*2015 Mestenhauser Lecture
on Internationalizing Higher Education*

The Freedom to Be: International Education and Crossing Borders

by Hanneke Teekens

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

This paper is an expanded version of a presentation of the same title at the annual Josef A. Mestenhauser Lecture Series on Internationalizing Higher Education sponsored by the Global Programs and Strategy Alliance at the University of Minnesota on Oct. 2, 2015.

This publication/material is available in alternative formats upon request. Direct requests to the Global Programs and Strategy Alliance, 612-624-5580 or global@umn.edu.

The University of Minnesota, founded in the belief that all people are enriched by understanding, is dedicated to the advancement of learning and the search for truth; to the sharing of this knowledge through education for a diverse community; and to the application of this knowledge to benefit the people of the state, the nation and the world. The University's threefold mission of research and discovery, teaching and learning, and outreach and public service is carried out on multiple campuses and throughout the state.

The Freedom to Be: International Education and Crossing Borders

I have always lived that way,
crossed borders resolutely
while looking over my shoulder.

Leslie Norris, "Borders"

Introduction

It is a great honor to be here today to deliver the next lecture in the distinguished Mestenhauser Lecture Series on Internationalizing Higher Education. But it is foremost a very emotional and special moment for me, now that this is the first time that Professor Josef Mestenhauser is not here with us. I dedicate this lecture that bears his name to his memory and his lasting legacy to the field. Joe, we miss you deeply. I wish you were here to support me and to share with me your thoughts, ideas and comments.

Allow me to start this lecture with some personal notes and memories of Professor Mestenhauser. Joe (as he insisted on being called) has been a friend, a mentor, and an example for me, as he was for so many people regardless of age, gender and nationality. He was a person who combined academic rigour and personal charm in a way that inspired others. Joe was deeply committed to the internationalization of higher education, but at the same time he was highly critical of some of its methods. And many of you will recognize this fact: Joe was particularly apprehensive of claims that had no theoretical base. He simply considered publications on "how to do things" as guidebooks that lacked academic value and would not take the field to a higher and deeper level of functioning. Or, even worse, he liked to argue that some perspectives on internationalization might even be an invitation to failure (Mestenhauser, 2013).

The last mail that Joe himself wrote to me, on 22 January of this year [2015], discussed his planning for the work he wanted to finish, adding "if I have enough

time to do so." At the same time, he assured me that he would "live the rest of my days to the fullest." But most reassuring was his promise (or was it a threat?!) that "I am developing a new theory that will shake up the existing line of thinking": a true academic, till the very last of his days, seeking wider horizons, developing new ideas and contesting current knowledge: crossing borders. I am convinced that if Joe had been allowed the time to finish this "last" book, a new one would have been in the making soon after. I feel so privileged to have known Joe.

The "internationalization of higher education" brought us together. Of course, I was familiar with the work of Professor Mestenhauser before I had the honour and pleasure to meet him in person. My career started in higher education, but somewhere half way through I made the switch to work for national and European organizations in support of the development of international education programs and student mobility. In the Netherlands, I was the director of the Socrates National Agency, responsible for the execution of the Erasmus Program, among other responsibilities. In the eyes of my friends in the university, I became a bureaucrat! But I always kept a close link to academia and I have been actively involved in many educational developments and programs. And I did not lose my friends in the university!

Over the last 20 years, Joe and I met almost every year, mostly at conferences and seminars, and discussed many aspects of international education. Joe was a person who realized that the field needs people in different places and in different roles. Joe was an academic pure sang, but he was also highly political in realizing that powers other than those within the university have an important stake in furthering international education.

We talked and exchanged ideas about many topics, in particular on the notion that internationalizing education is more than dealing with the mobility of students: this was our common interest. Internationalizing the Campus was a notion that I first learned about from Joe's publications. It was very important in developing the idea of "Internationalization at Home" (IaH), as it became known in the European context. Around 2000, I was a member of a special interest group, later represented in the European Association for International Education (EAIE), which coined the term and supported the debate on how to implement IaH in universities. This joint interest brought Joe to small working conferences in Sweden and the Netherlands (Teekens, 2006). These occasions provided time to share more personal stories. It turned out that Czechoslovakia and Indonesia were important places in both our biographies. This started our reflections on "home." Where do we come from, where do we go? Where does the personal narrative come in and how does international education contribute to personal growth, academic development, and individual identity?

In January 2014, we met for the last time, here in Minneapolis. It was freezing cold, icy, and slippery. Joe, aided by a walking stick but bolt upright, and me,

slithering behind, on the way to the restaurant where we enjoyed a lovely dinner together with his wife Pat and a friend.

Reflections on Home

As a young man Josef Mestenhauser, with the knowledge that it might cost him his life, crossed the border of his homeland to seek freedom. In doing so, he gave up everything he loved. His family, his home, his friends, his native language, his university degree, and the nation he belonged to. He could not take any luggage, but he brought with him the cultural capital that would sustain him for the rest of his life and that would be the base for his further personal development and academic career. Joe continued, all his life, to invest in this cultural capital. The return on this investment was huge, both for himself as well as a wide circle of family, friends, colleagues, and the Czech-Slovak community in Minneapolis and beyond.

Joe became an American. But he was an exile at the same time, and for many decades he did not know if ever he would return to his beloved Prague. Had he done so, he would have been imprisoned right away. But Joe always longed to go there and never turned his back on his past and his native country and culture. His Czech heritage was and remained part of his identity in the new country.

When freedom came to Central Europe after the Fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the dream of a homecoming became a reality after more than 40 years. Joe contributed to the reconstruction of democracy in the Czech Republic in many capacities: as an advisor, as a professor and as a personal friend of the new political leadership. President Vaclav Havel came to Minneapolis in April 1999.

But Joe also felt the disappointment of those who return and discover that they cannot find the home they have left. Both the person and the place have changed irrevocably and the intimacy of belonging is gone. Many friends are no longer friends, and perhaps they are even strangers. And the earlier loss is felt even more deeply. This tragic feeling is so beautifully portrayed by the Czech author Milan Kundera in his novel "Ignorance." Kundera, so estranged from his homeland and even from the Czech language in which he wrote the novels that brought him world fame, wrote this novel of loss in French.

In the book there is a hilarious episode in which Irene, a Czech émigré now living in France, meets her old girlfriends from school. She has brought some special French wine to celebrate this occasion that everybody has so much looked forward to. The women politely taste the wine, but the party only really gets going when they finally drink beer. And it turns out that the conversation among them never develops. Food and drink often say more than words, in any language. We might say, "culture comes with the mother milk."

Belonging and Personal Identity

In Dutch there is an expression that says "Oost West, Thuis Best." In translation it means: East West, at Home it is the Best. But what if home is not where you live? What if you are free, but feel deprived of your core cultural values and beliefs? Is "home" where we feel rooted, or is "home" a new place where we study, live and work and raise a family? Is "home" a free choice or is it a flight away from where we belong but don't want to be? Is "home" a virtual place where we meet friends from around the world but don't know our next-door neighbor? In the world today, virtual and real experiences increasingly blur, but the need and quest for belonging remain. I would even argue that this need becomes stronger amidst the confusion and complexity of our post-modern globalized world. The certainty of knowing where it is best is lost for many of us.

Migration flows, growing in dramatic numbers and impact, have created societies where the notion of "belonging" is increasingly ambiguous. Our past is often explored with the question: "where are you from?" How far back do we want to go when asked this question? What is "our fatherland"? And what is our "mother tongue," something that often transfers to other lands but loses its original strength of expression? Perhaps, today a new kind of belonging is better expressed by talking about "our children's land." We create the future but at the same time, we can never undo the past.

The father of my children, as a student, fled Prague after the Russian invasion in 1968. His mother tongue is Hungarian, as is the family name that is now carried by our grandchildren. They are Dutch, but our family stories, Nagymama's recipe for the Christmas soup, and other funny little things connect them to cousins who share the same family narrative but live in various other countries. None of them speak Hungarian. Even the former understanding of the Slovak and Czech languages that existed among their speakers is now fading following the breakup of Czecho-Slovakia and the creation of two new countries in 1993, countries that are both members of the EU and NATO. This is a reality that in 1968 seemed entirely inconceivable and certainly not unattainable within just one generation. During my last visit, one of the younger cousins, overhearing the conversation, asked: "What is this communism that you are talking about?"

In last year's novel, "In the light of what we know," Zia Haider Rahman tells the story of a boy who was born in rural Bangladesh, educated in Oxbridge, had experiences working in the UK and on Wall Street, and participated in missions in Afghanistan and Pakistan. By all standards, he was very successful in many countries, clearly able to negotiate across different cultures and settings both as a student, a professional and a citizen. The book draws heavily on autobiographical experiences and clearly does not represent an ordinary career. However, it illustrates brilliantly the psychological disintegration that the loss of identity may bring in the lives of

uprooted people, no matter what the reason for migration. I found it telling that Alex Preston, in his review in the Observer, stated of Rahman's book, "The novel I'd hoped Jonathan Franzen's Freedom would be." This quote appears on the cover of the copy in my possession. In my view, "On Freedom" portrays the sad loss of identity in the 21st century as seen from an American perspective, where Rahman's novel shows us the loss from a global point of view. But this book is not only about loss.

Zafar, the main character in Rahman's novel, wants to break away from his past. He describes his struggle to do so as "untethering" (p. 477). However, he realizes that there is so much that binds him to the past and to his origins. Unless he finds promise in the future, he will not be able to leave the past behind. He seeks a new identity and cultural and social belonging through his love for Emily and their future children. His is a quest to be accepted by those who have a past—that is, a past that they embrace, those who feel privileged and secure in their place in the world. Zafar hopes that they will let him in and welcome him into their world, a world that is white, rich, highly educated and well connected: a world with a strong alignment to a celebrated history, with all of its glorious traditions and achievements. Zafar does not seek freedom; rather, he wants to belong but is excluded. He is not necessarily sad, but he becomes ill and is very, very angry.

This new century began with the destruction of the Twin Towers. The result has been a clash of values in the new struggle for global power and influence. It is also economic in nature, of course, but it is my view that what we have is predominantly a struggle of competing worldviews—worldviews that are religiously fuelled and culturally imbued. This new world order contests western superiority. In part, this is caused by long anti-colonial sentiments and human despair, where war, hunger and destitution reign generation after generation without a glimpse of hope. There remains resentment about the fact that the U.S. has won the Cold War. But, as we know, keeping the peace is more difficult than winning a war.

The Americanized Dream

In this context I find it telling and most fascinating that the American Dream has never lost its appeal. On the contrary, while the U.S. may be hated in some places, at the same time, the country is deeply admired all over the world (even if it is often in deep secret). The powerful symbol of freedom, optimism, progress and prosperity is immensely popular and remains an inspiration for individuals and nations seeking to fulfill their personal and collective aspirations. It is especially powerful and attractive to students. But few truly understand the underlying assumption of the ideal of the American Dream: that you have to believe in freedom.

Freedom is defined as the liberation of man from the confinements of history, geography and class. What I have called the "Americanized" dream is the hope of

attaining this freedom and prosperity while at the same time clinging to old convictions, local beliefs, historical rights, and traditions: deeply ingrained cultural values and historical claims that, in many parts of the world, clash with the idea of freedom in the American tradition. This clash of mind-set portrays the misunderstanding of the new world order. The U.S. and the "West" in general, will see their dominance combatted by very different weapons than they could imagine a few decades ago, even when this dominance may in many cases be perceived rather than real. Some have argued that we have seen "the end of history." But the attack on the Twin Towers was, in my thinking, the "beginning of history" for America: that is, a loss of innocence. We all have to accept the wisdom that historical developments cannot be denied and that they set the stage for the future (Teekens, 2004).

Is international education co-creating personal uncertainty or is it contributing to our understanding of the world? In this debate, most of the literature is based on the experiences and learning of 'our' students who go abroad. Less researched is the long-term impact of our teaching and learning methods on international students from around the world. What does the experience do to these students? What do they take back with them? Are they really our "ambassadors" as we hope they are? After all, we want them to "integrate" instead of hanging around with their countrymen on our campuses. Do we understand how their brains work?

How can knowledge that is acquired within the cultural context of the learning environment in one country be transplanted and applied elsewhere? Are we really interested in these questions or is the university predominantly concerned with academic output in terms of credits, preventing drop out, and, ultimately, their financial income? Is the internationalization of higher education contributing to a better world, a world with more understanding of other cultures and differences? We look for people who are engaged in bridging the gap between cultures and who are willing to negotiate across differences. We all recognize this need. We see in our colleges and universities a deep and growing interest in "global learning." But is the "western" approach always supportive of the goals of global learning?

The Historical Imperative

This brings us back to the main topic of this lecture: the internationalization of higher education.

In talking about this topic, I will employ a historical and narrative approach. I am sure that Joe would have commented if I didn't make this explicit from the very start. I return to how I was educated: as a historian. But I also draw on many ideas and theories from other disciplines as well as borrow results from a wide range of research, as the references reflect.

The historical imperative of higher education is very powerful, but it is hardly ever reflected upon and is usually ignored in the current debate on mobility, insti-

tutional strategies, and curriculum development. In fact, I argue that by the time young people come to the university, they are "nationals" with deeply ingrained cultural beliefs and historical convictions that a university education usually will only reinforce. Our collective memory does not come from books, but rather from "how we tell stories to our children" (Ferro, 1981).

So, today I will take you back in time. Historical analysis is of course never "proof" of anything, but it may help us to understand where we stand and why. The past plays an essential role in our culture (Wood, 2008). The same is true for literature: it is a rich source of wisdom. I will mention facts and dates, but that is not what history is about. History is the story (some joke more "his" story than "hers") to make us understand that the living present is part of a dynamic process of change. Cultures are never static. When we think with history, we configure, organize, orient and comprehend ourselves as conditioned by the present as it defines us out of—or against—the past. We can then use elements from the past in the cultural construction of the present and the future (Schorske, 1998). It may help us to reflect both individually and collectively on our role in society or, for that matter, in our professional role in international education.

But most of all, I hope to inspire you, distinguished listeners. The internationalization of higher education is and remains a beautiful field. Within universities, wonderful people work in it. International students are among the most interesting, hardworking and talented students we see in the university. And I remain personally convinced that international education is one of the most powerful instruments to offer young people a chance for personal growth, intellectual stimulation and intercultural learning during important developmental years. The world needs them. *The most important issues in our time are global.*

In my presentation I will focus on three main topics. They appear all throughout the lecture, but I will discuss them more specifically in the following order:

• The historical foundation of the university and its role in creating collective and individual identity;

• International student mobility and individual learning outcomes;

• International education and Freedom.

At the same time, a second thread can be seen throughout four dimensions of international education that come into play here:

• Educational dimension: how do students (and really, all people!) learn?

• Political dimension: how does political power relate to education systems and universities?

• Economic dimension: how is education paid for?

• Cultural dimension: how does education shape societies and individual identity?

Comprehensive internationalization discusses each of these dimensions. The implementation of internationalization as well as current practice deals with all of them, though the main challenge remains to do so in a coherent and related way.

In fact, very different stakeholders have very different interests. These interests not only compete, but also often have very different goals that change over time.

As we all know, the internationalization of higher education is confronted with enormous challenges: growing numbers, dwindling budgets, digitalization, dealing with increased diversity and, in economic terms, tough global competition. There is hardly time to reflect while keeping up with all of the new developments. The field rarely looks back. So, let us now take a look at the origins of what became "the" university as we think of it today.

The Foundation of Universities Around the World

Formal intellectual higher learning originated in all parts of the world around religious or philosophical centers outside the "western" world. According to the Guinness Book of Records, the oldest university in the world is in Fez in Morocco and was built in the year 859. The Al-Azhar University in Cairo was founded in 970 and survives until today as a prestigious degree-granting institution.

Timbuktu, in what is now Mali and is often mentioned as synonymous with the end of the earth, was home from the 13th to the 16th century to a large and thriving centre of scholarship and learning. The teaching of Islam was important, but so were also mathematics, astronomy, medicine, and the law. An estimated 25,000 students were in residence. Hundreds of thousands of manuscripts were produced by eminent scholars who came from as far as Egypt and the Middle East.

In Vietnam, the first National University was established in 1076 in the Temple of Literature in Hanoi to educate the members of the elite as well as future bureaucrats. This pattern was derived from the Chinese tradition of higher learning. In China, the Imperial Academy was housed in the Confucius Temple in Beijing. The examinations tested the knowledge of classical literature through the rote learning. In principle, the system was merit based, and indeed, talent from humble and poor backgrounds were able to make it to the top. However, in reality the system still favoured the elites.

In Europe the first universities were established in what is now Italy and for a couple of centuries that part of Europe led in higher learning, with theology being the most important subject. It all started in Bologna (1088), then Oxford (1167) and Salamanca (1218), followed by Cambridge (1231). In Paris, while higher learning was provided since the 11th century, the Sorbonne originated in 1253 when Robert de Sorbon, founded a college where, with the financial help of the king, poor students could live and study.

In Northern Europe, universities sprang up in many major cities. Around 1500 there were more than a hundred universities. The Charles University in Prague was one of the first in 1348, followed by places like Heidelberg (1385), Basel (1460), Copenhagen (1479) and Leiden (157). In Eastern Europe, universities were established later, as in Budapest (1635) and Moscow (1755).

Universities in the new world emulated the European model and followed its pattern of development. In Latin America in the colonial period, institutions were founded by the conquistadores (Mexico, 1553) or religious orders, as in the case of the Universidad del Rosario in Bogota (1623). Harvard, founded in 1636, claims to be the oldest university in the United States. In the Philippines, the University of Santo Thomas was set up around the same time (1645).

A surge of growth took place in the nineteenth century, both in colonial parts of the world and in independent countries, with for example, the universities of Calcutta (1857), Buenos Aires (1821), Cape Town (1829), Sydney (1850), Tokyo (1876), the Indochinese University in Hanoi (1906) and Hong Kong (1911). By language, these universities remained closely linked to the colonizers, predominantly Britain and France, or former colonizers, as in the case of Spain and Portugal, who kept close links with the independent countries in Latin America.

Universities in the colonies were meant to create local elites that were favorable to the colonial powers. It was also the beginning of "modern" student mobility when students received scholarships to study in the "mother country." Many of these students turned into politicians who were the leaders of the movements for freedom that led their country into independence, as with Sukarno in Indonesia. The fight for freedom and the historical process of independence, in its various forms, as well as the ideologies it is based on, was of special interest to Josef Mestenhauser in his early career, particularly the case of Indonesia.

In the second part of the 20th century the foundation of a university was often a direct result of independence, as in Indonesia with the Universitas Gadja Mada in Jogjakarta (1949), and in 1970 the universities in Nairobi, Dar el Salaam, and Kampala, the heirs to older colonial schools in British East Africa. Like the early European universities, these universities were very important for the nation building of the country and for the development of national identity and economic growth. It created the idea of the "developmental university."

The United States was active in Asia, particularly in Korea and Japan, as well as in the Middle East and Egypt. In this case it was not the government that was involved but either missionaries of various denominations or individuals with a keen interest in international education provided in English. These academic relationships brought knowledge and modernization, with the intention being to develop a local disposition that was favorable to the interests of the donor.

During the Cold War "The Peoples' Friendship University of Russia" was set up in Moscow in 1960 to counterbalance western influence and to promote Marxist-Leninist education. This so called "Lumumba University" has educated more politicians, prime ministers and heads of state in Africa, Asia and Latin America than any other university in the world. Today the Friendship University of Russia is still the most internationalized university in that country and remains an important scientific centre.

It is estimated that there are now approximately 18,000 universities in the world. Around two third of these institutions can be found in the "west," that is, North America, Europe, and Australia. Currently, the largest numbers of new universities are established in Asia, especially in China, Malaysia, Singapore and Vietnam. The National University of Singapore and Peking University are placed very high in international rankings, with the research output comparable to that of many top institutions in the West. This is development that is congruent with the fact that, with the beginning of the 21st century, we may have entered "the Asian century," which follows the European and American periods of hegemony (Rizvi, 2013).

The Emotional Value of a Long Tradition

A superficial skim through the websites of important universities shows that the older the university, the more prominently its date of foundation will be mentioned. The best qualification is "the first" university in the country. It is clear that the emotional value of 'being old' remains very important in the image that institutions have of themselves until this very day (Slottved & Tamm, 2009).

University students around the world are often reminded of this affiliation with a "medieval" past. When they come to campus, gothic lines, brick and ivy must convince them that they enter a "cathedral of learning". The imagery of quality, as represented by this architecture, is projected as exclusiveness, and status, not inclusivity. For many students, often labelled "first generation," going to college is a daunting experience and it takes time to feel connected to the tradition of higher learning, to overcome the anxiety of not feeling connected. For international students, this is often a double load to bear.

Within the old medieval, or rather Renaissance centres of learning, debate centred around shared religious and philosophical beliefs. This created a strong feeling of community and shared cultural outlook. The lack of a political and economic frame for academic influence made the mobility of talent non-controversial. Cultural identity, religious belief and political power were overlapping. There was no need for intercultural learning: values were shared. These early universities were actually more communities of professors and students rather than organized institutions. Personal relations were very important. Both professors and students were highly mobile and moved around on so-called *peregrinationes academicae*. And it was easy at that time: passports in most European countries did not come into use until the 19th century, and it was only after the First World War that they really become obligatory in order to travel. This is unbelievable today, when we see that in most universities the international office is overburdened by all the difficulties of visa applications and residence permits.

Desiderius Erasmus, the European icon of the mobile professor, indeed felt himself a "European," or a Catholic, or a Humanist, but I don't think he ever felt himself "Dutch" in the sense that I would describe that feeling. Arguably, he might

not even have been able to articulate feeling "Dutch" because the Dutch were not a nation yet. The Dutch language was only just beginning to produce its own literature. And this was the same for peoples in others parts of a continent made up of regions, rather than countries. Borders were constantly shifting and wars were raging because competing dynasties were trying to build up their new kingdoms. Many of those kingdoms have forever disappeared into oblivion (Davis, 2011).

Universities and the Building of National Pride

With the growing influence in the 17th century of the modern nation states, the foundation of "new" universities became more and more linked to the demands of these new nation states, their bureaucracies, and the needs of the professions (medical doctors, teachers, lawyers, economists). The Reformation broke up the religious monopoly of the Catholic Church. Universities became part of a national political and economic system, fostering national identity, supporting the early capitalist state economies and the European expansion in other parts of the world. In many countries, religious structures also became part of political influence, as with The Church of England or the Dutch Reformed Church in the Netherlands. With more "national universities" in various countries, the earlier, "free" academic mobility across regions declined. This was also due to the fact that national languages took over, limiting personal contact. In academia, Latin was now becoming a dead language.

In fact, the formation of the "scientific" university after the Renaissance was a way to keep talent at home and to educate talented students within the political and economic frame of the state, with the clear intention of serving the national interests at home and abroad and to promote patriotism, if not downright nationalism.

Universities began to increasingly struggle with their academic identity as a result of the beginning of modernity and scientific research. In teaching and learning, the mainly oral tradition of debate, based on religion, literature and philosophy, was supplanted by the more scientific methods of experimentation and measurement, both documented and discussed through written argumentation. In addition, it was the beginning of the growing rift between the liberal arts and the hard sciences. While theology, philosophy and literature remained important, law, medicine, mathematics and the sciences became increasingly more important. This is a development that we see today in the Arab world, where old centres of predominantly religious learning increasingly become science-oriented research universities.

As academia became less personal, universities grew to be more organized and powerful as national institutions. This had a great impact on the curriculum. During the French Revolution, the Sorbonne was closed because it was considered a conservative religious and royalist bulwark, dangerous for the advancement of the revolutionary movement. Now that state and religion had become separate entities, universities became tools of the state. And even today in countries with a

large private sector, the state still maintains a strong influence through accreditation procedures, various regulations regarding the functioning of a university, or the tax system.

While it is perhaps difficult to imagine, the feeling of belonging to a nation and of sharing a collective cultural identity (that is, feeling patriotic) is a modern emotion. Where there is not a strong state, collective feelings of allegiance are local, tribal and religious. In Europe, even "national languages," an important expression of collective identity, did not develop as such until the 19th century. And that does not apply only to less widely spoken languages like Czech, but also to tongues like French and German. Until the development of national languages, the existence of very strong local dialects prevented people from understanding each other. People at that time were overwhelmingly illiterate, and elites spoke a French that most people in France today would not have understood.

In the European Union it could be argued that the current internationalization of universities, supported by the measures of the Bologna process and its implementation through Faboto (Facilitating the use of Bologna tools for HEI's and Quality Assurance Organizations), is a return to "medieval traditions." The "nationalization" of universities in the sixteenth century became the end of the natural "international" outlook and intercultural modes of operation and cooperation with which the universities had historically operated.

In Asia and Africa, a new and vibrant (post-colonial) nationalism contests (and, in certain cases, simply rejects) the dependency on notions that are based in the western perspective on university education related to research and critical thinking. In China, this confidence can be seen in the Chinese campus architecture that alludes to the Confucius temple style of two thousand years ago. The recent student agitation at Stellenbosch in South Africa was a strong protest against the cultural basis of teaching and learning, a style that was seen as a continuing form of Apartheid even though the institution is now completely mixed in terms of the ethnic background of students.

Student Mobility and Individual Learning Outcomes

In almost all the old myths and fairy tales, across very different cultural traditions, the hero (heroines stayed at home in those days!) traveled to unknown lands to solve at least three difficult problems, before they could return to show they had learned and matured, expecting to be rewarded (Fromm, 1957).

In many trades, it was customary to find a "master" away from one's home to finish training as an apprentice. When Goethe was in his thirties, he had what we now would call a "midlife crisis" and left his job to travel to Italy, where he stayed for two years. He marvelled at what he saw, and his experience is especially important because it provides us with an early and very insightful description of what

mobility and academic stimuli mean for personal development and reflection on the self (Goethe, 1985).

Because belief in learning away from home is so old and persistent, it must be true. And, for a long time, it was this "holy cow" moment of discovering another culture that served as the main underlying principle for and defence of international education and student mobility. But the field has lost its innocence. Numerous publications have come out over the last two decades discussing the learning process in international education. It is now widely accepted that, unless students are well prepared and coached, study abroad may not at all have the desired impact (Vande Berg & Paige & Lou, 2012).

The knowledge that learning is a physical process where emotional stimuli and cognition create new connections in the brain has become more useful than preparation in language, geography, history, cultural do's and don'ts, etc. In fact, knowledge about metacognition is highly appealing to students. Self-reflection thus becomes the most important and enduring outcome of an international (or intercultural) experience. When emotional stimuli evoke only negative feelings and insecurity, the brain will not want to connect emotions to cognition other than memory, and new learning becomes difficult.

People will tenaciously hold on to their convictions. This explains why it is so difficult to change deeply ingrained views—views and ideas that have been acquired when we were very young, either safe on our mother's lap or in school, feeling terribly afraid of a horrible teacher. It is not so much a matter of whether the conditions were positive or negative, but rather the fact that they triggered the part of the brain where emotions connect with memory. To "undo" memory and construct new knowledge is done by reflecting on previous learning, thus creating new insights (Zull, 2012).

And herein lies the link with collective memory, the rooting of national identity and of cultural belonging. When we do not reflect on our past, history is simply a body of facts and opinions, creating a "national canon" that is repeated over and over again, building stereotyped images of others that lead to prejudice. Authoritarian systems will use, or better to say misuse, history to indoctrinate and justify their "historical rights."

Reflecting on a collective past opens up the mind and allows for new connections in the brain between remembering and cognition, which in turn builds new images and opinions. It allows a person to be both a member of an in-group and an individual, culturally rooted but also free to be oneself.

To learn, at home and abroad, about "otherness" is to contest both your own individual as well as collective memory and to show a willingness to perform a very difficult mental exercise: to put a mirror before your face and to ask: is that me? Is that who I want to be?

Considering the carbon footprint of international travel, well-structured programs that teach interculturality must provide useful ways to promote self-reflection and intercultural competence at home for *all* students.

Education and Freedom

Education is never free. First of all because it is not for free. Higher education is expensive for countries and for individuals. Whoever pays has a stake and a voice.

In countries where higher education is free, that is students do not pay a fee (as is the case in Germany), political power has an important say. In Germany some years ago, various universities wanted to introduce student fees, but the Parliament interfered. Higher education is viewed both as a public good and an individual right. In the end, the taxpayer gets the bill. At the same time, the German government has a strong policy to attract international students in order to strengthen the system and to attract graduates to work for the German economy, and thus earn back the investment in their education through taxes. In the Netherlands students pay rather moderate fees, but the government also supports international graduates to work after finishing their study. The so-called "stay-rate" has become a political issue.

As was discussed earlier, the role of universities in creating national interests links them directly to politics and to the promotion of the country's interests. The branding of countries and the way they promote themselves both become part of their international reputation and image. Education plays a very important role in establishing the national brand (Anholt, 2007). The American Dream is an important part of the image.

Large endowments create their own dependency; the same is true of research grants. Indirectly, the issue of students who pay high fees is an enormous economic problem. In the U.S. the total student debt now surpasses the total credit card debt and is a major weakness in the free spending potential of the professional classes and the middle class in general.

In places where religious belief does not allow for free discovery of knowledge, science stagnates and social and economic progress is difficult. The clash between Islam and modernity in the Middle East has had an important backlash on the development of the region and has often created an image of backwardness (Lewis, 2002). Recently, however, a surge of renewal in higher education is taking off. The question is how much of the innovation is "indigenous" and how much is part of investments (and interests) in transnational education.

In most places, government, money and ideology are closely intertwined without allowing for personal freedom. In these places, faculty and students can only succeed when they adhere to the official (state) views. Corruption and favours are part of the deal, and the lack of a meritocracy often prevents talent from fulfilling their ambitions and aspirations, especially upon return after studying abroad.

These are the international students who do not wish to return, who seek academic freedom in new surroundings.

Freedom in higher education as it is perceived in the western tradition means foremost the freedom to explore, to teach and research, and to discover new knowledge and insights. It means the freedom to experiment, to err and try again. It means the idea that all knowledge is provisional. But most importantly, it means a safeguard that the individual is protected from persecution as a result of new ideas. This is a tradition to be proud of, a tradition that is worth defending; however, even within our own tradition, this freedom is not self-evident.

Reflections on the Historical Imperative of Higher Learning

Running an international program or an international office does not of course require one to know all that has been highlighted in this lecture. However, to think with history in international education may help us to understand why we do things the way we do, and why others don't. In my opinion, it provides an important insight.

While the university as an institution is modelled on a concept that teaches knowledge, it is actually equally important as a conveyer of cultural traditions, with the clear intention of educating students to strengthen collective - and national - identity. And vice versa: strong universities need a strong and stable government, favorable economic conditions, and collective cultural capital.

Universities imbue adolescents with the norms and values of the dominant culture and language, and are often – to this day – based on religious and philosophical ideas, if not explicitly, then certainly implicitly. In "new" and "young" countries, universities are motors of national development, both in economic, political and cultural aspects. And, most of all, they represent national pride. Their graduates are the new elites, bolstering self-confidence and in-group continuity.

This tradition positions universities centre stage in the national frame of thought. While knowledge may be universal, its application is highly culturally defined. This highlights the importance of the national self-image and identity for graduates and impacts their attitude towards others. The more elitist a system, the more prominent this attitude will be.

The process of internationalization, aimed to strengthen an institution, actually directly or indirectly strengthens the entire country where the university is located. And this is precisely why governments all over the world want more "internationalization of higher education": to strengthen their own universities and their own country. Comprehensive internationalization of universities concerns a national interest and is therefore well-guarded by national stakeholders and governments.

The notion of "Internationalism" is a western concept and could only develop because in "the west" there are strong nations seeking to interact with one another in order to strengthen their own self-interest. But currently, this notion of inter-

nationalism increasingly clashes with a newly defined, but deeply rooted, cultural awareness in non-western traditions, as for example, with the idea of the Middle Kingdom in the Chinese tradition, which sees China as the centre of the world and where others pay tribute.

But at the same time there are regions of the world where, after nation building, there is a lack of political and economic structures to sustain higher education within a stable national and cultural context. I think of many African as well as some Asian countries where there is no clear national identity as well as competition among different social, ethnic, and religious groups who either struggle for dominance or are excluded all together. In other words, as a university you can only "internationalize" when you have a clearly defined notion of what your own university stands for, a notion that is rooted in the culture and the geography of the particular place.

It could be argued that it took "the west" a few hundred years to arrive at the level of learning and research now associated with universities today, and the rest of the world will take a big leap to reach this level. Therefore, in our partnerships we need to find some essential common ground if we are truly interested in joint research, exchanges and collaboration. Is there enough trust in each other's "quality"?

Some will argue that two and two is four, no matter history and culture. And that is true. But to work as an architect in some regions of the world, it helps when you know that four is the number of death and eight brings good luck. The Olympic Games in Beijing started on the eighth day of the eighth month in the year 2008 at eight minutes past eight o'clock p.m.

Considering its roots, the university of the future will most probably remain an important national institution. Increasingly, top universities, world players, or world-class universities, as they like to call themselves, will express the ambition to play a global role in the race for talent (Wildavsky, 2008). Some already do; for those universities, it means that their "national" identity and collective cultural capital will be contested. They will only succeed when they become increasingly more inclusive. They will also have to ask themselves what they stand for; even world players are rooted in a country (and in the countries of their various partners). The outside world will continue to associate the main location and its branch campuses with the cultural values and ambitions of the country of origin, as for instance with the NYU Global Network. Both global….and quintessentially American at the same time.

And last but not least: internationalizing the curriculum and "global education" will always consist of the "adaptation" of a "local" curriculum or program. Ambitions for global learning may be "global," but these ambitions are defined nationally. There are American, French, Dutch, Swedish (and increasingly more) versions of it. Perhaps the content is the same (international textbooks and other materials) but the delivery in the local classroom, which includes international students, will be

deeply culturally defined as a result of local conditions and geography, even within countries (Leask, 2015).

Conclusion

Ladies and gentlemen, I come to the end of this lecture. In light of what we know today, leaders in the internationalization of higher education are faced with important choices. Individual mobility with the goal of enhancing personal and academic development has become part of a massive global movement of people and curricula that is both physical and virtual. Transnational education is a multibillion-dollar business. This is driven by motives and incentives outside of those that are academic in nature. Over the next twenty-five years, all of this is likely to become bigger and increasingly more income and profit driven. The gap between what students and faculty experience on campus in their personal relationships as teachers and learners and the political and economic forces that regulate the process is wider than ever before. Altogether, this poses important challenges for international education and creates the danger of the disintegration of the process of internationalization from an educational and cultural perspective.

Academic and personal freedoms are the core principles of universities in the "western" tradition. There exists a very long tradition that links collective cultural capital within countries to individual aspirations and the ambitions of young people across borders. It is my view that "borderless education" in our institutions should never impinge on the core of academic freedom in this tradition. Let us celebrate differences with the realization that values never hold universal truths: we believe in them. We have to learn to better understand how to communicate across divergent cultures: this is the ultimate reason for international education. It does not mean that we have to give up our principles. It does mean that we have to acknowledge that others may not believe in these same principles.

Important growth in higher education will take place outside of the western world. Both the context of education as well as formal education settings will differ from traditions in western universities. Distinct differences in belief and practice, based on long historical traditions in thinking and education, will reinforce diversity in higher education. Universities as manifestations of collective identity around the world will claim cultural self-determination and exhibit local pride.

I do not foresee a "global culture" in a new, blended world. Some will argue that globalization brings hybridization, whereby we all share cultural traits, such as reading the same books, or listening to the same kinds of music, or wearing the same clothes, and eating sushi anywhere in the world. Technology may create the image that everybody and everything looks the same from the outside, but deeply ingrained systems of perception will persist in ever changing forms. This enriches the world. We can learn from each other, live together and respect each other, but

we can do this only if we better understand cognitive differences. Only then "the twain shall meet" (Nisbett, 2003).

Global education is an important tool in making students aware of where they come from, what the world is all about, and where they want to go. Who do they want to become? Culture is learned and holds deeply ingrained notions that will have a persisting impact on us as individuals. At the same time, we all have the choice to change our way of thinking, living and belonging. Global learning that is truly inclusive will further a pedagogy of inclusiveness and challenge rooted believes.

To truly accept differences—and not ignore or belittle them—is a tremendous challenge and the first step toward international understanding and tolerance: the basis of lasting peace. Thanks to the pioneering work of Professor Mestenhauser, the University of Minnesota is a leading institution in the field of intercultural learning and global programs, helping students to become globally competent and become an asset to the international community.

Professor Josef Mestenhauser was an example of how to be open to the world, cross borders and stay true to one's principles and past. His legacy will help students to find their own true identity: the freedom to be, anywhere in the world.

References

Altbach, P.G. (2007). *Tradition and transition. The international Imperative in Higher Education.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Anholt, S. (2007). *Competitive Identity. The new brand management for nations, cities and regions.* New York: Palgrave Mac Millan.

Armstrong, K. (2001). *Islam. A short history*. London: Clays Ltd.

Bhopal, K., Danaher, P.A. (2013). *Identity and Pedagogy in Higher Education. International Comparisons.* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Brewer, E., Cunningham, K. (2009). *Integrating study abroad in to the curriculum. Theory and Practice Across the Disciplines.* Sterling: Stylus Publishing.

Davies, N. (2011). *Vanished Kingdoms. The rise and fall of states and nations.* New York: Viking.

Ferro, M. (1981). *Comment on raconte l'histoire aux enfants, a travers le monde entier*. Paris: Payot.

Fromm, E. (1957). *The Forgotten Language: An Introduction to the Understanding of Dreams, Fairy Tales, and Myths*. New York: Open Road.

Goethe von, J.W. (1885). *Goethe's Travels in Italy: together with his Second residence in Rome and Fragments on Italy.* Book digitized by Google and uploaded to the Internet Archive.

Gurung, A.R., Prieto, L.R. (2009). *Getting Culture. Incorporating Diversity across the Curriculum*. Sterling: Stylus Publishing.

Killick, D. (2015). *Developing the Global Student. Higher education in an era of globalization.* New York: Routledge.

Kissinger, H. (1995). *Diplomacy*. London: Simon & Schuster.

Kundera, M. (2001). *Onwetendheid*. Amsterdam: Ambo.

Kwok-bun, C., Luk, V. (2004). *Internationalising the Curriculum and Learning Environment. An East-West Focus.* Hong Kong: LEWI.

Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the Curriculum.* New York: Routledge.

Lewis, B. (2002). *What went wrong? The clash between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mestenhauser, J. (2013). Where is the beef? In H.Teekens, ed., *Global Education. A Narrative*. The Hague: Nuffic.

Ninnes, P., Hellsten, M. (2005). *Internationalizing Higher Education. Critical Explorations of Pedagogy and Policy*. Hong Kong: Springer.

Nisbett, R.E. (2003). *The Geography of Thought. How Asians and Westerners think differently – and why.* London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Rahman, Z.H. (2014). *In the light of what we know.* New York: Picador.

Rhoads, R.A., Szelenyi, K. (2011). *Global Citizenship and the University. Advancing Social Life and Relations in an Interdependent World.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Rizvi, F. (2013). Asia and the need for a new imaginary of Internationalisation in Europe. In H. de Wit, F.Hunter, L.Johnson, H.G. van Liempd eds., *Possible futures. The next 25 years of the internationalisation of higher education.* Amsterdam: Raddraaier.

Schorske, C.E. (1998). *Thinking with History. Explorations in the Passage of Modernism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Slottved, E., Tamm, D. (2009). *The University of Copenhagen. A Danish centre of Learning since 1479.* Copenhagen: Hendriksens.Eftf.

Stearns, P.N. (2009). *Educating Global Citizens in Colleges and Universities. Challenges and Opportunities.* New York: Routledge.

Teekens, H. (2004). The beginning of History. In W. Grunzweig, *The United States in Global Contexts. American Studies after 9/11 and Iraq.* Munster: Lit Verlag.

Teekens, H. ed. (2006). *Internationalization at Home. A global perspective.* The Hague: Nuffic.

Vande Berg, M., Paige, M.R., K.H.Lou. (2012). *Student Learning Abroad. What our students are learning, What they're not, and What we can do about it.* Sterling: Stylus Publishing.

Wildavsky, B. (2010). *The Great Brain Race. How Global Universities are Reshaping the World.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Wood, G.S. (2008). *The Purpose of the Past. Reflections on the uses of history.* London: Penguin.

Zull, J.E. (2012). The Brain, Learning and Study Abroad. In M.Vande Berg, M.R Paige, K.H.Lou, Student Learning Abroad. *What our students are learning, What they're not, and What we can do about it.* Sterling: Stylus Publishing.

Hanneke Teekens

Hanneke Teekens brings more than forty years of experience in education as a teacher, researcher, consultant, and manager. She retired in 2013 from the Board of Directors of NUFFIC, the Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education. At NUFFIC, Hanneke was responsible for a wide range of activities, including the Netherlands Education Support Offices in ten countries. She was director of the Socrates National Agency and Erasmus Mundus. Before joining NUFFIC, Hanneke worked at Twente University, the Hogeschool van Amsterdam, and the Graduate School of Teaching and Learning of the University of Amsterdam. She is the founder of Climes, her own consultancy company for coaching and advising in international education.

One focus of her research regards ways to support teaching staff in ensuring and demonstrating international, intercultural, and global learning outcomes. Hanneke has worked in many countries around the world on projects and training, and has published on various aspects of international education, in particular Internationalization at Home.

Hanneke is a frequent speaker at international seminars and conferences and is currently a senior fellow of NAFSA: Association of International Educators. She is Chair of the Board of AFS Netherlands, the organization that brought her to the U.S. as an exchange student in 1966. She studied at Leyden University and holds graduate degrees in History and Education.