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Chapter One

The Historical Context of Internationalisation of Higher Education

Little research has been done on the historical roots of the present wave of internationalisation of higher education. It is nonetheless important to relate the generally acknowledged focus on the internationalisation of higher education in today’s world to the original roots of the university, and to place the present developments in historical perspective. Only in this way is it possible to identify the specific character of the internationalisation of higher education, as currently encountered.

Stephen Muller (1995,75) states that we have entered the information age and seem to be “on the road toward a single global marketplace of ideas, data, and communication.” He comes to the conclusion that “knowledge as understanding is the province of the university, and as of now knowledge has outrun understanding by far. Higher learning must now restore understanding.” His reference to a supposed restoration of the universal character of science and education is based on the assumption that higher education in the past has gone from a transnational to a more isolationist national period, and that the globalisation of current society requires a renewal of its universal role. In similar words, Altbach (1998, 347) calls the university the one institution that has always been global. “With its roots in medieval Europe, the modern university is at the center of an international knowledge system that encompasses technology, communications and culture.” These observations are not new. F. Brown (1950, 11-21) wrote as early as 1950: “the universities of the world are today aspiring to return to one of the basic concepts of their origin – the universality of knowledge. Many are also seeking to discover and adopt procedures that will restore the desirable aspects of the itinerant character of scholars that was an accepted part of university education until growing nationalism created the barriers of language.”

The observations of both Muller, Altbach and Brown come close to Clark Kerr’s statement (1994 a, 6) that “universities are, by nature of their commitment to advancing universal knowledge, essentially international institutions, but they have been living, increasingly, in a world of nation-states that have designs on them.” Kerr (1990, 6) notes a historical movement from a unified model of higher education, lasting until the end of the Reformation, to a diversified nation-by-nation system of higher education, accelerating in the nineteenth century and again after the Second World War. Kerr (1994, 8-9) sees at present a ‘partial reconvergence’ of the cosmopolitan university. Until five hundred years ago, higher education could be typified by the ‘convergent’ model of universal education. That model was replaced by a ‘divergence model’, in which higher education came to serve the administrative and economic interests of the nation-state and also became an essential aspect of the development of national identity. Now, he sees the emergence of a partial reconvergence, which Kerr calls the ‘cosmopolitan-nation-state university’, a result of the fact that it has generally been to the advantage of nation-states to support the expansion of higher learning and its internationalisation within and beyond their borders. He judges that we will finally come to the conclusion that “it will have been a century of
transformation from nation-state divergences in higher education toward a more nearly universal convergence where universities best serve their nations by serving the world of learning."

Scott (1998, 109-110, 123) criticises the ‘myth of the international university’ dating from the medieval ages. Not only were very few universities founded in that period and ultimately transformed by the modern world, but also otherwise he classifies this myth as ‘internationalist rhetoric’. The university of the middle ages could not be ‘international’, given that nation-states did not yet exist. ‘Rather it shared an archaic notion of ‘universalism’, within that narrow world of medieval Europe, with other institutions ... So the peregrinatio academia of the medieval scholar cannot be seen as a precursor of today’s ERASMUS and SOCRATES student mobility programmes, or of junior year abroad, or of the (until recently) massive flows of international students ... any more than the debates within medieval scholasticism, or (a bit later) the ideological wars of Reformation and counter-Reformation can be compared to the global flows of information exchange in the knowledge society. The contemporary university is the creature of the nation state not of medieval civilization.” This view is also present in Neave (1997) who speaks of a ‘myth’, qualifying the notion of international mobility in the medieval period as ‘inaccurate’; and of ‘de-Europeanisation’ with the creation of the nation-state.

To provide a clearer insight into the international dimension of higher education in the medieval era, the twentieth century and the period in between, an overview of the main international elements of the periods as mentioned by Kerr is given below, ending with the present, post-Cold War context, which Kerr describes as a ‘confused period of partial reconvergence’.

1. The International Dimension of Higher Education in the Medieval Ages and Renaissance

Most publications on the internationalisation of higher education refer back to the days of the Middle Ages and up to the end of the eighteenth century. At that time, in addition to religious pilgrims, “pilgrims or travellers (peregrini) of another kind were also a familiar sight on the roads of Europe. These were the university students and professors. Their pilgrimage (peregrinatio) was not to Christ's or a saint's tomb, but to a university city where they hoped to find learning, friends, and leisure.” (De Ridder-Symoens, 1992, 280) The academic pilgrimage started long before the twelfth century, but became at that time a common phenomenon. According to De Ridder-Symoens (Ibid., 281), “in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when there were not many universities and they were not widely distributed over Europe, the 'happy few' who aspired to higher education had to leave home and travel long distances to the 'studium' of their (rather limited) choice.” But even later, in the fifteenth century, when higher education was more widespread in Europe, short-term study abroad and migration for complete studies continued to be important factors. Not so much because of numbers – owing to the creation of more universities recruitment of students became more regionalised and migration of students came nearly to a halt. By the end of the Middle Ages, three-quarters of all students went to a university in their region. The exception were those who wanted “to continue their studies in an internationally renowned university and in disciplines not taught in their own schools.” (Ibid., 287)
De Ridder-Symoens (Ibid., 302-303) describes the impact of the mobility of students and scholars on higher education and society in that period in a way which reminds us of many of the arguments used to promote mobility today. “The use of Latin as a common language, and of a uniform programme of study and system of examinations, enabled itinerant students to continue their studies in one 'studium' after another, and ensured recognition of their degrees throughout Christendom. Besides their academic knowledge they took home with them a host of new experiences, ideas, opinions, and political principles and views. Also – and this is important – they brought back manuscripts and, later on, printed books. They had become familiar with new schools of artistic expression, and with living conditions, customs, ways of life, and eating and drinking habits all previously unknown to them. As most itinerant scholars belonged to the élite of their country and later held high office, they were well placed to apply and propagate their newly acquired knowledge. The consequences of academic pilgrimage were, indeed, out of all proportion to the numerically insignificant number of migrant students.”

Reading this, it comes as no surprise that the European Commission chose the name Erasmus, one of the best-known wandering scholars of that period, for their most important mobility programme. However, according to Scott one cannot call it anything more than a myth, or (Neave, 1997) a symbolic expression, “a pleasant legend untroubled by the slightest relevance, save to the romantically inclined.” Field (1998, 8) sees a tension between this symbolism in the titles of the educational action programmes of the European Commission, their attachment to the humanistic tradition of education, and the technological and instrumentalist tendency of these programmes.

However, because nations as political units did not yet exist, one can speak of a medieval ‘European Space’, defined by this common religious credence, and uniform academic language, programme of study and system of examinations. (Neave, 1997, 6) This medieval European education space, although limited and scattered in comparison to present mass higher education, is relevant to the current debate on the development of a new European education space. One expression of that is the gradual growth of the English language as the common academic language today, resembling the role of Latin – and later, although in a more moderate way, French – in that period. More than a superficial resemblance and reference between the two is not possible however, because of the different social, cultural, political and economic circumstances.

2. International elements in higher education in the period between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries

With the emergence of the nation-state, universities became de-Europeanised and nationalised. This transition did not take place in a radical way. As Jan Kolasa (1962, 12-13) notes, towards the end of the seventeenth century, and in the eighteenth century, “European culture continued, to a considerable degree, its universalistic spirit (...) National cultures became more differentiated but the most prominent savants and artists still belonged to the whole of Europe, and the French language was commonly spoken by cosmopolitan aristocracy, which managed all political and a good deal of non-political affairs.” According to Kolasa, both the Middle Ages, the Reformation, and the Enlightenment were periods of “natural, not organized or regimented, flow of culture, and of free wandering of the creators of that culture across political frontiers.” This domain of international cultural relations was challenged though in the second
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Half of the nineteenth century, with the emergence of a strong sentiment of political and cultural nationalism.

Hammerstein (1996, 624) illustrates this with the following examples: prohibition of study abroad in many countries; displacement of Latin as the universal language by vernacular languages; disappearance of the 'peregrinationes academicæ' and its gradual replacement by the 'grand tour', which differed in its emphasis on cultural experience compared to the academic objectives of the former. Universities became institutions that served the professional needs and ideological demands of the new nations in Europe. "Paradoxically perhaps", observes Scott (1998, 123), "before it became an international institution the university had first to become a national institution – just as internationalization presupposes the existence of nation states." In that period, three international aspects of higher education can be identified: export of higher education systems, dissemination of research, and individual mobility of students and scholars.

The most important international element of higher education in this era was probably the export of systems of higher education. As Roberts, Rodrigues Cruz and Herbst (1996) describe, by the end of the eighteenth century, universities and other institutions of higher education could be found in North, Central and South America, as implants from Europe. Altbach and Selvaratnam (1989) describe this phenomenon for Asia. This took the form of export from the colonial powers to their colonies, and later to the newly independent states. Higher education in Latin America has been, and still is to a large extent, modelled on higher education in the Iberian Peninsula. Higher education in India and other Asian, African, Caribbean and Northern American countries belonging to the British Empire was modelled on British higher education. In the same way, the Asian, African, Caribbean and Northern American universities in the former French colonies have been built according to the structure of French higher education. After independence, these influences prevailed, and only more recently have other national and international influences had their impact on higher education in these countries.

Countries with a non-colonial heritage, such as Japan, China and Thailand were also affected and have largely Western university systems. Higher education in Japan, for instance, was seen as an important part of the modernisation process, which took place in the nineteenth century under pressure of Western economic, political and military power. First, the German university was used as a model then, after the Second World War, American higher education ideas were imposed. To this day, contemporary higher education in Japan includes elements of German origin and of current American higher education (Altbach and Selvaratnam, 1989, 10).¹

Even higher education in the United States, often regarded today as the dominant model in international developments of higher education, was based on European influences and continued to reflect these for a long time. Oxford and Cambridge were the models for the first colleges established in the colony. Later, with the creation of Johns Hopkins University, the German model of research university was also imported. As a side effect, many students sojourned to the universities in Europe, on which these institutions were modelled, to pursue further studies. The American system of higher education, which emerged in its modern form between the 1860s and

¹ See for the influence of Western ideas on Chinese higher education and the role of returned foreign-educated students on Chinese higher education, Yugui Guo, 1998.
the 1900s, can be considered, according to Joseph Ben-David (1992, 25), as "one of 'secondary reform' and belongs to the same category of externally inspired change as the establishment of modern systems of higher education in Russia, Japan and elsewhere in Asia, and Africa."

Peter Scott (1998, 124) calls this export of higher education models the first of two main forms of internationalisation of higher education that went on well into the twentieth century. This can hardly be seen, however, as a process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension. It would be tempting to call it a primitive form of globalisation of higher education or globalisation of higher education 'avant-la-lettre', but that would ignore the role of the nation-state in the process, although it coincides with what Thomas Friedman (1999, xiv) calls an ‘area of globalisation’, the period 1800–1920, with relatively similar volumes of trade and capital flows and Great Britain as the dominant global power. Nonetheless it was different in degree and kind to the present area of globalisation, and the adjective ‘avant-la-lettre’ is therefore appropriate. The best description is ‘academic colonialism’ and ‘academic imperialism’.

Although reference is made above to the export of educational systems as the dominant international dimension during the expansion of European colonialism, it is also important to note the impact colonialism has had on the academic curriculum in European higher education, in particular the study of foreign languages, anthropology and geography, but also in other disciplines such as agricultural science, medicine, law and economics. This impact can still be seen in the curriculum and, as will be indicated later, has had different implications in Europe for the development of area studies as compared to the United States, where area studies are a more recent phenomenon, a consequence of the role of the US as a superpower during the Second World War and the Cold War.

The second international element of higher education in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries could be found in research and publications. Although much of the research in that period had a national focus and interest, the international exchange of ideas and information through seminars, conferences and publications has remained a constant factor of international scholarly contact. To a certain extent, one can say that, although this international scholarly cooperation and exchange did not have the intensive form as in the present period, for most academics international contacts in research have always been and still are the main if not the only reference when asked about the need for internationalisation of higher education. Jan Kolas (1962, 15 and 163) notes that the international academic associations and societies of the nineteenth century were private of character and dedicated to individual and professional relationships. This element comes closest to the notion of 'universalism' that has always been present in higher education.

Although there is very little statistical information on the mobility of students and scholars in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, mobility – the third international element of this period – never completely came to an end but changed character. De Ridder-Symoens (1996, 417) describes this change as follows: "Renaissance teachers looked upon study abroad as the culmination of the humanist education of young members of the elite. In Renaissance times wandering students were strongly attracted by the renown of teachers," while most of the travelling students in early modern Europe were mainly concerned with the cultural and intellectual advantages of educational travel, the 'Bildungsreise'.


If the first decades of the sixteenth century were, according to De Ridder-Symoens (Ibid., 418) "the golden age of wandering scholars", by the mid-sixteenth century, the Reformation and Counter-Reformation did have a strong negative impact on mobility. Study abroad was prohibited in many countries, based on the argument that foreign universities were "sources of religious and political contamination". As in present foreign student flows, economic and financial arguments were important. Emigration of students was seen as a loss for the sending cities and a threat to the development of their own universities. At the same time, the reduction in foreign student numbers affected the cities which most of them visited. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Grand Tour did revive student mobility, at first in order to get a degree, later, in the period of Enlightenment, mainly for pleasure. All in all, De Ridder-Symoens concludes that until about 1700 student mobility was an important element of university life, and even afterwards continued to influence intellectual and political life in Europe.

Until the twentieth century, in sharp contrast to the present situation, the mobility of students was greater in the direction from the USA to Europe than from Europe to the USA. For many Americans, the pursuit of a study in Europe was considered the final touch to their cultural integration into American society, the 'Grand Tour'. The same can be said of Canadian and Australian higher education.

The last two elements, research and student flows, together relate to the second main form of internationalisation that Scott (1998, 124) observes, transmitted via the Grand Tour, scientific academies and literary salons. It is better to call it a primitive form of internationalisation, more incidental than structured and strategic, as the present form of internationalisation can be defined.

In summary, one can describe the period from the end of the Renaissance to the beginning of the twentieth century as of a predominantly nationally oriented higher education. The main areas of international academic attention in that period were the individual mobility of a small group of well-to-do and academically qualified students to the top centres of learning in the world; the export of academic systems from the European colonial powers to the rest of the world; and co-operation and exchange in academic research.

This confirms the suggestion of Clark Kerr, Altbach and Scott that the focus of higher education, in that period, became more directed to the development of a national identity and national needs and less to universal knowledge. This applies to Europe, but also to the United States, as will be shown later.

3. The International Dimension in the Twentieth Century

Even before the Second World War one can observe a certain shift in the direction of more international co-operation and exchange in higher education. Again, little research is available on this period, but for instance the creation of the Institute of International Education (IIE) in 1919 in the United States, the 'Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst' (DAAD) in 1925, and the British Council in 1934 are indications of the growing attention for international co-operation and exchange. Academic co-operation in that time was more focused on scholars than on students. And, as will be shown in the following chapters, in the aftermath of the First World War it was
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driven by political rationales of peace and mutual understanding. The ‘International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation’, created in 1921 under the auspices of the ‘League of Nations’, and the predecessor of UNESCO, is a manifestation of that new emphasis. As Jan Kolasa (1962, 41) observes, “the co-operation of intellectuals with politicians within the framework of the League of Nations is one of the most essential differences between the unofficial organizations of the nineteenth century and the League organization for intellectual co-operation.”

According to Tierney (1977, 1505), “educational exchange as we know it is very much a product of the twentieth century,” and he sees two main factors which explain the rise of that phenomenon after the Second World War: the establishment of UNESCO and the Fulbright Act, both immediately after the end of the war, More than the creation of these two institutions, the political and cultural rationales behind them were crucial. As will be shown in the next chapters, the international dimension was more present in American higher education than in Europe, and what international activities did take place were mainly between the two continents.

After the Second World War international educational exchange expanded, first and foremost in the USA. Europe was still too heavily focused on recovering from the severe wounds of two world wars and on reconstruction to be able to invest in international educational exchange and co-operation. In the field of area studies it was barely able to maintain its historical strength in the knowledge of other cultures and languages. Many of its academics had become either victims of the wars or migrated to other parts of the world, mainly the US, Canada and Australia. The world of academia was turned upside down, as Goodwin and Nacht (1991, 4-5) describe: “Views of the world in US higher education were transformed almost overnight by World War II. From a cultural colony the nation was changed, at least in its own eyes, into the metropolis; from the periphery it moved triumphantly to the center.” Cunningham (1991, 1) describes the same phenomenon for Canada: “Until the Canadian higher education system was well established, Canadians often had to study in the United States and Europe to obtain their qualifications, particularly in the professions. Then, as our own infrastructure matured, students from other countries began to arrive here for advanced studies. But this phenomenon is quite recent. Students from overseas began arriving in Canada in significant numbers only after World War II.”

At the same time, the Soviet Union, the other new superpower that was the result of the war, expanded its political, economic, social and academic control over Central and Eastern Europe, in a quite different and clearly repressive way, bringing academic freedom and autonomous co-operation and exchange almost to an end. “Higher education, as well as the educational system in general, had been made subservient to the political and economic interests of the state and in fact the party. The universities were among the chosen and most prestigious instruments for transforming human minds and for providing the State economy with the right numbers and the right kind of highly qualified manpower,” as Dennis Kallen (1991, 17) describes the situation of higher education in Central and Eastern Europe during the communist period. He recognises at the same time that “some of them remained institutions of high intellectual and cultural prestige where, in contrast to what happened in many other walks of life, integrity, merit and individual academic performance remained important values.” For academic co-operation, the Western world was not a priority (Ibid., 27-28): “Much higher importance was attached to co-

2 The Netherlands Commission for International Academic Relations is another example of this period.
operation with other socialist countries, whether in Central/Eastern Europe itself or elsewhere in the world. Large numbers of students with scholarships attended higher education in the USSR and in other socialist countries, and considerable numbers of staff were invited to teach or learn, particularly in the USSR. The Third World at large represented the second priority. Apart from receiving large numbers of students on state scholarships and inviting considerable numbers of staff, the Central/Eastern European countries carried out a vast programme of development assistance in third World countries."

Both powers had clear political reasons to promote international educational exchange and co-operation: to gain a better understanding of the rest of the world and to maintain and even expand their spheres of influence. Together with diplomacy, development aid and cultural exchange, international exchange and co-operation in higher education became an important tool to reach these objectives.

In general, though, one can say that the international dimension was marginal, certainly at the institutional level. Most national governments did enter into cultural and academic agreements with other friendly nations, under which the exchange of faculty and students was made possible with national grants, mainly for research co-operation, language studies and postgraduate training. But the numbers were small and the objectives more related to diplomacy than to academic and cultural co-operation. Guy Neave (1992 a, 15, 18) characterises the period between 1945 and 1964 with respect to mobility as “overwhelmingly voluntarist, unorganized and individual” and with respect to exchanges by “the relatively small numbers of students involved and though organized under the aegis of national agencies, whether public or private, continued in the main along a North – North axis, between North America and the United States in particular and Western Europe. Or, from the standpoint of the Eastern bloc, between the Soviet Union and its satellites.”

In the 1960s and 1970s, the second phase in Guy Neave’s analysis of international co-operation after the Second World War (1964 – 1981), the situation changed with developments such as the decolonisation of the developing world, expansion of higher education and the changing role of universities as generators of human resources in addition to their traditional role as centres of scholarly study. In this period, internationalisation is expressed predominantly in the growing one-way mobility of students from the South to the North.

After the Second World War and in particular in the 1960s and 1970s, the Third World, in itself not a factor in academic co-operation and exchange, became ironically enough the main battlefield of international academic co-operation. First, the Western models and systems of higher education continued to dominate as in the previous era. This expressed itself in the influence of the English language, the impact of foreign training, the dominance of Western scientific products, and the impact of Western academic ideas and structures, academic neocolonialism or imperialism (Altbach and Selvaratnam, 1989, 12-15). Second, the role of the Third World manifested itself through development co-operation and technical assistance projects. “More than a few development projects in the Third World became something of a chess game between the superpowers,” as Burkart Holzner and Davydd Greenwood (1995, 39) observe. Not only the USSR saw the developing countries as an important region in which to expand their political and economic power and invested in development aid programmes for universities, but
also the USA and soon after Western Europe, Canada and Australia moved large development funds into higher education in Asia, Latin America and Africa. Academic staff were sent to these regions for teaching, training and curriculum development; students and junior staff received grants for postgraduate training in the donor countries; and equipment and books were sent to improve the infrastructure of the universities in the developing world. North–South relations dominated internationalisation strategies in higher education in the period 1950–1985, both in Europe (East and West), the USA, Canada and Australia. That relationship was a one-way relationship with different aspects – student flows from South to North, faculty and funds from North to South – and severe impacts, both negative (brain drain) and positive (better understanding and knowledge).

At first, development co-operation and technical assistance were the dominant factors in North–South relations in higher education. However, the massive mobility of students from South to North, in particular to the five most important receiving nations – Soviet Union, Germany, France, United Kingdom and (in absolute numbers in particular) the United States of America – became increasingly prominent and has remained so to the present day.

This period, described by Kerr (1990, 6) as an acceleration of the process of divergency, as a consequence of intensification of international military and economic competition, can be seen from the point of view of internationalisation as a period in which the international dimension of higher education moved from the incidental and individual into organised activities, projects and programmes, based mainly on political rationales and driven more by national governments than by higher education itself. Kerr (1994 a, 20) notes that “it has been to the advantage of nation-states to support the expansion of higher education and its internationalization within and beyond their borders.”

The Cold War played a central role in the development of internationalisation in this period, in particular in the United States and the Soviet Union, but also elsewhere. The Cold War and the related increase in military expenditure provided opportunities for American higher education for research grants, fellowships and new fields of study. Area studies, for instance, received a big push as a result of the Cold War, even though, as Wallerstein (1997) says, not always delivering the results the military had hoped.

4. The International Dimension of Higher Education after the Cold War

In the 1980s, the third phase in Guy Neave’s analysis (1982–1991) and the period of partial reconvergence according to Kerr, the global context changed. The strengthening of the European Community and the rise of Japan as an economic world power challenged not only the political and economic dominance of the USA but also its dominance in research and teaching. Both Japan and the European Community invested in research and development programmes to compete with the USA. As described in Callan and de Wit (1995), the European Community invested in programmes of co-operation for R&D between the member states, with specific reference to the technological race with Japan and the USA. Following the example of countries such as Germany and Sweden, the European Commission decided to expand its role to the promotion of international co-operation in curriculum development, mobility of students and faculty and university-industry networks.
The collapse of communism at the end of the 1980s/beginning of the 1990s changed the map even further. The countervailing political and military superpower, the USSR, fell apart, at a time when the USA was being increasingly threatened as the economic superpower by Japan and the European Union.

The end of the Cold War has created an atmosphere of global anarchy, a contradictory context of growing nationalism based on the exclusivity of ethnic groups, in itself the result of “disintegration of nation-states and national societies”, and the development of a global culture and society, a “global complex of social relations”, both at the level of systems as in the value sense. This global society can, according to Shaw (1994,19), be best understood, “as a diverse social universe in which the unifying forces of modern production, markets, communications and cultural and political modernization interact with many global, regional, national and local segmentations and differentiations. Global society should be understood not as a social system but as a field of social relations in which many specific systems have formed some of them genuinely global, others incipiently so, and others still restricted to national and local contexts.”

The global environment moved from one dominated by the superpowers USA and USSR to one characterised by Jonathan Friedman (1994, 100) as “ethnicization and cultural pluralization of a dehegemonizing, dehomogenizing world incapable of a formerly enforced politics of assimilation or cultural hierarchy.” A development that is expressed in the stronger emphasis on globalisation of economics, social and political relations and of knowledge, but at the same time by tendencies towards ethnic conflicts and nationalism – most clearly at present in the former USSR and former Yugoslavia; or broader, the clash of civilizations, as Huntington (1996) predicts – and isolation, a danger in present USA. The last is evident, for example, in a reduction in international education, as Altbach and de Wit (1995, 10) describe: “For a half century after World War II, American higher education has been the undisputed leader in higher education internationally. Cold War competition, a booming US economy, and rapidly expanding student population were contributing factors. American higher education remains very strong, but it is losing its competitive edge in the international marketplace. The slide has begun, and growing insularity will mean that the United States will fall behind its competitors.”

This context is different from that prevailing after the Second World War and in the period 1970–1980. The immediate post-war period was strongly influenced by the war and had a strong idealistic connotation of peace and mutual understanding. The second period, as mentioned above, focused more on the developing countries, with North–North co-operation marginalised to a small sector within diplomatic relations. The third period is characterised by an emphasis on economic arguments to promote international co-operation and exchange in higher education. Richard Lyman (1995, 4) describes this for the United States: “For too long, international education, especially exchange and study abroad programmes, were justified by a vague sense that such studies were the path to mutual understanding and world peace,” but “today, internationalizing education in the US is proposed as a way to help restore our economic competitiveness in the world.” Harari (1992, 57) also stresses the growing importance of the argument of economic competitiveness. Callan and de Wit (1995) have stated that the same applies for the arguments used by the European Commission for their programmes to promote co-operation and exchange within the European Union and with the rest of the world. Van der Wende (1997 b) also mentions
a change in rationale from political to economic. Guy Neave (1992 a, 21) uses terms as ‘the market ethic’ and the ‘cash nexus’ for this period.

A more analytical approach to the internationalisation of higher education is needed, however, than simply assuming that the internationalisation of higher education is now based only on money. As we have seen, Kerr analyses this development as a partial reconvergence, a hybrid situation of the ‘cosmopolitan-nation-state-university’. This might be considered an over-nostalgic approach. The end of the Cold War, the deepening of European integration and the globalisation of our societies started a process of strategic development of the international dimension of higher education. Although one could disagree with Callan’s emphasis (2000, 17) on the role of analysts in this process, her description of the change between the 1980s and 1990s is correct: “a dominant concern through the 1990s has been with internationalization as a process of strategic transformation of institutions. This concern makes a clear departure from earlier, piecemeal and limited, concerns with the management of student mobility ... ‘Striving for strategy’ has become a recurrent motif in the construction of internationalization, both descriptively and prescriptively.”

Teichler (1999, 9-10) argues that this period is one of substantial qualitative changes, referred to as the ‘three quantum leaps’ in the internationalisation of higher education. The first one is the leap from “a predominantly ‘vertical’ pattern of co-operation and mobility, towards the dominance of international relationships on equal terms.” That leap coincides with the ‘piecemeal and limited’ focus on internationalisation as described by Callan. The second leap is “from casuistic action towards systematic policies of internationalisation.” That leap refers to the emergence of a strategic perspective on internationalisation, as mentioned by Callan. The third one is “from a disconnection of specific international activities on the one hand, and (on the other) internationalisation of the core activities, towards an integrated internationalisation of higher education.” This analysis is the more appropriate view of the developments in this period, where the third leap can be seen as the millennium leap, the leap we are just starting at the beginning of the twenty-first century. The leap in which internationalisation as a strategic issue moves into an integrated part of the overall strategy of institutions of higher education. One should note, however, that the observations made by Callan and Teichler are based on the European context, while in the United States, as will be shown later, one can question such development of strategic analysis and implementation of internationalisation.

5. Concluding remarks

From the description of the historical development of the international dimension of higher education, as given above, it becomes obvious that changes in the external and internal environment of higher education over the centuries have been extremely influential on the way in which this international dimension has manifested itself.

In summary, one can say that until the twentieth century this dimension was rather incidental and individual: the wandering scholar and student, the ‘Grand Tour’, the student flows from South to North. The export of higher education models in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, seen by some as an important manifestation of the internationalisation of higher education, is difficult to understand as such and is better seen as academic colonialism. The notion
of knowledge as universal applied mainly to research and it did not presuppose action, on the contrary it assumed no need of action. Perhaps Davies’ description (1995, 4) of the international character of universities as a ‘devolved way’ is the appropriate expression.

Before the Second World War and immediately afterwards, these incidents became more structured into activities, projects and programmes, mainly in the United States and only marginally in Europe (Soviet Union, Germany, France, United Kingdom). National scholarship programmes for students and staff (Fulbright); institutional study abroad programmes (the American junior year abroad), the development of area studies, international studies and foreign language training (NDEA, HEA, Title VI); scientific and cultural agreements between countries; the creation of national agencies (IIE, DAAD and British Council), were manifestations of more organised activity-based approaches to internationalisation, and in the literature are collectively referred to as ‘international education’. They were driven in particular by the Cold War.

A second manifestation appearing in the 1960s is ‘technical assistance and development co-operation’, an area that in some countries, such as Australia, Canada and the Netherlands, until the 1980s became the most dominant international programme and is also strongly present elsewhere. In addition, though less organised, the international flow of students, mainly from South to North, continued and even expanded.

Major changes in internationalisation took place in the 1980s. The move from aid to trade in Australia and the United Kingdom; the development of the European programmes for Research & Development (the Framework programmes and their predecessors) and for education (SOCRATES, LEONARDO and their predecessors); the development of transnational education; and the presence of internationalisation in mission statements, policy documents and strategic plans of institutions of higher education, were clear manifestations of these changes.

Globalisation and the related knowledge society based on technological developments, as well as the end of the Cold War and the creation of regional structures (in particular the EU), influenced these changes. The need for an organised response by higher education to these external developments resulted in an internationalisation strategy that was based on more explicit choices (rationales) and a more integrated strategy (process approach). It was only in the 1980s that the internationalisation of higher education became a strategic process. Competitiveness in the international market became a key rationale. Incidents, isolated activities, projects and programmes were still present, both at the national and institutional level, but internationalisation as a strategic process became more central in higher education institutions. This relates to the first two quantum leaps identified by Teichler.

However, this situation is one of transition, the beginning of a great transformation, according to Kerr (1994 a, 9). The globalisation of our societies, markets and its impact on higher education and the new knowledge society based on information technology, will change higher education profoundly and will also change the nature of internationalisation of higher education. Will that change be, as Kerr (Ibid., 26) is convinced, “in the direction of the supremacy of the pure model of academic life consistent with reasonable guidance by the nation-state” and “a

---

3 See also Davies (1995, 4-5) who links the need for institutional strategies for internationalisation to these external changes.
universal reconvergence where universities best serve their nations by serving the world of learning"? That would be a too simplistic and naïve conclusion. Internationalisation will take place in the context of globalisation processes; processes that, as Scott (1998, 124) states, "cannot simply be seen as reiteration of the old internationalism, still dysfunctionally dominated by the West (or, at any rate, the developed world) but are now intensified by the new information (and knowledge) technologies." It would be better to speak of a transition to an integrated internationalisation of higher education, i.e. a response of higher education to globalisation and regionalisation (see Chapter Eight).

The development of the international dimension and the different paths it has followed are illustrated by case studies of the United States of America (Chapter Two) and Europe (Chapter Three). In Chapter Four, these two regions are compared.