent actors granting knowledge, humanity, resources, or rights to those they perceive to lack them, and leading the way toward universal human evolution, they simultaneously affirm the supremacy of their own knowledge and values, and absolve themselves of any complicity in harm. This dynamic tends to, as Jefferess (2008) suggests, "mask the material relationships that produce some as privileged, and hence capable of being active global citizens, and some as in need of support, care, 'aid'" (p. 31). Yet because the liberal humanist position does not include a strong critique of power nor trace global histories and ongoing racialized structures of expropriation and exploitation, it does not connect individual students' "good intentions" to the tradition of Western universities acting as "civilizing entities" within colonial contexts (Stier, 2004), nor does it address how ISL potentially reproduces and enacts new forms of economic and cultural imperialism (Khoo, 2011). Hence, this script can reify the notion that students in positions of relative material advantage have "solutions" to the problems of those denied it, rather than prompting these students to consider how their own advantages may have been assured through the impoverishment of the very people they seek to "help." This impulse to "help" also ignores that communities imagine their own, context-specific solutions and visions of the future.

Killick (2011) describes a liberal humanist approach when he suggests "belonging within and identifying with such an international community offers students the basis for extending the circle of people whose rights they recognize within the global community, people at least a little closer now to being equally human" (p. 380). The fact that affirmation of equal humanity is understood as the (potential) *outcome* of global citizenship education, instead of its presumed

starting point, is telling. Rather than an existential claim, it is aspirational. Thus, in this position

the global citizen is implicitly situated as a resident of the West who needs to have their horizons

of humanity expanded, yet their position as the arbiter of Others' humanity is not challenged;

meanwhile, the rest of the world is positioned as passively awaiting recognition and aid.

In short, because liberal humanist global citizenship is premised on identification with the

Other and the belief that transcending difference is not only possible but desirable for the Self, it

erases persistent racial, economic, and other power differentials between the Self and Other

(Jefferess, 2008). This position also registers as a demand that the Other adapt to the Self's

supposedly universal norms and values in order to be deemed deserving and fully human (Patel,

2016). Even when the focus is on valuing difference, because of the emphasis on shared

humanity and the failure to question the frames through which value is assessed, there is a limit

on how much difference is permitted. This is particularly true in the case of difference that

prevents global citizens' ability to see themselves in the Other (because the Other is viewed as

dangerous, unworthy, or simply too different), or to see themselves as "good" (because they are

implicated in the Other's subjugation). In this sense, liberal humanist scripts exemplify the desire

for "social difference without social consequence" (Povinelli, 2002, p. 16), and may

reconsolidate rather than interrupt the Self as the gauge of universal value.

Imperial Imaginings and the Entrepreneurial-Liberal Humanist Subject

Baillie Smith and Laurie (2011) suggest, "international volunteering may promote global

equity by fostering greater awareness of social justice and development and enhancing global

citizenship, *or* promote corporate efficiency and career progression through individual skills

enhancement" (p. 548, emphasis added). Although they position a social justice approach as

antithetical to a career-oriented approach, these two possibilities are not mutually exclusive, and

186

often converge within a single student or program. Indeed, despite identifying entrepreneurial and liberal humanist scripts as distinct, in practice they are difficult to disentangle, as the line between them is blurred in the different forms of capital (material, moral, cultural) that are accumulated by the global citizens they imagine. For instance, "intercultural competency" may be central to the humanist orientation, but can also be leveraged toward international job opportunities, while participation in international service-learning becomes a "value-added" line on one's CV (Deardorf, 2006; Hunter, White & Godbey, 2006; Zemach-Bersin, 2007).

In one example of these blurred positions, Reimers (2009) argues,

Absent a strong and wide base of skills that include international competencies such as knowledge of world history and geography, understanding of global issues, foreign language skills and cultural flexibility, the prospects are bleak for American competitiveness, and for good and enlightened government and citizenship, at a time of growing integration with the global economy. (p. 39)

In this piece, Reimers merges ethical and economic concerns under the banner of what he calls "Enlightening globalization." Indeed, the entanglement of ethical and economic rationalities within global citizenship discourse and practice is rooted in European Enlightenment political philosophy and its idealized human subject (Silva, 2015).

As theorized by decolonial scholars, this subject first emerged five hundred years ago as Europe sought to reorder the globe through processes of colonization and slavery, and laid the foundations for the three pillars of colonial modernity: nation-states, global capitalism, and 'universal' humanity. The 'universal' (i.e. European) subject that emerged in this context was/is conceived to hold universal human knowledge and values, and therefore be entitled to unfettered access to the world's resources and uniquely qualified to lead inferior/less developed (Indigenous

187

and racialized) Others toward universal humanity. Here is where the link to global citizenship becomes evident. According to Angod (2015), it is in "global space" that this supposedly universal subject is encouraged to "encounter her innate leadership abilities" (p. 84), especially through encounters with the object of her ethical and/or economic intervention – the Other.[28] Hence emerges the "global citizen." Returning to the three pillars, of which I have only addressed 'universal' humanism and global capitalism thus far, I note that, despite the fact that making a claim to *global* citizenship apparently disavows or diminishes the importance of the third pillar, the nation-state, global citizenship is generally reserved for and accessible to those with certain nationalities, especially from Western countries whose global hegemony ensures their citizens' relative ease of mobility. Thus, it is precisely one's particular nationality that, among other things, serves as the conditions for one's 'universal' globality.

The Euro-supremacist genealogy of 'universal' humanity, and the colonial conditions required for the existence of a 'universal' subject, are clearly evident in classical notions of cosmopolitanism that commonly inform global citizenship efforts (Rizvi, 2008). Though cosmopolitanism has its origins with the Hellenes (commonly known as the Ancient Greeks), during the Enlightenment Kant revisited it to propose a globally unifying vision. Particularly given his use of racialized logics, Grosfoguel (2012b) suggests that Kant's vision was really one of a "European provincialism camouflaged as universalist cosmopolitanism and sold to the rest of the world as an imperial design" (p. 91). Indeed, Kant's cosmopolitanism offered a rationale for global trade that presumed a racist geography of the planet. Dhawan (2013) argues that

---

[28] Note the shift in gender pronouns here. While the universal subject of the Enlightenment was and remains a white cis-male, much global citizenship theory and practice today is organized with white cis-women in mind. Thus, the question of gender is an important issue to unpack. Although I do not have the space to do so here, see Angod (2015) and Heron (2007), regarding the role of white femininity in relation to the 'helping imperative' and 'civilizing mission' that drive many liberal humanist global citizenship efforts.

contemporary calls for a renewed cosmopolitanism generally fail "to seriously address the historical processes through which certain individuals are placed in a situation from which they can aspire to global solidarity and universal benevolence," while other individuals are placed in a situation in which they are grateful objects/recipients of that solidarity, benevolence, and economic intervention (p. 144). Jazeel (2011) suggests that the concept of cosmopolitanism continues to be characterized by "planetary yearnings [that] normalize universality *as* an extension of Eurocentric modernity" (p. 78, emphasis in the original).

In sum, the guiding assumptions that frame the imagined purposes and possibilities of both entrepreneurial and liberal humanist global citizenship tend to reflect the imperial global imaginary that, as Lowe (2015) describes it, "continues to be elaborated today, casting differentiated peoples across the globe in relation to liberal ideas of civilized personhood and human freedom" (p. 92). This imperial imaginary compromises the transformative possibilities of higher education internationalization more generally, and reproduces harmful patterns and ideas. Matus and Talburt (2009) suggest that common discourses of internationalization "naturalize certain ideas about global space and [in so doing] produce the realm of the institutionally thinkable and unthinkable" (p. 525). What, or who, remains unthinkable is anyone who fails to adhere to the presumed universality of the good economic and ethical (Enlightenment) subject. Thus, this subject/Self depends on the presumed particularity/ irreducible difference of the global outside (object/Other) against which to assert their universality and enact their imagined global citizen rights and responsibilities. Yet, this dependence is foreclosed by the belief that the universal subject is self-made, while their Other is determined by external forces within a pre-existing global space (Silva, 2007).

As a result, within both the entrepreneurial and liberal humanist global citizenship positions, it is presumed that the relationship between Self/Other begins only when the former freely decides to 'engage' the Other, when in fact, decolonial critiques contend that the Self and the Other are both constituted within the epistemological and ontological conditions of an imperial global imaginary. What is the effect of the ontological and epistemological presuppositions of the entrepreneurial and liberal humanist positions? The conviction that the Self's perceived responsibility to the Other is a matter of individual choice that would-be global citizens can opt in or out of, depending on their assessment of the benefits of doing so, the extent to which they identify shared concerns, values, or goals with the Other, or their desire to serve as benevolent global leaders. Made absent from view are the larger contexts (discursive and material architectures) within which these 'individual' ethical and economic choices are made and affected. Conversely, the two remaining global citizenship positions that I theorize attend to the colonial logics that produce these contexts, and assign differential places in them.

The Anti-Oppressive Position

Given the accumulated institutional and historical power of the entrepreneurial and liberal humanist positions, it can be difficult to pose alternative imaginings of global citizenship. Nonetheless, a growing number of scholars and students have demanded more critical approaches to global engagements in higher education. The anti-oppressive global citizenship position is largely scripted in contestation of the normative, existential, and aspirational claims of the first two positions, which it identifies as, at best, depoliticized and ahitorical, and at worst, actively engaged in the reproduction of global and local inequality and harm. Existentially, this position identifies how colonial, racialized, and gendered flows of power, wealth, and knowledge operate to ensure the continued advantage of the Global North as a whole, and elites in both the

Global North and South, through the continued subjugation of marginalized populations. Normatively, it advocates for global solidarity, achieved through the redistribution of resources, epistemic justice, and horizontal, grassroots forms of governance, while aspirationally it seeks the radical transformation of existing structures and relationships to interrupt "the imperial politics that has shaped the current world system" (Jefferess, 2008, p. 31).

Despite internal diversity within this position, most question the entrepreneurial emphasis on affluence pursued through capital accumulation, and the liberal humanist tendency to structure relationships in ways that affirm the 'universal' knowledge, values, and benevolence of the imagined global citizen. There is an understanding in scripts of the anti-oppressive position that although the concept of global citizenship is not transcendentally tied to any particular state, institution, or identity, the ways it is commonly deployed tend to reify existing inequalities. In particular, they problematize how mainstream approaches tend to implicitly presume that the global citizen is a middle-class white citizen of the Global North, while nonetheless positioning them as uniquely able to transcend their own particularity (race, class, nationality) to achieve universal humanity. Zemach-Bersin (2007) argues that these approaches to citizenship obscure "politics and power structures that are tied to the interests of and allegiances to the nation-state" (p. 20) and produce "a sense of universal entitlement" (p. 21), while Angod (2015) captures the circularity through which "Not only…does global citizenship fail to make a meaningful intervention in structural disadvantage, but structural disadvantage is also the condition that makes global citizenship possible" (p. 76)

Some iterations of the anti-oppressive position therefore suggest the need to reformulate or reframe the concept of global citizenship. For example, rooted in her work on transnational feminism, Mohanty (2003) conceptualizes "transborder democratic citizenship" (p. 528), which

entails "building feminist solidarities across the divisions of place, identity, class, work, belief, and so on" (p. 530). Jorgenson and Shultz (2012) suggest the need to explicitly link global citizenship with social justice efforts, while Rhoads and Szelényi (2011) argue for a "globally informed collectivism" that is "less imperial, more thoughtful, more caring, more transnationally connected" (p. 42). Aspirationally, then, many anti-oppressive scripts suggest their interventions will disrupt and resist the reproduction of existing violent patterns of the Self-Other relation, in order to "develop an alternative imaginary of global connectivity" (Rizvi, 2009, p. 266).

Examples of practical efforts articulated from this position are campaigns against the use of sweatshop labor in production of university apparel sold on campus (Silvey, 2002), or those that advocate that universities divest their endowments from fossil fuel companies or companies that profit from war and imperial occupation. Campaigns to make universities into "sanctuary campuses" for undocumented students may also be understood as an example of this position. Notably, there tends to be less institutional recognition and material support for these efforts than there are for those aligned with entrepreneurial and liberal humanist positions, and in fact they are more likely to be framed as disruptive activism than engaged global citizenship (Stern & Carey, 2017). Others in this position emphasize the need to more substantively connect local and global injustices. For instance, Roshanravan (2012) notes the risk that global engagements are being instrumentalized to disavow responsibilities to marginalized local communities, which "erases the presence of culturally and racially different inhabitations of gender amongst US [sic] people of color" (p. 7). In response, she proposes the praxis of "staying home" as an alternative to studying abroad, which would entail "*fracturing* the familiar ideological and epistemic boundaries that constitute one's sense of home by *re-inhabiting* one's geographic home through the lens of the colonized and racially dispossessed" (p. 2, emphasis in the original).

Although not all of the above actions are articulated through the frame of global citizenship, their scripts tend to question the depoliticization, ahistoricism, salvationism, ethnocentrism, and paternalism that often characterize mainstream global citizenship efforts (Andreotti, 2012), and they thereby offer a means to speak back to the two dominant global citizenship scripts, and create opportunities for discussion, systemic analysis, and reflexivity. Notably, the anti-oppressive contests the liberal humanist position that global subjects are paternalistically responsible *for* the Other, instead arguing that they are responsible *to* the Other, precisely out of recognition of the Self's complicity in historical and ongoing harm. Thus, there is perceived to be an ethical obligation to fight for redress and social transformation, including in ways that seek to displace the "Self" from the centre of the global citizenship narrative.

However, this position also has limitations. Anti-oppressive scripts can at times inadvertently enact claims of their own innocence or heroism by failing to recognize their structural complicity in the systems under critique (Ellsworth, 1989; Hoofd, 2012). This risks presuming that there is a 'pure' space outside of contamination by Eurocentrism, and that an avant-garde of activists and intellectuals will lead the rest of us there (Moallem, 2006). Thus, while the anti-oppressive position and its interventions are indispensible, in its concern to refute the power and universalism of the two dominant positions, it can at times overlook the possibility, as Lee (2014) suggests, that "rather than rupturing the Western inscription of citizenship at its core, [it] actually replicates the transcendent aspirations of colonial enlightenment and liberal universalism to which it is opposed" (p. 76).

Another limitation of the anti-oppressive position is that, as with the entrepreneurial and liberal humanist positions, it may reproduce the assumption that Self and Other are preconstituted positions who subsequently meet within a field of (uneven) relations. This

presumes that what needs transforming is the relationship between Self and Other, albeit on a structural rather than individual level (in contrast to the liberal humanist approach). However, in assuming that Self and Other are produced independently, another possibility is foreclosed, a possibility that is offered by the fourth and final position I map: global citizenship otherwise. From this space, the Self and Other are positions constituted relationally through a colonial framework that produces categories of knowledge and existence (epistemological and ontological) marked by differential value. Thus, what needs transforming is not simply the relationship between Self and Other, but the framework in which *both* subject categories are produced. Rather than displacing the Self and moving the Other to the centre from the margins, there is an effort to dismantle the framework that organizes that centre-margin dynamic, and that is falsely imagined to represent the full range of possibilities for human existence.

The Otherwise Position

Although each of the three positions detailed above offer different approaches to global citizenship, they all largely presume that their desired outcome is achievable by making willed choices, either through self-interested compromise, shared interests, or reasoned and/or morally righteous critique. Against this notion, Silva (2013) and others have suggested that interventions based in existing understandings of justice limit possibilities for moving and imagining otherwise from sanctioned categories of knowing, being, and relating. Jones and Jenkins (2008) suggest that in order to pursue more just relations across difference, those in structurally dominant positions need to cede the "*ability to define the conditions* or the social-political space within which, they believe, getting to know each other becomes possible" (p. 477, emphasis in the original). With this in mind, I articulate a fourth position, global citizenship otherwise, in which existing scripts for thought and action are not outright rejected, but their limitations are

illuminated and other possibilities are experimented with, but not determined in advance. To conceptualize this position, I draw on decolonial scholars who critique the Euro-supremacist cosmopolitical ordering of the world through symbolic and material violence. This position offers an existential claim that the supposed coherence and universality of European/Western scripts produce white subjects of the liberal West (whose humanity is projected as superior and universal) in relation to racialized and Indigenous Others (whose humanity is deemed suspect, and defined as perpetually underdeveloped and particular according to the West's purportedly universal standards of value). From the otherwise global citizenship position, efforts to address inequality by 'elevating' those assigned to the category of Other to a position equal to the Self are misplaced, and may even reproduce the colonial dynamic. Rather, the source of the problem is understood to be the reproduction of colonial categories of difference and measures of value themselves, and how these enframe and grant unequal worth to those who are assigned to them. This position contends that, as long as we continue to operate within these frames, different possibilities for existence will be disciplined or contained by the limited available categories that they offer: the universal Self versus particular Other. The cost of inclusion into the category of the universal Self is the sublation of a difference deemed *too* different, and the cost of remaining the particular Other is the continued rationalization of one's subjugation.

Although not addressing global citizenship in particular, Nayar (2013) has argued that if universalism is foundational to Western ontology and epistemology, then rethinking existing arrangements must not become efforts to merely "include" into Euro-supremacist ideas of humanity those who have been excluded, as this would maintain (though expand) existing boundaries, as in many entrepreneurial and liberal humanist approaches (as well as some anti-oppressive). Universalism contains an imperative of commensurability, which Povinelli (2001)

argues tends to manifest as a demand that those whose difference exceeds the sanctioned liberal humanist norms of universal reason adjust and adhere to those norms – or else face the consequences of failing to comply. In other words, commensurability is only made possible through "actual legal, economic, and social repression" of those deemed to be "repugnant" (p. 329), or by effacing difference by grafting it onto Western knowledge in ways that are legible to normative subjects (Ahenakew, 2016). This is the underside of the liberal humanist imperative to find shared humanity and orient justice around social harmony and universal values.

Refusing the imperative for commensurability within colonial frames challenges existing social arrangements and Self-Other relations, and in the process, potentially prefigures or revitalizes possibilities for scripting them differently – or, perhaps, for not scripting them at all. Existing possibilities for the subjects produced as Self and Other themselves come under scrutiny and become potential objects of transformation. In reply to the question of "where this will take us" that arises in response to a refusal of commensurability, Povinelli (2013) asks another question: "How can this be answered when 'us' is no longer because the world that made 'us' has been unmade?" (p. 443). We might therefore describe this as an approach to global citizenship that "look[s] to its own undoing" (Jazeel, 2011, p. 94), because it recognizes its entanglement with harmful forms of world-making. It would invite students to engage at the edges of what is possible or knowable within the existing imperial global imaginary, and create experiences wherein they become dissatisfied with the available possibilities. It is at that space that something "otherwise" becomes possible, though is never reassured, and the risk of relapsing back into the comfortable positions and frames of reference is high.

The project "Through Other Eyes" (TOE) may be understood as a practical example of an otherwise approach to global citizenship. By presenting Indigenous perspectives on international

development to students in the UK, TOE was intended to prompt recognition of "the limits of modern reasoning triggered by radical alterity" (Andreotti, 2014a, p. 142). The project was formulated so as to invite (but not coerce) participating students to "re-arrange their attachments to absolute certainties and desires for consensus, intelligibility and discursive completeness" (p. 143). Through this program, engagement with difference was not formulated as a means to develop greater understanding of the Self or of the Other, or to find commonalities between the two, but rather served as a "push towards the limits of existing possibilities" (p. 143).

Hayes and Cuban's (1996) "border pedagogy" framework for service learning could potentially operate as an otherwise position, but is often carried out in ways that ultimately reaffirm the existing dynamics of Self-Other relations. Border pedagogy emphasizes engaging across difference toward deeper self-reflection and possible reconstruction of the Self. While cultivating self-awareness is an important educational objective, it can also recentre and reaffirm one's worldview if one's frames of reference are not disrupted but rather new experiences are incorporated into existing frames. Although border pedagogy may ultimately facilitate transformation, in an otherwise global citizenship position, encounters across/through difference are not meant to primarily result in a re-fashioning of the Self. Rather, they are invitations into a space of enhanced awareness of: entanglement of the Self with the Other; the violence of existing Self-Other relations; and the obligation (before/beyond) individual will to interrupt and dismantle those relations, as well as the ontological and epistemological framework that produced them, without presuming a predetermined endpoint to this work.

As with any other global citizenship position, the otherwise position has limitations. Its comparatively 'thinner' script might be frustrating for those, particularly in the liberal humanist or anti-oppressive positions, who seek clearly more defined, progressive goals and outcomes.

Indeed, there is a simultaneous need for immediate targeted and harm-reducing interventions to go alongside this position's open-ended experimentation with alternatives. However, the otherwise position's limitations with regard to immediate practical interventions is also its gift. Because there is no demand to formulate finite, immediate answers to the questions of how to make the world differently, or "How can I know difference in ways that do not prescribe otherness in my own terms" (Jazeel, 2011, p. 88), the otherwise positions holds open the space in which previously suppressed or unimaginable possibilities might emerge.

Conclusion: Global Citizenship Off Map, Off Script

The idea of global citizenship has broad purchase in universities in the Global North, but its meaning remains contested within higher education theory and practice. Furthermore, as in the case with internationalization efforts more generally, global citizenship carries with it the imperial baggage of the European Enlightenment's discursive-materialization of the globe, and the ethical and economic norms of universal humanity that it naturalizes. In this chapter I sought to unpack this baggage and to ask what else is possible by mapping four common global different citizenship positions (summarized below in Table 7.1).

Table 7.1: Summary of global citizenship positions

	Entrepreneurial	Liberal Humanist		Anti-oppressive	Otherwise
Self/Other Framing	All people are either potential competitors or sources of profit (cost-benefit)	Privileged people should help those less fortunate than themselves (humanitarianism)		Those committed to justice should work together to create change (solidarity)	Interdependence is a condition, not an individual choice (entanglement)
Normative claim (how global citizens should act)	Make choices that maximize profit and advance one's personal gain	Defend universal knowledge and values, work toward progress/ shared goals	critique of imperial global imaginary	Transform unequal systems and relations, redistribute resources	Unlearn/dismantle colonial categories of knowing, being, and relating, without guarantees
Existential claim (current state of things)	We have shifted from an industrial to a knowledge economy; the world is flat	Over-emphasis on economic imperatives compromises humanistic values		The world is organized by structures of exploitation and domination	Within dominant frames of knowing/ being, it is difficult to imagine/enact true alternatives
Aspirational claim (path to desired future)	Acquire skills and capital to succeed in a global economy	Develop greater understanding in order to see others as equally human, achieve harmony		Centre the most oppressed peoples/ communities, decentre the privileged	Dismantle dominant frames, learn how to be (and be in relation) in ways as-yet-unimaginable
Example	Microfinance projects organized by student groups	Volunteer-centred international service learning projects		Fossil fuel divestment, sanctuary campus campaigns	"Through Other Eyes" project

Following the spirit of social cartography, the purpose of this map was to offer a provisional and partial interpretation of the global citizenship positions that are presently available in Global North colleges and universities, rather than a timeless, transparent representation of all the positions that are possible. However, while existing scripts of global citizenship may provide the sense of security demanded of those guiding students' international experiences, they can also foreclose opportunities to imagine differently.

This is not to say scripts are all 'bad' or that they we can merely will them away in order to imagine them anew. Indeed, they are often strong and difficult to dislodge, being kept in place through repetition and entrenched institutional forces, as well as students own identities and sense of Self. Thus, putting common scripts under question can generate both cognitive and affective resistance (Taylor, 2013). Drawing on Spivak and emphasizing how imperial European imaginings of global cohabitation tend to inflect even the most radical efforts to think differently, Jazeel (2011) concludes that unlearning might therefore be a necessary step toward living together differently, through "a willful wrenching away from the desire to know without any degree of certainty or singularity" (p. 89). Paradoxically, it may be from a place of *not* knowing that a different kind of (non-imperial) knowing becomes possible (Alexander, 2005).

Such unlearning/unknowing may offer a useful avenue for rethinking global citizenship in university internationalization contexts. This would also demand, according to Jazeel (2011)

> that we desist from the desire to too categorically fix and singularize the meanings
>
> of the planet as totality. Provisionality and humility must be woven into the
>
> geographies we bring to the planet, and those geographies must always leave
>
> space for a plurality to come. (p. 90)

We might translate unlearning to an "unscripting" of discursive patterns of global citizenship. A first step in this process might be to deepen critical engagement with existing scripts while nonetheless problematizing the colonial desire to make the world fully knowable, and therefore, controllable. The exercise of having students engage with maps of global citizenship, such as the one provided here or one that they collaboratively produce, without requiring that they identify with and defend a single position, offers one way of denaturalizing common sense scripts for thought and action in international engagements. This activity neither necessitates giving up a

commitment to critical interrogation, nor adopting absolute relativism. Yet, engaging the range

of scripts by tracing where they are coming from and where they are going might illuminate the

arrogance of the desire for mastery – of ourselves, of others, of knowledge, of the planet. In this,

they might understand indeterminacy, incommensurability, and discontinuity not as limitations

but as generative of new possibilities for knowing, being, and relating.

Conclusion

It is rare for a dissertation to produce more questions than answers. Usually, one starts

with questions in order to arrive at answers by the end. However, it has been my contention

throughout this dissertation that critical scholars examining the ethics and politics of

internationalization in higher education have perhaps been asking the wrong questions. There is

growing recognition that our dominant system of knowledge is inadequate for addressing the

unprecedented global challenges and crises we face. Yet, if not only the ecological but also the

economic, political, and other challenges we currently face indeed have their roots in longer

histories but also ongoing modern epistemological and ontological frames, then we must take

this into consideration or else risk reproducing that same violence (Grosfoguel, 2013; Stein et al.,

2017). This means developing a healthy suspicion around the search for solutions that can be

found within existing possibilities. Throughout this dissertation I have argued that what is needed

is not simply new answers to old questions about internationalization, but rather the

historicization of old questions, and the posing of questions that many of us have previously not

thought to ask. This also includes grappling with the fact that a whole set of other possibilities

have been foreclosed by imperial epistemic frames that are not easily cracked or bypassed. I

approached this task from a decolonial orientation, informed by Indigenous, Black, postcolonial,

and modernity/coloniality studies, that: challenges narrow ideas of the public good;

problematizes the uneven global politics of knowledge; resists universalist ideas of human

progress and development (specifically as these are defined by capitalism and liberal

democracy); denaturalizes and historicizes global wealth inequality; and fosters (self-)reflexivity

in critique and familiarity with the complexity and difficult of enacting social change.

In addition to this overarching decolonial orientation, I also experimented with several frameworks in relation to key concerns of critical internationalization scholarship. These included: a social cartography of three approaches to critical internationalization studies in Chapter 4 (soft, radical, and liminal); conceptualization and historicization of four different approaches to the interruption of Western epistemic dominance in Chapter 5, as this might relate to internationalizing the curriculum (thin inclusion, thick inclusion, institutionalizing interdisciplines, and alternative institutions); and, in Chapter 7, a map of four different global citizenship positions (entrepreneurial, liberal-humanist, anti-oppressive, and otherwise). I have also employed the notion of an imperial global imaginary, and three pillars of the architecture of colonial modernity (nation-state, global capital, and 'universal' Enlightenment humanism). These frames and vocabularies have raised as many questions as they have provided answers, and could be put into conversation with one another future work. At the same time, they remain flexible, partial, and open to further development, transformation, or replacement once they cease to be useful. My intention has not been to prescribe definitive alternative frameworks for internationalization theory and practice, but instead to make use of provisional, imperfect concepts in order to explore and experiment at the limits and edges of existing options.

Primary Insights of the Dissertation

Despite examining different dimensions of internationalization, I found that the most common perceptions of the purposes of internationalization within Western literature are heavily informed by capitalist economic and 'universal' humanist rationales. Further, perceived critical possibilities for how to approach internationalization are largely circumscribed by a contested, but enduring imaginary that categorizes difference into hierarchies of value ahead depending on an assessment of one's placement with regard to a linear path of human development. Three

primary insights emerged, which I review below before reflecting on my own position as author

of this dissertation, and considering implications for policy and practice, and outlining future

lines of research in this area. I found that: 1) liberal frames of justice limit the available

possibilities for reimagining internationalization; 2) higher education as both an institution and a

field of study has yet to come to terms with its own colonial foundations; and 3) despite the

importance of critique, critique alone is not adequate to the task of dismantling imperial frames

or continued investment in/desire for fulfillment of the promises of colonial modernity. Until we

recognize this, then even the most critical interventions may continue to reproduce an imperial

global imaginary premised on Euro-supremacy of humanity and knowledge, and a single story of

human progress through capitalism. I review each finding in more detail below.

Limits of Liberal Justice

As Rizvi and Lingard (2010) note, "Justice is a highly complex idea which does not

admit any universal definition" (p. 157). Thus, it becomes necessary to ask, "Where do our

visions for justice originate? How do we inhabit them?", so that we might "reexamine and

transform inherited practices that stand in the way of justice" (Alexander, 2005, pp. 92-93). In

this dissertation, I have asked how and why those of us working in and on the global dimensions

of higher education imagine justice in the way(s) that we do, and why it is often so difficult to

imagine it otherwise. Why do certain ideas flourish, while others remain inconceivable or

illegible, and why do certain questions appear timeless, while others continue to remain

unthought and unasked? What explains the proliferation of a particular rhetorical pattern or

practical approach to problems surrounding internationalization, and not others?

I have found that many of even the most critical assessments of contemporary

internationalization lean heavily on the normative terms of liberal justice and its presumed

universality. Indeed, this idea of justice is so deeply engrained within our dominant global imaginary that it is difficult to imagine and act outside of it. For instance, in the face of the neoliberal transformation of higher education, critical scholars have often responded with a defense of liberal ideals. In the context of internationalization, the shift from the post-War development aid-centred focus toward a focus on profit is lamented as a betrayal of the West's global leadership responsibilities. Clear distinctions are made between international educational engagements oriented by benevolence and goodwill, and those oriented by economic interests or greed. Further, in contestation of the increasingly hegemonic spectre of a "global knowledge economy," there has been a tendency to champion the abstract idea of a "global public good" as a more democratic and inclusive alternative. These responses are invaluable in their commitment to resist the idea that there is no alternative to neoliberalism, and I have not sought to dismiss the good intentions underlying this commitment. However, I have asked about the conceptual grounding and material effects of these intentions. In particular, I note that while the inevitability of neoliberal capitalism is resisted, and some form of redistribution is sought, rarely questioned is whether capitalism as a whole is inevitable. Similarly, the critique of the international education shift from "aid to trade" depoliticizes the phenomenon of international aid, uncritically delinking it from the Euro-supremacist evolutionary assumptions and Western economic and political interests that have driven and continue to drive many aid programs (Silva, 2015).

Ultimately, liberal theories of justice can only recognize harms that are legible within, and resolvable through, the epistemological and ontological codes of liberalism itself. The result of defining injustice as exclusion from universality in the context of internationalization is that we tend to prescribe access or inclusion as the means to then achieve justice. We rarely ask: Access to/inclusion into what, at whose/what expense, and to what end? Here I briefly employ a

metaphor of a table to outline the limits of this liberal approach to justice. I treat the table as a metaphor for higher education itself; in fact, it is not uncommon for people to colloquially refer to diversity and inclusion efforts as making sure everyone has a "seat at the table."[29]

If liberal theories of justice identify the absence of certain groups at the table as a problem rooted in exclusion, then the solution will be to invite select people to the table who are deemed to embody the 'missing' difference. Different iterations of liberal justice may envision this process of inclusion unfolding somewhat differently. For instance, some approaches may be satisfied with the mere offer of an open *invitation* to the table, and are not terribly concerned about actually ensuring excluded people secure a spot; others would 'reserve' one or a few spots for those who had historically been excluded, but that space would then be considered a gift for which the new attendee should be grateful (and owe allegiance and compliance to the table hosts). Rarely do the hosts consider it a viable possibility to add *many* new seats, especially if those seats would displace those who were already there and are deemed to have 'properly' earned their spots and their authority. This also means that the previously excluded may be prompted to compete with one another for access to one of the limited number of spots.

Generally, the previously excluded are only welcomed to the table if they fit perfectly into the seat that is offered to them. Minor adjustments may be accepted, but anything that would fundamentally alter the structure of the table is not. Seat adjustments or requests for a different chair or suggestions about reorganizing the table or redistributing power at it may be taken as intrusive and perceived as a betrayal of the presumed neutrality of the table itself. In other words, these requests or demands may be understand as a threat to the authority of those who (falsely) consider the table to be rightfully 'their' property, despite their own claims about its universality.

---

[29] See Ahmed (2012) for an extended meditation on these questions, including some references to tables.

Within the frames of liberal justice, it is rare to ask about how the existing members at the table arrived and secured their place, about who decided the shape of the table and why, or about how the table itself came to be in the first place. But what does justice mean if the labour and resources that built the table in the first place, and sustain its continued renewal, are not taken into account? Does offering "a seat at the table" (i.e. conditional and tokenistic inclusion) to a small number of people from the populations on whose backs the table was built, and on whose lands the table sits, equate to justice? And what about those who do not desire a seat at the table at all – because it is not, in fact, a universally desired structure – but who rather want something else? Such questions do not appear in liberal justice deliberations because it is simply presumed that everyone should want to be at the table; if they don't, they must have improper aspirations, in which case they are perceived to have no right to comment on the state of the table at all. With liberal justice, the problem therefore can never be perceived to originate with the table itself, or any of its three foundational 'legs', as this would challenge the whole enterprise; but this precisely where decolonial critiques begin. Indeed, decolonial critiques suggest we must "reconfigure what constitutes global justice or injustice if we are to make sense of the real-world inequities that motivate critical theorists and social movements" (Mckeown & Nuti, 2016, p. ii). Through the internationalization of higher education, there are potential opportunities to explore or experiment with such reconfigurations, yet these efforts remain rare, and relatively marginalized as compared to mainstream internationalization approaches (Stein et al., 2016).

The Coloniality of Modern Higher Education

Patton (2016) makes a powerful case that, "The establishment of U.S. higher education is deeply rooted in racism/White supremacy, the vestiges of which remain palatable" (p. 317). Indeed, as Wilder (2013) found in his study of slavery and colonialism in early U.S. colleges,

these institutions "were instruments of Christian expansionism, weapons for the conquest of indigenous peoples, and major beneficiaries of the African slave trade and slavery" (p. 17). Rodríguez (2012) takes this even further, suggesting "the university (as a specific institutional site) and academy (as a shifting material network) themselves cannot be disentangled from the long historical apparatuses of genocidal and protogenocidal social organization" (pp. 812-813). However, the role of white supremacy, settler colonialism, anti-Blackness, and global imperialism are rarely centred in accounts of the formation and ongoing organization of U.S., or Canadian, higher education (Patton, 2016; Thobani, 2016). These absences create an ethical gap that precludes higher education scholars and practitioners from coming to terms with the field's complicity in colonial and racial violence. They also produce a conceptual gap, stymieing our ability to adequately grasp the implications of universities' historical and ongoing simultaneous dependence on *and* vulnerability to the imperative of global capitalist expansion. These gaps become evident in many theories of, and practical approaches to, internationalization that fail to adequately situate the present within a longer history of global colonial relations.

What is it about the "field imaginary" of higher education research that makes it so difficult to address questions about racial, colonial, and capitalist conditions of possibility of modern higher education, and how this relates to the present? According to Pease (1990), a field imaginary is constituted by "norms, working assumptions, and self-understandings" (p. 3) through which practitioners of a field make sense of their shared objects and methods of study (see also Wiegman, 2012). To engage the questions that a decolonial orientation raises regarding the basic legitimacy of modern higher education institutions and their ability to deliver justice represents a significant challenge that arguably extends beyond moral or political questions to existential ones as well. Unlike the fields of anthropology, comparative literature, and more

recently, sociology, international relations, and to some extent other areas of education, higher education as a field has yet to have its own iteration of a (de-)/(post-)/colonial turn.

Notably, there is nothing necessarily transformative about such 'turns', as often they are either (or both) strongly resisted, and/or quickly adopted but in relatively superficial or instrumental ways. Regarding the latter, the destabilizing effects of troubling a field's foundations hold both enormous potential for transformation but also present the risk that it will be met with efforts to incorporate the destabilizing critique in such a way that enables a reestablishment of firm grounds, even as some potentially important changes may be made in the process. The effect of this desire to reestablish the field's stability is that critiques of existing internationalization policies and practices may be welcomed only insofar as they provide immediate, status quo-affirming solutions to the problems that are raised. Critiques that raise existential questions – such as those that consider contemporary uneven global engagements and ethical crises as more continuous with past formations of higher education than not (Rodríguez, 2012), or those that imagine universities as spaces of abolition (Marez, 2014), or spaces in which to practice 'hospicing' modernity (Andreotti et al., 2015) – may be understood as threatening. In general this means that race, racism, and colonialism can only be critiqued as long as they are framed as epiphenomenal to modern higher education, rather than foundational to it. To not only 'hear' but also act on critiques that go beyond this would require disinvesting in: the normative rights and ideals of subjecthood, citizenship, and property ownership; the presumption of one's own superiority, universality, and benevolence; and the promise a future based in certainty, prosperity and progress (Moten, 2014; Stein et al., 2017). This is true for those who currently have access to these benefits, as well as for those who are denied them yet nonetheless aspire to achieve them. Hence, the colonial circularity of critical internationalization studies should be

understood in relation to the failure of higher education studies as a whole to address its racial/colonial entanglements, and the persistent desire to "transcend affluence without giving anything up" (Jefferess, 2012, p. 19). I address this dynamic further in the following section.

Circularities and Traps of Critique

Ahenakew (2016) describes a two-step process of addressing epistemic injustice. The first is to "make what is invisible noticeably absent, so that it can be remembered and missed"; the second is to "make what is absent *present*" (p. 333, emphasis in the original). The second step is impossible without the first, and yet getting from step one to step two is a deceivingly complicated and challenging process. In many ways this dissertation is an effort to inhabit the liminal space of risk and possibility between steps one and two in the context of critical approaches to internationalization. There is growing recognition that existing theories and practices of internationalization tend to reproduce old economic and epistemic patterns, and non-horizontal relationships at both local and global levels. Scholars and practitioners have started to see that something is absent, and we seek to bring this absence to the attention of others who haven't realized it is missing. However, in our efforts to make what is absent present, there are many potential pitfalls that undermine the intended effort of seeking greater justice. I summarize two of these pitfalls as: failure to address the histories, systemic power relations behind the absence; and the mistaken belief that the absence is about missing *content* rather than about the epistemological and ontological assumptions and investments that make up our *frames*.

To briefly illustrate these two pitfalls, I employ Santos's (2007) metaphor of the abyss. For Santos, modern/Western thought can be characterized as "abyssal thinking," which institutes a divide between Western knowledge as universal human truth, and all other knowledge traditions on the other side of the divide, in the "abyss." These non-modern/Western knowledge

traditions are denied relevance and even existence – they are made invisible, and actually become illegible from within the frames of Western knowledge. Hence, these knowledge traditions are actively made to be *absent*, and those who hold them and deemed incapable of "universal knowledge" and thus denied recognition within the bounds of humanity. For Santos, in order to achieve global justice we must therefore enact cognitive justice, or what he calls "post-abyssal thinking," and work toward creating an "ecology of knowledges", in which *all* knowledges are both insufficient and indispensible, and the framing that institutes universal/particular divide becomes meaningless. This process of moving from abyssal to post-abyssal thinking is where many new challenges arise – that liminal, transitional space between Ahenakew's (2016) step one and two of addressing epistemic injustice. At this edge of the abyss is where the pitfalls happen – but also where different possibilities also lie.

The first pitfall is about power. Simply put, until we recognize and start to address the extent to which Western knowledge, and the subjects of Western knowledge, have not only sought to assert their/our own universality, but have also actively rationalized the psychic and material violability of non-Western peoples and the exploitation and expropriation of their labor, land, and resources for the accumulation of capital, the abyss will remain in place. The structure of the abyss not only denies the equality of those on the 'other' side of the abyssal line, it also forecloses acknowledgement of how those on the 'good' side of the line depend on the line and its violence to both epistemologically validate and materially reproduce their own existence. This means that we need to address how Western knowledge/Western subjects of knowledge, are embedded in larger architectures that depend on abyssal thinking to keep the nation-state and global capital running smoothly, and to affirm their/our humanity through Euro-supremacy.

In this way, the abyss is not a product of individual ignorance, and undoing it is not a process of simply adding different knowledge, or knowledge about difference. Rather, it is one of collectively tackling, disinvesting from, and taking apart the architectures that enable the violently productive work of the line. It is not possible to transcend this violence through the articulation of critique alone, nor is it possible to heal its harms without transforming the way that we live and organize our collective lives (Jefferess, 2012). It is necessary to return expropriated labors and lands, not simply through the payment of monetary sums within existing economic architectures of colonial modernity, but through ultimately dismantling those architectures and collectively reimagining how to pay the unpayable debts of modern racial and colonial violence (Silva, 2014). Some people describe this process as decolonization, others term it abolition, reconstruction, revolution, or resurgence, but it goes by many names as well as many unnamed projects and practices of organized and every-day resistance and social transformation that are not collapsible into each other, but which nonetheless share many basic commitments.

To arrive at the point where dismantling the abyssal line (and the architectures that hold it up) appears imaginable and just requires facing up to complicity in its reproduction, and unraveling investments in its promised securities of universality, entitlement, benevolence, autonomy, and righteousness. These investments are not easily dispensed with, given that they form the basis of what those of us who were socialized as "modern subjects" consider a meaningful existence (Stein, Hunt, Suša & Andreotti, 2017). In the context of higher education, the difficulty of facing the truth about this line is evident when we consider the popular consensus about the basic *goodness* that higher education in general is thought to represent and enable, ideally if not always in practice (McMillan Cottam, 2017). Tilak (2008) succinctly summarizes this perceived positive role: "Public higher education systems are generally regarded

as the single most important instruments in the maintenance of a democratic system, as it [sic] produces [a] better, well-informed citizenry, enabling more sensitive and wider public participation and debate on national issues" (p. 455). Meanwhile, writing about the U.S. context, Trow (2000) argues, "[C]olleges and universities…give substance to the idea that anything is possible to those with talent, energy and motivation. This sense of society with limitless possibilities for all, largely (though not exclusively) through higher education, is what is usually meant by 'the American dream'" (p. 312). To face the abyssal line would force a confronting with the fact that this dream is subsidized by nightmares (Stein et al., 2017), and to face higher education's historical and ongoing participation in colonial violence (Roy, 2006; Wilder, 2013).

The second pitfall is not unrelated to the first, having to do primarily with misdiagnosis/misrecognition of the problem. Often once we recognize an absence, we think the solution is to 'bring in' what is missing, which indicates that we think we lack some kind of important content. As Bruyneel (2013b) writes, we often presume "if only we all knew better, had all the facts, then these historic injustices would be resolved, or at least we would be on our way to addressing them" (p. 238). However, it is not simply a lack of knowledge that perpetually threatens to foreclose alternative possibilities for resistance and other imaginaries of justice. What the metaphor of the abyss illustrates is that the problem is located deeper down. For those who believe themselves to be transparent universal modern subjects of universal knowledge, it is hard to grasp that their/our own epistemic frames are frames at all, rather than, as is often assumed, simply open windows onto universal truth/reality. The challenge of how to crack this illusion of universality is substantive, as in many ways it undermines the central promises made to modern subjects. To do so would require, amongst other things,

a suspension of the conviction that I am necessarily better, I am necessarily

indispensable, I am necessarily the one to right wrongs, I am necessarily the end

product for which history happened, and that New York is necessarily the capital

of the world. (Spivak, 2004, p. 532)

The practical and pedagogical question of how to prompt such a suspension has run throughout

this dissertation. My partial answer is that, in order to interrupt the circularity of critique and

reframe our approaches to internationalization, it is necessary to identify, denaturalize, and

interrupt our satisfaction with existing sociohistorical and geopolitical frames of conceptualizing

higher education. By mapping the tensions, edges, limits, paradoxes, and scholarly short-circuits

of existing research within the burgeoning field of "critical internationalization studies," I have

sought to generate deeper, more self-implicated conversations about the complexities and

contradictions that accompany both internationalization and critical responses to it. Further,

identifying and distinguishing between contrasting investments and assumptions that underlie

different approaches to global justice in higher education are necessary (but insufficient) for

reimagining internationalization in more ethical, sustainable, and socially responsible ways.

However, as Gaztambide-Fernández (2012) writes, critiques that emphasize "individual

autonomy and rational consciousness" tend to "reconstitute the individual as the site of social

change and are ultimately based on the same conception of knowledge – and of the

human/'Man'– that served as the foundation for justifying slavery, genocide, and wars of

conquest" (p. 42). He argues that Western reason alone "has so far failed to yield an ethical mode

of being that can satisfactorily counter the forces of colonization" (p. 42). Yet, this mode of

rational argument and planning of alternatives through individual will is a popular approach to

critique, including in the context of critical internationalization studies, and including in my own

work. Indeed, the modern university itself is rooted in the liberal promise of continuous self-critique and subsequent improvement, as has been the premise of the Enlightenment mode of knowledge production all along (Foucault, 1984; Moten & Harney, 2004). Critique can therefore serve as much as a re-instantiation of hegemonic power as an interruption of it (Mitchell, 2015).

Perhaps part of the problem is that we often think that what is needed is for us to 'know better' so that we can 'do better,' when what may be required is for us to first admit: we don't know. That is, perhaps the kind of knowing that many of us are used to is not they key to radical transformation, as is often assumed. As Burman (2012) notes, "[T]here is no way we are going to intellectually reason our way out of coloniality, in any conventional academic sense. There is no way we are going to publish our way out of modernity. There is no way we are going to read our way out of epistemological hegemony" (p. 117). We might also consider that often in our efforts to 'do better', we do more harm than good, either because our desire to 'do better' is still rooted in the same old colonial promises, and/or because our desire to 'do better' contradicts other desires that we are not yet ready to give up. When we have finally not only denaturalized but have also become disenchanted with the imperial global imaginary, and the architectures of colonial modernity, and their shiny promises, there is much work still to be done – not all of which is intellectual, and most of which cannot be accomplished through the efforts of one individual. As Alexander (2005), Moten (2014), Silva (2013, 2014), King (2015) and many others affirm, decolonization is as much about offering persistent and trenchant critiques of the world as it is about addressing own complicity in harm and resolutely affirming (without romanticizing) the creative, collective power of alternative possibilities and socialities.

Reflections on My Role as Knowledge Producer

This dissertation was explicitly ordered by a decolonial orientation committed to identifying how frameworks of higher education research and practice (including critical ones) either interrupt and/or reproduce an imperial imaginary of the globe. At the same time, I have sought to not simply evaluate and condemn these frameworks, but to also trace the complex processes that contribute to their ongoing reproduction, to consider how they shape desires and even good intentions, and to explore the difficulty of interrupting them and enacting possibilities otherwise. Thus, throughout the dissertation I have not only offered critiques of existing phenomena and patterns of world-making in internationalization, but I have also reconsidered the frames of existing critique deployed by both myself and others. I have done so not to diminish the importance of critical internationalization studies, but rather to ask what underlies my own and others' continued investment in it. In other words I have sought to interrogate that which I and many others "cannot not want" (Spivak, 1994, p. 278). This approach is informed by a committment to self-reflexively inhabit and trace the terms of the debate in which one wishes to intervene (Kapoor, 2004), in order to ask about both the productive and circumscriptive effects of these terms, their colonial genealogies, and their material conditions of possibility.

Further, I have done this not simply for the sake of documenting contradiction, complexity, and complicity but also out of what I perceive as the need to deepen and complicate existing conversations about internationalization with a diverse set of scholarly, practitioner, and lay communities with contrasting stances from my own. In this element of my approach, the process of engagement is as important as the outcome, and in fact the process has no predetermined outcome apart from the general intention to interrupt harmful discourse and practices. The combination of a decolonial orientation and a commitment to "stay with the

difficulty" without prematurely seeking to resolve it led me to explore the tensions and

paradoxes of a critical approach to internationalization in several different formats. This

included: my effort in Chapter 4 to tease out some of the existing, contrasting approaches to the

critical study and practice of internationalization; my attempt, in Chapter 5, to outline the

strengths and limitations of different approaches to address curricular Euro-supremacy; my

illustration, in Chapter 6, of how we might, in more empirical work, produce a fuller accounting

of coloniality in its contradictory, transnational character; and my effort, in Chapter 7, to bring

the questions that occupy me in the previous chapters into conversation with the increasingly

hegemonic higher education discourse of developing students into future "global citizens."

This range of approaches reflects my own perceived necessity to bring these

conversations to different focus areas, and tailor my approach for each context. What I have

learned from my work experimenting with different vocabularies and frames is that it is possible

to speak about the same issue from multiple perspectives and to multiple communities. When

intervening in any space or ongoing conversation, it is important to consider where people are

coming from, and to be aware of and responsive to their investments, interests, and concerns,

without at the same time condoning harms that they might be engaged in. It is also crucial to

carefully situate oneself in those conversations. As Alexander (2005) notes in a reflection about

the reasons behind the shortcomings and failures of many decolonizing efforts,

> Part of our own unfinished work…is to remember the objective fact of these
>
> systems of power and their ability to graft themselves onto the very minute
>
> interstices of our daily lives. It means that we are all defined in some relationship
>
> to them, in some relationship to hierarchy. Neither complicity (usually cathected
>
> onto someone else) nor vigilance (usually reserved for ourselves) is given to any

of us before the fact of our living. Both complicity and vigilance are learned in

this complicated process of figuring out who we are and who we wish to become.

(p. 272)

Our relationships to hierarchy will vary depending on our social positions. Undoubtedly, my

position as a white, middle-class settler in the Global North affects how I articulate my critiques

of colonial modernity, and how I am received in different spaces when I do so. For instance, this

position tends to allow me to speak and be heard in predominantly white spaces where racialized

and Indigenous peoples are often less welcomed, or welcomed under strict conditions as "space

invaders" (Ahmed, 2012). In many cases when already vulnerable populations point out and

contest their own subjugation, they are identified as disruptive, often intensifying their existing

vulnerabilities. As Ahmed writes, "those of us who report problems become the problem" (p.

164). Conversely, in these spaces I have an opportunity to try and "make space" for necessary,

uncomfortable critical conversations. Such an approach nonetheless risks a self-righteous

paternalism or saviorism, and can quickly become a means to "take space" from those who are

most immediately affected by colonial and racial violence in order to advance one's own career

and other personal interests (Naepi, personal communication, April 5, 2017; see also Andreotti,

2014a; Cusicanqui, 2012; King, 2016a; Lee, 2015; Snelgrove et al., 2014).

As Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández write (2013), "the future of the settler is ensured by

the absorption of any and all critiques that pose a challenge to white supremacy, and the

replacement of anyone who dares to speak against ongoing colonization" (p. 73). This absorption

of critique can also take the form of absolution-seeking by individuals from dominant

populations who are motivated by the false notion that "If I recognize and state the problem, then

I am no longer part of the problem." This is underscored by the socialized desires to "feel good,

218

look good and be seen as doing good" (Andreotti et al., 2015, p. 29), which may take precedence

over uncomfortable efforts to face up to complicity in a harmful system. This stance fails to

grapple with the fact that one's relation to (and accountability for) structural domination is not

simply a matter of individual attitudes and that, from a decolonial orientation, critique is itself

only one part of addressing the ethical and political debts that are owed in their psychological,

epistemological, and material dimensions. In seeking to avoid the traps of self-affirmation and of

treating critique as the end goal of transformation rather than its starting point, there are no easy

answers or perfect strategies, only constant vigilance, humility, negotiation, learning, listening,

learning that often even when we think we are listening we often still cannot hear, and taking

responsibility for one's ongoing structural position in relation to the reproduction of violence and

for one's new mistakes and their effects, regardless of our intentions or our individual

convictions. This would, as Pillow (2003) suggests, recognize that there is a need for

> ongoing critique of all of our research attempts, a recognition that none of our
>
> attempts can claim the innocence of success (even in failure) – with the
>
> realization that many of us do engage in research where there is real work to be
>
> done even in the face of the impossibility of such a task. (p. 192).

While recognizing the necessary uncertainty and discomfort around this work, certain

guiding principles may help to minimize further harm done. For instance, it is decidedly not the

role of the white scholar to speak for racialized or Indigenous populations, or to co-opt their

knowledges. The end product of interventions by white scholars in the area of decolonial critique

should be not the replacement of marginalized scholars through absorption of their critiques

without any substantive consequence, but rather a sustained commitment to participate in the

necessary transformation of existing mainstream structures, institutions, and practices of power

219

and knowledge production. Even for those who are agnostic about whether modern institutions can in fact be "made just," as long as those institutions remain in place there remains a responsibility to make the institutions more immediately livable for all (Andreotti et al., 2015). Much of this work can be done in collaboration with, and often in deference to, those populations that are most affected, in full recognition of and respect for the heterogeneity and complexity of those populations (Gordon, 1997). Yet, there must also be attention paid to who is expected to engage in the bulk of the labor of transformation. In many cases, marginalized populations have always and already offered the most sustained and rigorous critiques, and taken on the labor of demanding and enacting change, often at great personal risk to themselves, their health, their kin, and their careers. The burden of transformation should rest disproportionally on those with the most responsibility for creating the problem. Without this, there is simply a desire for absolution from one's participation in the violence of colonialism, without actually dismantling the structures the pillars of colonial modernity that hold it up.

Future Work

For the remainder of the conclusion, I use my findings from this dissertation to consider what further scholarly and practical interventions might be useful in efforts pluralize and complicate possibilities for global justice and social change in higher education in the context of internationalization, and more generally. However, I note that the idea of pluralization I reference here is not that of liberal pluralism, which polices the boundaries of acceptable difference on liberalism's own terms – difference that can be neatly contained by liberalism's 'universal' frames. To enact a different form of plurality, as in the one posed in the Zapatistas' famous decolonizing vision of "a world in which other worlds fit" (as cited by Grosfoguel, 2012a, p. 99), is to refute and commit to dismantling the colonial "worlding of the world"

(Spivak, 1990), i.e., the imperial global imaginary. As Gaztambide-Fernández (2012) notes, "educators are called upon to play a central role in constructing the conditions for a different kind of encounter, an encounter that both opposes ongoing colonization and that seeks to heal the social, cultural, and spiritual ravages of colonial history" (p. 42). If this is the case, then it remains pressing that those of us in higher education actively engage in the work of denaturalizing, unlearning, and actively dismantling sedimented social, political, and economic architectures, enacting redress and reparations at symbolic and material levels, and confronting our own stubborn self-conceptions of superiority, universality, and transparency.

Global Justice Literacy

This dissertation has suggested that there is a significant need for more theoretically informed practical tools, frameworks, and resources for prompting and fostering ethical local and global engagements amongst practitioners and students alike. There are multiple theories of global justice, which are in turn premised on different ideas and imaginaries of social change, but I have found that liberal frames of global justice tend to predominate in internationalization scholarship, and tend to presume that both the nation-state and global capital are inevitable and benevolent structures that can adjudicate justice as long as the right policies and precautions are in place (McKeown & Nuti, 2016; Tuck & Yang, 2016). However, other theories of justice are possible and indeed are already being practiced, even if they are invisibilized and invalidated within an imperial global imaginary. Thus, in any effort to intervene within global contexts of education, it is important to develop critical literacy around different visions of justice – to trace where they come from, what investments they rest on, and where they (potentially) lead. Social cartographies are one such literacy tool that I have explored in this dissertation; metaphors, such as the metaphors of the table and the abyss offered in this conclusion, are another.

Whatever pedagogical methods or theoretical concepts one uses, developing literacy for global justice should prepare people to engage the complexity, uncertainty, and plurality of the world. Literacy for global justice might entail familiarizing students with the following processes: tracing and denaturalizing uneven distributions of wealth, power, and resources; attending to the politics of knowledge production and epistemic authority/certainty, including asking what/who is absent from a context or conversation, and why; considering whether we are asking the right questions, rather than simply answering existing questions; mapping both the possibilities and limitations of divergent imaginaries of justice, ideas of social change, and desired futurities; and learning how to be and be in relation without requiring a shared consensus.

A global justice literacy framework would also prepare people to take into account at least three layers of any issue before they intervene: the past, to develop a critical historical memory, and learn the sources and root causes of novel developments; the present, to identify recurrent patterns of inequality, in order to interrupt them and stop repeating the same mistakes; and the future, to pluralize what is possible by recognizing the limits of dominant narratives and knowledges, maintaining an global-mindedness to other narratives and knowledges without co-opting them, and possibly creating new ones. Further, this would require students to self-reflexively situate themselves in relation to any potential intervention, including how their actions, responses, and intentions are informed by: 1) their individual experience (that is, one's own personal and family history); 2) their collective referents (that is, subject positions, social roles, and shared social meanings), and 3) institutional patterns and practices.

Finally, all of this might be fruitfully informed by Spivak's (2004) formulation of education as an "uncoercive rearrangement of desires" (p. 526). By describing her approach to education as 'uncoercive,' Spivak indicates that the necessary pedagogical disruption of existing

harmful desires operates open-endedly, 'without guarantees' and without a predetermined landing point. That is, the intention behind preparing students with global justice literacy is not to indoctrinate them into a single, shared imaginary of justice, but rather to have them trace where different ideas, imaginaries, and practices of justice come from, and where they are likely to lead, while also recognizing the limits of their own understanding and transparency.

Higher Education at the Roots

While I am increasingly skeptical of the idea that more knowledge and more critical accounts of colonial and racial violence will alone lead to transformation, this knowledge remains indispensible for the potential disruption of existing colonial frames. Addressing the archive from a decolonial orientation rarely answers our existing questions, yet it may be powerful in its ability to prompt previously unasked questions (Morgan, 2016). Hence, one of my primary findings was that critical internationalization studies should be understood in relation to the failure of higher education studies as a whole to address its racial/colonial entanglements. Returning to Patton (2016), who argues, "capturing the present context of racism/White supremacy in higher education requires acknowledging its violent, imperialistic, and oppressive past" (p. 317), there is a need for more sustained engagements with the colonial roots of modern Western higher education, however, engagements with these roots must proceed with an awareness of the ethical risks involved in doing this sort of decolonial excavating work.

In the past ten years, a number of universities have taken steps to address their own institutional histories of race and colonialism (Auslander, 2010; Brophy, 2008; Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice, 2006; Clarke & Fine, 2010; John Evans Study Committee, 2014). Growing public awareness accompanied by student demands around these issues suggest that they will increasingly garner attention. While I am heartened by this uptick in

interest, I am also concerned that the institutional incorporation of these histories will not necessarily lead to deeper examination of ongoing racial and colonial violence. In my own case study examination of one institution's apology for its participation in slavery, I found a tendency for the institution to instrumentalize the apology as a move toward absolution, rather than having it prompt more substantive transformation (Stein, 2016). In this way, the apology actually created a space in which slavery could be framed as a temporally confined exception to what was otherwise a noble institutional ideal, one which has since been more thoroughly honoured. Thus, the apology served as a means for the institution to position itself as 'good' for having made the apology, while making few commitments to address ongoing anti-Blackness or to address the wider implications and obligations around this foundational violence. Nonetheless, this liberal justice framing was refuted and critiqued by some members of the university community, as well as the surrounding community, and because of this, the conversation continues on that campus.

Granted, this was only one institution, and my findings cannot be generalized without further study. However, scholars who examine contemporary apologies in other contexts trace a similar tendency. Sharpe (2016) writes of "trying to articulate a method of encountering a past that is not past" (p. 13) with regard to the afterlife of slavery, and points to the failure of institutions like museums to do this work. She finds that even when these institutions try to account for slavery and colonialism, it is falsely presumed that these are past events that are over and done, or at least progressing toward an inevitable end, rather than identifying them as the organizing logics of contemporary existence that continue to produce the present. In response, Sharpe asks: "How does one, in the words so often used by such institutions, 'come to terms with' (which usually means move past) ongoing and quotidian atrocity?" (p. 20). I argue that it is the task of higher education scholars not to simply ask these questions but to also, as Sharpe

224

suggests, question the terms through which institutions ask and pose answers to them – and, crucially, the terms through which higher education as a field has done so.

In examining the social foundations of higher education, it is fruitful and ethically important to engage existing critiques and critical histories of the modern university. This would include direct engagement with the various traditions of decolonial thought, including Black studies, Indigenous studies, Latinx studies, Asian American studies, post-colonial studies, women and gender studies, and more. As Mitchell (2013) notes, "scholars in these fields negotiated, debated, and theorized the conditions of their institutionalization in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s" (p. 739). In other words, in fighting for their own institutionalization, these fields articulated sharp critiques of the universities they sought to enter and transform. These genealogies of thought are significant, and should inform our framings of the past and present.

If the promises of liberal democracy, and the knowledge produced and transmitted within its institutions of education, are as deeply entangled with empire as decolonial scholars suggest, then racism and colonialism cannot be reduced to exceptional, shameful moments in a larger, prouder history of progress and freedom. Nor can they be treated as mere synonyms for exclusion that can be adequately redressed through inclusion when the institutions into which people are being included still depend on violence to exist. Yet, these conditions of possibility are often disavowed. To talk about the disavowals that structure dominant modes of higher education research and practice is to signal various modes of active forgetting or un-knowing. Thus, for the possibility of transformative ideas of justice to become a reality, the field must not simply examine higher education's historical role in subjugation, but also historicize its own epistemological frames and their underlying colonial conditions.

Learning from Alternatives

For Silva (2013), "Knowing at the limits of justice…requires critique and something else"; this kind of knowing is at once a kind of knowing and doing; it is a praxis, one that unsettles what has become but offers no guidance for what has yet to become" (p. 44). The way I have conceptualized a decolonial orientation in this dissertation calls for three analytical moves in relation to an intervention into the critical study of internationalization, but also of higher education more generally. The first move is to *interrupt and denaturalize* the epistemological and ontological frames of modern existence that are produced through violent and unsustainable relationships and processes – and to ask about the role of education in reproducing and or/interrupting these frames. This means going beyond simply rearranging the content within existing frames, and instead stepping back to ask about the conditions and productive effects of the frame itself. The second move is one of *grappling with/at the limits* of the kinds of relations and futures that are possible within existing frames, so that we might start to disinvest from attachments to their harmful promises, and to learn the lessons from our repeated mistakes. Finally, the third move is one of attending to the need to *reimagine and recreate what is possible* – and to ask about the role of education in facilitating these other possibilities. Such a reimagining starts to become possible at the moment of denaturalization, in particular through recognition of the limits of justice within the modern configuration of existence. Further, the possibility for existence 'otherwise' is signalled by everything that exceeds and cannot be contained by modern categories of knowing and modern modes of being. Here is the invitation to engage and experiment responsibly with alternative possibilities, without simply appropriating difference. In this dissertation, I have focused primarily on the first and second move, and having done so, we might be better equipped to consider tentative, provisional possibilities for the third.

226

In addition to important interventions within existing internationalization programs and policies at mainstream institutions, there are a growing number of experimental education projects and communities that have approached questions of global justice and its various dimensions from a decolonial orientation. I explored a few of these in Chapter 5 in my discussion of 'alternative institutions' as one approach to denaturalizing epistemic Euro-supremacy. These efforts often take place outside of formal, mainstream settings, because of the difficulty of enacting radical alternatives within established institutions that are rooted in and often highly invested in reproducing colonial modernity. Even as these projects situate their work in relation to larger global contexts and developments, they tend to be locally rooted, and centre the interests and concerns of a particular community. As such, they may be described as "trans-local" (Stein et al., 2016). Several such projects have organized into an emergent education collective and developed a framework for integrative and intergenerational approaches to justice: ecological, cognitive, affective, relational, economic – Earth CARE – justice.

Projects like those hosted by Earth CARE collective members can offer valuable learning for those involved in their day-to-day operations and efforts to reimagine the meaning of justice. As Alexander (2005) suggests, "we need to learn how to *practice* justice, for it is through practice that we come to envision new modes of living and new modes of being that support these visions" (p. 93, emphasis in the original). However, those of us working in mainstream institutions also have much to learn from these experiments. Namely, they signal that the limit of what *appears* possible within our institutions is not the limit of what is *actually* possible. The lessons learned from conceptualizing the gap between what appears possible and what is actually possible is a crucial one if we are to commit to truly pluralizing and transforming higher education beyond liberal frames of justice. At the same time, there is a danger in romanticizing

these alternative educational projects, which can lead to papering over their internal contradictions, heterogeneities, and problems. Further, there is an imperative not to decontextualize these interventions from the local communities from which they largely have arisen, and which they seek to serve. We cannot 'copy and paste' from these diverse contexts to our own, lest we repeat, in reverse, the ruse of universal value and relevance. Thus, in engaging with alternatives, there is a need to interrupt the modernist desire for prefabricated futures that would enable us to easily or quickly transcend the entangled messes of colonial modernity. As Santos (2007) argues, what is demanded by decolonial critique is not a proliferation of predetermined alternatives (that will be imagined from within the bounds of what it is already possible to imagine) but instead alternative ways of thinking about alternatives.

Final Thoughts

In the era of Trump, Brexit, and other xenophobic and white/ethno-nationalist and, at least nominally, anti-globalist movements, there has been a strong response amongst many educators to affirm the power of global education and global engagements for combating prejudice and avoiding political isolationism. Others have specifically expressed concern that Trump's immigration and foreign policy agendas may negatively affect international student applications and enrolments in the United States – and conversely, Canadian institutions have eagerly sought to court the potential defecting international students. However, the findings of this dissertation challenge simplistic assumptions that international engagement necessarily interrupts harmful desires, extractive social relations, or economic systems.

Much has been written about how internationalization can enable universities to produce more relevant knowledge and better prepare students for personal and professional success in an increasingly volatile, complex, and uncertain world. Even when framed in a way that ostensibly

opens up new possibilities for knowing, being, and relating, in many cases calls for rethinking our international educational engagements eschew genuine alternatives and are motivated by underlying anxieties: about growing competition and the potential loss of Western nations' exceptionalism, and their historical (unearned) economic and political advantage (George-Jackson, 2008; Tannock, 2007); about the unassimilable difference of the Other (Povinelli, 2011); about conflict and dissensus, instead of the more comforting (false) promises of consensus (Suspitsyna, 2012); and about our own vulnerabilities, particularly to the very structures of harm that we have previously used against others in the name of our own self-actualization and self-preservation (Butler, 2004; Thobani, 2007; Stein et al., 2017).

For this reason, as higher education institutions, scholars, and practitioners have responded to (or, in some cases, made) these calls to rethink internationalization, we have often done so according to inherited modes of problem solving without questioning the framing of the problem itself. This framing is characterized, as Clarke and Phelan (2015) argue, by the modern "penchant for (epistemic) certainty, (ahistorical) predictability, and (centralized) control" (p. 268). The effect has been to: limit the available possibilities for ethical relationality between both humans and other than human beings (Andreotti, 2011; Alexander, 2005; Donald, 2012; Gaztambide-Fernández, 2012; Kuokkanen, 2008); deny marginalized communities, both near and far, the resources and opportunities to create and lead their own visions for education, social development, and transformation (Battiste, 2013; Gandhi, 2011; Kapoor, 2014; Mignolo, 2012; Spivak 2004); and reproduce existing Euro-supremacist knowledge hierarchies (Andreotti, 2011; Santos, 2007; Smith, 2012). By using the very tools that caused contemporary problems in order to solve them, we narrow rather than pluralize possible futures (Nandy, 2000).

The desire to minimize uncertainty and risk in an intensely connected world can also lead educators and researchers to arrogantly overstate the predictive and problem-solving capacity of modern knowledge (Morin, 1999). Considerable harm has resulted from earlier efforts to engineer human progress and guarantee certain outcomes; the imperative to maintain (the illusions of) security, control, and our own innocence has been used to justify the production and mobilization of knowledge in the service of preventative measures, extractive mechanisms, and modes of governance that diminish others' well-being and life chances (Nandy, 2000; Smith, 2012; Stein et al., 2017). If we do not find a way to interrupt these cycles and reorient our desires toward different horizons, we may lose the opportunity to nurture other kinds of relations, learn with other ways of knowing, and imagine other worlds than the one we have inherited.

Bibliography

Abdi, A. A., & Shultz, L. (2011). Recolonized citizenships, rhetorical postcolonialities: SubSaharan Africa and the prospects for decolonized ontologies and subjectivities. In V.D.O Andreotti & L. M. T. M. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education* (pp. 158–171). New York, NY: Routledge.

Abu El-Haj, T.R. & Skilton, E. (2017). Toward an awareness of the "colonial present" in education: Focusing on interdependence and inequity in the context of global migration. *Curriculum Inquiry, 47*(1), 69-79.

Adnett, N. (2010). The growth of international students and economic development: Friends or foes*? Journal of Education Policy, 25*(5), 625-637.

Agnew, M. (2012). A false dichotomy of serving either the local or the global community and its impact on internationalisation of the university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *34*(5), 473-489.

Ahenakew, C. (2016). Grafting Indigenous ways of knowing onto non-Indigenous ways of being. *International Review of Qualitative Research, 9*(3), 323-340.

Ahenakew, C., Andreotti, V. D. O, Cooper, G., & Hireme, H. (2014). Beyond epistemic provincialism: De-provincializing Indigenous resistance. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples, 10*(3), 216-231.

Ahenakew, C., & Naepi, S. (2015). The difficult task of turning walls into tables. In A. Macfarlane, M. Webber, and S. Macfarlane (Eds.), *Sociocultural theory: Implications for curricula across the sector* (pp. 181-194). Christchurch, NZ: University of Canterbury Press.

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Aikau, H. K. (2015). Following the Alaloa Kīpapa of our ancestors: A trans-Indigenous futurity without the state (United States or otherwise). *American Quarterly*, *67*(3), 653-661.

Akomolafe, B. & Jain, M. (2016, March 11). The revolution will not be schooled. The Rules. Retrieved from: http://therules.org/education-learning-and-development-this-revolution-will-not-be-schooled-how-we-are-collectively-improvising-a-new-story-about-learning/

Alcoff, L. M. (2007). Mignolo's epistemology of coloniality. *CR: The New Centennial Review, 7*(3), 79-101.

Alexander, M. J. (2005). *Pedagogies of crossing: Meditations on feminism, sexual politics, memory, and the sacred.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Alfred, T. (2009). Colonialism and state dependency. *Journal de la Santé Autochtone*, *5*, 42-60.

Altbach, P. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management, 10*(1), 3-25.

Altbach, P., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3-4), 290-305.

Alvarado, L. A. (2010). Dispelling the meritocracy myth: Lessons for higher education and student affairs educators. *The Vermont Connection, 31*, 10-20.

American Council on Education (n.d.). Internationalization toolkit. Retrieved from September 7, 2016: http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Internationalization-Toolkit.aspx

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso.

Anderson, T. (2015). Seeking internationalization: The state of Canadian Higher education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *45*(4), 166-187.

Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy & Practice-A Development Education Review*, (3).

Andreotti, V. (2009). Global education in the '21st century': Two different perspectives on the 'post-' of postmodernism. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, *2*(2), 5-22.

Andreotti, V. (2012). Education, knowledge and the righting of wrongs. *Other Education*, *1*(1), 19-31.

Andreotti, V. D. O (2014a). Conflicting epistemic demands in poststructuralist and postcolonial engagements with questions of complicity in systemic harm. *Educational Studies, 50*(4), 378-397.

Andreotti, V. (2014b). Strategic criticism and the question of (in)accessibility of the Other. *Glottopol: Revue de sociolingquistque en ligne*, 23, 134-147.

Andreotti, V. (2016). The educational challenges of imagining the world differently. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, *37*(1), 101-112.

Andreotti, V., Ahenakew, C., & Cooper, G. (2011). Epistemological pluralism: Ethical and pedagogical challenges in higher education. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *7*(1), 40-50.

Andreotti, V.D.O., Stein, S., Ahenakew, C., & Hunt, D. (2015). Mapping interpretations of decolonization in the context of higher education. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 4*(1), 21-40.

Andreotti, V. D. O., Stein, S., Pashby, K., & Nicholson, M. (2016). Social cartographies as performative devices in research on higher education. *Higher Education Research and Development, 35*(1), 84-99.

Angod, L. (2015). *Behind and beyond the ivy: How schools produce elites through the bodies of racial others* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto).

Arthur, N., & Flynn, S. (2011). Career development influences of international students who pursue permanent immigration to Canada. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, *11*(3), 221-237.

Arthur, N., & Flynn, S. (2013). International students' views of transition to employment and immigration. *The Canadian Journal of Career Development/Revue canadienne de développement de carrière, 12*(1).

Arvin, M., Tuck, E., & Morrill, A. (2013). Decolonizing feminism: Challenging connections between settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy. *Feminist Formations*, *25*(1), 8-34.

Asimov, N. (2016, February 26). Raucous confrontation at SF State over ethnic studies cuts. *SF Gate*. Retrieved September 1, 2016 from: http://www.sfgate.com/education/article/SFSU-s-iconic-Ethnic-Studies-school-threatened-6852705.php

Auslander, M. (2010). The other side of paradise: Glimpsing slavery in the university's utopian landscapes. *Southern Spaces*. Retrieved May 5, 2014 from: https://southernspaces.org/2010/other-side-paradise-glimpsing-slavery-universitys-utopian-landscapes

Baillie Smith, M., & Laurie, N. (2011). International volunteering and development: Global citizenship and neoliberal professionalisation today. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 36*(4), 545-559.

Ball, S. J. (2012). *Global education Inc: New policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ballantyne, E. F. (2014). Dechinta Bush University: Mobilizing a knowledge economy of reciprocity, resurgence and decolonization. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 3*(3), 67-85.

Barkan, J., & Pulido, L. (2017). Justice: An epistolary essay. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, *107*(1), 33-40.

Barnett, R. (2014). Thinking about higher education. In *Thinking about higher education* (pp. 9-22). Springer International Publishing.

Barnett, R. (2017). Eco-dreams and university geopolitics. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 1-3.

Bascara, V. (2014). New empire, same old university? Education in the American tropics after 1898. In P. Chatterjee, & S. Maira. *The imperial university: Academic repression and scholarly dissent* (pp. 53-77). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit.* Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Bauman, Z. (2000). Education under, for, and despite postmodernity. In A. Brown, & M. Schemmann (Eds.), *Language, mobility, identity: Contemporary issues for adult education in Europe* (pp. 27-43). Munster: Lit Verlag.

Bazinet, T. (2016). *White settler-colonialism, international development education, and the question of futurity: A content analysis of the University of Ottawa Master's Program mandatory syllabi in globalization and international development*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Ottawa, ON: Université d'Ottawa/University of Ottawa.

Beck, K. (2012). Globalization/s: Reproduction and resistance in the internationalization of higher education. *Canadian Journal of Education, 35*(3), 133-148.

Beck, K. (2013). Making sense of internationalization. In Y. Hébert & A A. Abdi (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on international education* (pp. 43-59). SensePublishers.

Belcourt, B.R. (2016, February 1). Can the other of Native Studies speak? *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society.* Retrieved May 15, 2017 from: https://decolonization.wordpress.com/2016/02/01/can-the-other-of-native-studies-speak/

Bhabha, H. (1985). Signs taken for wonders: Questions of ambivalence and authority under a tree outside Delhi, May 1817. *Critical Inquiry, 12*(1), 144–165.

Bhabha, H. (1994/2004). Of mimicry and man: The ambivalence of colonial discourse. In H. Bhabha (Ed.), *The location of culture* (pp. 121–132). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bhambra, G. K. (2013). The possibilities of, and for, global sociology: A postcolonial perspective. *Political Power and Social Theory, 24*, 295-314.

Biccum, A. (2010). *Global citizenship and the legacy of empire: Marketing development*. London, UK: Routledge.

Blanco Ramírez, G. (2014). Trading quality across borders: colonial discourse and international quality assurance policies in higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *20*(2), 121-134.

Boden, R., & Epstein. D. (2006). Managing the research imagination? Globalisation and research in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Eduation, 4*(2), 223-236.

Bolsmann, C., & Miller, H. (2008). International student recruitment to universities in England: Discourse, rationales and globalisation. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 6*(1), 75-88.

Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalization. *International Higher Education, 62*(Winter), 15-17.

Braskamp, L. A. (2008). Developing global citizens. *Journal of College and Character*, *10*(1), 1-5.

Brennan, J., & Naidoo, R. (2008). Higher education and the achievement (and/or prevention) of equity and social justice. *Higher Education*, *56*(3), 287-302.

Brennan, J., & Teichler, U. (2008). The future of higher education and of higher education research. *Higher Education*, *56*(3), 259-264.

Brighter Investment (2014). About us: FAQ. Retrieved May 1, 2017 from: www.brighterinvestment.com/about

Brophy, A. L. (2008). Considering William and Mary's History with Slavery: The Case of President Thomas Roderick Dew. *William & Mary Bill of Rights Journal ,16*, 1091.

Broeck, S. & Junker, C. (2014). Postcoloniality-decoloniality-black critique: Preface. In S. Broeck & C. Junker (Eds.), *Postcolonialit-decoloniality-black critique: Joints and fissures* (pp. 9-18). Frankfurt and New York: Campus Verlag.

Brooks, R. & Waters, J. (2013). *Student Mobilities, Migration and the Internationalization of Higher Education.* UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brown, W. (2003). Neo-liberalism and the end of liberal democracy. *Theory and Event, 7(1)*.

Brown, N. A. (2014). The logic of settler accumulation in a landscape of perpetual vanishing. *Settler Colonial Studies, 4*(1), 1-26.

Brown, L., & Jones, I. (2013). Encounters with racism and the international student experience. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(7), 1004-1019.

Brown, P. & Tannock. S. (2009). Education, meritocracy and the global war for talent. *Journal of Education Policy, 24* (4), 377-392.

Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice (2006) *Slavery and justice: Report of the Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice*. Providence, RI: Brown University.

Brunner, L. R. (2016a). Facilitating transformation through international education. *CBIE.* Retrieved November 10, 2016 from: http://cbie.ca/facilitating-transformation-international-education/

Brunner, L. R. (2016b). The uses of capital in international student and immigration selection criteria. Unpublished paper.

Brunner, L. R. (2017). Higher educational institutions as emerging immigrant selection actors: a history of British Columbia's retention of international graduates, 2001–2016. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, *1*(1), 22-41.

Brustein, W. I. (2007). The global campus: Challenges and opportunities for higher education in North America. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(3-4), 382-391.

Bruyneel, K. (2013a). The American liberal colonial tradition. *Settler Colonial Studies*, *3*(3-4), 311-321.

Bruyneel, K. (2013b). The trouble with amnesia: Collective memory and colonial injustice in the United States. In G. Berk, D. Galvan, & V. Hattam. *Political creativity: The mangle of institutional order, agency, and change.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bryan, A. (2013). 'The impulse to help': (Post) humanitarianism in an era of the 'new' development advocacy. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning, 5(2),* 5-29.

Bu, L. (2003). *Making the world like us: Education, cultural expansion, and the American century*. Praeger Publishers.

Burman, A. (2012). Places to think with, books to think about: Words, experience and the decolonization of knowledge in the Bolivian Andes. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge, 10*(1), 101–119.

Busingye, J., & Keim, W. (2009). The political battlefield: Negotiating space to protect indigenous and traditional knowledge under capitalism. *International Social Science Journal*, *60*(195), 37-54.

Butin, D. W. (2007). Justice-learning: Service-learning as justice-oriented education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *40*(2), 177-183.

Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious life: The powers of mourning and violence*. London, UK: Verso.

Byrd, J. A. (2011). *The transit of empire: Indigenous critiques of colonialism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Cabrera, N. L. (2014). Exposing whiteness in higher education: White male college students minimizing racism, claiming victimization, and recreating white supremacy. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 17*(1), 30-55.

Callan, H. (2000). Higher education internationalization strategies: Of marginal significance or all-pervasive? The international vision in practice: A decade of evolution. *Higher Education in Europe, 25*(1), 15-23.

Cambridge, J. (2002). Global product branding and international education. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *1*(2), 227-243.

Campbell, H., & Murrey, A. (2014). Culture-centric pre-emptive counterinsurgency and US Africa Command: Assessing the role of the US social sciences in US military engagements in Africa. *Third World Quarterly, 35*(8), 1457-1475.

Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) (2014a). *A world of learning: Canada's performance and potential in international education.*

Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) (2014b). *Internationalization statement of principles for Canadian education.*

Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) (2015). A world of learning: Canada's performance and potential in international education. Retrieved October 10, 2016 from: https://mp.cbie.ca/mpower/event/loadevent.action?e=94#home

Cantwell, B. (2015). Are international students cash cows? Examining the relationship between new international undergraduate enrollments and institutional revenue at public colleges and universities in the US. *Journal of International Students*, *5*(4), 512-525.

Cantwell, B., & Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2009). Four stories: Confronting contemporary ideas about globalisation and internationalisation in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 7*(3), 289-306.

Caruana, V. (2014). Re-thinking global citizenship in higher education: from cosmopolitanism and international mobility to cosmopolitanisation, resilience and resilient thinking. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *68*(1), 85-104.

Carvalho, J. J. D., & Flórez-Flórez, J. (2014). The Meeting of Knowledges: A project for the decolonization of universities in Latin America. *Postcolonial Studies, 17*(2), 122-139.

Castro-Gómez, S. (2007). The missing chapter of empire: Postmodern reorganization of coloniality and post-Fordist capitalism. *Cultural Studies, 21* (2-3), 428-448.

CBC News. (2014, November 7). UBC's vantage college: Canadians need not apply. Retrieved from August 5, 2015 from: http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/ubc-s-vantage-college-canadians-need-not-apply-1.2826142.

Césaire, A. (2000). *Discourse on colonialism*, trans J. Pickham. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

Chakrabarty, D. (2000). Introduction: The idea of provincializing Europe. In *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference* (pp. 3-23). Princeton University Press.

Chakravartty, P., & Silva, D. F. D. (2012). Accumulation, dispossession, and debt: The racial logic of global capitalism—an introduction. *American Quarterly, 64*(3), 361-385.

Charania, G. R. (2011). Grounding the global: A call for more situated practices of pedagogical and political engagement. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, *10*(3), 351-371.

Chatterjee, P., & Maira, S. (2014). The imperial university: Race, war, and the nation-state. In P. Chatterjee & S. Maira (Eds.) *The imperial university*, pp. 1-50. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Cheah, P. (2006, November). The limits of thinking in decolonial strategies. The Doreen B. Townsend Center for the Humanities. Retrieved from May 6, 2016 from: http://townsendcenter.berkeley.edu/publications/limits-thinking-decolonial-strategies

Chellaraj, G., Maskus, K. E., & Mattoo, A. (2008). The contribution of international graduate students to US innovation. *Review of International Economics, 16*(3), 444-462.

Chernilo, D. (2006). Social theory's methodological nationalism myth and reality. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *9*(1), 5-22.

Chiose, S. (2016, March 31). International student work program creating low-wage work force: report. *The Globe and Mail.* Retrieved May 15, 2016 from: http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/international-student-work-program-needs-overhaul-report-says/article29463566/?cmpid=rss1

Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC). (2015). Revocation of citizenship. Retrieved October 10, 2016 from: http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/tools/cit/acquisition/revocation.asp

Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC). (2016). Stay in Canada after graduation. Retrieved October 10, 2016 from: http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/study/work-postgrad.asp

Clarke, M., & Fine, G. A. (2010). "A" for Apology: Slavery and the discourse of remonstrance in two American universities. *History & Memory*, *22*(1), 81-112.

Clarke, M., & Phelan, A. (2015). The power of negative thinking in and for teacher education. *Power and Education*, *7*(3), 257-271.

Clifford, V. A. (2009). Engaging the disciplines in internationalising the curriculum. *International Journal for Academic Development, 14*(2), 133-143.

Clifford, V., & Montgomery, C. (2014). Challenging conceptions of Western higher education and promoting graduates as global citizens. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *68*(1), 28-45.

Cobo, C. (2013). Skills for innovation: Envisioning an education that prepares for the changing world. *Curriculum Journal, 24*(1), 67-85.

Collins, C. S. (2012). Land-grant extension as a global endeavor: Connecting knowledge and international development. *The Review of Higher Education, 36*(1), 91-124.

Collins, C. S., & Rhoads, R. A. (2010). The World Bank, support for universities, and asymmetrical power relations in international development. *Higher Education, 59*(2), 181-205.

Coloma, R. S. (2013a). Empire: An analytical category for educational research. *Educational Theory, 63*(6), 639-658.

Coloma, R. S. (2013b). 'Too Asian?' On racism, paradox and ethno-nationalism. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *34*(4), 579-598.

Coloma. R. S. (2017). "We are here because you were there": On curriculum, empire, and global migration. *Curriculum Inquiry, 47*(1), 92-102.

Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science.* Cambridge.

Coulthard, G. (2014). *Red skin, white masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 1241-1299.

Cudmore, G. (2005). Globalization, internationalization, and the recruitment of international students in higher education, and in the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 35*(1), 37-60.

Cusicanqui, S. R. (2012). Ch'ixinakaxutxiwa: A reflection on the practices and discourses of decolonization. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, *111*(1), 95-109.

Cumings, B. (1993). Boundary displacement: Area studies and international studies during and after the Cold War. *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*. Retrieved August 5, 2015 from: http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/cumings2.htm.

David, M. E. (2011). Overview of researching global higher education: challenge, change or crisis?. *Contemporary Social Science*, *6*(2), 147-163.

Davies, B., & Bansel, P. (2007). Neoliberalism and education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20*(3), 247-259.

Day, I. (2015). Being or nothingness: Indigeneity, Antiblackness, and settler colonial critique. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, *1*(2), 102-121.

de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

de Wit, H. (2014). The different faces and phases of internationalisation of higher education. In A. Maldonado-Maldonado and R.M. Bassett (Eds.), *The forefront of international higher education: A Festschrift in honor of Philip G. Altbach* (pp. 89-99). Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media.

de Wit, H., & Urias, D. (2012). An overview and analysis of international education research, Training and resources. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. Heyl, & T. Adams, *The SAGE handbook of international higher education* (101-109). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

De Lissovoy, N. (2010). Decolonial pedagogy and the ethics of the global. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 31*(3), 279-293.

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10(3),* 241-266.

Dechinta Centre for Research and Learning. (2015). "What Dechinta Offers." Retrieved Ocotber 5, 2015 from: http://dechinta.ca/what-dechinta-offers/

Deem, R., Mok, K. H., & Lucas, L. (2008). Transforming higher education in whose image? Exploring the concept of the 'world-class' university in Europe and Asia. *Higher Education Policy, 21*, 83-97.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. NYU Press.

Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD). (2014). *Canada's international education strategy: Harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity.*

Dhamoon, R. K. (2015). A feminist approach to decolonizing antiracism: Rethinking transnationalism, intersectionality, and settler colonialism. *Feral Feminisms*, *4*, 20-38.

Dhawan, N. (2013). Coercive cosmopolitanism and impossible solidarities. *Qui Parle: Critical Humanities and Social Sciences*, *22*(1), 139-166.

Dirlik, A. (1994). The postcolonial aura: Third World criticism in the age of global capitalism. *Critical Inquiry*, 328-356.

Dixon, M. (2006). Globalisation and international higher education: Contested positionings. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*(4), 319-333.

Dodds, A. (2008). How does globalization interact with higher education? The continuing lack of consensus. *Comparative Education, 44*(4), 505-517.

Doherty, C., & Singh, P. (2005). How the West is done: Simulating Western pedagogy in a curriculum for Asian international students. In P. Ninnes & M. Hellsten (Eds.) *Internationalizing higher education: Critical explorations of pedagogy and policy,* (pp. 53-73). Springer Netherlands.

Dolby, N. (2008). Global citizenship and study abroad: A comparative study of American and Australian undergraduates. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *17*, 51-67.

Dolby, N., & Rahman, A. (2008). Research in international education. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(3), 676-726.

Donald, D. (2012). Forts, colonial frontier logics, and Aboriginal-Canadian relations. In *Decolonizing philosophies of education* (pp. 91-111). SensePublishers.

Douglass, J. A., King, C. J., & Feller, I. (2009). Room with a view: Globalization, and the imperative of a broader U.S. perspective. In J. A. Douglass, C.J. King, & I. Feller (Eds.), *Globalization's muse: Universities and higher education systems in a changing world* (pp. 1-11). University of Berkeley Press.

Dua, E., & Lawrence, B. (2000). Challenging white hegemony in university classrooms: Whose Canada is it? *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice, 24*(2), 105–122.

Duderstadt, J. J. (2010). Engineering for a changing world. In D. Grasso & M. B. Burkins (Eds.), *Holistic engineering education* (pp. 17-35). Springer New York.

Dudley, J. (1998). Globalization and education policy in Australia. In J. Currie & J. Newson (Eds.), *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dussel, E. (1998). Beyond Eurocentrism: The world-system and the limits of modernity. In F. Jameson & M. Miyoshi (Eds.), *The cultures of globalization* (pp. 3-31). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Dussel, E. D. (2000). Europe, modernity, and eurocentrism. *Nepantla: Views from South*, *1*(3), 465-478.

Dussel, E. (2013). Agenda for a South-South philosophical dialogue. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, *11*(1), 3-18.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *59*(3), 297-325.

Escobar, A. (2007). Worlds and knowledges otherwise : The Latin American modernity/coloniality research program. *Cultural Studies*, *21*(2-3), 179-210.

Ethical Internationalism in Higher Education (EIHE) Research Project. (2013). Home page. Retrieved January 5, 2016 from: http://eihe.blogspot.ca

European Association for International Education (2012). International student mobility charter. Retrieved January 5, 2016 from: http://www.aieaworld.org/assets/docs/Additional_Resource_PDFs/eaieglobalcharter.pdf

Enslin, P., & Hedge, N. (2008). International students, export earnings and the demands of global justice. *Ethics and Education, 3*(2), 107-119.

Ferguson, R. A. (2012). *The reorder of things: The university and its pedagogies of minority difference.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Fitzgerald, A. & Moten, F. (2015, August 15). An interview with Fred Moten, Part 1: In praise of Harold Bloom, collaboration, and book fetishes. *Literary Hub*. Retrieved May 10, 2016 from: http://lithub.com/an-interview-with-fred-moten-pt-i/

Flaherty, C. (2014, February 22). Who should teach Ethnic Studies? *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved October 5, 2015 from: https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/02/27/cal-state-la-faculty-split-changing-diversity-requirement

Fletcher, R. (2012). The art of forgetting: Imperialist amnesia and public secrecy. *Third World Quarterly, 33*(3), 423-439.

Fong, V. (2011). *Paradise redefined: Transnational Chinese students and the quest for flexible citizenship in the developed world*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fontaine, T. (2016, April 22). What did Justin Trudeau say about Canada's history of colonialism? *CBC Online.* Retrieved October 5, 2016 from: http://www.cbc.ca/news/aboriginal/trudeau-colonialism-comments-1.3549405

Forbes-Mewett, H., & Nyland, C. (2013). Funding international student support services: Tension and power in the university. *Higher Education, 65*(2), 181-192.

Foster, M., & Anderson, L. (2015). Editorial: Exploring Internationalisation of the Curriculum to Enhance the Student Experience. *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice, 3*(3). 1-2, doi:10.14297/jpaap.v3i3.206

Foucault, M. (1984). What is Enlightenment? In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 32-50). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France, 1978–1979.* Ed. M. Senellart. Trans. G. Burchell. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fregoso, R. L. (2014). For a pluriversal declaration of human rights. *American Quarterly*, *66*(3), 583-608.

Gacel-Avila, J. (2005). The internationalisation of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *9*(2), 121-136.

Gaffikin, F., & Perry, D. C. (2009). Discourses and strategic visions: The U.S. research university as an institutional manifestation of neoliberalism in a global era. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*(1), 115-144.

Gale, T. (2012). Towards a southern theory of student equity in Australian higher education: Enlarging the rationale for expansion. *International Journal of Sociology of Education, 1*(3), 238-262.

Gale, T., & Tranter, D. (2011). Social justice in Australian higher education policy: An historical and conceptual account of student participation. *Critical Studies in Education*, *52*(1), 29-46.

Gandhi, L. (1998). *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Gaonkar, D. P. (2002). Toward new imaginaries: An introduction. *Public Culture, 14*(1), 1-19.

Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2012). Decolonization and the pedagogy of solidarity. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1*(1), 41-67.

Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A., & Howard, A. (2013). Social justice, deferred complicity, and the moral plight of the wealthy. *Democracy and Education*, *21*(1), 7.

George-Jackson, C. E. (2008). The Spellings Commission on the Future of Higher Education: Global competitiveness as a motivation for postsecondary reform. *Higher Education Review, 5*, 68-73.

Gibb, T., & Walker, J. (2011). Educating for a high skills society? The landscape of federal employment, training and lifelong learning policy in Canada. *Journal of Education Policy*, *26*(3), 381-398.

Gibbs, P., & Murphy, P. (2009). Implementation of ethical higher education marketing. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *15*(4), 341-354.

Glasgow Caledonian University (n.d.). Internationalising the curriculum: 'Global perspectives' audit tool. Retrieved from October 5, 2015 from: https://www.gcu.ac.uk/media/gcalwebv2/theuniversity/centresprojects/globalperspectives/IoC%20audit%20tool.pdf

Global Affairs Canada. (2016a). Canada's international human rights policy. Retrieved October 5, 2016 from: http://www.international.gc.ca/rights-droits/policy-politique.aspx?lang=eng

Global Affairs Canada. (2016b). EduCanada: New international education brand. Retrieved October 5, 2016 from: http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=1035499&tp=1

Goastellec, G. (2010). Small world: Access to higher education between methodological nationalism and international organisations. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *8*(2), 283-293.

Goldstein, A. (2014). Finance and foreclosure in the colonial present. *Radical History Review*, *2014*(118), 42-63.

Goodwin, C. D., & Nacht, M. (1991). *Missing the boat: The failure to internationalize American higher education*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gonzalez, G. (1982). Imperial reform in the neo-colonies: The University of California's basic plan for higher education in Colombia. *Journal of Education, 164*(4), 330-350.

Gordon, A. (1997). *Ghostly matters: Haunting and the sociological imagination*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Gordon, T., & Webber, J. R. (2008). Imperialism and resistance: Canadian mining companies in Latin America. *Third World Quarterly*, *29*(1), 63-87.

Gorski, P. C. (2008). Good intentions are not enough: A decolonizing intercultural education. *Intercultural Education*, *19*(6), 515-525.

Gottschall, K., & Saltmarsh, S. (2016). 'You're not just learning it, you're living it!' Constructing the 'good life' in Australian university online promotional videos. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/01596306.2016.1158155

Grebennikov, L., & Skaines, I. (2007). Comparative analysis of student surveys on international student experience in higher education. *Journal of Institutional Research*, *13*(1), 97-116.

Grenier, F. (2013). The global educational challenge: how Canada can contribute to global developmental solutions through innovation in higher education. *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*, *19*(3), 354-367.

Grewal, I., & Kaplan, C. (2001). Global identities: Theorizing transnational studies of sexuality. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, 7*(4), 663-679.

Griffith Institute for Higher Education (2011). The GIHE good practice guide to internationalising the curriculum. Retrieved October 5, 2015 from:

https://www.griffith.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/345291/Internationalising-the-Curriculum.pdf

Groennings, S. (1997). The Fulbright Program in the global knowledge economy: The nation's neglected comparative advantage. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *1*(1), 95-105.

Grosfoguel, R. (2007). The epistemic decolonial turn: Beyond political-economy paradigms. *Cultural Studies*, *21*(2-3), 211-223.

Grosfoguel, R. (2012a). Decolonizing Western uni-versalisms: decolonial pluri-versalism from Aimé Césaire to the zapatistas. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, *1*(3), 88-104.

Grosfoguel, R. (2012b). The dilemmas of ethnic studies in the United States: Between liberal multiculturalism, identity politics, disciplinary colonization, and decolonial epistemologies. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge, 10*(1), 81-89.

Grosfoguel, R. (2013). The structure of knowledge in Westernized universities: Epistemic racism/sexism and the four genocides/epistemicides of the long 16th century. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge, 11*(1), 73-90.

Guo, Y., & Guo, S. (2017). Internationalization of Canadian higher education: discrepancies between policies and international student experiences. *Studies in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2017.1293874

Hage, G. (2012). *White nation: Fantasies of white supremacy in a multicultural society*. Routledge.

Haigh, M. J. (2002). Internationalisation of the curriculum: Designing inclusive education for a small world. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 26*(1), 49-66.

Haigh, M. (2008). Internationalization, planetary citizenship and Higher Education Inc. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 38*(4), 427-440.

Hall, S. (1996). When was 'the post-colonial'? Thinking at the limit. In I. Chambers & L. Curtis (Eds.), *The post-colonial question: Common skies, divided horizons* (pp. 246-260). London, UK: Routledge.

Handa, N. (2010). International students and international education: Recognising WES students' agency for educating citizens of a cosmopolitan society. In L. Naidoo (Ed.), *Education without borders: Diversity in a cosmopolitan society* (pp. 61-78). Nova Publishers.

Handler, R., Edmunds, D., Ng, D., Tewolde, S., & Woldu, M. (2016). Between engagement and critique: Development studies in a liberal arts tradition. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, *37*(3), 261-278.

Hanson, L. (2010). Global citizenship, global health, and internationalization of curriculum: A study of transformative potential. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 14*(1): 70-88.

Haraway, D. J. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Harney, S., & Moten, F. (2013). *The undercommons: Fugitive planning & black study.* Weavenhoe, UK: Minor Compositions.

Harper, S. R. (2012). Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms. *The Review of Higher Education*, *36*(1), 9-29.

Harper, S. R., Patton, L. D., & Wooden, O. S. (2009). Access and equity for African American students in higher education: A critical race historical analysis of policy efforts. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *80*(4), 389-414.

Hartman, S. V. (1997). *Scenes of subjection: Terror, slavery, and self-making in nineteenth-century America*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hartman, S. (2008a). *Lose your mother: A journey along the Atlantic slave route*. New York, NY: Farar, Straus, and Giroux.

Hartman, S. (2008b). Venus in two acts. *small axe*, *12*(2), 1-14.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (2014). *Seventeen contradictions and the end of capitalism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hayes, E., & Cuban, S. (1996). Border pedagogy: A critical framework for service learning. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York. Retrieved September 10, 2014 from: http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED393992.pdf

Henry, F., Dua, E., Kobayashi, A., James, C., Li, P., Ramos, H., & Smith, M. S. (2017). Race, racialization and Indigeneity in Canadian universities. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *20*(3), 300-314.

Henry, F., & Tator, C. (Eds.). (2009). *Racism in the Canadian university: Demanding social justice, inclusion, and equity*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Heron, B. (2007). *Desire for development: Whiteness, gender, and the helping imperative*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Hoofd, I. M. (2012). *Ambiguities of activism: Alter-globalism and the imperatives of speed*. New York, NY: Routledge.

hooks, b. (1992). Eating the other: Desire and resistance. In *Black looks: Race and representation* (pp. 21-39). Boston, MA: South End Press.

Hong, G. K. (2008). "The future of our worlds": Black feminism and the politics of knowledge in the university under globalization. *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism, 8*(2), 95-115.

Hong, G. K. (2014). Property. In B. Burgett & G. Helder (Eds.), *Keywords for American Cultural Studies.* Retrieved January 10, 2016 from: http://keywords.nyupress.org/american-cultural-studies/essay/property/

Houshmand, S., Spanierman, L. B., & Tafarodi, R. W. (2014). Excluded and avoided: Racial microaggressions targeting Asian international students in Canada. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *20*(3), 377.

Howell, A. (2005). Peaceful, tolerant and orderly? A feminist analysis of discourses of 'Canadian values' in Canadian foreign policy. *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*, *12*(1), 49-69.

Hudson, P. J. (2010). Imperial designs: The Royal Bank of Canada in the Caribbean. *Race & Class*, *52*(1), 33-48.

Hughes-Warrington, M. (2012). The ethics of internationalisation in higher education: Hospitality, self-presence and 'being late'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 44*(3), 312-322.

Huisman, J. (2007, July). *Research on the internationalisation of higher education: The state of the art.* Paper presented at the Seminar on the Internationalisation of Higher Education, Department of Education, University of Bath.

Hunter, B., White, G. P., & Godbey, G. C. (2006). What does it mean to be globally competent? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *10*(3), 267-285.

Indelicato, M. (2015). Australia's "Colombo Plan": The beacon of Western knowledge in the Asia-Pacific Region. *Critical Race and Whiteness Studies, 11*(1), 1-16.

International Institute of Education (2016). *Open Doors Report 2016*. Retrieved from: https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors

James, C. L. R. (1969/1993). Black Studies and the contemporary student. In A. Grimshaw (Ed.), *C.L.R. James Reader.* Oxford, UK and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

James, J. (2013). "Concerning violence": Frantz Fanon's rebel intellectual in search of a black cyborg. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, *112*(1), 57-70.

Jazeel, T. (2011). Spatializing difference beyond cosmopolitanism: Rethinking planetary futures. *Theory, Culture & Society, 28*(5), 75-97.

Jefferess, D. (2008). Global citizenship and the cultural politics of benevolence. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 2*(1), 27-36.

Jefferess, D. (2009). Responsibility, nostalgia, and the mythology of Canada as a peacekeeper. *University of Toronto Quarterly*, *78*(2), 709-727**.**

Jefferess, D. (2011). Benevolence, global citizenship and post-racial politics. *TOPIA: Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies*, (25), 77-95.

Jefferess, D. (2012). The "Me to We" social enterprise: Global education as lifestyle brand. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 6*(1), 18-30.

John Evans Study Committee. (2014). University of Denver. Retrieved October 10, 2014: http://portfolio.du.edu/evcomm

Johnstone, D. B. (1992). The university, democracy, and the challenge to meritocracy. *Interchange, 23*(1-2), 19-23.

Johnstone, M. & Lee, E. (2014). Branded: International education and 21st century Canadian education policy, and the welfare state. *International Social Work, 57*(3), 209-221.

Jones, E. A. (2002). *Transforming the curriculum: Preparing students for a changing world*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2008). Rethinking collaborations: Working the Indigene-colonizer hyphen. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln & L. Tuhiwai Smith (Eds.) *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies,* (pp. 471-486). London, UK: Sage.

Jones, E., & Killick, D. (2013). Graduate attributes and the internationalized curriculum: Embedding a global outlook in disciplinary learning outcomes. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(2), 165-182.

Jorgenson, S., & Shultz, L. (2012). Global citizenship education (GCE) in post-secondary institutions: What is protected and what is hidden under the umbrella of GCE. *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education*, *2*(1), 1-22.

Joseph, C. (2012). Internationalizing the curriculum: Pedagogy for social justice. *Current Sociology, 60*(2), 239-257.

Kalvemark, T., & Wende, M. V. D. (1997). National policies for the internationalization of higher education in Europe. Stockholm, Sweden: National Agency for Higher Education.

Kamola, I. (2014). US universities and the production of the global imaginary. *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations, 16*(3), 515-533.

Kapoor, I. (2004). Hyper‑self‑reflexive development? Spivak on representing the Third World 'Other'. *Third World Quarterly*, *25*(4), 627-647.

Kapoor, I. (2014). Psychoanalysis and development: Contributions, examples, limits. *Third World Quarterly, 35*(7), 1120-1143.

Kay, S. (2009). From Sputnik to Minerva: education and American national security. *Defense Horizons, 65*, 1-8. Center for Technology and National Security Policy.

Kehm, B. M., & Teichler, U. (2007). Research on internationalisation in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*, 260-273.

Kelly, P. (2000). Internationalizing the curriculum: For profit or planet. In, S. Inayatullah and J. Gidley (Eds.) *The university in transformation: Global perspectives on the futures of the university* (pp. 161-172). Westport, CT: Bergin and Harvey.

Kelley, R. D. (2002). *Freedom dreams: The black radical imagination*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Kelley, R. D. (2017). The rest of us: Rethinking settler and native. *American Quarterly*, *69*(2), 267-276.

Kerr, C. (1991). International learning and national purposes in higher education. *The American Behavioral Scientist, 35*(1), 17-42.

Khoo, S. (2011). Ethical globalisation or privileged globalisation or privileged internationalisation? Exploring global citizenship and internationalisation in Irish and Canadian universities. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *9*(3-4), 337-353.

Killick, D. (2012). Seeing-ourselves-in-the-world: Developing global citizenship through international mobility and campus community. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *16*(4), 372-389.

Kim, J. (2011). Aspiration for global cultural capital in the stratified realm of global higher education: why do Korean students go to US graduate schools? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *32*(1), 109-126.

King, T. L. (2015). Interview with Tiffany Lethabo King. *Feral Feminisms*, *4*, 64-68.

King, T. L. (2016a). New World grammars: The 'unthought' Black discourses of conquest. *Theory & Event*, *19*(4).

King, T. L. (2016b). The labor of (re) reading plantation landscapes fungible (ly). *Antipode*, *48*(4), 1022-1039.

Kish, Z., & Leroy, J. (2015). Bonded life: Technologies of racial finance from slave insurance to philanthrocapital. *Cultural Studies*, *29*(5-6), 630-651.

Kizilbash, Z. (2011). Branding Canadian higher education. *CBIE Research*. Ottowa, ON: Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE).

Klein, N. (2015). *This changes everything: Capitalism vs. the climate*. Simon and Schuster.

Kondakci, Y. (2011). Student mobility reviewed: attraction and satisfaction of international students in Turkey. *Higher Education*, *62*(5), 573-592.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8*(1), 5-31.

Knight, J. (2014). Is internationalisation of higher education having an identity crisis? In A. Maldonado-Maldonado and R.M. Bassett (Eds.), *The forefront of international higher education: A Festschrift in honor of Philip G. Altbach* (pp. 75-87). Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media.

Kramer, P. A. (2009). Is the world our campus? International students and US global power in the Long Twentieth Century. *Diplomatic History, 33*(5), 775-806.

Kuokkanen, R. (2008). What is hospitality in the Academy? Epistemic ignorance and the (im)possible gift'. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 30*(1), 60-82.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7-24.

Lawrence, B., & Dua, E. (2005). Decolonizing antiracism. *Social Justice*, *32*(4 (102), 120-143.

Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the curriculum.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Leask, B., Beelen, J., & Loveness, K. (2013). Internationalisation of the curriculum: International approaches and perspectives. In H. de Wit, F. Hunter, L. Johnson, & H. van Liempd (Eds.), *Possible futures: The next 25 years of the internationalisation of higher education* (pp. 187-203). Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Lee, C. T. (2014). Decolonizing global citizenship. In E. Isin & P. Nyers (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of global citizenship studies* (pp. 75-85). London, UK: Routledge.

Lee, E.V. (2015, November 9). "Indigenizing the academy" without Indigenous people: Who can teach our stories? *Moontime Warrior.* Retrieved May 10, 2017 from: https://moontimewarrior.com/2015/11/09/who-can-teach-indigenous-philosophy/

Lee, J. J. (2006). Global citizenship: Extending students' knowledge and action to the global context. *Journal of College and Character*, *7*(1), 1-5.

Lee, J. J. (2017). Neo-nationalism in higher education: Case of South Africa. *Studies in Higher Education*, *42*(5), 869-886.

Lee, J. J., Maldonado-Maldonado, A., & Rhoades, G. (2006). The political economy of international student flows: Patterns, ideas, and propositions. In J.C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 545-590). Springer Netherlands.

Lee, J. L., & Kim, D. (2010) Brain gain or brain circulation? U.S. doctoral recipients returning to South Korea. *Higher Education, 59*, 627–643

Lee, J.J. & Opio, T. (2011). Coming to America: Challenges and difficulties faced by African international student athletes. *Sport, Education and Society, 16*(5), 629-644.

Lee, J. & Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? International student perceptions of discrimination. *Higher Education, 53*(3), 381-409.

Leroy, J. (2016). Black history in occupied territory: On the entanglements of slavery and settler colonialism. *Theory & Event, 19*, 4.

Levy, D. C. (2005). *To export progress: The golden age of university assistance in the Americas.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Li, G. (2016). Politically sensitive Chinese students' engagement with democracy in Canada: A case study. *Journal of Chinese Overseas, 12*(1), 96-121.

Lilley, K., Barker, M., & Harris, N. (2014). *Journal of Studies in International Education,* 1-22.

Lomer, S., Papatsiba, V., & Naidoo, R. (2016). Constructing a national higher education brand for the UK: positional competition and promised capitals. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1-20.

Loomba, A. (2005). *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Lowe, L. (2015). History Hesitant. *Social Text*, *33*(4 125), 85-107.

Lugones, M. (2007). Heterosexualism and the colonial/modern gender system. *Hypatia, 22*(1), 186-219.

Luke, A. (2010). Educating the Other: Standpoint and theory in the 'internationalization' of higher education. In E. Unterhalter & V. Carpentier, (Eds.), *Global inequalities in higher education: Whose interests are we serving?* (pp. 43-65). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Luig, T., Ballantyne, E. F., & Scott, K. K. (2011). Promoting well-being through land-based pedagogy. *International Journal of Health, Wellness & Society, 1*(3).

Madge, C., Raghuram, P., & Noxolo, P. (2015). Conceptualizing international education From international student to international study. *Progress in Human Geography, 39*(6), 681-701.

Malaney, G. D. (2006). Educating for civic engagement, social activism, and political dissent: Adding the study of neoliberalism and imperialism to the student affairs curriculum. *Journal of College and Character*, *7*(4), 1-15.

Maldonado-Torres. (2007). On the coloniality of being. *Cultural Studies, 21*(2-3), 240-270.

Maldonado-Torres, N. (2011). Thinking through the decolonial turn: Post-continental interventions in theory, philosophy, and critique—An introduction. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, *1*(2), 1-15.

Marez, C. (2014). Seeing in the red: Looking at student debt. *American Quarterly*, *66*(2), 261-281.

Marginson, S. (2006). Dynamics of national and global competition in higher education. *Higher Education, 52*(1), 1-39.

Marginson, S. (2007). The public/private divide in higher education: A global revision. *Higher Education, 53*(3), 307-333.

Marginson, S. (2008). Global field and global imagining: Bourdieu and worldwide higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 29*(3), 303-315.

Marginson, S. (2012). Including the other: Regulation of the human rights of mobile students in a nation-bound world. *Higher Education, 63*(4), 497-512.

Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education, 43(3),* 281-309.

Marginson, S., & Sawir, E. (2005). Interrogating global flows in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 3*(3), 281-309.

Marker, M. (2004). Theories and disciplines as sites of struggle: The reproduction of colonial dominance through the controlling of knowledge in the academy. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 28*(1&2), 102-110.

Marker, M. (2011). Sacred mountains and ivory towers: Indigenous pedagogies of place and invasions from modernity. In G.J.S. Dei (Ed.), *Indigenous philosophies and critical education: A reader* (pp. 197-211). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Martínez-Alemán, A. M., Pusser, B., & Bensimon, E. M. (2015). Introduction. In A. M. Martínez-Alemán, B. Pusser, & E. M. Bensimon (Eds.), *Critical approaches to the study of higher education: A practical introduction*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mather, P. C., & Konkle, E. (2013). Promoting social justice through appreciative community service. *New Directions for Student Services*, *2013* (143), 77-88.

Matthews, J., & Sidhu, R. (2005). Desperately seeking the global subject: International education, citizenship and cosmopolitanism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education,* 3(1): 49-66.

Matus, C, & Talburt, S. (2009). Spatial imaginaries: Universities, internationalisation and feminist geographies. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education 30*(4), 515-527.

Matus, C., & Talburt, S. (2015). Producing global citizens for the future: Space, discourse and curricular reform. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 45*(2), 226-247.

McCartney, D. (2016). From 'welcome sojourners' to 'dangerous immigrants': Exploring discourse in international student policy talk, 1945-1975. *Historical Studies in Education, 28*(2), 1-27.

McKittrick, K. (2002). 'Their blood is there, and they can't throw it out': Honouring Black Canadian geographies. *Topia: Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies, 7*, 27–37.

McKittrick, K. (2014). Mathematics black life. *The Black Scholar*, *44*(2), 16-28.

McGregor, A. & Hill, D. (2009). North / South. In R. Kitchin, & N. Thrift (Eds.), *International encyclopedia for human geography,* Volume 1 (pp. 473-480). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

McMahon, W. W. (2009). *Higher learning, greater good: The private and social benefits of higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

McMillan Cottom, T. (2017). *Lower Ed: The Troubling Rise of For-Profit Colleges in the New Economy*. New York, NY: The New Press.

McNamee, S. J., & Miller, R. K. (2004). *The meritocracy myth.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Melamed, J. (2006). The spirit of neoliberalism from racial liberalism to neoliberal multiculturalism. *Social Text*, *24*(4 89), 1-24.

Melamed, J. (2011). *Represent and destroy: Rationalizing violence in the new racial capitalism.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Menashy, F. (2009). Education as a global public good: The applicability and implications of a framework. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *7*(3), 307-320.

Mendoza, S. L. (2013). Savage representations in the discourse of modernity: Liberal ideology and the impossibility of nativist longing. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 2*(1).

Metcalfe, A. S. & Fenwick, T. (2009). Knowledge for whose society? Knowledge production, higher education, and federal policy in Canada. *Higher Education*, *57*(2), 209-225.

Metcalfe, A. S., Stein, S., & Chauhan, J. (December, 2014). Theorizing an anti-racist pedagogy of place for critical internationalization studies. Comparative and International Education Society of Canada (CIESC) West Coast Networking Conference in Vancouver, BC.

Mignolo, W. (2003). Globalization and the geopolitics of knowledge: The role of the humanities in the corporate university. *Nepantla: Views from South, 4*(1), 97-119.

Mignolo, W. D. (2006). Citizenship, knowledge, and the limits of humanity. *American Literary History*, *18*(2), 312-331.

Mignolo, W. (2011). *The darker side of Western modernity: Global future, decolonial options.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Million, D. (2009). Felt theory: An Indigenous feminist approach to affect and history. *Wicazo Sa Review*, *24*(2), 53-76.

Mills, C. W. (2015). Decolonizing Western political philosophy. *New Political Science*, *37*(1), 1-24.

Mitchell, N. O. (2011). *Disciplinary matters: Black studies and the politics of institutionalization.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Mitchell, N. (2013). The object of object Lessons: Thoughts and questions. *Feminist Formations*, *25*(3), 180-189.

Mitchell, N. (2015). (Critical ethnic studies) intellectual. *Critical Ethnic Studies, 1*(1), 86-94.

Miyoshi, M. (2005). The university, the universe, the world, and "globalization". *Concrescence*, *6*.

Moallem, M. (2006). Feminist scholarship and the internationalization of women's studies. *Feminist Studies, 32*(2), 332-351.

Mohanty, C. T. (1984). Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Boundary 2*, 333-358.

Mohanty, C. T. (2003). "Under western eyes" revisited: Feminist solidarity through anticapitalist struggles. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 28(2),* 499-535.

Moore, J. W. (2015). *Capitalism in the web of life: Ecology and the accumulation of capital.* London, UK: Verso Books.

Moraga, C. & Anzaldúa, G. (Eds.) (1981). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color.* Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press.

Morais, D. B., & Ogden, A. C. (2011). Initial development and validation of the global citizenship scale. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *15*(5), 445-466.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2008). Writing off treaties: White possession in the United States Critical Whiteness literature. In A. Moreton-Robinson, M. Casey, & F. Nicoll (Eds.), *Transnational whiteness matters* (pp. 81-95). New York, NY: Rowan & Littlefield.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2015). *The white possessive: Property, power, and indigenous sovereignty*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Morgan, J. L. (2016). Accounting for "the most excruciating torment": Gender, slavery, and Trans-Atlantic passages. *History of the Present*, *6*(2), 184-207.

Morin, E. (1999). *Seven complex lessons in education for the future.* Paris: UNESCO

Moten, F. (2013). The subprime and the beautiful. *African Identities*, *11*(2), 237-245.

Moten, F. (2014). Performance and 'blackness.' Retrieved May 10, 2015 from: https://vimeo.com/100330139.

Moten, F. & Harney, S. (2004). The university and the undercommons: Seven theses. *Social Text, 22*(2), 101-115.

Naepi, S. & Stein, S. (2016, July 28). Possibilities and paradoxes of Indigenization and internationalization. Internationalizing Higher Education: Past Practices and Future Possibilities Conference. Simon Fraser University, Surrey, BC

NAFSA (n.d.). Internationalizing the curriculum. Retrieved May 5, 2016 from: http://www.nafsa.org/Professional_Resources/Browse_by_Interest/Internationalizing_Higher_Education/Internationalizing_the_Curriculum/

Naidoo, R. (2010). Global learning in a neoliberal age: Implications for development. In E. Unterhalter & V. Carpentier, (Eds.), *Global inequalities in higher education: Whose interests are we serving?* (pp. 66-90). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Naidoo, R., & Jamieson, I. (2005). Knowledge in the marketplace: The global commodification of teaching and learning in higher education. In P. Ninnes, & M. Hellstén (Eds.), *Internationalizing higher education: Critical explorations of pedagogy and policy* (pp. 37-51). Springer Netherlands.

Naidoo, R., & Williams, J. (2015). The neoliberal regime in English higher education: Charters, consumers and the erosion of the public good. *Critical Studies in Education, 56*(2), 208-223.

Nandy, A. (2000). Recovery of indigenous knowledge and dissenting futures of the university. In S. Inayatullah and J. Gidley (Eds.) *The university in transformation: Global perspectives on the futures of the university* (pp. 115-123). Westport, CT: Bergin and Harvey.

Nayar, J. (2013). The politics of hope and the other-in-the-World: Thinking exteriority. *Law Critique, 24,* 63-85.

Nichols, R. (2010). Postcolonial studies and the discourse of Foucault: Survey of a field of problematization. *Foucault Studies, 9* 111-144.

Nokkala, T. (2006). Knowledge society discourse in internationalization of higher education. *Revista Española de Educación Comparada, 12*, 171-201.

Nopper, T. (2011). The wages of non-Blackness: Contemporary immigrant rights and discourses of character, productivity, and value. *Tensions Journal*, (5), 1-25.

Nussbaum, M. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 21*(4-5), 289-303.

OECD. (2014). Education at a glance 2014: Highlights. OECD Publishing. Retrieved June 5, 2015 from http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2014_eag_highlights-2014-en

OECD. (2015). Education at a glance 2015. OECD Publishing. Retrieved June 5, 2015 from http://www.oecd.org/education/education-at-a-glance-19991487.htm

O'Mara, M. (2012). The uses of the foreign student. *Social Science History, 36*(4), 583-615.

Ortiga, Y. Y. (2017). The flexible university: higher education and the global production of migrant labor. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *38*(4), 485-499.

Osei-Kofi, N., Shahjahan, R. A., & Patton, L. D. (2010). Centering social justice in the study of higher education: The challenges and possibilities for institutional change. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *43*(3), 326-340.

Osei-Kofi, N., Torres, L. E., & Lui, J. (2013). Practices of whiteness: Racialization in college admissions viewbooks. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *16*(3), 386-405.

Owens, C., & Boggs, A. (2016). The global American Studies classroom: International students and critical pedagogy. *American Quarterly*, *68*(2), 379-385.

Owens, D. L., Srivastava, P., & Feerasta, A. (2011). Viewing international students as state stimulus potential: Current perceptions and future possibilities. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 21*(2), 157-179.

Paik, A. N. (2013). Education and empire, old and new: HR 3077 and the resurgence of the US university. *Cultural Dynamics, 25*(1), 3-28.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, *84*(1), 85-100.

Park, H. (2010). The stranger that is welcomed: Female foreign students from Asia, the English language industry, and the ambivalence of 'Asia rising' in British Columbia, Canada. *Gender, Place & Culture*, *17*(3), 337-355.

Pashby, K., & de Oliveira Andreotti, V. (2016). Ethical internationalisation in higher education: interfaces with international development and sustainability. *Environmental Education Research*, *22*(6), 771-787.

Patel, L. (2016). *Decolonizing educational research: From ownership to answerability*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Patterson, L. M., Carrillo, P. B. & Salinas, R. S. (2012). Lessons from a global learning virtual classroom. *Journal of Studies in International Education,* 16(2), 182-197.

Patton, L. D. (2016). Disrupting postsecondary prose: Toward a critical race theory of higher education. *Urban Education*, *51*(3), 315-342.

Paulston, R.G. (2009). Mapping comparative education after postmodernity. In R. Cowen & A.M. Kazamias (Eds.), *International handbook of comparative education* (pp. 965–990). Dordrecht: Springer.

Paulston, R.G., & Liebman, M. (1994). An invitation to postmodern social cartography. *Comparative Education Review, 38*(2), 215–232.

Pease, D. E. (1990). New Americanists: Revisionist interventions into the canon. *boundary 2*, *17*(1), 1-37.

Pennsylvania State University. (2008). *University Office of International Programs Strategic Plan: 2009-2013*. Retrieved October 5, 2014 from: http://www.global.psu.edu/about/pdf/StrategicPlan.pdf

Peters, M. A., & Besley, T. (2006). *Building knowledge cultures: Education and development in the age of knowledge capitalism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Peterson, A. P. (2011). Academic conceptions of a United States Peace Corps. *History of Education*, *40*(2), 229-240.

Phillips, A. R. (2014). A qualitative exploration of critical approaches to social justice in student affairs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.

Phillips, D. C., & Ruitenberg, C. W. (2012). A critical review of representative sources on multicultural epistemology. In C.D. Phillips & C. Ruitenberg (Eds.), *Education, culture and epistemological diversity: Mapping a disputed terrain* (pp. 11-38). Springer Netherlands.

Pidgeon, M. (2016). More than a checklist: Meaningful Indigenous inclusion in higher education. *Social Inclusion*, *4*(1).

Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *16*(2), 175-196.

Potter, E. H. (2008). *Branding Canada: Projecting Canada's soft power through public diplomacy*. McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.

Povinelli, E. A. (2001). Radical worlds: The anthropology of incommensurability and inconceivability. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *30,* 319-334.

Povinelli, E. A. (2011). *Economies of abandonment: Social belonging and endurance in late liberalism.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Povinelli, E. A. (2013). Response. *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies, 15*(3), 435-457.

Pusser, B. (2014). Forces in tension: The state, civil society and market in the future of the university. In P. Gibbs & R. Barnett (Eds.), *Thinking about higher education* (pp. 71‑89). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla, 1*(3), 533-580.

Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural Studies*, *21*(2-3), 168-178.

Rafael, V. L. (1994). The cultures of area studies in the United States. *Social Text,* (41), 91-111.

Ramaley, J. A. (2015). Educating for a changing world: The importance of an equity mindset. *Metropolitan Universities, 25*(3), 5-15.

Ramírez, F. O., & Meyer, J. W. (2013). Universalizing the university in a world society. In *Institutionalization of world-class university in global competition* (pp. 257-273). Springer Netherlands.

Rankin, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, *46*(1), 43-61.

Razack, S. H. (1999). Making Canada white: Law and the policing of bodies of colour in the 1990s. *Canadian Journal of Legal Studies, 14*(1), 159-184.

Razack, S. (2004). *Dark threats and white knights: The Somalia affair, peacekeeping, and the new imperialism.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Reichard, R. (2015, August 29). Why we say Latinx: Trans and gender non-conforming people explain. *Latina.com.* Retrieved May 10, 2017 from: http://www.latina.com/lifestyle/our-issues/why-we-say-latinx-trans-gender-non-conforming-people-explain

Rhee, J. E. (2009). International education, the new imperialism, and technologies of the self: Branding the globally educated elite. *Multicultural Education Review*, *1*(1), 55-82.

Rhee, J. E., & Sagaria, M. A. D. (2004). International students: Constructions of imperialism in the Chronicle of Higher Education. *The Review of Higher Education, 28*(1), 77-96.

Rhoads, R. A. (2011). The US research university as a global model: Some fundamental problems to consider. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies, 7*(2).

Rhoads, R. A., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Graduate employee unionization as symbol of and challenge to the corporatization of US research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *76*(3), 243-275.

Rhoades, G., & Sporn, B. (2002). Quality assurance in Europe and the US: Professional and political economic framing of higher education policy. *Higher Education*, *43*(3), 355-390.

Rhoads, R. A., & Szelényi, K. (2011). *Global citizenship and the university: Advancing social life and relations in an interdependent world*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Rifkin, M. (2013). Settler common sense. *Settler Colonial Studies*, *3*(3-4), 322-340.

Rizvi, F. (2008). Epistemic virtues and cosmopolitan learning. *The Australian Educational Researcher,* 35(1), 17-35.

Rizvi, F. (2009). Towards cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Eeducation*, *30*(3), 253-268.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. London, UK: Routledge.

Rizvi, F. & Savage, G. C. (2015). From imagination to social imaginary: Some notes on the 'imaginative turn' in education policy studies. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting. Chicago, IL.

Roberts, L., & Ajai-Ajagbe, P. (2013). Higher education and the Millennium development goals: Where are we coming from, and where are we going? London, UK: The Association of

Commonwealth Universities. Retrieved March 15, 2015 from: https://www.acu.ac.uk/publication/download?id=499

Roberts, P., & Dunworth, K. (2012). Staff and student perceptions of support services for international students in higher education: A case study. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 34*(5), 517–528.

Roberts, D. C., Welch, L., & Al-Khanji, K. (2013). Preparing global citizens. *Journal of College and Character*, *14*(1), 85-92.

Robertson, S., Bonal, X., & Dale, R. (2002). GATS and the education service industry: The politics of scale and global reterritorialisation. *Comparitve Education Review, 46*(4), 472-496.

Robinson, C. J. (1983). *Black Marxism: The making of the Black radical tradition*. Zed Books.

Rodríguez, D. (2012). Racial/colonial genocide and the" neoliberal academy": In excess of a problematic. *American Quarterly*, *64*(4), 809-813.

Rodríguez, D. (2014). Goldwater's left hand: Post-raciality and the roots of the post-racial racist state. *Cultural Dynamics*, *26*(1), 29-51.

Roshanravan, S. (2012). Staying home while studying abroad: Anti-imperial praxis for globalizing feminist visions. *Journal of Feminist Scholarship, 2*, 1-23.

Roy, A. (2006). Praxis in the time of empire. *Planning Theory, 5*(1), 7-29.

Ruther, N. L. (2002). *Barely there, powerfully present: Years of US policy on international higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Salmi, J. (2009). *The challenges of establishing world-class universities.* Washington, DC: The World Bank

Santos, B.D.S. (2005). Beyond neoliberal governance: The World Social Forum as subaltern cosmopolitan politics and legality. In B. Santos & C. Rodriguez-Garavito (Eds.), *Law and globalization from below: Towards a cosmopolitain legality* (pp. 29-63). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Santos, B. D. S. (2007). Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledges. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center), 45-89.*

Santos, J. L., Cabrera, N. L., & Fosnacht, K. J. (2010). Is "race-neutral" really race-neutral?: Disparate impact towards underrepresented minorities in post-209 UC system admissions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *81*(6), 675-701.

Saranillio, D. I. (2015). Settler colonialism. In S. N. Teves, A. Smith, & M. Reheja (Eds.), *Native studies keywords* (pp. 284-300). Tuscon, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Sawir, E. (2013). Internationalisation of higher education curriculum: The contribution of international students. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 11*(3), 359-378.

Schoorman, D., & Acker-Hocevar, M. (2010). Viewing faculty governance within a social justice framework: Struggles and possibilities for democratic decision-making in higher education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *43*(3), 310-325.

Scott, P. (2000). Globalization and higher education: Challenges for the 21st century. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 4*(3), 3-10.

Scott, D. (2004). *Conscripts of modernity: The tragedy of colonial enlightenment*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Scott, C., Safdar, S., Trilokekar, R. D., & El Masri, A. (2015). International students as 'Ideal Immigrants' in Canada: A disconnect between policy makers' assumptions and the lived experiences of international students. *Comparative and International Education/Éducation comparée et internationale*, *43*(3).

Sexton, J. (2010a). African American Studies. In J. C. Rowe (Ed.), *A concise companion to American Studies* (pp. 210-228). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sexton, J. (2010b). People-of-color-blindness notes on the afterlife of slavery. *Social Text*, *28*(2 103), 31-56.

Sexton, J. (2015). Unbearable blackness. *Cultural Critique*, *90*(1), 159-178.

Sexton, J. (2016). The vel of slavery: Tracking the figure of the unsovereign. *Critical Sociology, 42*(4-5), 583-597.

Shahjahan, R. A. (2013). Coloniality and a global testing regime in higher education: unpacking the OECD's AHELO initiative. *Journal of Education Policy, 28*(5), 676-694.

Shahjahan, R. A., & Kezar, A. J. (2013). Beyond the "national container": Addressing methodological nationalism in higher education research. *Educational Researcher*, *42*(1), 20-29.

Shahjahan, R. A., Blanco Ramirez, G., & Andreotti, V. D. O. (2017). Attempting to imagine the unimaginable: A decolonial reading of global university rankings. *Comparative Education Review*, *61*(S1), S51-S73.

Shaker, G. G., & Plater, W. M. (2016). The global public good: Students, higher education, and communities of good. *Higher Learning Research Communications, 6*(2).

Sharma, N., & Wright, C. (2008). Decolonizing resistance, challenging colonial states. *Social Justice*, *35*(3 (113), 120-138.

Sharpe, C. (2016). *In the wake: On Blackness and being*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Sharpe, J. (1995). Is the United States postcolonial?: Transnationalism, immigration, and race. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, *4*(2), 181-199.

Shen, A. (2016, November). Express Entry reforms benefit international students seeking permanent residence in Canada. *University Affairs*. Retrieved January 5, 2017 from: http://www.universityaffairs.ca/news/news-article/express-entry-reforms/

Shohat, E. (1992). Notes on the "post-colonial". *Social Text*, *31/32,* 99-113.

Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *53*(3), 248.

Sidhu, R. K. (2006). *Universities and globalization*: *To market, to market*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Siegel, H. (2006). Epistemological diversity and education research: Much ado about nothing much? *Educational Researcher, 35*(2), 3-12.

Silva, D. F. D. (2007). *Toward a global idea of race*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Silva, D. F. D. (2009). Outline of a global political subject: Reading Evo Morales's election as a (post-) colonial event. *Seattle Journal for Social Justice, 8*(1), 25-49.

Silva, D. F. D. (2013). To be announced: Radical praxis or knowing (at) the limits of justice. *Social Text, 31*(1 114), 43-62.

Silva, D. F. D. (2014). Toward a Black Feminist Poethics: The quest(ion) of Blackness toward the End of the World. *The Black Scholar*, *44*(2), 81-97.

Silva, D. F. D. (2015a). Before Man: Sylvia Wynter's rewriting of the modern episteme. In K. McKittrick (Ed.), *Sylvia Wynter: On being human as praxis* (pp. 90-104). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Silva, D. F. D. (2015b). Globality. *Critical Ethnic Studies, 1*(1), 33-38.

Silva, D. F. D. (2015c). Reading art as confrontation. *Remai Modern.* Retrieved January 5, 2016 from: https://remaimodern.org/pre-launch-programs/supercommunity/reading-art-confrontation-denise-ferreira-da-silva

Silva, D. F. D. (2016). The racial limits of social justice: The ruse of equality of opportunity and the global affirmative action mandate. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, *2*(2), 184-209.

Silva, D. F. D., Andreotti, V.D.O., & Stein, S. (2016, May 26). (Untitled poem). Presented at the Anti-Colonial Experiments in Entangled Socialities Event, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.

Silvey, R. (2002). Sweatshops and the corporatization of the university. *Gender, Place and Culture, 9(2),* 201-207.

Simpson, A. (2014). *Mohawk interruptus: Political life across the borders of settler states*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Simpson, A. & Smith, A. (2014). Introduction. In A. Simpson & A. Smith (Eds.), *Theorizing Native Studies* (pp. 1-30). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Simpson, J. S., James, C. E., & Mack, J. (2011). Multiculturalism, colonialism, and racialization: Conceptual starting points. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, *33*(4), 285-305.

Simpson, L. (2011). *Dancing on our turtle's back: Stories of nishnaabeg re-creation, resurgence and a new emergence*. Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publishers.

Singh, M. (2011). The place of social justice in higher education and social change discourses. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *41*(4), 481-494.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, A., & Kauanui, J. K. (2008). Native feminisms engage American studies. *American Quarterly*, *60*(2), 241-249.

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples.* London, UK: Zed Books.

Smith, J. M., & Kruse, J. (2009). "Making connections" at the University of North Carolina: Moving toward a global curriculum at a flagship research university. The *Journal of General Education, 58*(2), 106-120.

Snelgrove, C., Dhamoon, R., & Corntassel, J. (2014). Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *3*(2), 1-32.

Spade, D. (2011). *Normal life: Administrative violence, critical trans politics, and the limits of law*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 24-28). Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Spivak, G. C. (1990). *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Spivak, G. (1994). Bonding in difference. In A. Arteaga (Ed.), *An other tongue: nation and ethnicity in the linguistic borderlands* (pp. 273-285). Durham, NC: Duke Univesity Press.

Spivak, G. C. (2004). Righting wrongs. *The South Atlantic Quarterly, 103*(2/3), 523-581.

Spivak, G. C. (2012). *An aesthetic education in the era of globalization.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stack, M. (2016). *Global university rankings and the mediatization of higher education.* London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan

Stam, R. & Shohat, E. (2014). Race in translation: The red, black and white Atlantics. In S. Broeck & C. Junker (Eds.), *Postcolonialit-decoloniality-black critique: Joints and fissures* (pp. 63-91). Frankfurt and New York: Campus Verlag.

Stanley, T. J. (2016). John A. Macdonald, "the Chinese" and racist state formation in Canada. *Journal of Critical Race Inquiry, 3*(1), 6-34).

Stehr, N., & Ufer, U. (2009). On the global distribution and dissemination of knowledge. *International Social Science Journal*, *60*(195), 7-24.

Stein, S. (2016). Universities, slavery, and the unthought of anti-Blackness. *Cultural Dynamics*, *28*(2), 169-187.

Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. D. O. (2016). Cash, competition, or charity: international students and the global imaginary. *Higher Education*, *72*(2), 225-239.

Stein, S. & Andreotti, V.D.O. (2017). Afterword: provisional pedagogies toward imagining global mobilities otherwise. *Curriculum Inquiry, 47*(1), 135-146

Stein, S., Andreotti, V.D.O., & Suša, R. (2016). "Beyond 2015", within the modern/colonial global imaginary? Global development and higher education. Critical Studies in Education.

Stein, S., Andreotti, V., Bruce, J., & Suša, R. (2016). Towards different conversations about the internationalization of higher education. *Comparative and International Education*, *45*(1).

Stein, S., Hunt, D., Suša, R., & Andreotti, V.D.O. (2017). The educational challenge of unraveling the fantasies of ontological security. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 1-11.

Stern, M. & Carey, K. (2017, May 4). Good citizen, bad activist: How institutions structure moral economies. Paper presented at the International Conference on Cultural Studies and Education. Vancouver, BC.

Stevens, M. L., & Miller-Idriss, C. (2009). Academic internationalism: US universities in Transition. *Social Science Research Council*.

Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 2*(1), 83-97.

Stier, J. (2010). International education: Trends, ideologies and alternative pedagogical approaches. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 8*(3), 339-349.

Stiglitz, J. E. (1999). Knowledge as a global public good. *Global Public Goods*, *1*(9), 308-326.

Stone-Mediatore, S. (2011). A not-so-global ethics: Contradictions in U.S. global ethics education. *Philosophy in the Contemporary World, 18*(1), 43-57.

Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education, 53*(1), 81-105.

Streeck, W. (2014). How will capitalism end? *New Left Review, 87*(May-June), 35–64.

Suša, R. (2016). *Social cartographies of internationalization of higher education in Canada: A study of exceptionalist tendencies and articulations*. Doctoral dissertation. Oulu, Finland: ACTA.

Suspitsyna, T. (2012). Higher education for economic advancement and engaged citizenship: An analysis of the US Department of Education discourse. *The Journal of Higher Education, 83*(1), 49-72.

Suspitsyna, T. (2015). Cultural hierarchies in the discursive representations of China in the Chronicle of Higher Education. *Critical Studies in Education, 56*(1), 21-37.

Svensson, L., & Wihlborg, M. (2010). Internationalising the content of higher education: The need for a curriculum perspective. *Higher Education, 60*(6), 595–613.

Swanson, D. M., & Pashby, K. (2016). Towards a critical global citizenship? A comparative analysis of GC education discourses in Scotland and Alberta. *Journal of Research in Curriculum and Instruction*, *20*(3), 184-195.

Tannock, S. (2007). To keep America number 1: Confronting the deep nationalism of US higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 5*(2), 257-272.

Tannock, S. (2009). Global meritocracy, nationalism and the question of whom we must treat equally for educational opportunity to be equal, *Critical Studies in Education, 50*(2), 201-211.

Tannock, S. (2011). Points of prejudice: Education-based discrimination in Canada's immigration system. *Antipode*, *43*(4), 1330-1356.

Tannock, S. (2013). When the demand for educational equality stops at the border: wealthy students, international students and the restructuring of higher education in the UK. *Journal of Education Policy, 28*(4), 449-464.

Tarrant, M. A. (2010). A conceptual framework for exploring the role of studies abroad in nurturing global citizenship. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *14*(5), 433-451.

Taylor, C. (2002). Modern social imaginaries. *Public Culture, 14*(1), 91-124.

Taylor, L. (2013). Against the tide: Working with and against the affective flows of resistance in social and global justice learning. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 7*(2), 58-68.

Teamey, K., & Mandel, U. (2016). A world where all worlds cohabit. *The Journal of Environmental Education,* 47(2), 151-162.

Teichler, U. (2010). Internationalising higher education: Debates and changes in Europe. In D. Mattheou (Ed.), Changing educational landscapes: *Educational policies, schooling systems and higher education – A comparative perspective* (pp. 263-283). Springer Netherlands.

Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada*. University of Toronto Press.

Thobani, S. (2016, March 4). After UBC ousted Arvind Gupta as president, it made the university whiter. *Rabble.ca.* Retrieved May 5, 2016 from: http://rabble.ca/blogs/bloggers/campus-notes/2016/03/after-ubc-ousted-arvind-gupta-president-it-made-university-white

Tight, M. (2004). Research into higher education: an a-theoretical community of practice? *Higher Education Research & Development*, *23*(4), 395-411.

Tight, M. (2014). Discipline and theory in higher education research. *Research Papers in Education*, *29*(1), 93-110.

Tikly, L. P. (2004). Education and the new imperialism. *Comparative Education, 40*(2), 173-198.

Tilak, J. B. (2008). Higher education: a public good or a commodity for trade? *Prospects*, *38*(4), 449-466.

Tobago Center for the Study and Practice of Indigenous Spirituality. (2015). Welcome. Retrieved October 5, 2015 from: http://latierraspirit.org/

Trask, H. K. (2004). The color of violence. *Social Justice*, 8-16.

Trilokekar, R. D. (2010). International education as soft power? The contributions and challenges of Canadian foreign policy to the internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education, 59*(2), 131–147.

Trilokekar, R. D. (2015). From soft power to economic diplomacy? A comparison of the changing rationales and roles of the US and Canadian federal governments in international education. Center for Studies in Higher Education Research and Occasional Paper Series.

Trilokekar, R. D. (2016, July 28). *The governance of IE in Canada: Bringing 'education' to international education.* Keynote presented at the Internationalizing Higher Education: Past Practices and Future Possibilities Conference, Vancouver, BC.

Trilokekar, R. D., & El Masri, A. (2016). The '[h]unt for new Canadians begins in the classroom': the construction and contradictions of Canadian policy discourse on international education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 1-13.

Trilokekar, R.D., & Jones, G. (2007). Internationalizing Canada's universities. *International Higher Education, 26,* 12-14.

Trilokekar, R. D. & Kizilbash, Z. (2013). Imagine: Canada as a leader in international education. How can Canada benefit from the Australian experience? *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 43*(2), 1-26.

Trow, M. (2000). From mass higher education to universal access: The American advantage. *Minerva*, *37*(4), 303-328.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015). *Calls to action*. Retrieved April 5, 2017 from: http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Findings/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf

Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, *79*(3), 409-428.

Tuck, E., & Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2013). Curriculum, Replacement, and Settler Futurity. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *29*(1).

Tuck, E., McKenzie, M., & McCoy, K. (2014). Land education: Indigenous, post-colonial, and decolonizing perspectives on place and environmental education research. *Environmental Education Research*, *20*(1), 1-23.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1), 1-40.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2016). What justice wants. *Critical Ethnic Studies, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *2*(2), 1-15.

Turner, Y., & Robson, S. (2007). Competitive and cooperative impulses to internationalization: Reflecting on the interplay between management intentions and the experience of academics in a British university. *Education, Knowledge & Economy: A Journal for Education and Social Enterprise, 1*(1), 65-82.

UNESCO (2013). Rethinking education in a changing world: Meeting of the senior experts group. Retrieved January 5, 2017 from: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002247/224743e.pdf

UNESCO (2014a). *Global citizenship education: Preparing learners for the challenges of the twenty-first century*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2014b). Global flow of tertiary level students. Retrieved from January 5, 2017: http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Pages/international-student-flow-viz.aspx

United Nations Human Rights Committee (2015, August 13). *Concluding observations on the sixth periodic report of Canada.*

University of Wisconsin-Madison. (2008). *University of Wisconsin- Madison Reaccreditation 2009. Team 4: Preparing Global Citizens and Leaders.* Retrieved from January 5, 2017: http://www.greatu.wisc.edu/theme- teams/documents/team4_report_050908.pdf

Universities Canada (2014). *Canada's Universities in the World: AUCC Internationalisation Survey.* Ottawa: UNIVCAN.

Unterhalter, E., & Carpentier, V. (2010). Introduction: Whose interests are we serving? Global inequalities and higher education. In *Global inequalities in higher education: Whose interests are we serving?* (pp. 1-39). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Toukan, E. V. (2017). Expressions of liberal Justice? Examining the aims of the UN's Sustainable Development Goals for education. *Interchange*, Advance online publication. doi:10.1007/s10780-017-9304-3

Vavrus, F., & Pekol, A. (2015). Critical internationalization: Moving from theory to practice. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education, 2*(2), 5-21.

Vestal, T. M. (1994). *International education: Its history and promise for today*. ABC-CLIO.

Vimalassery, M., Pegues, J. H., & Goldstein, A. (2016). Introduction: On colonial unknowing. *Theory & Event*, *19*(4).

Wæraas, A., & Solbakk, M. N. (2009). Defining the essence of a university: Lessons from higher education branding. *Higher Education*, *57*(4), 449-462.

Wagner, E. (2007). The peaceable kingdom? The national myth of Canadian peacekeeping and the Cold War. *Canadian Military Journal, 7*(4).

Wainwright, J. (2013). *Geopiracy: Oaxaca, militant empiricism, and geographical thought.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Walker, P. (2014). International student policies in UK higher education from colonialism to the coalition developments and consequences. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 18*(4), 325-344.

Walia, H. (2013). *Undoing border imperialism.* Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Walia, H. (2014, October 28). No safe haven: Canada's 'managed migration'. *Rabble.ca.* Retrieved March 5, 2016 from: http://rabble.ca/news/2014/10/no-safe-haven-canadas-managed-migration

Walcott, R. (2011). Into the ranks of man: Vicious modernism and the politics of reconciliation. In A. Mathur, J. Dewar, & M. DeGagne (Eds.), *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity* (pp. 341-349).

Walcott, R. (2014a). The book of others (Book IV): Canadian multiculturalism, the state, and its political legacies. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, *46*(2), 127-132.

Walcott, R. (2014b). The problem of the human: Black ontologies and "the coloniality of our being." In S. Broeck & C. Junker (Eds.), *Postcoloniality–decoloniality–black critique: Joints and fissures*, (pp. 93-105). Frankfurt and New York: Campus Verlag.

Waters, J. (2006). Emergent geographies of international education and social exclusion. *Antipode, 38*, 1047–1068.

Waters, J. L. (2012). Geographies of international education: Mobilities and the reproduction of social (dis)advantage. *Geography Compass*, *6*(3), 123-136.

Watts, V. (2013). Indigenous place-thought and agency amongst humans and non humans (First Woman and Sky Woman go on a European world tour!). *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 2*(1), 20-34.

Wanyenya, P. & Lester-Smith, D. (2014). Neoliberalism and public university agendas: Tensions along the global/local divide. *Journal of Feminist Scholarship, 7-8*, 93-101.

Weigl, R. (2009). Intercultural competence through cultural self-study: A strategy for adult learners. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33*, 346-360.

Wende, M. V. D. (2007). Internationalization of higher education in the OECD countries: Challenges and opportunities for the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(3-4), 274-289.

Wiegman, R. (2012). *Object lessons*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Wiegman, R. (2014). If, suddenly. *Scholar & Feminist Online, 12*(1-2). Retrieved November 5, 2015 from: http://sfonline.barnard.edu/activism-and-the-academy/if-suddenly/

Wilder, C. S. (2013). *Ebony and ivy: Race, slavery, and the troubled history of America's universities.* New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Wilderson, F. (2003). Gramsci's black Marx: Whither the slave in civil society? *Social Identities, 9*(2), 225-240.

Wilderson, F. (2010). Introduction: Unspeakable ethics. In *Red, white & black: Cinema and the structure of U.S. antagonisms* (pp. 1-32). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the Native. *Journal of Genocide Research, 8*(4), 387-409.

Wolfe, P. (2016). *Traces of history: Elementary structures of race*. New York, NY: Verso Books.

Wynter, S. (2003). Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom: Towards the human, after man, its overrepresentation--An argument. *CR: The New Centennial Review, 3*(3), 257-337.

Wynter, S. (2006). On how we mistook the map for the territory, and reimprisoned Ourselves in Our Unbearable wrongness of being, of Desêtre: Black Studies toward the human project. In L. R. Gordon & J. A. Gordon (Eds.), *A companion to African-American Studies* (pp. 107-118). Blackwell Publishing.

Wynter, S. & McKittrick, K. (2015). Unparalleled catastrophe for our species? Or, to give humanness a different future: Conversations. In K. McKittrick (Ed.), *Sylvia Wynter: On being human as praxis*, (pp. 9-89). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Wynveen, C., Kyle, G. T., & Tarrant, M. A. (2011). Study abroad experiences and global citizenship: Fostering proenvironmental behavior. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 16*(4), 334-352.

Yamamoto, Y., & McClure, M.W. (2011). How can social cartography help policy researchers? In J.C. Weidman & W.J. Jacob (eds.), *Beyond the comparative: Advancing theory and its application to practice* (pp. 153–170). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Yang, K.W. (2008). For and against: The school-education dialectic in social justice. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Justice in Education* (pp. 455-464). New York, NY: Routledge.

Young, R. J. C. (2001). *Postcolonialism: An historical introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Zemach-Bersin, T. (2007). Global citizenship and study abroad: It's all about US. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 1*(2), 16-28.

Ziguras, C. (2016). And fairness for all? Equity and the international student cohort. In A. Harvey, C. Burheim, & M. Brett (Eds.), *Student equity in Australian higher education* (pp. 207-220). Springer Singapore.