RHETORIC AND THE GLOBAL TURN IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Christopher Minnix

palgrave

Rhetoric, Politics and Society

Series Editors
Alan Finlayson
University of East Anglia
Norfolk, UK

James Martin
Goldsmiths, University of London
London, UK

Kendall Phillips
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY, USA

Rhetoric lies at the intersection of a variety of disciplinary approaches and methods, drawing upon the study of language, history, culture and philosophy to understand the persuasive aspects of communication in all its modes: spoken, written, argued, depicted and performed. This series presents the best international research in rhetoric that develops and exemplifies the multifaceted and cross-disciplinary exploration of practices of persuasion and communication. It seeks to publish texts that openly explore and expand rhetorical knowledge and enquiry, be it in the form of historical scholarship, theoretical analysis or contemporary cultural and political critique. The editors welcome proposals for monographs that explore contemporary rhetorical forms, rhetorical theories and thinkers, and rhetorical themes inside and across disciplinary boundaries. For informal enquiries, questions, as well as submitting proposals, please contact the editors: Alan Finlayson: a.finlayson@uea.ac.uk James Martin: j.martin@gold.ac.uk Kendall Phillips: kphillip@syr.edu

More information about this series at
http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14497

Christopher Minnix

Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education

palgrave
macmillan

Christopher Minnix
University of Alabama at Birmingham
Birmingham, AL, USA

Preface

The attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon that took place on September 11, 2001, occurred during my third week as a college English teacher. In fact, word of the attacks came to me and my colleagues as we sat in our graduate teaching practicum course, discussing rhetorical pedagogy. In the days that followed, I found myself struggling to discuss issues of nationalism, military response, terror, and religion with my students, who asked some of the most important questions that I have encountered about globalization and global responsibility. During those days, my students asked questions about our ethical responsibilities to distant others, puzzled over the difficulties of universal human rights and their application across cultures, voiced their opinions and concerns about the national response to the attacks, and discussed the emotional impacts of the images and narratives of the attack that played endlessly across the 24-hour news cycle. Scrambling myself, as a new teacher, I attempted to structure discussions that challenged students to think critically about the range of messages and arguments being circulated in the media. Looking back on our conversations, I find that this moment pointed me to one of the key arguments of this book—the relationship between precarity, rhetoric, and rhetorical education.

Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education takes up this relationship and the ethical and political questions it manifests at a time when global and nationalist understandings of citizenship are once again being drawn into sharp contrast. Following Brexit and perhaps the most polarizing presidential election in US political history, we have seen a range of emboldened arguments against global political perspectives, global

education, and global ethics. In the week following the election of Donald J. Trump as the 45th president of the United States, the *New York Times* ran an article entitled "Globalism: A Far-Right Conspiracy Theory Buoyed by Trump." Shortly after the introductory paragraphs of the article, readers find an embedded Tweet from Donald Trump posted on June 22, 2016 that reveals the political binaries that define our current moment in American politics quite well: "Hillary says things can't change. I say they have to change. It's a choice between Americanism and her corrupt globalism. #Imwithyou" (Trump, qtd. in Stack 2016). The article goes on to point to the use of globalism not only as a term used by the far-right but also as a term that, despite its origins in conspiracy theory, has the potential to cross into mainstream conservative thought. The article cites Brian Levin, an expert in hate speech and extremism who directs California State University, San Bernadino's Center for the Study of Hate and Extremism: "Anti-globalism is a very efficient net to unite disparate parts of the right" (qtd. in Stack). For myself, and I suspect many educators who were teaching after 9/11, there is an overwhelming feeling of déjà vu in these claims and in the initiatives from the far-right that follow them.

The parallels are quite striking. In the days following the election of Donald Trump, we saw the appearance of a new professor watch list, called, "Professor Watchlist," from Turning Point USA. This initiative is, of course, reminiscent of the list of professors grouped together under "campus responses" (Martin and Neal 2002, 12–29) in the report "Defending Civilization: How Our Universities Are Failing America and What Can Be Done About It," which was published in November 2001 by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, an organization founded by Lynn Cheney and Joseph Lieberman among others. Another example from this period can be found in the work of David Horowitz's *Discover the Networks*, which also provided a list of intellectuals considered dangerous to American life. Following the 2016 election, we also immediately began hearing reports of acts of political hate on campus against minority and international students, while at the same time many across the country found themselves introduced to a new set of campus-provocateurs, such as Richard Spencer and Milo Yiannopoulos. Also following the election, we found educational organizations such as the *National Association of Scholars* advising President Trump, Congress, and state legislators to slash funding for service-learning and global education (2017a, b). Despite the rapid growth of global higher education in US colleges and universities over the past 20 years, our current

moment is one in which educational buzzwords such as "global citizenship," "global education," and "internationalization" can no longer be assumed to evoke a positive response.

And yet, despite the fact that anti-global arguments are gaining political traction during conservative turns in our national election cycles, global higher education has perhaps never been on more solid footing in the US university system and in colleges and universities around the world. Many, if not most, US colleges and universities have begun to define their institutional mission in global terms and their ultimate outcomes in terms of global citizenship and participation in a global society. This movement has been led by a variety of powerful and well-funded educational organizations committed to the values of liberal and civic education, such as the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and Campus Compact. Indeed, in researching this book, it became exceptionally clear that global education has become, quite simply, an inseparable part of the American higher education system. We see this inseparability not simply in the broad values laid out by college mission statements but also in the work of hundreds of global academic programs, an expansive scholarly literature on the internationalization of the college curriculum, and in hundreds of reports and policy documents calling for the necessity of global education. Despite calls to return to more traditional models of civic learning that highlight the moral and political exceptionalism of American values, global higher education is deeply entrenched in the American university system and, I believe, will remain a part of this system.

Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education examines the role of rhetorical education in our current moment in higher education, one in which the global turn has become ubiquitous on American college and university campuses even as it has continued to spark opposition beyond the college gates. One of the central arguments of this book is that while global communication is a repeated outcome of global higher education programs, there has been, so far, little room for rhetorical education in the global curriculum. Because of this, I argue for rhetoricians in both rhetoric and composition studies and communication to draw on their shared expertise in rhetoric to critically and productively engage global higher education. Both rhetoric and composition studies, my own disciplinary home, and communication have undoubtedly experienced what Wendy Hesford termed "global turns" (2006, 787) in her 2006 *PMLA* article "Global Turns and Cautions in Rhetoric and Composition Studies." Research in transnational rhetoric, transnational writing programs, translingual practices, cultural rhetorics,

and digital rhetorics have pointed to the necessity of moving rhetoric and composition studies beyond the borders of the nation-state. In communication, research on transnational rhetorics, border rhetorics, and work in intercultural communication have also provided important tools for understanding rhetoric in a world shaped by globalization. While I draw on this research throughout *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education*, I also point out that neither research in rhetoric and composition studies nor communication has directly addressed the broader movement of global higher education taking place across colleges and universities over the past 20 years. I argue that it is vital that we do so, both because this movement is, perhaps, one of the most significant movements in higher education in the past century and because it brings with it certain cautions that require a critical response.

While scholars in rhetoric and composition studies and communication have not fully engaged the global turn in higher education, higher education's global turn has likewise completely ignored rhetorical education in both rhetoric and composition studies and communication. As I will show throughout the early chapters of this book, to read the expansive literature on global higher education—a dizzying amount of scholarly research, policy papers, reports from educational organizations, and curricular programs and assessment initiatives—is to see, simultaneously, paradoxically, the centrality of communication and rhetoric to global curricula alongside the complete absence of rhetorical education. Within this literature, we are told that students need savvy communication skills and the ability to communicate across a diverse range of mediums and global networks, but the rhetorical capacities students will need to communicate in this way, as well as the educational experiences that foster them, are almost completely absent from the discussion. We might be tempted to chalk this omission up as either the typical silo effect of academic life or the typical marginalization of rhetoric and rhetorical education within the university curriculum, but to do so, I will argue, could lead us to miss an opportunity to argue for the important role rhetorical education can play in capacitating students for lives of global engagement.

Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education presents the first sustained study of the role rhetorical education can play in the global higher education movement. However, I argue against a simple alignment of rhetorical education with the aims and outcomes of this movement. Instead of asking how rhetoric can be synthesized with existing models of global higher education, I argue that rhetorical scholars can usefully

complicate the aims and outcomes of global education. In response to the visions of global citizenship and cosmopolitanism advanced by global higher education programs, I argue for *transnational rhetorical citizenship,* an understanding of citizenship as being shaped by conditions of global interdependence—networks of power, materiality, and precarity that shape global life and link us to others. I draw on the work of Robert Asen (2004), and Christian Kock and Lisa Villadsen (2014), among others for an understanding of rhetorical citizenship, but I expand these theorizations of rhetorical citizenship by drawing on Judith Butler's (2004, 2009, 2012) understanding of precarity and interdependency. I argue for a vision of rhetorical citizenship that is rooted not in cosmopolitan recognitions of universal humanity, but in the recognition of the interdependency of the rhetorical processes by which we practice civic engagement.

Bibliography

Asen, Robert. 2004. "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship." *Quarterly Journal of Speech.* 90, no. 2. (May): 189–211.

Butler, Judith. 2009. *Frames of War: When Is Life Grievable?* New York: Verso.

———. 2004. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence.* New York: Verso.

———. 2012. "Precarious Life, Vulnerability, and the Ethics of Cohabitation." *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy.* 26, no. 2: 134–151. JSTOR.

Hesford, Wendy. 2006. "Global Turns and Cautions in Rhetoric and Composition Studies." *PMLA.* 121, no. 3: 787–801.

Kock, Christian, and Lisa Villadsen. 2014. *Contemporary Rhetorical Citizenship.* Leiden, NL: Leiden, University Press.

Martin, Jerry L., and Anne D. Neal. 2002. *Defending Civilization: How Universities are Failing America and What Can Be Done About It.* Washington, DC: American Council of Trustees and Alumni.

National Association of Scholars. 2017a. *Making Citizens: How American Universities Teach Civics.* Prepared by David Randall. National Association of Scholars. Accessed January 30, 2017.

———. 2017b. "Radical Activists Hijack Civics Education, Study Finds." *NAS.org,* January 10, 2017. Accessed February 2, 2017.

Stack, Liam. 2016. "Globalism: A Far-Right Conspiracy Theory Buoyed by Trump." *The New York Times*, November 14, 2016.

Birmingham, AL, USA   Christopher Minnix

Acknowledgments

This book is the product of many kindnesses and acts of collegiality, the product of numerous conversations with inspiring colleagues, and the product of an immense amount of intellectual and emotional support from family and friends. As I look back on the four years of researching and writing this book, I am also reminded of the many kindnesses shown to me by a range of different readers, some anonymous and some known, who took the time to provide exceptional feedback on parts of the manuscript. I am indebted most to Professor Margaret Jessee, my partner and colleague, for her sharp insights and continuous support of this project, without which I am certain it would not have been completed. Everything of merit that I have accomplished is owed completely to her support. Stanley also deserves his share of thanks for his cheerful and constant company during the writing and revision process. I am also deeply indebted to my parents, Emily and Donald Minnix, for their tireless work to provide me with the opportunity to further my own education, an opportunity that they did not have, and for their constant support. Jan and Dick Jessee are also owed a great deal of gratitude for their belief in my work and enthusiasm for my progress.

During the writing and revising of this project, I have been fortunate to enjoy the support of two outstanding department chairs and an exceptionally talented and kind faculty at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. I am indebted to Alison Chapman, chair of the Department of English, for her enthusiasm for this project, and the support she has shown for my research by helping me balance the demands of research while directing our Freshman English program. Peter Bellis, former department chair,

CONTENTS

Abbreviations

AAC&U	American Association of Colleges and Universities
ACE	American Council on Education
CID	Communication in the Disciplines
CXC	Communication Across the Curriculum
IEA	International Education Act of 1966
NAFSA	Association of International Educators
NAS	National Association of Scholars
NCTE	National Council of Teachers of English
NDEA	National Defense Education Act
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
SAC	Speaking Across the Curriculum
UAB	The University of Alabama at Birmingham
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization
WAC	Writing Across the Curriculum

Rhetorical Education and Global Higher Education in an Age of Precarity

That higher education in America is a global phenomenon is not news. American colleges and universities were historically shaped by the German model of the research university and have, since the late nineteenth century, remained centers of international exchange through both international research and the beginnings of robust programs of international student recruitment. What is news is the growing movement among US colleges and universities to define the outcomes of their undergraduate curricula in global terms and to define their overarching goal as preparing students for global citizenship. The past 20 years have witnessed significant efforts on the part of American colleges and universities to redefine the civic goals of higher education in global terms. Higher education researcher Peter Stearns (2009) has recently summed up the scope of these initiatives, stating that "it would be hard to find an American community college, college, or university that has not devoted serious new thought, in recent years, to some aspect—often, to many aspects—of global education" (1). The influence Stearns notes can be easily observed in the copious references to global citizenship and global education in the mission statements of many colleges and universities, as well as in a growing number of global higher education initiatives and organizations.

Drawing on the strength of the civic education movement in American higher education, organizations like Campus Compact and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) have launched

well-funded and significant initiatives to shape integrated university curricula for global education. While traditional global higher education programs such as study abroad or student exchange have reached a small number of students, more recent initiatives have sought to integrate global knowledge and capacities throughout the entire undergraduate curriculum. In a 2015 news article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Fanta Aw, the president of NAFSA, the Association of International Educators, points to the problem of relying too heavily on traditional programs such as study abroad for global education, noting "even if we double the numbers, most students will not go abroad" (Fischer 2015). Instead, she argues, "the place where there is the opportunity to make the greatest inroads is the internationalization of the curriculum" (Fischer 2015). Aw references efforts often termed "comprehensive internationalization," which a recent report for the NAFSA defines as "a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education" (Hudzik 2011).[1] The AAC&U project *Shared Futures* is one of the most significant examples of these programs. *Shared Futures* is made up of a partnership with 32 colleges and universities and works to develop curricular and assessment models that speak to outcomes such as "global knowledge, global engagement, intercultural knowledge, and intercultural competence" (Hovland 2006, vii) throughout the university curriculum.

Global education programs are not simply confined to colleges and universities, however. A wide range of initiatives from the US Department of Education, the Council on Foreign Relations, political think-tanks, and international education associations have argued for internationalizing K-12 curricula in order to prepare students for global citizenship. Producing students who can actively engage in global society has become an often-repeated goal throughout the American educational system. In the introduction to the 2010 Common Core State Standards, for example, we are told that a standard was included "only when the best available evidence indicated that its mastery was essential for college and career readiness in a twenty-first century, globally competitive society" (3). In addition to the rhetoric of global competitiveness, we also see wide range of recent efforts toward integrating global learning into the Common Core State Standards. A recent collaboratively authored report from the Council of Chief State School Officers (one of the chief sponsors of the Common Core State Standards) and the Asia Society Partnership for

Global Learning, for example, asks educators, "how can your school creatively use the Common Core State Standards or state standards to promote global competence in English language arts and mathematics?" (Boix Mansilla and Jackson 2011, 87). Though the curricular outcomes and civic goals of these programs and initiatives often vary, they reflect a sustained movement for internationalizing the curriculum of schools and universities and often a sustained commitment to ideals of global citizenship.

Visions of global higher education manifest themselves in different ways across various institutions, but throughout the vast literature on global higher education and comprehensive internationalization, we find a central, recurring relationship between students' capabilities as global communicators and their roles as national and global citizens. At this time, however, no study has placed the global turn in rhetorical scholarship in dialogue with the broader global higher education movement. *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education* argues that while there are compelling reasons for rhetorical educators and writing teachers to contribute to global higher education, there are also compelling reasons to critique and strategically resist the project of global higher education. *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education* thus takes up both the possibilities of the "global turn" in rhetoric and composition studies and communication outlined by Hesford (2006, 787), while also paying specific attention to the "global cautions" (787) she outlines. The global turn, as Hesford describes it, "necessitates new collaborations and frameworks, broader notions of composing practices, critical literacies that are linked to global citizenship, a reexamination of existing protocols and divisions, and the formation of new critical frameworks in light of a changing world" (796). At the same time, however, she cautions that in taking up the interdisciplinary project of the global turn, "we also need to consider the links between education and empire, the impact of security policies on the humanities, and the degree to which our colleges and universities, including the humanities, are being coopted by the global war on terror and national security initiatives" (796). As I will illustrate in the next chapter, these cautions are not simply potential, but play a significant role in the history of global higher education from the Cold War period to our current moment.

For now, however, I want to simply note the necessity of proceeding with caution as we take up the global turn in higher education and continue to explore the global turn in rhetoric. In the introduction to their

recent special issue of *Composition Studies* on "Composition's Global Turn," Brian Ray and Connie Kendall Theado (2016) suggest that the global turn described by Hesford "seems inevitable" for scholars in composition studies to engage because, the "discourse about higher education" is becoming "more fully immersed in and responsive to global flows of individuals and cultures" (10). Important work in composition studies has focused on both transnational composition and on issues of globalization, postcolonialism, and translingualism. Christine Donahue's (2009) survey of "internationalization" in composition studies has pointed to important pedagogical work, international writing research, and consulting projects as indications of the growing global reach of research on composition and rhetoric (213). A growing body of research has also addressed writing programs around the world, as the contributors to Thaiss et al.'s (2012) recent collection *Writing Programs Worldwide* and David S. Martins's (2015) collection *Transnational Writing Program Administration* illustrate. In addition, work on transnational rhetoric, such as Rebecca Dingo's (2012) *Networking Arguments: Transnational Feminism and Public Policy Writing* has explicated how global networks of power shape identity and agency. Research in critical literacy and World Englishes, code-meshing, and translingualism is also challenging our understanding of the politics of academic literacy and their ability to silence student voices and gloss over issues of political difference (Villanueva 1997; Guerra 2004, 2016; Canagarajah 2006, 2013; Horner and Trimbur 2002). In addition, research that integrates postcolonial studies and composition has expanded our understanding of how borders, national sovereignty, and multicultural ideology shape our contemporary composition classrooms, as the contributors to Lunsford and Ouzgane's (2004) *Crossing Borderlands* and Ruiz and Sánchez's (2016) *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition: New Latinx Keywords for Rhetoric and Composition Studies* illustrate.

Despite significant work in the global turn in composition studies and work on global and transnational rhetoric in communication, it is not surprising that communication and rhetoric and composition are often left out of efforts to forge global undergraduate curricula, both in educational policy discourse and in local efforts on college campuses. We will encounter many examples of programs that largely ignore rhetorical education and that discuss writing instruction vaguely as part of a prerequisite set of basic skills necessary for global engagement. This absence

makes it tempting to simply call for rhetorical educators in rhetoric and composition and communication to advocate for the importance of rhetorical education to global higher education and to seek a voice in the conversation. Throughout *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education*, I explore how such a call comes with significant political and pedagogical risks, including the tacit acceptance of political motives that may run counter to both our disciplinary knowledge and politics.

Regardless of the political and curricular challenges posed by the global turn in US higher education, I will argue here that rhetorical educators should not simply confine themselves to a critique of these programs. We face the task of either contributing to global higher education or being left out of a movement that many see as redefining the shape of twenty-first-century higher education. Against the vagueness of global citizenship, I argue for the role of rhetorical education in fostering what I will call *transnational rhetorical citizenship*.

Transnational Rhetorical Citizenship

In placing these terms together, I am not simply seeking to extend global citizenship or transnational citizenship to rhetorical citizenship.[2] Understanding rhetorical citizenship in a global context is important, but I want to make a more substantial claim—transnational rhetorical citizenship captures the dynamic rhetorical work of forming civic associations and solidarities with others positioned within and/or without of rhetorical, political, and legal contexts of civic belonging that are shaped by material, symbolic, and cultural flows of globalization. Such a rhetorical understanding of citizenship sees citizenship as a site of rhetorical invention even as it sees it as a politically and juridically constituted identity. This goes beyond understanding citizenship as an activity or something we "do," a commonplace of work on rhetorical citizenship, by seeking to account for the legal, material, political, symbolic, and cultural dimensions of citizenship that precede our "doing citizenship," in addition to the rhetorical practices through which we embody, reproduce, and even challenge our citizenship.[3]

In this sense, I am drawing on rhetoric's tradition as a productive art or techne to suggest another dimension of citizenship—a citizenship of rhetorical invention, or the citizenship we "make" through rhetorical practices. Such an understanding of rhetorical citizenship complements the focus on rhetorical practices of citizenship we see in work on rhetorical citizenship while also recognizing that such practices take place within a

matrix of overlapping and conflicting contexts that provide opportunities and constraints for rhetorical enactments of civic belonging. Following Arjun Appadurai's (1996, 2013) work on the global "production of locality" (178), I argue here that transnational networks do not, on their own, produce the conditions that lead to global understandings of citizenship, but instead produce the rhetorical conditions for the invention of forms of civic association and recognition beyond the nation-state.[4]

To be clear, however, the understanding of transnational rhetorical citizenship I am arguing for here is neither Utopian nor deeply pessimistic, but rather shaped by an understanding of rhetoric as an art of both conflict and consubstantiation (Burke 1969, 21).[5] The transnational rhetorical citizens I envision here are neither the deliberative post-national citizens of deliberative democracy theory (Habermas 1998, 2001; Rawls 1999; Benhabib 2008), the cosmopolitan citizens of political and ethical philosophy (Nussbaum 1997a, b, 2002; Appiah 2007; Waldron 2000), the citizens of post-national institutions (Held 2010), nor the multicultural citizens discussed in the work of Will Kymlicka (2012), each of which I critique throughout this book. Instead, I offer a vision of transnational rhetorical citizenship as a dynamic site where contesting forms of citizenship are invented out of the conditions brought about by globalization and enacted through rhetorical practices that reflect, respond to, reproduce, critique, and transform these conditions. Globalization, and before it territorial expansion through empire, have always brought what Danielle Allen (2004) has termed "anxieties of citizenship" (1), and these civic anxieties have shaped the rhetorical invention of various overlapping and conflicting senses of citizenship. Some of these rhetorical invocations of citizenship are indeed cosmopolitan, while others are nationalistic, xenophobic, and racist. The anti-globalist white nationalism we see as resurgent in American political life is also a form of rhetorical citizenship forged in a transnational context, despite being a despicable form of civic association. Such citizenships share the transnational contexts of democratic citizenship despite fitting the description of what Jacques Ranciere (2009) has called "the hatred of democracy" (3).[6] Democracy allows for such invocations of citizenship even if they are radically undemocratic.

Here, I use "transnational" as a descriptive rather than as a normative term, and I argue against a melding of cosmopolitan forms of global citizenship with rhetorical citizenship as a normative alternative. Cosmopolitan forms of citizenship are indeed rhetorically invoked citizenships, but they are often invoked in two ways that run contrary to the project of rhetorical

citizenship. First, they are often invoked as macro-level, normative alternatives to national citizenship. While I am sympathetic to these alternatives, and the motivations for invoking them, such invocations often operate rhetorically to entrench and reproduce a binary opposition between the cosmopolitan and the national that captures the discourse of democratic theory better than the rhetorical practices of transnational citizenship. Second, as I will show in the next chapter, cosmopolitan visions of citizenship often reduce the complexities of rhetorical practices to ethical encounters, encounters that are mediated through ethical dialogue rather than rhetorical practices. While cosmopolitan political theory has been critiqued by political theorists such as Chantal Mouffe (2013) for subjugating politics to ethics, I argue that, without a robust vision of rhetoric, political theory can offer no better tools for describing and unpacking the communicative practices of political action. To raise both of these objections is not to argue that there cannot be critical articulations of cosmopolitanism. On the contrary, as Robert J. Holton (2009) has shown us, there are hundreds of articulations of cosmopolitanism (212–219). Rather than posit such forms of cosmopolitan citizenship as false or ideal, the rhetorical perspective I outline here leads us to acknowledge them as neither alternatives nor inevitabilities but rather as forms of association that are invented, sustained, and transformed through rhetorical processes that are shaped by the conditions of globalization and citizenship.

In this sense, I am arguing for a vision of rhetorical citizenship that is not an alternative to national citizenship, but rather a critical process of recognizing the gaps in citizenship brought about by processes of globalization as opportunities for rhetorical invention. Rhetorical invention can reproduce, challenge, and transform conditions of citizenship in ways both productive and harmful to democracy. Rather than developing a macro-theory of transnational rhetorical citizenship, I argue here for an agonistic understanding of rhetorical citizenship that captures a range of competing articulations of global and national citizenship. In her work on agonistic democratic theory, Chantal Mouffe has argued that cosmopolitan visions of citizenship proceed from an ethically driven logic of consensual politics that fails to account for conflict (2013, 21–22). In education, Sharon Todd (2010) has drawn on the work of Mouffe, Butler, and Honig to argue against cosmopolitan education and for what she terms an "agonistic cosmopolitics" for understanding cultural conflict in education (215). Todd traces out three key areas of this project: "(1) that universality is itself a product of cultural translation and as such it enables us to see

how our claims of universality are open to transformation as they come into play in diverse cultural contexts; (2) that such claims are contingent upon contesting norms and antagonistic perspectives and thus subject to struggles over intelligibility and signification; and (3) that the paradoxical aspects of politics commits us to continual self-interrogation of these claims we are making and focuses attention on keeping alive the possibility for renewal and transformation" (225). Todd's work provides a significant argument for the inclusion of agonistic conflict in education, one that points to the necessity of equipping students not simply with universal cosmopolitan dispositions, but rather with strategies for confronting "the difficulties of living in a dissonant world" (216). While I agree with the more critical vision of political education and citizenship Mouffe and Todd argue for, I want to add that to understand the agonistic politics of citizenship we need to move the conversation beyond the macro-level of democratic theory and toward sites where citizenship is rhetorically invented and articulated. We need, I argue, to move from theoretical depictions of political and ethical actions and choices—often described at the level of "citizens" or "citizenry"—and toward a more complex understanding of the ecologies in which practices and identities of citizenship emerge.

For example, in his work on national citizenship and globalization, political theorist Will Kymlicka (2012) has argued that, despite arguments that the emergence of global institutions has created the conditions for new forms of cosmopolitan citizenship, national citizenship continues to define the political association of citizens. Kymlicka argues against political theorist David Held's idea that globalization challenges the assumption that "each nation forms 'a political community of fate'" (437). In response, Kymlicka argues that the power of globalization and global networks cannot sufficiently explain how forms of political community and belonging are shaped. For Kymlicka, "People belong to the same community of fate if they *care* about each other's fate, and want to *share* each other's fate— that is, want to meet certain challenges together, so as to share each other's blessings and burdens. Put another way, people belong to the same community of fate if they feel some sense of responsibility for one another's fate, and so want to deliberate together about how to respond collectively to the challenges facing the community. So far as I can tell, globalization has not eroded the sense that nation states form separate communities of fate in this sense" (437).[7] While Kymlicka's understanding of "care" is important, it takes place among a well-ordered system of

rhetorical discourse that, like we see in many other political descriptions of communication, define the citizen as the initiator of rational deliberation about political decision-making.

Such readings do capture a deliberative form of citizenship, but often at the macro-level of national discourse and in normative terms that tend not to question the rhetorical work that has shaped the discursive fields that prefigure deliberation and configure possibilities for rhetorical practices. Rhetorical citizenship, as a site of rhetorical invention and practice, can productively challenge such readings and provide opportunities for more inventive negotiations of the national and the global. To examine Held and Kymlicka's understandings of "communities of fate" (437) from the perspective of transnational rhetorical citizenship, we might ask "what rhetorical conditions lead some national citizens to invoke identities and rhetorical practices of citizenship beyond the resources of national citizenship?" Or, beyond national citizenship, we might ask, "what rhetorical conditions enable those excluded from national citizenship to rhetorically invent and invoke forms of transnational and national civic belonging out of the conditions of exclusionary national citizenship?" At the same time, taking a rhetorical approach to transnational citizenship can also provide us with a framework for understanding complicated invocations of national citizenship against practices of global identification and recognition, and even the contradictions we see in some forms of transnational civic life. How, for example, might we account for a citizen who views themselves as part of a universal body of Christian believers and who contributes to international missions (that provide aid as well as evangelism), but who argues or votes for policies that endanger the lives of immigrants or refugees? To argue that their positions are philosophically inconsistent does not get us very far in terms of rhetoric or public discourse.

Instead, we need a framework that accounts for how transnational flows of texts, events, images, people, and rhetorics produce the conditions for rhetorical inventions of citizenship within specific localities. Rhetoric, I argue, can provide such a framework. Rhetorical invention is, indeed a situated practice, but one that draws on the topos of locality in order to produce persuasion and identification in audiences. Because, as Appadurai (1996, 2013) has argued, localities are subject to being produced through processes of globalization, we might understand the rhetorical invention of citizenships as taking place within ecologies that are shaped by inward and outward flows of ideas, texts, peoples, materials, goods, images, and so on. Understanding transnational rhetorical citizenship as a site of

rhetorical invention and agonistic rhetorical practices that take place within transnational networks and ecologies provides a more helpful framework for understanding citizenship in a transnational age.

RHETORICAL EDUCATION, POPULISM, AND RESURGENT NATIONALISMS

At the same time, understanding transnational rhetorical citizenship in this way means, to use a term from the 2016 US presidential election, taking the "deplorable" with the democratic.[8] Arguing for such an understanding of rhetorical citizenship in the context of education might seem particularly dangerous, as it does not provide the safe, normative underpinnings of either national citizenship or cosmopolitan citizenship. One of the central premises of this book is that rhetorical educators must critically examine invocations of the global in global higher education and their positive and negative relationship to conceptions of citizenship. Global higher education should, I argue, be understood as an agonistic site of competing discourses that define citizenship against the global. The global, in these terms, not only reflects the exigence of globalization—the necessity of responding to a world of increasingly blurred national borders—and its nationalist critiques, but also the sometimes subtle inflections of global citizenship articulated by discourses of national security and militarism, neoliberalism, and global capital. In our current moment, the populist rhetoric of anti-globalism and anti-global education create a situation where global higher education seems to have clearly demarcated lines of political engagement, with hard right critiques of global citizenship and global education on one side and a vision of higher education as preparing ethically and socially engaged global citizens on the other. It is vital, however, to recognize that these lines of demarcation are, as I will show in the next chapter, the effect of a populist rhetoric that reduces political conflict to a clear set of binary antagonisms—global/American, global citizen/ American citizen, and global disloyalty/nationalist loyalty.

This point is particularly important because the significant force of anti-global populism of the right demands a rhetorical response by educators. The stakes are all too real, as calls for defunding global education programs are advanced and professor watchlists begin once again to be filled with professors whose work critiques American foreign policy. At the same time, however, invoking the global as an abstract good in higher

education—as an ethical response to the politics of nationalism, xenophobia, racism, and fascism—simply reproduces the same rhetorical logic of the populist rhetoric of anti-global education. For example, we often see the call to bring more global content and contexts to the study of various disciplines in the literature on global higher education. What is missing from each of them is a recognition of the global as a site of agonistic conflict, a site of conflicting discourses that produce and reproduce conceptions of global citizenship that are just as troubling as their anti-global and nationalist counterparts. As rhetorical educators, we face the responsibility of critically engaging the invocation of the global in higher education, both in its positive and negative forms—the responsibility of troubling the global in global higher education, even as we defend global higher education against its nationalist counterparts.

One of the central tasks in advancing this critique is to show how nationalist discourse and ideology serves not simply as a binary to global citizenship and education, as the anti-global populists would have us believe, but rather as a rhetorical process of framing specific visions of global education and citizenship in a global context. While populist rhetoric would lead us to a vision of global education as a progressive enterprise and civic education as a conservative, nationalist enterprise, what we think of now as a global turn in higher education or global higher education is a site of interpenetrating, sometimes conflicting discourses and interests. These discourses and interests produce not only clear ethical and political positions, but also their fair share of interesting bedfellows—global ethics inflected with global capitalism, global education for better understanding our national enemies, global education as a form of soft power.

In her work in political theory, Bonnie Honig has shown how citizenship in Western democracies is most often defined in relationship to the foreign (2001, 13). While often invoked in terms of universalist ethics, global citizenship, especially in the context of higher education, is not immune to this political process. Indeed, the history of global higher education in America clearly illustrates that global education has often been rhetorically framed and pedagogically developed to serve the interests of national security and economic hegemony. This is, in fact, one of the central political ironies produced by anti-global education populism. In reducing the terms of debate to global versus national, such rhetoric obscures a history of the global as productive of the national.

I will take up these rhetorical and political complexities of global higher education in the next chapter. For now, it is sufficient to point to the necessity of critically engaging invocations of the global and their relationship to political discourses, even as we defend forms of global education from nationalist assaults. At first, this might seem to offer little footing for the project of transnational rhetorical education, or confine rhetorical educators to the task of constantly critiquing the rhetoric and discourses of global higher education. I will argue, however, that the political and ethical ironies of global higher education provide the grounds and the exigency for the project of transnational rhetorical education. Such an education can enable students to critically understand the visions of global education offered to them, including their vocational, ethical, and political manifestations, and to critically position themselves within these discourses.

At the same time, however, I do not argue that rhetorical education can provide a neutral point of critique or forms of engagement wholly outside of these discourses. Instead, I argue for an understanding of transnational rhetorical education as a pedagogical imperative for enabling students to recognize how processes of globalization enmesh us in forms of political and ethical responsibility that are dependent upon frameworks of recognition and action that are neither universal or neutral nor simply national and deterministic. Instead, I argue that rhetorical education can enable students to critically understand how the global is shaped by specific frameworks of recognition—human/inhuman, citizen/non-citizen—and also provide them with tools for critically contesting these frameworks. This is why I have chosen to use the term *transnational* rather than *global*, as it captures both the ways in which national discourses and cultural knowledge shape our recognition of others and our responses to global exigencies, while at the same time capturing how globalization and the permeability of borders create opportunities for rhetorical invention and articulation of forms of association, solidarity, and belonging that need not be defined by traditional, nationalist, and normative understandings of citizenship.[9]

In making the argument for *transnational rhetorical citizenship* rather than global rhetorical citizenship, or a form of rhetorical cosmopolitanism, I am not seeking to ignore arguments for a more critical cosmopolitanism. Honig (2001), for example, has argued that subjects outside of national citizenship—foreigners—have played an iconic role as founders of democracy and can point to "not only the reconstruction of the national… but

also the violation of the national" (13). Honig argues for "an alternative conception of democracy, democratic cosmopolitanism," which recognizes that democracy "is a commitment to generate actions in concert that exceed the institutional conditions that both enable and limit popular agencies" (13). Honig is, of course, not alone in her recuperation of cosmopolitanism, and several of the key arguments throughout this book are strengthened by and aligned with the more critical and radical forms of cosmopolitanism articulated by writers such as Bruce Robbins (2013), Walter Mignolo (2000, 2012), and others.[10]

At the same time, however, I argue that global citizenship and its predecessor, cosmopolitanism, have begun to lose their theoretical and conceptual punch. In fact, recent moblizations of the terms "cosmopolitan" and "cosmopolitanism" on the right have brought the historical problems with this term back to public consciousness.[11] While my argument is shaped by the insights of work in critical cosmopolitanism, I will suggest that employing cosmopolitanism as an outcome for higher education can lead us to reproduce the binary framework of national or civic versus cosmopolitan advanced in populist arguments against global education.

The project of transnational rhetorical education I outline here is also aligned with critiques of cosmopolitanism as a normative political project, especially in its insistence on understanding transnational education as an agonistic project. Mouffe (2005, 2009, 2013) has argued forcefully that many forms of political cosmopolitanism often proceed from a logic of universalist consensus that obscures the conflictual nature of politics. Following Mouffe's critique, I argue that global higher education and its attendant articulations of global citizenship can not only obscure the range of political and ideological interests vying for space in global higher education, but can also manifest itself in non-conflictual articulations of communication and rhetorical practices that are presented, in turn, as seemingly neutral processes of "global communication skills," "global collaboration," and "global problem-solving." Here, conceptions of global engagement and global citizenship are caught up in a dynamic relationship with definitions and conceptions of processes, mediums, and strategies of global communication. As I show in the third chapter of this book, the conflictual or agonistic dimensions of global communication are often papered over by a rhetoric of outcomes and capacities in the literature of global higher education programs. We can see this not only in depictions of the relationship between technology and global communication, but also in the traditional and ongoing

depiction of foreign language study as a conduit to global communication, a depiction that most often ignores the more critical understandings of language and transnational engagement we see in work on translingualism and World Englishes. Instead, we see, more often, communication as a neutral medium for global engagement, collaboration, problem-solving, and the articulation and working-out of global values and ethics.

Of course, the counter-argument to this point might be that these articulations of global communication and global citizenship are made at the macro-level of educational discourse and policy. Mission statements and organizational calls for global higher education map out broader visions of higher education rather than particular practices. In addition, others might advance arguments of definition against my critique here by arguing that I am collapsing global higher education with nationalist understandings of International Education, which have often been linked to projects informed by discourses of national security through work in disciplines such as International and Area Studies.[11] While both of these arguments hold weight in principle, they often don't hold in practice. First, despite a voluminous organizational and scholarly literature on global higher education, virtually all of this literature discusses communication and rhetoric at an high level of abstraction. Visions of students as global communicators are central to these discussions, but discussions of rhetorical pedagogy are wholly absent. Where global communication is discussed, it is often discussed in terms of technological skills and ethical dialogue, obscuring a range of other rhetorical knowledge and practices. For scholars located in English studies, like myself, and scholars located in communication studies, such abstract depictions of communication should be troubling. Second, while conceptual definitions are important, their ability to hold in rhetorical practice is not contingent on the clarity of their definitions, but on how they are mobilized in discourse. Insisting on a hard distinction between international education and global education, the first more nationalistic and the second more cosmopolitan, simply ignores how these forms of education can become hybrid in practice. When global education becomes articulated as an institutional goal or outcome and takes on the incentive of disciplinary capital within specific institutions, conceptual distinctions give way to rhetorical articulations. In this context, attempts to distinguish forms of international education focused on national security, militarization, and foreign policy from a global education focused on ethical responsibility and civic engagement become difficult to sustain.

I bring these two arguments together here because they both obscure, in their own related ways, the need for rhetorical education. Consensus-based understandings of global communication allow us to remain at the level of communicative abstraction because they proceed from an understanding of communication as a neutral medium. This allows communication to be subsumed under both a broad conception of global ethics and more narrow conceptions of technological and disciplinary communication skills. Rhetorical conflict can be subsumed under ethical dialogue, a space where global citizens can work out their differences in spaces of mutual recognition, and rhetorical practices can be subsumed under new communication skills brought about by global communication technologies, which displace the need for rhetorical education in their celebration of "new" mediums of global communication.

Such depictions of global communication are not accidental. They sell quite well. They can be easily linked to vocationalism—learning the communication skills vital to participate in the global economy—and the traditional goals of liberal education—an expanded sense of awareness and universal human obligation. At the same time, they can obscure the conflicts between these and other ideals of global education. The idea that global higher education could entertain, at the same time, the goal of making students more ethically engaged while also maintaining a rhetorical frame of preparing students to participate in a global marketplace responsible for a significant share of the world's suffering is as fascinating as it is troubling. While few global educators would articulate these goals in the same breath, in practice they can become articulated simultaneously at institutions of higher learning that pursue global education programs in a space made up of disciplinary enclaves.

Why Not Global Citizenship?

Visions of global communication have long been associated with the normative through their grounding in ethical visions of cosmopolitanism that project cosmopolitan ethical dialogue as a model of global communication and reasoning. As a concept, global citizenship is supported by both ancient and contemporary philosophies of cosmopolitanism that more often than not define global citizenship in terms of ethical dispositions toward distant others brought closer by processes of national expansion, colonization, and globalization. Both the use of the term and the popularity of books such as Kwame Appiah's (2007) widely read *Cosmopolitanism:*

Ethics in a World of Strangers point to the staying power of this concept, which has its beginnings with Diogenes of Sinope in fourth-century Greece. Global or cosmopolitan citizenship, despite its many critics, has become an important organizing framework for thinking through globalization's production of "increased human interconnection and the moral questions this enjoins" (Wallace Brown and Held 2012, 1). The definitions of global citizenship that we find in the mission statements of our colleges and universities often reflect a cosmopolitan moral framework of engagement, awareness, and pluralism. For example, the definition of global citizenship from my own institution's webpage defines a global citizen as a person who "recognizes that our world is increasingly interconnected," "does not see 'them' but rather 'us,'" "values diversity, cultural sensitivity and has awareness beyond just an individual perspective," "actively contributes to the improvement of local and global communities through service, civic engagement and action to promote social responsibility," and "builds collaborative professional relationships based on principles of respect and reciprocity" (UAB Global). The rhetorical approach to global engagement that I develop throughout this book certainly entails the development of ethical perspectives. However, I will illustrate two key points about these perspectives. First, they tend to become collapsed with communication in ways that obscure the distinctiveness of rhetoric and ethics and marginalize rhetorical education. Second, ethical perspectives are easily adopted rhetorically and pedagogically by a range of political interests and motivations that need to be critically questioned.

In this important sense, global citizenship may seem like a vague term or empty term suited to broad mission statements or policy discourse, but we should not underestimate global citizenship as an empty rhetorical term. One of the central arguments of *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education* is that this term has, in fact, too much ideological and pedagogical power and that it must be critically resisted by those who teach rhetoric and writing. Rather than being an empty term, global citizenship can be more accurately described by drawing on Amy Wan's (2014) description of the "ambient nature of the use of the term 'citizenship'" (18) in *Producing Good Citizens*. Wan points to the need to question ambient articulations of citizenship in the literacy classroom because often "the capacious nature of the term citizenship contributes to a lack of attention to concrete civic goals" (19). For Wan, "responding to the ambient use of citizenship as a term requires examining its multiple definitions in order to sort out how and why citizenship is used in conjunction

with institutions' sponsorship of literacy. Citizenship has become a common term in relation to education, mainly because the concept of citizenship can be formed to fit any kind of outcome" (23). Wan's analysis of how citizenship and literacy can intertwine to exclude or limit civic agency illustrates the stakes of this critical questioning.

Central to Wan's argument is the idea that ambient forms of citizenship education are often developed in response to particular cultural anxieties (5). I would add that the ambient forms of global citizenship we find in the literature of global higher education evoke such powerful responses because they respond to anxieties of global economy, national security, cosmopolitan ethics, and disciplinary practices.[12] Within the American university, depictions of global higher education as a means to global citizenship have taken on a variety of ideological as well as pedagogical forms. Global citizenship has also been articulated in a variety of ways, some as predictable as they are paradoxical. Global citizenship can sometimes be a Trojan horse as well as an ambient form of citizenship, and universities can and have played a role in providing this gift. David Harvey's (2009) critical reading of the role of the academic disciplines in advancing racist understandings of distant cultures and imperialistic policies under the guise of cosmopolitanism, or global citizenship, should serve as an important warning here (11). Global citizenship, as an outcome of global education, has a troubled history that I will return to in the first chapter of this book. Here, it is enough to say that as teachers of rhetoric we should approach the term critically and respond to it with our own alternatives. The vagueness of global citizenship makes it a seductive concept because it can be adapted and hybridized to fit a variety of interests and support a variety of political agendas. In addition, this vagueness also leads to impoverished descriptions of students' civic capacities. Broad educational goals such as "making students more aware of global issues," or "enabling students to communicate across borders" certainly offer opportunities for developing flexible curricula, but they also paper over a variety of analytical and performative capacities necessary for civic engagement. In the expansive and growing literature from contemporary global higher education programs, broad conceptions of "communication" or "communication skills" often serve as a black box for a range of rhetorical capacities that are never addressed.

When communication is discussed, we most often see an understanding of rhetoric and literacy as "soft skills" in global higher education literature. In *Building a Social Democracy*, Robert Danisch

([2015a](#)) has argued that despite the civic agency of rhetoric, communication and rhetoric are often characterized as "'soft skills' that can aid in transmitting the complex new knowledge produced by STEM disciplines to a passive and receptive public" (xxiii). In the context of global education, this characterization of communication, rhetoric, and writing as soft skills is driven not only by STEM disciplines but also by the social sciences. Because global communication is often linked to rhetorics of technology, there is also a troubling distinction between old and new communication skills throughout the literature of global higher education. For example, a recent strategic plan from the US Department of Education ([2012](#)) draws a clear contrast between writing and more advanced communicative capacities. According to the report,

> In today's globalized world, an effective domestic education agenda must address global needs and trends and aim to develop a globally competent citizenry. It is no longer enough to focus solely on ensuring that students have essential reading, writing, mathematics, and science skills. Our hyper-connected world also requires the ability to think critically and creatively to solve complex problems, the skills and disposition to engage globally, well-honed communication skills, and advanced mathematics, science and technical skills. (2)

The plan's characterization of writing as one among a set of basic skills that are no longer sufficient to meet the needs of global education is troubling. In place of these skills, the plan highlights "communication skills" that will enable students to communicate in an increasingly diverse society, and across borders. Here, however, the rhetorical education necessary to cultivate these skills is unaddressed because it is collapsed within a discussion of increased technological skills and literacy that are seen to fall outside of the few institutional spaces of recognition for rhetorical education.

While the emphasis on global communication skills underlines the importance of rhetorical education, rhetorical educators thus still face the challenge or articulating the contributions of rhetorical education from what is often a marginalized position in our institutions. Joseph Petraglia ([2003](#)) has argued that for rhetorical education to be successful in the contemporary American university "we have to … identify the comparative advantage that rhetoric has over other disciplines and to argue for what rhetoric has to offer learners" (169). In the context of global higher

education, this means engaging in work on rhetorical education that articulates the analytical and performative capacities fostered through rhetorical education and their role in promoting transnational acts of rhetorical citizenship. While the arguments throughout *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education* are intended to contribute to global higher education, a central task of this book is also to sound a note of caution against adopting global citizenship or cosmopolitanism as an educational goal and argue for critical, rhetorical alternatives.

As a site of agonistic politics, global higher education presents rhetorical educators with both the critical project of defining and defending the politics of their own curricula, as well as with the curricular project of illustrating the necessity of rhetorical education for global engagement. Following Mouffe's (2013) description of agonistic politics in her *Agonistics: Thinking the World Politically*, we can refer to this process as a "double moment," one of "dis-articulation" and "re-articulation" (74). For Mouffe, agonistic politics requires not only the work of critique (dis-articulation), but also the work of "'engagement' with institutions, with the aim of bringing about a different hegemony" (71). Rhetorical educators must struggle to find valuable ways to articulate the centrality of rhetoric to global engagement while also critiquing forms of global education and global citizenship that we find politically suspect. As we shall see, there are rich opportunities to contribute to global higher education, but there is also plenty to critique.

Rhetorical Citizenship, Normativity, and Precarity

I take up the project of critiquing the rhetoric of global citizenship in global higher education precisely because global citizenship, as a concept, is so difficult to resist. Global citizenship is attractive for a variety of academic and professional programs, as global engagement, or even just the discourse of global engagement, can bring institutional capital to specific academic disciplines. Global citizenship and engagement are attractive to university administrations, as they can play a role in raising the institutional profile of an institution. For faculty, global citizenship and global education are also attractive, as they offer a framework of civic relevance for courses and opportunities to work with faculty across the disciplines toward a common civic goal. The idea that they are being trained to be not only global citizens but global leaders cannot help but be attractive to students as well, as it reaffirms the value of higher education in both civic and economic terms. I raise these motivations not to argue for a purer

form of global higher education, but to instead point to the need to ana-
lyze how these motives are connected to particular understandings of
global literacies and communicative abilities. While I am sympathetic to
several of the key goals linked to global citizenship, I argue that global citi-
zenship is easily coopted by a variety of different political, ethical, military,
and disciplinary interests, each of which brings with them troubling politi-
cal problems and implications for students.

In arguing for transnational rhetorical citizenship I am seeking to place
a distinct emphasis on rhetorical citizenship as a contested site of global
engagement rather than as a form of global citizenship. The term "trans-
national" seeks to capture the porous relationship between the global and
the local, while also capturing the force of national sovereignty and forms
of civic belonging that shape citizenship in particular nations. Transnational
rhetorical citizenship roots the global by placing it within rhetorical cul-
tures of interpretation and performance, rhetorical cultures that are shaped
by particular configurations of space, power, materiality, and rhetorical
practices. While retaining the term "global" in "globally engaged rhetori-
cal education" might help rhetorical educators find a common language
with others pursuing global higher education initiatives, rhetorical prac-
tices are often better characterized as taking place in and across *transna-
tional space.* As Rebecca Dingo (2012) has argued, "*transnational* …
generally refers to how globalization has influenced the movement of
people and the production of texts, culture, and knowledge across borders
so that the strict distinctions among nations and national practices can
become blurred" (8). Following this definition, we might think of trans-
national rhetorical practices as taking place within particular rhetorical
ecologies that are made up of interpenetrating global, national, local, and
virtual networks of rhetorical circulation and discourse. Understanding
how these discourses connect, clash, and rub up against one another in
rhetorical ecologies can enable us to be attentive to not only the conflicts
that surround invocations of global citizenship, but also the uneven politi-
cal and rhetorical conditions that make such invocations possible.

The rhetorical citizenship that I develop throughout this book is one
that recognizes that invoked alternatives to national citizenship, such as
global citizenship, are most always articulated from the position of those
who enjoy the civic benefits of particular forms of democratic sovereignty.
In "Extending Civic Rhetoric: Valuing Rhetorical Dimensions of Global
Citizenship in Civic Education," Rebecca A Kuehl (2014) argues for
"adding global citizenship to the civic rhetoric tradition as both a concept

and a practice" (293). While I am sympathetic to the need to explore rhetorical education outside of the boundaries of the nation-state, extending global or cosmopolitan citizenship to rhetoric runs the risk of obscuring the conflictual, agonistic character of rhetorical practice with practices of non-conflictual, ethical citizenship. Transnational rhetorical citizenship avoids this problem by acknowledging not only the ways in which networks of discourse shape national citizenship, but also by acknowledging that national citizenship configures and constrains practices of civic engagement across borders.

At the same time, I argue that transnational rhetorical citizenship can enable us to conceive of political and pedagogical possibilities for resisting the confines of normative national citizenship. In *Against Citizenship: The Violence of the Normative*, Amy Brandzel (2016) argues that normative national citizenship, for all of its promises of inclusion, exacts specific forms of violence on non-normative subjects. She argues that "citizenship is not only the central structure for reifying the norms of whiteness, heterosexuality, consumerism, and settler colonialism in the United States, but that these norms are brutally enforced against non-normative bodies, practices, behaviors, and forms of affiliation through divide and conquer logics that set up non-normative subjects to compete against each other in order to gain privileged access to citizenship" (4). Brandzel points here, I would argue, to the central problem with forms of citizenship—their normative and exclusionary power. While some might respond that this is just the type of exclusionary power that global citizenship seeks to draw attention to and transcend, such an argument ignores not only how conditions of national citizenship configure possibilities for global citizenship, engagement, and solidarity, but also how the citizenships of acknowledged citizens are often spoken against the interests of others by discourses of political power. Instead of extending rhetoric to global citizenship, or extending rhetorical education to global education, I argue for a rhetorical education that enables students to recognize and respond to the rhetorical conditions that make transnational solidarity and engagement possible while also enabling them to recognize how these conditions are constrained by forms of national, normative citizenship. This means moving students beyond arguments for cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism that often project non-conflictual discourses of global citizenship grounded in a recognition of a universal humanity that transcends cultural and political boundaries.

In *Frames of War,* Judith Butler (2009) addresses the problem with multiculturalism's blind spots in ways immediately conversant with understandings of global citizenship. For Butler,

> we confront a certain rift or schism that recurs at the heart of contemporary politics. If certain lives are deemed worth living, protecting, and grieving and others are not, then this way of differentiating lives cannot be understood as a problem or identity or even of the subject. It is rather a question of how power forms the field in which subjects become possible at all, or, rather, how they become impossible. And this involves a critical practice of thinking that refuses to take for granted that the framework of identitarian struggle which assumes that subjects already exist, that they occupy a common public space, and that their differences might be reconciled only if we had the right tools for bringing them together. The matter is, in my view, more dire and requires a kind of analysis capable of calling into question the framework that silences the question of who counts as a 'who'—in other words, the forcible action of a norm on circumscribing a grievable life. (163)

I quote Butler in full here, as I know of no better description of the conditions of citizenship in a world shaped by constant tensions between the global and the local and perhaps no better call for the necessity of rhetorical education in a world shaped by transnational networks. Rhetorical education can enable students to critically question these exclusionary frameworks and can provide opportunities to recognize and pursue critical opportunities for solidarity and alignment obscured by broader forms of global citizenship.

Following Butler's logic, we can begin to perceive the problems with universal visions of global citizenship. Such visions of citizenship allow those with citizenship rights to extend their ethical understanding of their obligations to others, but in doing so could lead them to understand that extension as a universal moral choice. The conditions of power that configure this choice are left unaddressed, as are the conditions that make the same form of identification as global citizen inconceivable for others. If global citizenship, as an invoked form of citizenship, often comes from a place of democratic privilege, then we need to recognize that it is not equally accessible nor are their equal opportunities to invoke it. This means looking closely at the margins of democratic sovereignty in order to consider the refugee, the stateless, the undocumented immigrant, and others who live in conditions that Giorgio Agamben (1998) has called a state of "bare life" (6) and Judith Butler (2004) has called "precarious

life" (130). To think of the multitudes of stateless Rohinyga Muslims who sought, often in vain, to find asylum as global citizens illustrates some of the cultural and material limitations of the term. Similarly, to think of a young Dream Act activist who came to the United States as an undocumented child as only exercising a form of global citizenship in their activism would, I think, also be false. In both instances, what is being sought are rights, benefits, and political recognition from a particular nation-state, not from an international governmental organization and not just from a community of global citizens who stand in solidarity with them.

I raise these points because, as rhetorical educators, we not only face the task of critically questioning the ethical and political outcomes of global higher education, but also of our own curricula. Employing a rhetoric of global citizenship, as I will show throughout this book, can lead educators to obscure key aspects of political identity and conflict. Jessica Enoch's (2008) study of women educators teaching African-American, Native American, and Chicano/a students illustrates how rhetorical education serves as a "form of politicized acculturation because it teaches students how to communicate inside a culture" (176). As Enoch's study illustrates, the "connections between culture, politics, and rhetorical education" make it "important to acknowledge how dominant forms of rhetorical education are often linked to cultures of whiteness" (176). It is particularly important for rhetorical educators, as well as students, to continuously question how their rhetorical practices position themselves and others culturally, politically, and ethically. A critical rhetorical education should enable students to question the cultural assumptions behind discourses of global citizenship, as well as the cultural gazes and perspectives it fosters.

Against the vagueness of global citizenship, I argue for the role of rhetorical education in fostering transnational rhetorical citizenship. The theory of transnational rhetorical citizenship that I develop throughout *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education* draws on an understanding of citizenship as rhetorically constituted. A growing body of scholarship on rhetorical citizenship has argued that rhetorical citizenship is not simply rooted in rights or the status of citizens but instead in the rhetorical processes that allow citizens to exercise citizenship (Asen 2004; Danisch 2015a; Kock and Villadsen 2014). As William Keith and Paula Cossart (2012) have defined it, "rhetorical citizenship is that set of communicative and deliberative practices that in a particular culture and political system allow citizens to enact and embody their citizenship, in

contrast to practices that are merely 'talking about' politics" (46). This understanding of citizenship has particular benefits for understanding citizenship in a transnational age because it recognizes the cultural situatedness of rhetoric and the relationship of rhetoric to cultural discourse, materiality, and power. Rhetorical citizenship is often rooted in an understanding of rhetorical agency or "communicative agency" (Danisch 2015a, 222) that requires the cultivation of both analytical and performative capacities. In defining rhetorical citizenship, Kock and Villadsen (2014) argue that "the concept unites under one heading citizens' own discursive exchanges, in public or in private conversation, i.e., the active or *participatory* aspect of rhetorical citizenship, and the public discourse of which citizens are *recipients*" (13). Rhetorical citizenship can be understood, as Kock and Villadsen have argued, as "a pedagogical project" that prepares students with "practical skills necessary to participate in, and to receive, public discourse, including intercultural communication" (17). Such an understanding of rhetorical citizenship points to opportunities to challenge "ambient" or more loosely defined understandings of global citizenship in global higher education initiatives and the often underspecified "communication skills" that are linked to them. Scholars of rhetorical citizenship have also recognized that our understanding of the term "citizen" has been indelibly shaped by processes and discourses of globalization (Cisneros 2013; Danisch 2011; Kuehl 2014). In this important sense, transnational rhetorical citizenship can be seen as recognizing the porousness of national borders while also recognizing and questioning the constraining effects of particular cultures and ideologies on rhetorical practice.

However, I want to also extend understandings of rhetorical citizenship here by pointing to the need to critically examine the forms of identification and exclusion that are in play as citizens "enact and embody their citizenship" (Keith and Cossart 2012, 46). While research on rhetorical citizenship has focused on shifting our understanding of citizenship toward the rhetorical practices that allow us to participate in democracy, forms of civic identification, even rhetorical forms, are, as Kenneth Burke taught us, forms of identification and exclusion. In *A Rhetoric of Motives,* Burke (1969) argues that rhetoric is fundamentally rooted to conditions of conflict and though it can sometimes "move from the factional to the universal … . its ideal culminations are more often beset by strife as the condition for their organized expression, or material embodiment. Their very universality becomes transformed into a partisan weapon. For one need not scrutinize the concept of 'identification' very sharply to see,

implied in every turn, its ironic counterpart: division" (23). Civic identifications, national or global, produce their own forms of division and exclusion and, as I will show in the next chapter, can become weapons against others.

Both Butler and Burke point us to an understanding of the global as rhetorically produced within discourses and networks of ideological and material power, and each orients us to the global frames and identifications that shape our ability to perceive the global. To this effect, readers will notice that the examples of transnational rhetorical education used throughout this book are rooted more in the everyday experiences of globalization than in specialized programs such as study abroad and intercultural exchange initiatives. Intercultural projects, opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue, and other transnational encounters are vitally important. My choice here comes not from a critique of these programs. Global higher education needs, frankly, more of them, and we need to argue for improved access to some of them—especially study abroad—for lower-income students. My choice to present more everyday examples comes instead from my belief that transnational or border-crossing experiences make up only one part of global education and that overemphasizing these experiences can lead us to overlook how globalization shapes the cultural and political spaces of students' daily lives. Students do not have to go in search of the global; it has already found them through processes of globalization. At the same time, practically, such an approach can enable us to advocate for the value of rhetorical education across a wider range of global classrooms. By beginning with what we have in common, our students' diverse experiences of globalization, we can provide pedagogical strategies for rhetorical education that can cross disciplines as well as inform our own courses. Theoretically, the examples that I present throughout *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education* are designed to illustrate strategies for fostering students' understanding of the rootedness of globalization and the situatedness of its exigencies. Pedagogically, these examples are intended to offer strategies for rhetorical pedagogy that can be pursued in a variety of classrooms that fall outside of the scope of specialized, cross-cultural programs, and initiatives.

The concept of rhetorical ecologies (Edbauer 2005; Danisch 2015b) is particularly useful in this regard because it can orient rhetorical educators to how particular strands of discourse and culture come together and shape the rhetorical practices of culturally situated communities. Jenny Edbauer has argued that in contrast to the more static models of the rhe-

torical situation, rhetorical ecology "recontextualizes rhetorics in their temporal, historical, and lived fluxes" (9). For Edbauer, "rhetorical situations involve the amalgamation and mixture of many different events and happenings that are not properly segmented into audience, text, or rhetorician … . Rhetorical ecologies are coordinating processes, moving across the same social field and within shared structures of feeling" (20). Drawing on Dingo's (2012) understanding of transnationalism and Edbauer's definition of rhetorical ecologies provides us with a subtler, and more nuanced understanding of global discourse, one that we might refer to as *transnational rhetorical ecologies*. Examining transnational ecologies can enable rhetorical educators to conceive of classrooms that allow us the opportunity to foster transnational rhetorical citizenship by beginning with our students' experiences of the global. Such an approach would differ from the more traditional approaches of bringing global texts and contexts into the classrooms or sending students abroad. Instead, such an approach might begin instead by challenging students to analyze the "lived fluxes" (Edbauer 9) of globalization by exploring the transnational rhetorical ecologies surrounding their own campuses, towns, and cities.

In addition to focusing on examples from everyday experiences of globalization, I have also placed this study squarely within discussions of global higher education in American colleges and universities. To do so limits the scope of this book in specific ways, including forgoing the comparative focus of some transnational work in composition studies and rhetoric. I draw on this important work throughout this book, but my focus here is different. First, while I have used the term "global higher education" as a shorthand, global higher education is articulated in particular institutions and within particular national inflections. As someone who has taught and studied rhetoric for the past 15 years in the American university system, this is the particular inflection that I know best.

Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education

While a central task of this project is to articulate the role that rhetorical education can play in global higher education initiatives, we need to articulate our role critically. I take up this critical project in the first part of *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education*, which examines the political history and ideological contexts of global higher education. In Chap. 2, I develop an analysis of global education that spans from the period after WWII to the present. I trace the sustained presence of

discourses of global economy and militarization from the signing of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and the International Education Act of 1966 (IEA) to the coming of post-Cold War and post-9/11 period of international and global higher education. These periods illustrate how developments in global higher education reflect not a single historical trajectory but a rather a site of political articulation between sometimes overlapping and sometimes conflicting discourses of national security, cosmopolitan ethics, global economics, and global disciplinarity. I trace out the consistent presence of these discourses through an analysis of their continued impact on current programs of global higher education. Drawing on this discussion, I then take up how these discourses configure particular understandings of students' and teachers' civic agency within global public spaces of civic engagement. I respond to the troubling discourses of global higher education and international education in the third chapter of *Rhetoric and the Global Turn*, mapping out resistant forms of transnational rhetorical education and rhetorical citizenship. I focus here on two central tasks for transnational rhetorical education, mapping out rhetorical capacities of inquiry and performance that can enable students to critically perceive opportunities for critique and engagement, and fostering a rhetorical ethics rooted in the relationships to others brought about by conditions of precarity.

After mapping out the problems and perils of global higher education and global citizenship, I then turn to the rhetoric classroom to pursue a specific understanding of how students' rhetorical practices are shaped by and can respond to transnational discourses. Chapter 4 examines how transnational networks and rhetorics condition the ways students perceive rhetorical and ethical obligations toward others, and draws together work in visual culture to develop an understanding of rhetorical citizenship as a process of critical spectatorship. I argue for the role of critical spectatorship in exercising transnational rhetorical citizenship. Drawing on contemporary theories of spectatorship, photography, and visual rhetoric, I present rhetorical strategies for fostering students' abilities to navigate the difficult ground between representation, ethics, and rhetorical efficacy. Chapter 5 then develops an argument for situating globally engaged rhetorical education within transnational rhetorical ecologies. I argue that rhetorical education provides a richer understanding of the political spaces and tactics of civic engagement for students by locating them within particular places of engagement. Rhetorical education shifts the focus

from the classroom as a space of ethical dialogue to concrete spaces of engagement. Drawing on work on rhetorical ecology, I present the course profiled in this chapter as a means of helping students understand transnational rhetorical ecologies. *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education* concludes by framing rhetorical strategies for articulating the goals of transnational rhetorical education in ways that contribute to shaping global curricula across the curriculum within institutions.

NOTES

1. See John K. Hudzik's (2015) recent *Comprehensive Internationalization: Institutional Pathways to Success* for a complete overview of comprehensive internationalization programs in universities around the world, including the United States.
2. See Rebecca Kuehl's (2014) "Extending Civic Rhetoric: Valuing Rhetorical Dimensions of Global Citizenship in Civic Education" for an example of a study that applies cosmopolitanism to rhetorical citizenship.
3. See Asen's (2004) description: "Theorizing citizenship as a mode of public engagement draws attention, first and foremost, to citizenship as a mode. As noted above, this perspective shifts our focus from *what* constitutes citizenship to *how* citizenship proceeds. Mode denotes a manner of doing something, a method of proceeding in any activity. Mode distinguishes the manner by which something is done from what is done. Mode highlights agency: someone is doing a deed. Drawing this distinction conceptually suggests that a theory of citizenship ought to take into account dispositional factors by placing 'manner' and 'deed' in relation to each other" (194).
4. In referencing "making," I am invoking a particular understanding of rhetoric as a productive art or techne. See Atwill (1998) for a full discussion of the relationship between techne, rhetorical invention, and citizenship. See also Pender (2011) for a discussion of techne as a productive knowledge.
5. See Burke's (1969) *Rhetoric of Motives* 21–22 for a discussion of consubstantiation in relation to identification.
6. Ranciere (2009) describes hatred of democracy as follows: "The thesis of the new hatred of democracy can be succinctly put: there is only one good democracy, the one that represses the catastrophe of democratic civilization" (4)
7. See also Michael W. McConnell's (1996) "Don't Neglect the Little Platoons," a response to Martha Nussbaum's call for cosmopolitan education in *For Love of Country?*.
8. I am referring here to Hillary Clinton's naming of some of Trump's nationalist supporters as a "basket of deplorables."

9. Juan Guerra's discussion of "transcultural citizenship" offers an important, resistant reading of global citizenship. Guerra notes his concern "that the term global citizens tends to draw our attention away from the local" and he argues that "to counter a tendency that privileges the global over the local, I recommend the use of *transcultural citizens* and *transcultural citizenship* as useful substitutes" (299). Guerra suggests that "Some will argue that the distinction between global citizens and transcultural citizens is mere semantics, but I firmly believe that educators must signal and privilege students' local communities as forcefully as they signal and privilege the influences of globalization on them" (299). While I agree with Guerra's argument for paying attention to the local, I suggest that the local and the global interpenetrate in ways that make these boundaries increasingly difficult to separate.

10. See Mignolo's (2000) description of critical cosmopolitanism. Mignolo argues for "a need to reconceive cosmopolitanism from the perspective of coloniality (this is what I call *critical cosmopolitanism*) and within the frame of the modern/colonial world" (723). He continues "Critical cosmopolitanism, in the last analysis, emerges precisely as the need to discover other options beyond both benevolent recognition and humanitarian pleas for inclusion (Habermas 1998). Thus, while cosmopolitan projects are critical from inside modernity itself, critical cosmopolitanism comprises projects located in the exteriority and issuing forth from the colonial difference" (724).

11. See the American Council on Education's *Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide* for a discussion of these distinctions between international education, global education, and so on.

12. The relationship between anxiety and globalization is an old one, as Robert Schlereth's *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought: Its Form and Function in the Ideas of Franklin, Hume, and Voltaire, 1694–1790* argues. In addition, even the quickest look at the preambles to the global higher education policy documents cited throughout this study will illustrate these anxieties. See the American Council on Education (2003) *Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide* for an example.

Bibliography

Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Allen, Danielle. 2004. *Talking to Strangers: Anxieties of Citizenship Since Brown V. Board of Education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2013. "How Histories Make Geographies: Circulation and Context in a Global Perspective." In *The Future as Cultural Fact: Essays on the Global Condition*. 61–70. London: Verso.

Appiah, Kwame. 2007. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton.

Asen, Robert. 2004. "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. 90, no. 2: 189–211.

Atwill, Janet. 1998. *Rhetoric Reclaimed: Aristotle and the Liberal Arts Tradition*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Benhabib, Seyla. 2008. *Another Cosmopolitanism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brandzel, Amy L. 2016. *Against Citizenship: The Violence of the Normative*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Boix Mansilla, Veronica, and Anthony Jackson. 2011. *Educating for Global Competence: Preparing Our Youth to Engage the World*. Asia Society and Council of Chief State School Officers. Accessed January 3, 2015. https://asiasociety. org/files/book-globalcompetence.pdf.

Burke, Kenneth. 1969. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Butler, Judith. 2009. *Frames of War: When Is Life Grievable?* New York: Verso.

———. 2004. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. New York: Verso.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 2013. *Translingual Practices: Global English and Cosmopolitan Relations*. New York: Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 2006. "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued." *College Composition and Communication*. 57, no. 4: 586–619.

Cisneros, Josue David. 2013. *The Border Crossed Us: Rhetorics of Borders, Citizenship, and Latina/o Identity*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Common Core State Standards Initiative. 2010. *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects*. Accessed June 7, 2014. http://www.corestandards.org/ ELA-Literacy/

Danisch, Robert. 2011. "Preface." *Citizens of the World: Pluralism, Migration, and Practices of Citizenship*, edited by Robert Danisch, vii–xi. New York: Rodopi.

———. 2015a. *Building a Social Democracy: The Promise of Rhetorical Pragmatism*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

———. 2015b. "Occupy Wallstreet as Rhetorical Citizenship." In *Culture, Catastrophe, and Rhetoric: The Texture of Political Action*, edited by Robert Hariman and Ralph Cintron, 87–105. New York: Berghahn.

Dingo, Rebecca. 2012. *Networking Arguments: Rhetoric, Transnational Feminism, and Public Policy Writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Donahue, Christine. 2009. "'Internationalization' and Composition Studies: Reorienting the Discourse." *College Composition and Communication*. 61, no. 2: 212–243.

Edbauer, Jenny. 2005. "Unframing Models of Public Distribution: From Rhetorical Situation to Rhetorical Ecologies." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*. 35, no. 4: 5–24.

Enoch, Jessica. 2008. *Refiguring Rhetorical Education: Women Teaching African American, Native American, and Chicano/a Students 1865–1911*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Fischer, Karin. 2015. A Global Education Opens Doors But Leaves Many Shut Out. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. May 29, 2015. http://www.chronicle.com/article/A-Global-Education-Opens-Doors/230511.

Geuss, Raymond. 2008. *Philosophy and Real Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Guerra, Juan C. 2004. "Emerging Representations, Situated Literacies, and the Practice of Transcultural Repositioning." In *Latino/a Discourses: On Language, Identity, and Literacy Education*, edited by Michelle Hall Kells, Valerie Balester, and Victor Villanueva, 7–23. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Guerra, Juan C. 2016. *Language, Culture, Identity, and Citizenship in College Classrooms and Communities*. NCTE-Routledge Research Series. New York: Routledge.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1998. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Translated by William Rehg. Cambridge, MA: MIT University Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. 2001. *The Postnational Constellation*. Translated by Max Pensky. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Harvey, David. 2009. *Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies of Freedom*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Held, David. 2010. *Cosmopolitanism: Ideas, Realities, and Deficits*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hesford, Wendy. 2006. "Global Turns and Cautions in Rhetoric and Composition Studies." *PMLA*. 121, no. 3: 787–801.

Holton, Robert J. 2009. *Cosmopolitanisms: New Thinking and New Directions*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Honig, Bonnie. 2001. *Democracy and the Foreigner*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Horner, Bruce and John Trimbur. 2002. "English Only and U.S. Composition." *College Composition and Communication*. 53, no. 4: 594–630.

Hovland, Kevin. 2006. *Shared Futures: Global Learning and Liberal Education*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Hudzik, John K. 2011. Comprehensive Internationalization: From Concept to Action. *NAFSA*. 2011. Accessed June 13, 2015. https://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA_Home/Resource_Library_Assets/Publications_Library/2011_Comprehen_Internationalization.pdf.

———. 2015. *Comprehensive Internationalization: Institutional Pathways to Success.* New York: Routledge.

Keith, William and Paula Cossart. 2012. "The Search for 'Real' Democracy: Rhetorical Citizenship and Public Deliberation in France and the United States." In *Rhetorical Citizenship and Public Deliberation*, edited by Christian Kock and Lisa S. Villadsen, 46–68. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Kock, Christian and Lisa Villadsen. 2014. In "Introduction: Rhetorical Citizenship as a Conceptual Frame: What We Talk About When We Talk About Rhetorical Citizenship." *Contemporary Rhetorical Citizenship*, edited by Christian Kock and Lisa Villadsen, 9–26. Leiden, NL: Leiden University Press.

Kuehl, Rebecca A. 2014. "Extending Civic Rhetoric: Valuing Rhetorical Dimensions of Global Citizenship in Civic Education." In *Contemporary Rhetorical Citizenship*, edited by Christian Kock and Lisa Villadsen, 291–308. Leiden, NL: Leiden University Press.

Kymlicka, Will. 2012 "Citizenship in an Era of Globalization." In *The Cosmopolitan Reader*, edited by Garrett Wallace Brown and David Held, 435–443. Cambridge, MA: Polity.

Lunsford, Andrea and Lahoucine Ouzgane eds. 2004. *Crossing Borderlands: Composition and Postcolonial Studies.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press

Martins, David S., ed. 2015. *Transnational Writing Program Administration.* Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

McConnell, Michael W. 1996. "Don't Neglect the Little Platoons." In *For Love of Country?*, edited by Joshua Cohen, 78–84. Boston: Beacon Press.

Mignolo, Walter. 2000. "The Many Faces of Cosmo-polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism." *Public Culture.* 12, no. 3: 721–748.

Mignolo, Walter. 2012. *Local Histories/Global Designs Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mouffe, Chantal. 2005. *On the Political.* London: Routledge.

———. 2009. *The Democratic Paradox.* New York: Verso.

———. 2013. *Agonistics: Thinking the World Politically.* New York: Verso.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 1997a. *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 1997b. "Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism." *The Journal of Political Philosophy.* 5, no. 1: 1–25.

———. 2002. "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism." In *For Love of Country?*, edited by Joshua Cohen, 3–20. Boston: Beacon.

———. 2012. *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pender, Kelly. 2011. *Techne, from Neoclassicism to Postmodernism: Understanding Writing as a Useful, Teachable Art.* Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

Petraglia, Joseph. 2003. "Identity Crisis: Rhetoric as an Epistemic and a Pedagogic Discipline." In *The Realms of Rhetoric: The Prospects for Rhetoric Education*,

edited by Joseph Petraglia and Deepika Bahri, 151–170. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Ranciere, Jacques. 2009. *Hatred of Democracy*. Translated by Steve Corcoran. New York: Verso.

Rawls, John. 1999. *The Law of Peoples*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ray, Brian and Connie Kendall Theado. 2016. "Composition's 'Global Turn': Writing Instruction in Multilingual/Translingual and Transnational Contexts." *Composition Studies*. 44, no. 1: 10–12.

Robbins, Bruce. 2013. *Perpetual War: Cosmopolitanism from the Viewpoint of Violence*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Ruiz, Iris and Raul Sánchez. 2016. *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition Studies: New Latinx Keywords for Theory and Pedagogy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Thaiss, Chris et al. 2012. *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

Todd, Sharon. 2010. "Living in a Dissonant World: Toward an Agonistic Cosmopolitics for Education." *Studies in the Philosophy of Education*. 29: 213–228.

University of Alabama at Birmingham. 2015. "UAB Global." University of Alabama at Birmingham. Accessed May 5, 2015. http://www.uab.edu/global/.

U.S. Department of Education. 2012. *Succeeding Globally Through International Education and Engagement: US Department of Education International Strategy*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Accessed June 12, 2014. https://www2.ed.gov/about /inits/ed/internationaled/international-strategy-2012-16.pdf.

Villanueva, Victor. 1997. "Maybe a Colony: And Still Another Critique of the Comp Community." *Journal of Advanced Composition*. 17, no. 2: 183–190.

Waldron, J. 2000. "What Is Cosmopolitan?" *Journal of Political Philosophy*. 8: 227–243.

Wallace Brown, Garrett and David Held. 2012. "Editor's Introduction." *The Cosmopolitanism Reader*, edited by Garrett Wallace Brown and David Held, 1–14. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Wan, Amy J. 2014. *Producing Good Citizens: Literacy Training in Anxious Times*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press.

Global Higher Education and the Production of Global Citizenships

What should a global higher education entail for undergraduates? Despite sustained efforts to answer this question, numerous federally funded programs, and numerous initiatives by national organizations and colleges and universities, there is no clear consensus on this question. For many, the mention of global higher education would immediately evoke discussions of study abroad programs that expose students to other cultures and facilitate their ability to communicate in another language. Such programs often reflect the traditional, cosmopolitan hope that contact with other cultures will broaden students' perspectives and make them more tolerant citizens who recognize the shared humanity of distant others. At the same time, such programs are also linked in various policy papers to concerns regarding national security, concerns which have been traditional since the Cold War era. Calls for increased funding for these programs have come from a variety of unlikely bedfellows, including organizations devoted to liberal or cosmopolitan education and organizations devoted to national defense. While many of these calls have come from high places, they have had only a slight effect.

For those who hold out hope for such programs, the national data on student participation in study abroad programs paints a dismal picture. According to NAFSA, the association of international educators, 1% of students in US colleges and universities studied abroad in 2012–13. In my own state, Alabama, the same report shows that 0.86% of students studied

abroad (2013b). Perhaps more telling are the demographic trends presented in NAFSA's research: over 60% of these students were white, and over 53% traveled to Europe, while, in contrast, 4% traveled to Africa and 2% to the Middle East (2013a). In response to these limitations, global higher education organizations have developed well-funded programs and higher education partnerships that seek to internationalize the college curriculum, and these programs play a major role in shaping the discourse of contemporary global education in America. While the university wide scope of these programs is perhaps unique, the internationalization of US higher education can be traced back much further to the late nineteenth century.

These earlier sites of global higher education include the influx of exchange students, the development of international educational associations, and the development of student organizations such as the Cosmopolitan Clubs Movement in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth century (Sylvester 2007, 11–17). Post-WWII developments, such as the founding of UNESCO in 1945, also play a significant role in the history of global higher education in the American university. In this chapter, I have chosen to focus on the development of global higher education in the post-WWII period, specifically since the signing of the 1958 National Defense Education Act (NDEA). What makes the period since the NDEA so important is that it marks a time when international education becomes a sustained site of educational struggle to define the function and purpose of global higher education. It is during this period that numerous approaches are developed, approaches that map out the function of academic research and expertise, as well as the roles American college students might play as global citizens. As an "ambient" term (Wan 18), global citizenship during this era is utilized to define students in sometimes overlapping and sometimes conflicting ways. As global citizens, students play a variety of different roles, from cosmopolitan citizens shaped by liberal values of tolerance and mutual respect, economic citizens who can advance the national economy through global enterprise, to national citizens who can promote the defense of America from foreign threats and democracy abroad.

Reading the development of global higher education should warn us against viewing global higher education as a singular educational paradigm. While a range of alternatives and programs have developed from the era of the NDEA to now, to read global higher education as one commonly acknowledged enterprise in American higher education risks

papering over key areas of political conflict. To argue for a particular vision of a global curriculum is to argue for a particular vision of students as global citizens. This is why efforts toward "internationalizing the curriculum," or comprehensive internationalization cannot help but be a site of ideological conflict. The description of comprehensive internationalization from the NAFSA report mentioned earlier is particularly troubling:

> A comprehensive approach to internationalization is all encompassing. Globally informed content is integrated into the vast majority of courses, curricula, and majors. Comparative and global perspectives are integrated into research and scholarship of faculty. The benefits of cross-cultural and comparative understanding are extended through outreach to citizens, businesses, and public officials. (Hudzik 2011, 40)

The vagueness of such a statement, typical of this type of report, makes it more broadly adaptable to a range of different institutions, to be sure. This typical rhetorical move—write broadly and then point to the need for local implementation—is understandable given the broad audience of the report, but it also makes such programs politically troublesome. While the report speaks of incentivizing faculty buy-in, the description should, for example, raise significant questions among educators about the ideological underpinnings and constraints of what is meant by terms like "globally informed content."

Statements such as these indicate how the policy documents of global higher education initiatives reveal specific understandings of global politics and the role of students in global politics. To understand the role that rhetorical education can play in global higher education, it is important to understand how international politics have shaped the global higher education movement. Specifically, we must understand how global politics have created often conflicting and sometimes overlapping visions of students as global citizens. This historical understanding can enable us to recognize the range of political commitments that can be affirmed and reproduced when global citizenship is invoked as a goal of higher education, and perhaps provide tactics for critically confronting and resisting these commitments.

Rather than describing global higher education as a neutral movement that rhetorical educators need to take part in, I would argue that global higher education can be more productively understood as a site of political contention that rhetorical educators should engage. This definition may seem

counter-intuitive to those who have worked on global curricula for their institutions, where the ethos may have seemed more collaborative and cooperative than conflictual. Yet, as I will illustrate below, arguments for global higher education and efforts towards "internationalizing the curriculum" invoke discourses of global politics—security, global economy, ethics, and expertise—that cannot be easily synthesized. Nevertheless, the ideological discourse of these initiatives does what ideology does best by constructing a perceived consensus out of a range of contradictory political positions. As we will see, even positions that would seem completely incompatible—such as ethical cosmopolitanism and national security— can often be synthesized in this ideological discourse. Take, for example, the American Council on Education's (2003) description of bringing together stakeholders in their handbook for internationalizing the campus. After noting stakeholders in academia, the corporate world, the intelligence industry, and the military, the ACE report argues for a process of bringing these stakeholders together and "guiding" them "as they explore the changing external environment, define excellence in today's world, and clarify learning goals for students" (11). Global higher education in the American university can sometimes produce troubling relationships between security and global education.

The number of curricular initiatives, policy papers, and reports on global higher education from 1958 to the present is much more extensive than can possibly covered here, and a rhetorical analysis of these initiatives would require a book of its own.[1] Instead I focus on the emergence of four specific discourses of global higher education and trace their continued presence. Though this chapter provides some historical overview of global higher education, my intent is not to develop a linear history but rather a genealogy of discursive practices (Foucault 1984, 96) and an explanation of how they have manifested in specific historical moments. Such an approach can help avoid the mistakes of relegating certain discourses to the past or claiming that a specific discourse has won out over others. Discourses of security, economics, ethics, and disciplinarity continue to shape the discourse of global higher education. Global citizenship and global education become, in the presence of these discourses, not only "ambient" terms (Wan 18), but what we might call "sticky" terms, terms that pick up traces of military, economic, colonial, and political discourse as they are articulated by programs with particular interests. I argue here for critically examining these discourses by pointing to their political motivations and underpinnings. While discourses of global higher education and global citizenship

in the American university system are often shaped by internal tensions and conflicts, they also face external challengers, most notably critiques from the political right that they promote a lack of loyalty to country and a progressive agenda.[2]

Anti-global education arguments are ever-present in the rhetorical ecology of global higher education, but they most often gain ground, as I will show, during conservative presidential regimes. In fact, when writing the first draft of this book in the summer of 2015, I was convinced that nationalist arguments against global education had been somewhat confined to the margins of discussions of higher education. The 2016 presidential campaign and election showed, however, that these arguments have once again gained force among some sectors of the public. As these views align themselves more closely with political power, the need to respond to charges of academic indoctrination will become more urgent. While these claims have a long history, the difficulty in responding to them is heightened by new platforms of digital media that allow these charges to spread rapidly across networks. These claims have been advanced by alt-right media with particular vigor, including Alex Jones's *InfoWars* and *Breitbart*, as well as being disseminated through the media of more traditional organizations such as the John Birch Society. Arguments alleging that the Common Core state standards are a globalist educational conspiracy (Anderson "Common Core Goes Global") are quite common across far-right and alt-right media. In addition, the idea that global education is a liberal consipiracy has also been advanced specifically against global higher education by organizations such as The National Association of Scholars.

I argue here that rhetorical educators must engage global higher education on both of these fronts. This means facing the difficult task of arguing against far-right assaults on global higher education while also remaining critical of how easily aligned global higher education is with discourses of national security and economic power. To return to Judith Butler's (2009) discussion of "frames of war," I argue that we must be aware that global higher education can be and has been framed by frames of war and frames of capital that create rather than ameliorate conditions of global precarity or "precarious life" (2004, 129). In addition to alignments of global education to economic security initiatives, higher education in America continues to have significant ties to national defense. As Henry Giroux (2014) has recently reminded us, "more research projects in higher education than ever before are being funded by various branches of the military, but either no one is paying attention or no one seems to care" (37). Rhetorical educators

should not simply recognize these challenges for themselves, but also, as I will argue in the next chapter, give their students critical rhetorical capacities and rhetorical ethics that enable them to resist these frames. Before making this argument, however, it is important to trace out the discourses of global higher education and their anti-globalist responses in order to illustrate how each set of discourses provides opportunities and obligations for resistance.

The Foundations of the Global Turn: Cosmopolitan Education

While calls of internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum often make the necessity of global education seem inevitable, the rhetoric used to describe the need for global education directly impacts not only curriculum but also the roles played by students and educators. How we present the exigencies of global education shapes the particular type of political subject we want to produce. That being said, the politics of global higher education are often subtle in their expression. The politics of global citizenship present themselves in visions of students as global citizens who are equipped to respond to specific risks and opportunities. The way that global risks and opportunities are rhetorically framed directly impacts descriptions of the types of students who will be able to respond to these risks and take up these opportunities. This overarching vision of global citizenship, in turn, shapes global curricula and defines the skills, knowledge, and performative capacities students need in order to thrive in a global context. A key project of disarticulating transnational rhetorical education from the discourses of global higher education is critically untangling this relationship between global exigencies, student subjectivities, and political motives.

To advance this project requires asking a different sort of question about the motives of global higher education than those asked in the policy and program literature. Instead of asking "how do we cultivate students who are ethical and capable global citizens?," I begin by questioning the political motives of invoking particular ethical perspectives of citizenship in calls for global education. While training students to be "ethical global citizens" or "cosmopolitan citizens" is sometimes invoked innocently or vaguely, cosmopolitan or global ethics can also be intertwined with discourses of economic globalization, national security, and disciplinary practice. The ACE (2003) internationalization guide I

cited above, for example, clearly identifies students as global citizens, while also seeking to align faculty with a variety of economic and military stakeholders. Cosmopolitanism, or global citizenship, is often invoked as an ethical paradigm for global education, but while cosmopolitan ethics can provide a compelling normative framework for students, they can also be utilized rhetorically to support seemingly contradictory initiatives.

From its earliest beginnings in the West, cosmopolitanism has been conceived of in ethical terms. In the earliest Western reference, Diogenes of Sinope responds to the question of his place of origin with the remark "I am a kosmopolites," or citizen of the world (Wallace Brown and Held 2012, 4). While this term implies citizenship, it signifies ethical identification with mankind more than a sense of civic identity or duty. Garrett Wallace Brown and David Held summarize this point: "By insisting that he was a universal citizen [kosmopolites], Diogenes was suggesting that 'the morally good are all friends,' that we are all part of a fraternity of mankind and that as a member of the cosmos he could not be defined merely by his city-state affiliation" (4). Citizenship, in this reading, hinges on a shared identity of moral goodness. Diogenes's original conception of cosmopolitanism was most fully developed by the Roman Stoics, and takes its clearest form in the writings of Cicero, Marcus Aurelius, and Seneca. We see, for example, this vision of global citizenship as moral community in Book I of Cicero's *De Officiis* ([44 BC] 2000): "Of all bonds of fellowship, however, none is more pre-eminent or enduring than the friendship forged between good men of like character" (III 55. 20). This Stoic tradition emphasized the universality of reason and ethics as the foundation of global community. Despite the number of different conceptions of cosmopolitanism that shape our current understanding of the concept, this vision of community has traveled well since its origins in Ancient Greece and its development in Rome.[3]

Kwame Appiah (2007) develops a conversational and practice-based cosmopolitanism in his *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers,* which he contrasts to critiques of "rootless cosmopolitanism" (xvi). The cosmopolitans Appiah envisions are individuals with particular loyalties, ethics, and experiences, who develop practices that enable them to transcend difference or reach useful compromises on issues of difference and construct just relationships with others. Appiah critiques philosophical positivism by arguing that "practices and not principles are what enable us to live in peace" (85). One of the key practices he identifies is the com-

municative practice of conversation with others. Conversation is used "not only for literal talk but also as a metaphor for engagement with the experience and the ideas of others. … Conversation doesn't have to lead to consensus about anything, especially values; it's enough that it helps get people used to one another" (85). Appiah's discussion points, importantly, to the role of such conversations in shaping an overlapping philosophical vocabulary that allows for the forging of cosmopolitan ties despite the presence of deep philosophical disagreements over normative principles. In addition, his focus on shared practices rather than shared principles opens the door to a reading of cosmopolitanism as a practice of dialogical rhetorical encounters. Little is said, however, about the accessibility of these conversations (real or imaginary) or how these conversations might lead to the deliberation and action necessary to make cosmopolitanism have political influence. While cosmopolitan conversation informs philosophical cosmopolitanism, there is a danger of it becoming a reified concept that ignores the intensive rhetorical labor that goes into constituting, reproducing, and transforming transnational forums of public discourse.

I pause here to examine ethical cosmopolitanism not because of its philosophical importance, but because it is central to the development of global higher education in two specific ways. First, ethical cosmopolitanism is, for lack of a better term, hot once again. The post-9/11 era has seen a resurgence in discussions of cosmopolitanism and ethics that have pervaded both popular discourse and academic culture. We can see this not only in the spate of academic books and papers on cosmopolitanism over the past ten years, but also in the influence of books that span the academic and the popular, such as Appiah's own. We can also see the influence of cosmopolitanism penetrating into popular media through a variety of youth media campaigns, including the popular *Global Citizen* campaign, which sponsors the annual *Global Citizen Festival*. The logic behind invocations cosmopolitanism in our present moment follows that of many earlier invocations: patterns of migration and new technologies have shortened the distance between ourselves and others and this requires the development of new ways to live morally and justly with one another.

Second, while moments of globalization do require an ethical response, cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan education have tended to separate the ethical from the political and the rhetorical. We can see this by turning to the way in which cosmopolitan thought and theories of cosmopolitan education have framed global communication as ethical dialogue. Perhaps the most significant voice for cosmopolitan education has been that of

Martha Nussbaum.[4] Nussbaum's philosophically based cosmopolitan education has been adopted by a wide range of liberal educators and is utilized by many liberal education programs, such as the AAC&U's *Shared Futures*, which will be discussed below. Since her 1994 essay "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism" (2002), which drew a flurry of criticism, Nussbaum has continued to develop and defend her program of cosmopolitan education in books such as *Cultivating Humanity* (1997a) and *Not for Profit* (2002). Nussbaum describes cosmopolitan education as cultivating recognition of "the dignity and humanity of each person" by providing curricula that enable students to perceive human similarity across difference, develop critical thinking skills for evaluating difference, and develop understandings of the economic, historical, and cultural forces that shape cultural difference (1997a, 12). The project of cosmopolitan education must be achieved throughout the entirety of students' undergraduate education, and ideally throughout all of their primary and secondary education.

Nussbaum's vision of cosmopolitan education calls on educators to challenge students to see themselves as ethically obligated world citizens. She draws on a synthesis of Stoic cosmopolitanism and Kantian ethics that she pits against identity politics. In "Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism" (1997b) Nussbaum characterizes Stoic/Kantian cosmopolitanism: "We are told that our moral acts must take their bearings from the equal worth of humanity in all persons, near or far, and that this moral stance leads politics in a cosmopolitan direction; we are told that morality should be supreme over politics, giving political thought both constraints and goals" (18). Nussbaum argues that this morally constrained but engaged vision of cosmopolitan politics provides a more hopeful paradigm for acting in a world shaped by political factionalism and conflict. For Nussbaum, Kant's moral politics provide a means of developing a theory of cosmopolitan education that "requires transcending the inclination of both students and educators to define themselves primarily in terms of local group loyalties and identities" (1997a, 67). In her discussion of the motivation for including the study of other cultures, Nussbaum argues that "World citizens will therefore not argue for the inclusion of cross-cultural study in a curriculum primarily on the grounds that it is a way in which members of minority groups can affirm such an identity. … Only a human identity that transcends these divisions shows us why we should look at one another with respect across them" (1997a, 67). The role of the humanities in cosmopolitan education is central to Nussbaum, because the humanities

provide philosophical tools for Socratic self-examination as well as encounters with texts that cultivate students' moral imagination.

It must be acknowledged that Nussbaum is a tireless advocate of human rights, and my criticism here of her philosophy of cosmopolitan education does not seek to make her complicit with apolitical or neoliberal understandings of cosmopolitanism. However, it must be said that the supremacy of morality or ethics over politics in her theory of cosmopolitan education runs the risk of both being easily coopted by other discourses and obscuring concrete strategies of political education, including rhetorical education. In the realm of political education, local identities and group loyalties matter. In the realm of rhetorical education, they certainly matter, as they significantly shape and constrain rhetorical cultures surrounding issues and communities and form the basis of rhetorical performances. What makes her work so appealing, however, is that it defines a central place for the humanities in global higher education, a necessary point given the role that discourses of national security, economic globalization, and disciplinary expertise have played in shrinking the space of the humanities in global higher education. While a humanities-focused cosmopolitan education can serve as a counterweight to these discourses, cosmopolitan education can, however, also serve as a humanistic counterpart to forms of militarized, economic, and disciplinary education. As I will show below, however, the term "cosmopolitanism" or "global citizen" continues to retain its force as an ethical term, one that can not only be aligned with other discourses of global higher education but also has a tendency to overshadow politics with ethics.

Sputnik 1.0: The Cold War Origins of Global Higher Education

Cosmopolitan education and international education have a long history in the American university. In the early twentieth century, groups such as Corda Frateres, or the International Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs brought together American and international students from a range of many different nations together to discuss shared values and peace among nations. Most educational historians, however, point to the post-WWII period as being the most significant period of growth for global higher education, including both international education and forms of cosmopolitan education that stem from liberal education. Educational historian Kenneth Tye (2009) has argued that it was during this period that we begin to see a "global and international emphasis to the curricula of the schools of the United States, albeit with only marginal success and not

without conflict" (4). The period from the signing of the 1958 NDEA to the development of global higher education programs in the 1990s and 2000s witnessed the development of a complex web of sometimes intersecting, sometimes conflicting visions of global education and global citizenship. The passing of the NDEA in 1958 serves as a watershed moment for contemporary global education programs, as it provided funding for research centers on international politics and international education programs. Robert P. Parker Jr. (1979) describes the central questions surrounding the passage of this act: "Would this child be the intellectual equal, or better still, the superior of his or her Russian peer whose progress in science and technology seemed to have put Russia ahead of the U.S. in the Cold War?" (314). In the brief statement he gave upon signing the act, Eisenhower (1958) states that act is designed to "strengthen our American system of education so that it can meet the broad and increasing demands imposed upon it by considerations of basic national security" (Eisenhower). The "General Provisions" section of the act, which sought to correct educational "imbalances" (1581) in technical and scientific education and foreign language training, accentuated, as Albert Kitzhaber (1967) would argue, imbalances between "the allegedly 'practical' and therefore valuable and prestigious subjects (science and mathematics) and the 'impractical' and thus unimportant ones, the 'frills' (English, history, geography, etc.)" (135). In addition to science and mathematics, this period also marks the growth of International Studies, with the founding of the International Studies Association in 1959. The increased specialization of International Studies is important, as the discipline distinguishes itself as social science rather than humanistic inquiry and becomes one of the "prestigious subjects" Kitzhaber noted. Title VI of the act provided funding for increased academic research on international relations and played a significant role in constructing a technocratic sphere for international relations.

The impact of this act on the development of composition studies is well documented in the history of composition, and gave momentum to several of the field's founding moments, including Project English and the 1966 Dartmouth Conference (Harris 2012, 4). While Dartmouth is often considered a key beginning point in composition's "growth" (Harris 4) period, this same year saw the continued growth of international education through Lyndon Johnson signing The International Education and Health Act of 1966. This act points to a synthesis of disciplinary knowledge and ethics that continues to shape the global higher education programs

of our post-Cold War context. A striking difference between this act and the NDEA can be found in its move toward a rhetoric of peace and international cooperation from a rhetoric of defense. While this act was ultimately unfunded by Congress, it indicates a vision of international education that was pursued by a variety of different international and area studies programs, as well as several programs that were funded through Title VI of the NDEA.

In his speech upon signing the act, Johnson charged Congress with the task of adding a "world dimension" to education and health. Johnson (1966) defines this process in explicitly ethical terms:

> We would be shortsighted to confine our vision to this nation's shorelines. The same rewards we count at home will flow from sharing in a worldwide effort to rid mankind of the slavery of ignorance and the scourge of disease. We bear a special role in this liberating mission. Our resources will be wasted in defending freedom's frontiers if we neglect the spirit that makes men want to be free. Half a century ago, the philosopher William James declared that mankind must seek 'a moral equivalent of war.' The search continues—more urgent today than ever before in man's history. Ours is the great opportunity to challenge all nations, friend and foe alike, to join this battle. We have made hopeful beginnings. ("Special Message")

Given the earlier rhetoric of the National Defense Education Act, Johnson's speech is quite remarkable, though its ethos is severely challenged by American involvement in the Vietnam War. In the global vision conjured by Johnson's speech, education provides the central means for achieving a peaceful world: "Schooled in the grief of war, we know certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth: Ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace. The conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms" ("Special Message"). The act provides, in this way, a globally focused moral framework for national education, while also providing a concrete plan for expanding programs for international education in K-12 and in higher education. The act also provides funding for research on international affairs, provides resources for global research partnerships, expands the teaching of English abroad, and fosters opportunities for classroom collaborations across borders.

I point to the importance of this act for two reasons. First, it marks the continued expansion of disciplinary expertise and programs in

International Studies, resulting in an increasingly technocratic public sphere surrounding many international issues. Second, this act fuses disciplinary knowledge with an ethical/political perspective that creates a vision of students as agents of "soft power" (Nye 2004, x), who can carry cooperative democratic practices across national borders. Students are not defined as global citizens in this act, nor in Johnson's speech. They are, rather, American citizens prepared to act across borders to export an American vision of freedom and moral progress. In contrast to the NDEA's emphasis on education creating a better-trained or superior student, the students and scholars envisioned in this act are in the business of exporting democracy in a Cold War climate. This historical context is important because it illustrates one of the most significant attempts in American history to fuse an ethical politics with the specialized knowledge of academic research. Current liberal global education initiatives, such as *Shared Futures*, often resist the nationalist tenor of the NDEA and IEA, but the project of achieving this synthesis between ethics and disciplinary knowledge continues. The attempt to achieve this synthesis leaves rhetorical education, which can claim neither a systematic ethical perspective nor the space of a privileged discipline in the contemporary academy, out of the conversation.

The thaw of the Cold War marks a time of exceptional optimism for global education, and many contemporary global higher education initiatives stem from work during this period. The early 1990s were a high-water mark period for human rights movements and witnessed a significant increase in activity from NGOs and social movements. Global education programs from this period reflect this emphasis on human rights education, with a specific shift away from nationalist visions of global education and toward post-national conceptions of global education grounded in the universality of human rights. The 1993 Vienna Conference on Human Rights produced "The Vienna Declaration and Program of Action" (1993), which argued that human rights education can "play an important role in the promotion and respect of human rights with regard to all individuals without distinction of any kind such as race, sex, language or religion, and this should be integrated in the education policies at the national as well as international levels" ("Vienna Declaration" 33). Calls for human rights education were advanced at major human rights conferences, and the work of UNESCO during this time is particularly important. At the 1993 Montreal Conference on Human Rights, the International Congress on Education for Human Rights and Democracy developed the "World

Plan of Action on Education for Human Rights and Democracy," which provided a framework for integrating human rights education throughout primary, secondary, and university education.

The 1993 Vienna and Montreal conferences, as well as a host of other human rights conferences during this period, capture a particular moment in the history of global education. It was at this time that several prominent scholars, including Nussbaum (1997a, b), began to look back to the philosophical ideas of cosmopolitanism as an antidote to overtly nationalistic conceptions of global education. The early 1990s also mark the beginning of well-funded and nationally recognized programs of global higher education that seek to integrate global education throughout undergraduate education. While many programs were developed during this time, one of them, the AAC&U's *Shared Futures*, has become perhaps the most fully developed and supported global education platform in the United States. According to Kevin Hovland's (2006) brief history in *Shared Futures: Global Learning and Liberal Education*, the work of the AAC&U on global curricula can be traced to *The Project on Engaging Cultural Legacies: Shaping Core Curricula in the Humanities*, which began in 1990, and "brought together sixty-three institutions eager to broaden notions of a 'common cultural heritage' as traditionally manifested in core Western civilization courses" (1). The knowledge gained through the development of this project and others throughout the 1990s led the AAC&U to undertake the task of reformulating the idea of liberal education in global terms. These efforts often defined global citizenship and global education in the same cosmopolitan terms as Nussbaum, while also attempting to develop measurable educational goals. Among objections from the political right that multicultural curricula lacked concrete goals, advocates of global education began to develop a broad set of cross-curricular outcomes designed to capture the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind that make up a truly global education. Since this period, the strength and influence of projects like *Shared Futures* has continued to grow.

Sputnik 2.0?: The Contemporary Context

The period during and after the Cold War has significantly shaped the landscape of contemporary global higher education, but the period since the 1990s has been significantly shaped by a variety of political and educational forces. A variety of organizations have made vigorous attempts

to assess the outcomes of global higher education and voiced calls for internationalizing the entire undergraduate curriculum. Both of these developments resulted in a variety of initiatives by organizations like AAC&U, the American Council on Education (ACE), and even the US Department of Education to clearly define and measure the global capacities of both university and K-12 students. For many of these programs, the attacks of 9/11 serve as a political exigency for the role of global higher education.

The period shortly after 9/11 was, of course, a highly contentious time in higher education, and many of these efforts were shaped by the rhetorical culture of the time. While many progressive and radical educators saw the period as an opportunity for global education, the period marked a return of some of the tactics and rhetoric of the culture wars of the 1990s. The examples from this period are numerous and include the American Council of Trustees and Alumni's November 2001 report "Defending Civilization: How Our Universities Are Failing America and What Can Be Done About It." The report, defended by Lynne Cheney, one of the American Council of Trustees and Alumni's founders, was unflinchingly clear about the role of US intellectuals in aiding terror: "We learn from history what happens when a nation's intellectuals are unwilling to sustain its civilization" (Martin and Neal, 7). The jingoism of this report was attacked widely, but it was also taken up widely by many on the political right, such as David Horowitz, whose website "Discover the Networks" sought to develop a genealogy of the American left and included an extensive section on academia and political indoctrination. It was also during this time that high-profile lawsuits were filed against universities, such as the suit filed against the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill by the Family Policy Network over its decision to require *Approaching the Qur'an* for its summer reading program for incoming freshmen. Accusations of "liberal indoctrination" became commonplace during this time and created a significantly challenging period for global educators or those teaching global issues.

These vigorous debates over global education in a post-9/11 context are covered extensively by a number of authors, and I will not delve into them more fully here, as I want to focus instead on how the post 9/11 context has shaped global education at the policy and curriculum level.[5] The period from 2001 to the present has witnessed not only reframings of the political exigency of global education but also a range of efforts to

define and assess the knowledge and capacities of global education more specifically. This period has also witnessed a significant rise in global education efforts for K-12 education. The post-9/11 era challenged educational policy organizations to reframe their discourses of national security, economics, disciplinary expertise, and ethics in new ways, but certain Cold War understandings of international hegemony, national defense, American values, and soft power continue to retain their rhetorical power. At the same time, liberal education initiatives such as *Shared Futures* have continued to develop ethically driven alternatives to these more nationalist conceptions of global education. However, despite the ethical emphasis of liberal education programs like *Shared Futures*, humanistic and ethical approaches to global education are often easily aligned with nationalist conceptions in rhetorical practice, even if they are opposed philosophically.

A November 2003 report for NAFSA, written by multiple members of NAFSA's Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad, captures the staying power of Cold War logics of global education. The report argues for the need to radically expand study abroad and ensure that US undergraduates have facility in a foreign language, as well as "understanding of at least one foreign area" (3). But the report also frames the need for global education by pointing back to the era of the NDEA: "We are now in another Sputnik moment. We can remain as ignorant of the outside world as we were on September 11, or do the work necessary to overcome this handicap. That grim morning took us by surprise, in part, because we had closed our eyes and ears to the world around us. We could not hear or understand what our enemies were saying. We need to reverse this dangerous course by adequately preparing our youth to understand and deal with the problems of today's world" (3). The report frames the exigency of study abroad in terms of national defense and recalls the atmosphere of both the NDEA and IEA in its pages, and it also frames study abroad in terms of tolerance and mutual understanding. According to the report, students studying abroad are "surprised to find that ordinary citizens of the country they are visiting will grill them on American policies and politics, and force them to defend beliefs they may always have taken for granted. … Study abroad brings an increased appreciation for one's own culture and traditions, as well as a more sympathetic understanding of the views and norms of others" (6). Study abroad thus allows American students to understand their Americanness in an international context and perhaps more clearly understand which nations are friends and which are enemies.

More recently, a range of global education initiatives for both K-12 and higher education have framed their exigencies by invoking the rhetoric of national defense and economic competition in ways that focus on the contributions of specific disciplines. In a report sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations (2012) and entitled *US Education Reform and National Security*, a panel of experts in K-12 education chaired by Condoleeza Rice and Joel Klein characterize the "problems" of K-12 education as a "grave national security threat" (4). There are several troubling aspects of this report. First, the report carries forward the focus on defense-focused education from the NDEA by noting the need for students who will be educated so that they can contribute to intelligence agencies, defense industries, and the military in an effort to protect America's "national interests" (9). In this way, the report shows that while the political contexts may differ, the rhetoric of national defense and education has remained strikingly similar to the era of the Cold War. Second, while the report pays lip service to critical thinking skills and civic education, it echoes the dominance of foreign language instruction and STEM disciplines in educational efforts. By focusing on shortfalls of foreign language speakers, engineers, and scientists for intelligence and defense, the report repeats the dichotomy between the important disciplines and the "frills" (135) that Albert Kitzhaber noted in 1967. Finally, the report clearly connects global awareness and understanding with national defense: "too many Americans are also deficient in both global awareness and knowledge of their own country's history and values. An understanding of history, politics, culture, and traditions is important to citizenship and is essential for understanding America's allies and its adversaries" (12). Tellingly, directly after this statement this awareness and the ability to communicate with others from different cultural backgrounds is connected to the ability of US soldiers to "correctly read and assess situations they encounter" (12).

There is a tendency in reports such as this one to develop the neoliberal logic of the inseparability of US economic dominance and national defense. Despite its many critics, economic hegemony remains a central goal. In the now infamous "A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education," the Spellings Report (2006), the relationship between the national economy and global literacy is explicit: "The need to produce a globally literate citizenry is critical to the nation's continued success in the global economy" (26). In a recent article in the AAC&U's magazine *Liberal Education*, former Congressman David Skaggs (2014)

sums up the implicit connection between education, security, and economy: "The ability of the United States to protect itself and its interests around the world—our national security, broadly defined—depends directly on the strength of our economy. And it is clear that economic strength in the era of global competition depends on a nation's educational attainment—most importantly, the proportion of the workforce with postsecondary credentials" (2014). This logic is repeated in the rhetoric of many global higher education initiatives, including those that are not directly connected to national defense. The American Council on Education's (2011) *Strength Through Global Leadership and Engagement: US Higher Education in the 21st Century*, for example, does not reflect the national defense rhetoric of the Council on Foreign Relations report, but nevertheless directly references the role of US students as agents of "soft power" (10) and the global benefits of a higher education fueled US economy. Such work takes place against a backdrop that Jeffrey R. Di Leo et al. (2014) describe as "the most invasive higher education legislation in U.S. history" (27) through bills such as the International Studies in Higher Education Acts proposed in 2003 and 2005. These acts called for significant spending on higher education initiatives that support America's military power and economic hegemony. Di Leo, Giroux, McClennen, and Saltman suggest that "even though these versions of the law did not pass, the debates over them reveal much about the political lobbying regarding the teaching of global studies since 9/11" (27). At stake in such bills is not only a vision of students as citizens, but a vision of the role of education in producing citizen subjects for the national interest.

In contrast to the focus on American security and economic hegemony we see in calls for international education, global higher education programs from liberal education organizations like the American Association of Colleges and Universities develop arguments for the role of liberal education in promoting global citizenship. *Shared Futures* reflects the perspective and values of cosmopolitan education and human rights education: "while economic globalization, threats of global terrorism, and global health crises have captured the attention and imagination of today's public, the questions of power, privilege, ethics, social responsibility, political action, and personal identity central to these global issues have always been fundamental to liberal education" (27). From its beginnings, *Shared Futures* has become one of the most fully developed and supported global citizenship education platforms in the United States and offers a humanistic alternative to international education programs based in security and

American economic hegemony. The vision of global education outlined in the various reports for the project reflects Nussbaum's understanding of cosmopolitan education; however, *Shared Futures* has paired this with the development of more concrete civic learning goals and assessment methods. *Shared Futures* provides a refreshing turn from the outcomes of producing more students with knowledge of a foreign language, understanding of a foreign "area," and STEM training.

In contrast to the goals of initiatives that follow the rhetoric of defense and "soft power" that stem from the NDEA and IEA, the educational goals outlined by *Shared Futures* recognize the limitations of national citizenship and the role of higher education in producing students who identify as global citizens. We might compare just a few of the educational outcomes outlined in the report *Shared Futures: Global Learning and Liberal Education* to those of initiatives rooted in national security:

> recognize that citizenship in a nation is only one factor in understanding the world; recognize similarities and differences in and among cultures and the multiple perspectives, values, and identities they engender; sustain difficult conversations in the face of highly emotional and perhaps uncongenial differences; understand—and perhaps redefine—democratic principles and practices within a global context; … translate global learning into ethical and reflective practice, mindful of the consequences of their actions in a locally diverse and globally heterogeneous community; recognize the impact of global issues on their own lives, and believe that their own actions, both individually and collaboratively, can, in turn, influence the world. (16–17)

The difference between the language of *Shared Futures* and a report like the Rice and Klein group's report, *US Education Reform and National Security*, is striking. In these outcomes, we see students as taking part in civic action on global issues, developing deeper knowledge of the contexts of these issues, and understanding their civic and ethical responsibilities to address these issues. At the same time, *Shared Futures* also reflects a turn toward a competencies-based approach to global higher education. As I will discuss below, what *Shared Futures* and its many partnering institutions have brought to bear on cosmopolitan education are more developed educational outcomes and tools for assessing them.

For now, we can sum up by saying that the picture of our current context that emerges is a complicated and often idiosyncratic one. We need to acknowledge that economic, national security, disciplinary, and ethical dis-

courses of global higher education can be configured in different ways in different programs and can sometimes align in interesting, if not contradictory ways. The numerous reports and proposals advocating global education from 1958 to the present reveal a myriad of different alignments. Nevertheless, for our purposes, it is possible to trace out two different pathways of global higher education in the United States since 1958—one that is rooted in work on global citizenship, peace, and human rights education, and one that is rooted in conceptions of globally minded and globally capable American citizens who carry American ideals across borders and advance American interests through their work in other nations. As rhetorical educators, we are perhaps more likely to be drawn to programs such as *Shared Futures* than programs rooted in national defense or economic hegemony, both for political and for pedagogical reasons. Many programs that frame their exigency through defense or economy, as we have seen, tend to focus more heavily on STEM disciplines and tend to collapse communication into foreign language instruction and vague notions of intercultural exchange.[6] However, while programs of global civic education like *Shared Futures* develop concrete civic goals, they also pose particular problems for rhetorical educators. Within these programs, a range of important rhetorical capacities are often blackboxed under the term "communication" or "communication skills." In addition, the strong sense of cosmopolitan ethics that pervades these programs often has the tendency to portray communication across borders as an ethical dialogue rather than as rhetorical or political. To argue for the role of rhetorical education in global higher education thus entails the project of rearticulating global communication as rhetoric. A growing focus on assessment and the need to define and assess the capacities of students as global citizens provides a key opportunity for this project.

Toward "Global Competencies" and Assessment

Recent assessments of global higher education programs point to important opportunities for rhetorical educators to contribute to global higher education. Assessment literature and more recent proposals often call for global higher education programs to move beyond macro-level descriptions of global curricula and toward specific, measurable curricular outcomes. Increasingly, the goals of the 1990s-era cosmopolitan education—increased global knowledge, ethical reflection, global awareness—are subject to being redefined in ways that foster concrete assessment practices. In a recent

project sponsored by *Shared Futures*, "Assessing Global Learning," Caryn McTighe Musil (2006) analyzed the outcomes and assessment tools of over 100 different global education programs at liberal arts universities across the country (2). The first analysis of its kind, Musil's examines a wide range of global education programs with the goal of "matching good intentions with good practice" (1). Musil notes that despite efforts to integrate global education across the curriculum, there are few global education programs that can be called interdisciplinary (2). In addition, while global education seeks to promote civic engagement, Musil found this goal to be inadequately defined in most programs (3). Overall, her analysis of global education programs illustrates that many programs have "unfocused curricular goals" (1), despite their good intentions.

In response to these problems, Musil reports that the AAC&U "identified global knowledge, ethical commitments to individual and social responsibility, and intercultural skills as major components of a 21st century liberal education" (1). These outcomes are supported by the additional learning goals for all global learning courses: (1) "to generate new knowledge about global studies," (2) "to spur greater civic engagement and social responsibility," (3) "to promote deeper knowledge of, debate about, and practice of democracy," and (4) "to cultivate intercultural competencies" (Musil 16). In her description of these outcomes, Musil argues for the role that local institutions can play in developing courses across the curricula that will support these goals and developing the assessment tools necessary to measure student progress. Musil provides sample rubrics that illustrate how specific courses might develop assignments and activities that enable faculty and institutions to assess the depth of students' global learning.

Looking at these rubrics, various types of courses in composition, digital composing, and rhetoric could easily be said to contribute to these goals. But, interestingly enough, courses in rhetoric and composition are never mentioned in the report, and only one intercultural communication course is used as an example. Writing is identified not as a means of global engagement but as means of assessment. Writing and "oral presentations" appear only on the rubric Musil provides for assessing global learning, where they are used to gauge global knowledge, reflect upon ethical commitments, or reflect upon participation in advocacy, community, or activist groups (32). What we see in Musil's assessment resources is a view of writing as a means of assessing students' global knowledge and the depth of their engagement in service-learning and other courses that provide opportunities for contact

with global communities. What we miss, however, is a view of writing as engagement and the role of rhetorical education in capacitating students for global engagement.

The impoverished understanding of rhetoric and the diminished description of writing we see in the literature of global education initiatives are not confined to individual programs like *Shared Futures*. The US Department of Education's *Succeeding Globally Through International Education and Engagement* (2012), which I mentioned in the introduction to this book, for example, constructs its kairos from economic and cultural globalization in order to highlight the urgency of global education and call for programs that will transform American students into global citizens in both the vocational and civic sense of the term. In this way, the proposal echoes some of the language of the National Defense Education Act and the International Education Act. In noting the aims of global education, this plan devotes equal discussion to both "Economic Competitiveness and Jobs," "Global Challenges," and "Diverse U.S. Society" and highlights civic engagement as an outcome of global education.

What perhaps stands out most in the plan, however, is its characterization of "global competencies for all students" (1). In contrast to the "essential reading, writing, mathematics, and science skills" that used to be adequate for a higher education, global competencies "comprise the knowledge and skills individuals need to be successful in today's flat, interconnected world and to be fully engaged in and act on issues of global significance" (5). The report illustrates a tendency to collapse rhetorical and technological capacities in ways that diminish the value of courses in rhetoric, writing, and basic communication for global education. The "communication skills" that the plan calls for are said to exceed the more limited "essential skills" of earlier periods, but the communicative skills we see outlined later in the report are essential rhetorical capacities and capabilities that are neither basic nor made obsolete by new technologies and mediums.

Though rhetorical education is never mentioned, the report defines the key communication skills it outlines in terms that will be immediately recognizable to most rhetorical educators and that resonate with statements like the NCTE's (2013) *Framework for 21st Century Curriculum and Assessment*. Global education should, according to the US Department of Education (USDE), produce globally competent students who can "recognize and express how diverse audiences perceive meaning and how that affects communication," "listen to and communicate effectively with diverse people," "select and use appropriate technology and media to communicate with diverse audiences," and "reflect on how effective communication affects understanding and collaboration in

an interdependent world" (6). These are rhetorical capacities that require a significant investment in rhetorical education. However, there are few places in the global curriculum where students can cultivate these capacities. When they are mentioned in specific contexts, they are often tied to either specialized courses that are taken by only a handful of undergraduates, rather than explored as capacities that can be cultivated across a variety of disciplines throughout the entire undergraduate career. Perhaps more important is the fact that these vague conceptions of communication are inseparably woven into discussions of students' civic engagement within this literature. To define these capacities vaguely, and to ignore the rhetorical education necessary to cultivate them, raises troubling questions about how effectively these programs can promote students' civic engagement.

Despite these problems, recent reports like the USDE's report do illustrate a turn toward designing and assessing global curricula based on what students can "do" rather than on vaguer notions of their global knowledge and awareness. Kevin Hovland (2014) notes in a report for AAC&U and NAFSA, "By focusing on students' capacities instead of the institution's programs, departments, courses, and trips … it is possible to begin a more inclusive and generative conversation about how better to match the values expressed in the mission statement with the expectations of faculty, student affairs professionals, and students" (7). This statement echoes Musil's findings on the diffuseness of global education and her call for integrating global education throughout the curriculum, as well as calls across US universities for programs of comprehensive internationalization. An increased emphasis on capacities creates more opportunities for concrete assessment of students' global learning, which can strengthen global education programs and keep them immune from the typical critiques of their effectiveness. This emphasis does not constitute a shift away from the values-based education of global learning or liberal/cosmopolitan conceptions of global higher education, but it does provide a key opportunity to reframe the goals of global higher education in terms of rhetorical performance and integrate rhetorical education into global higher education. In doing so, however, rhetorical educators must also directly confront the perennial and pervasive arguments against global higher education that position it as a conspiracy against national citizenship and civic loyalty.

The Pendulum of Anti-Global Education

Despite a clear trajectory of reports, programs, and initiatives that link global education to the protection of national security and global economic hegemony, both K-12 and global higher education have been targeted by

a range of populist critiques from the political right. As Kenneth Tye (2009) has argued, the flourishing of global education programs in the 1960s and 1970s can be thought of as the "golden years" of global education, but these golden years soon gave way to several significant attacks in the 1980s and 1990s (18). Tye cites the publication of a report commissioned by William Bennett as a formative attack on global education by conservatives. The report, "Blowing the Whistle on Global Education," argued that the University of Denver's Center for Teaching and International Relations "damages American values and encourages 'moral relativism'" (qtd. in Caporoso and Mittelman 1988, 37). In an article describing the controversy, James A. Caporoso and James Mittelman (1988) describe the reaction to the report by noting "a wave of hysteria has swept through the Colorado schools. Conservatives in the community have accused teachers of promoting communism, atheism, and anti-American ideas" (37). The report goes on to say that "prodded by the religious right, parents reproached teachers for undermining patriotism and neglecting old-fashioned values. The school board made decisions that supported this charge, causing 21 of the district's 65 teachers to resign" (37). Noting a pattern of these attacks throughout the 1980s and 1990s, Tye argues that they reflect the strategies of "movement conservatives," who "reject the notion that there is any kind of equivalence in the world; the United States is superior in all ways" (20). This example, among many others that occurred during the culture wars of the 1980s and 1990s, illustrates a set of common rhetorical moves that define the anti-globalization arguments of the far-right.

Flashing forward to our current moment, we can see both similar arguments and new threats to the global turn in higher education. In some ways, the current threats to global education are familiar threats in that they follow the typical claims we see in the 1980s and 1990s—claims regarding global education threatening American values and promoting disaffection from the country. While these moves are similar, two key changes shape our current moment—the platforms available for circulating these messages and gaining wider audience for them, and a much more significant degree of political influence. The number and potency of far-right and alt-right media networks has created what many have termed an era of "fake news." In our current moment, arguments against global higher education and K-12 global education have splashed across the pages of *Breitbart News*, the popular conspiracy site *InfoWars*, and a range of other alt-right and hard right publications. Many of these far-right

media outlets have begun to allege global education as a nefarious conspiracy to indoctrinate American youth. These claims have led to numerous arguments against the Common Core State Standards as a globalist conspiracy designed to make students complicit subjects of international institutions. In higher education, which I will focus on here, global education has been associated through both verbal and visual arguments with communism and terrorism, often by promulgating the network metaphor—a network of liberal academics who have plotted to take over academic culture and turn students away from traditional American values.

False representations of global education are not a rhetorical end in themselves but part of a populist rhetoric that seeks to unsettle the educational hegemony of global higher education and replace it with nationalist alternatives.[7] While responding to the fake news accounts of global higher education is important, scholars in rhetoric and composition studies need to turn their attention to how populist political rhetoric on the right functions as a framework for conservative think-tanks and policy organizations to portray global education as a distracting, anti-intellectual, and anti-American enterprise. Such rhetoric, I argue, functions through a process of rhetorical simplification that constructs global education and its often-stated goal of producing global citizens around a set of political binaries—global citizen/American citizen, global learning/civic learning, radical/non-partisan, loyalty/disloyalty, activist/citizen, transparency/deception. By mobilizing these binaries against global higher education, both far-right groups like the John Birch Society and right-wing educational organizations like the National Association of Scholars seek to create an aura of disloyalty and anti-American sentiment around global education initiatives. What we are encountering in our current moment is not simply, I would argue, a fake or false framing of global education, but rather an outgrowth of populist rhetoric aimed at restoring American exceptionalism to the classroom.

Understanding populism as a discursive process of reducing complexity is particularly important for our discussion of global higher education, as it enables us to recognize how the complexities of global life and global citizenship can be juxtaposed against a simpler vision of national belonging and unity. Such processes of rhetorical simplification are central to populist rhetoric. Following the work of political scientist Cas Mudde, sociologist Bart Bonikowski (2016) provides a useful definition of contemporary populism in his "Three Lessons of Contemporary Populism in Europe and the United States": "at its core, populism is a form of politics predicated on

the juxtaposition of a corrupt elite with a morally virtuous people" (10). In addition to this juxtaposition, Bonikowski also points to "institutional suspicion" as another defining feature of populist politics (11). In order for populist rhetoric to gain traction, it needs to successfully reshape the ways a broad group of people in society conceives of their social identity and their trust in institutions. In her landmark article "Trust the People: Populism and the Two Faces of Democracy," Margaret Canovan (1999) argues that "Populists claim legitimacy on the grounds that they speak for the people: that is to say, they claim to represent the democratic sovereign, not a sectional interest such as an economic class" (4). Speaking for the people, in the sense Canovan defines it, requires a rhetoric of simplicity that resists more nuanced approaches to political problems. Populist rhetoric simplifies the complexities of politics by constituting its arguments in terms that construct a unified people from an intentionally simplified rhetorical and political situation. In fact, populism seizes upon simplification as a central political value. Canovan explains that populists combine "simple and direct" rhetorical descriptions of social and political problems with claims for simple solutions (6). In contrast to nuanced depictions of the complexities of political and social problems, populists argue that "complexity is a self-serving racket perpetuated by professional politicians, and that the solutions to the problems ordinary people care about are essentially simple" (6). Institutional suspicion and arguments against needless complexity are central to political populism, but they are also tailor-made for arguments against educational institutions and initiatives, which have been positioned by hard right and now alt-right discourse as disconnected from the beliefs, values, and needs of the American people.

As I will show in the analysis below of the National Association of Scholars' (2017) *Making Citizens: How American Universities Teach Civics*, a central tactic of populist rhetoric is rearticulating the central terms of an opponent's rhetoric in ways that position them against the values of a people, or a unified vision of a public. We can easily see how this process can be turned against arguments for global literacies by rhetorical educators. For example, National Council of Teachers of English's (NCTE) (2013) *Framework for 21st Century Curriculum and Assessment* argues that in order to be "active, successful participants in this 21st century global society" students need to be able to "*Build intentional cross-cultural connections and relationships with others so to pose and solve problems collaboratively and strengthen independent thought*" (2013, emphasis in original). Compare this use of the term "cross-cultural" with how the NAS defines

the term in their report's expansive glossary of progressive code-words used in civic and global education initiatives in US colleges and universities. The report defines "cross-cultural" as "progressive advocacy focused upon disaffecting Americans from Western civilization" (2017a, b, 347). By seeking to rearticulate cross-cultural in this way, the report works to provide a framework for interpretation for its conservative audiences, one in which references to the terms "global" and "cross-cultural" can be read as signifiers for processes of progressive indoctrination and disloyalty to American values. While this example is used simply to illustrate how these populist rhetorical practices might be placed into action, we will see that such rhetoric has already been mobilized against existing programs. Here, the populist rhetoric of organizations like the NAS works to reduce the complexity of the relationship between globalization and the demands it places on higher education by mobilizing a conservative rhetoric of institutional suspicion against higher education.

Ernesto Laclau's (2005) work on populist practices of signification can help unpack how this rhetoric achieves its effects. In *On Populist Reason,* Laclau has argued for turning attention away from ethical condemnations of populist reason and rhetoric and toward an understanding of populism as "a constant dimension of political action which necessarily arises (in different degrees) in all political discourses" (18). Laclau argues that populism is not connected to any particular position or party but instead a form of reasoning through rhetorical discourse. Populist rhetoric operates through the production of what he terms "empty signifiers" (60). For Laclau, the function of empty signifiers—terms like "freedom," "order," "justice"—is not to "express *any* positive content but … to function as the names of a fullness which is constitutively absent" (96). What is important, for Laclau, is not that the terms are absent, but how this absence is created and mobilized: "the empty character of the signifiers that give unity or coherence to a popular camp is not the result of any ideological or political underdevelopment; it simply expresses the fact that any populist unification takes place on a radically heterogeneous social terrain" (98). Empty signifiers, in this way, are not weak or vacuous discourse, but rather rhetorical strategies that reduce the heterogeneous elements and contexts of discourse in an attempt to present a unified populist identity. Joscha Wullweber (2015) provides a helpful description of the process: "This is the basic essence of an empty signifier: a signifier which becomes detached from its *particular meaning* in order to provide an empty space that can be filled with universal meanings" (82). Signifiers don't just

become "empty." They are emptied through agonistic discursive contests over the production of meaning. In the discussion below, we will see examples of these agonistic discursive contests over the signifiers' civic education and citizenship.

Perhaps the most recognizable exemplar of this approach is David Horowitz's *Discover the Networks*, which I mentioned briefly above. Developed shortly after 9/11, at time when the nightly news was filled with descriptions and images of networks of terror, Horowitz capitalized on this rhetoric to chart out networks of liberal academics alongside networks of those he claimed supported political terror. Despite claiming in the section "Navigating DTN" that the site is not a "snitch file," a term used against the site by Gail Schaettner, a former Lieutenant Governor of Colorado (2005), the site nevertheless contextualizes its critique of the left in terms of the rhetoric of the communist or terror cell. For example, "the problem of deceptive public presentation is common enough to all sides but applies with special force to the left, which has a long and well-documented history of dissembling about its agendas. In the past, for example, the Communist party operated through 'front' groups that concealed the radical agenda of those who controlled them" (2005). *Frontpage* magazine, a publication founded and edited by Horowitz, often features articles on higher education that advance the hidden network theory of left indoctrination in education.

An article reporting a panel discussion in 2015 concerning the prospects of conservatism for 2016 reveals the ongoing presence of the hidden network frame. In response to an audience member asking "how much energy people should be putting into going to campuses dominated by these really nutso professors who are indoctrinating the students" (*Frontpage* 2016), several panelists weighed in on the nefarious indoctrination practices of liberal professors. Richard Baehr, chief political correspondent for the online conservative journal *American Thinker*, responded, "I think a big part of the problem is not just demented faculty, but the administrative bloat, and much of that bloat comes from things like Title IX, dealing with international students, multicultural initiatives, diversity initiatives, and these are not people who are just there to serve students. They are advocacy agents" (2016). From this perspective, multiculturalism and global education advance anti-Americanism and anti-Western thought not only through curriculum but also through an administrative hierarchy put in place to secretly support this agenda. Such rhetoric has power, as the attempt to replace the University of Tennessee's Office of

Diversity in 2016 and with an office of "Intellectual Diversity" in 2017 illustrates.

For others on the right, however, global education and multiculturalism are not conspiracies, but an example of the ascendency of the political left in Academia from the post-WWII period through the student movements of the 1960s. Yale computer science professor and political commentator David Gelernter (2012) argues, for example, that left academics, whom he labels "PORGIs"—"post-religious, globalist, intellectuals" (26), constitute a "post-moral, post-patriotic, airhead army" (152). The ascendancy of the PORGIs, for Gerlernter, is described in the title of his book as the work of "imperial academia." His characterization of the effects of global education leaves little doubt about his position: "PORGI Airheads see America as a mere multicultural grab bag with no more unity or purpose than the 'gorgeous mosaic' inside a box of assorted cookies" (152). What is perhaps most fascinating here is the equation of left academics with a lack of true knowledge, which Gelernter uses to point to the degraded state of teaching and learning in American higher education.

Gelernter's book is, of course, written for a popular audience and seems to speak to an audience who holds similar political views and who would like to act to address the sad state of higher education. The arguments he advances, however, do begin to take on a more official form in the reports of organizations like the *National Association of Scholars* (NAS). The NAS describes itself as a non-partisan group of academics, but their publications following the 2016 presidential election illustrate significant attempts to attack global higher education and replace it with more traditional forms of American civic education. Peter Wood, an anthropologist and president of NAS wrote a piece shortly after the 2016 election, entitled "My Counsel to President-Elect Trump on American Higher Education." In this piece, published on NAS's website, Wood (2016) counsels the president-elect that

> if we put freedom first, we will have to reconsider some major aspects of contemporary higher education. Areas such as 'service-learning' which emphasize turning students into activists rather than giving them freedom to pursue their own educational paths, should be de-prioritized. Topics such as 'civic engagement' and 'global learning,' which operate essentially as devices to make students conform to progressive political views, should be examined skeptically. Federal money right now rewards such conformist ideology. That needs to be stopped. ("My Counsel")

Following Wood's message, the NAS issued its 500-page report *Making Citizens: How American Universities Teach Civics* in January of 2017. This report is significant because it casts global higher education initiatives key to rhetoric and composition and communication into NAS's critque of the "New Civics," or programs of civic education designed to indoctrinate students with liberal or progressive values. Like Gelernter, the report acknowledges that left thinking is so much a part of American colleges and universities that efforts to promote New Civics "won't be stopped on campuses" (35). The report records its hope that "support from political appointees by the incoming Trump administration might make the campaign to eradicate the New Civics easier" (35), but argues that the Department of Education "can't be trusted to help" and that "state and federal legislatures have to do the hard work of defunding the New Civics" (35). While the report identifies a large number of educational initiatives under the umbrella of the New Civics, it specifically targets global education and global citizenship.

The National Association of Scholars' *Making Citizens: How American Universities Teach Civics*, researched and prepared by Director of Communications, David Randall, mobilizes many of the same arguments against global education that have circulated since the 1980s and uses a range of rhetorical tactics that are employed by groups such as David Horowitz's *Discover the Networks*. At the same time, *Making Citizens* does introduce a new political signifier and target for this discourse: the New Civics. The term "New Civics" is used in a variety of ways throughout the contemporary literature on civic education and does not have its origins in the NAS report. In addition, like most scholarly terms, it has its close variants, such as "civic studies," and encompasses a wide range of projects, such as service-learning, action civics, and global civics.[8] Many civic studies programs distinguish the New Civics from more traditional forms of civic education by synthesizing the civic knowledge of government and democracy found in earlier visions of civic education with opportunities for civic engagement through service-learning. While work in the global turn in rhetoric and composition studies has not fully engaged the broader global higher education movement, the report clearly aligns work in rhetoric and composition studies with the New Civics and offers disturbing portrayals of global higher education that resonate with global research and pedagogy in our field.

The 500-page report makes claims to scholarly rigor through its analysis of educational policy documents and through its case studies of civic education programs at University of Colorado, Boulder; Colorado State University; University of Northern Colorado; and University of Wyoming.[9]

At the same time, however, the report describes itself as targeting a "general audience" (36) and the solutions that it offers are clearly targeted at public stakeholders and state and federal legislators. In addition, the title of the press release following the report makes the populist tone of the report exceptionally clear: "Radical Activists Hijack Civics Education, Study Finds" (2017b). This press release was circulated widely by NAS and news of the report was not only covered by educational sites such as *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Inside Higher Ed*, but also by *Breitbart* and *Frontpage Magazine.* News of the report was also picked up and circulated through right-wing student media, such as *The College Fix.* Seizing on the kairos of Trump's election, the NAS report suggests political and legal action against a range of contemporary civic programs labeled "New Civics."[10] Again, following populist logic and rhetoric, the problem is simple—civic education and global education inspire activism and disaffection from America—and the solution is equally simple: defund these programs at the federal and state level, or sue when this is not an option (35).

The report portrays "New Civics" through negative and politically suspect discussions of the national literature on service-learning, civic engagement, and global higher education, but it consistently deploys "civics" as an empty signifier that can be filled with specific political values of American patriotism and national interest. Patriotism, in this context, becomes the binary of "disaffection," which is aligned with New Civic pedagogy: "good civics instruction must also teach civic virtues. We teach civics to make students into competent, confident, and patriotic participants in our nation's public life. Civics courses and programs should not aim to sow disaffection or foster resentment" (286). In the preface to the report, Peter Wood (2017), suggests that the term New Civics functions less as a term that signifies a heterogeneous body of study or group of programs and more as a term that signifies "a form of 'anti-civics'"(11) that "tries to prepare students to become social and political activists who are grounded in broad antagonism towards America's founding principles and its republican ethos" (13). In contrast, the old civics, or traditional civics instruction "was supposed to provide basic information about the structure of government and the nature of society, and it was also supposed to form an active citizen capable of taking part in that government" (54). In the recommendations section of the report, the NAS recommends mandatory courses in the old civics be placed in the core curriculum of universities (290) and that remedial courses be developed for students who do

not satisfactorily complete a civic literacy entrance exam (289). This ambitious list of courses (six courses total in the core curriculum) would focus on the history of Western Europe, the United States, and the core political ideas and texts of American democracy (290–2). According to the report, the old civics teaches this knowledge in non-partisan ways, though the depiction of this non-partisan knowledge is interesting: "All of this can and should be taught without favoring any political party or cause, except the cause of fostering the integrity of our free and self-governing republic. Civics education should teach students how and why to love America, with both head and heart" (286). This statement points to more than just the nationalist tenor of NAS's rhetoric. Instead, the NAS constructs civic education out of a rhetoric of patriotism and a rhetoric of the intellectual tradition of American democracy that allows them to position global higher education as not only disloyal but intellectually vapid.

In making its case against global higher education, the NAS draws on the populist rhetorical playbook discussed above, positioning global higher education as a radical liberal conspiracy to promote disloyalty to America and as a threat to American exceptionalism. New Civics (including global education) is projected as a form of progressive activism designed to move students away from national feeling and toward feelings of antagonism against and shame for America. Further advancing the rhetoric of liberal conspiracy, the report provides a "Dictionary of Deception"—a compendium of "camouflage vocabulary" that the left uses to portray their programs (14). In this dictionary, we find global citizenship defined in the following way: "'Global Citizenship' is a way to combine civic engagement, study abroad, and disaffection from primary loyalty to and love of America. … A global citizen seeks to impose rule by an international bureaucratic elite upon the American government, and the beliefs of an international alliance of progressive non-governmental organizations upon the American people" (22). Two aspects of the rhetoric of this definition are important to note. The first is that it portrays global citizenship as a shared, unidimensional goal of global education rather than as a contested term. The second is that it carries forward the globalist conspiracy rhetoric that we find in the pages of *Breitbart* and other hard right news sites.

Framing global citizenship and global education in this way serves as a key rhetorical means for advancing NAS's arguments against other elements of the "New Civics," especially service-learning and community literacy. While service-learning and community literacy do play a role in

many global higher education programs, the rhetorical strategy of the report is to position global higher education as an outgrowth of service-learning that makes the end goals of liberal civic education clear. Two examples from the report illustrate this rhetorical move. The first argues that "the origins of 'global citizenship' practically lie in the impulse by service-learning advocates to spread their programs to suburban and rural campuses" because the faculty who developed these programs "found it easier to persuade students to go overseas for a semester than to drive 50 miles to an urban ghetto" (108) and supposedly needed a term that would enable them to extend their local programs. This is, of course, simply false. As we have seen, around 1% of US college and university students study abroad in any given year (NAFSA 2013a). However, advancing this claim allows NAS to draw service-learning and global education together in its rhetoric and portray both as fostering anti-American values.

For NAS, global higher education, which is emptied of its differences, conflicts, and heterogeneous discourses and recast as global citizenship education, offers a form of citizenship hostile to American values. The populist logic developed in this report is worth quoting in full:

> Global Citizenship actually directly subverts the purportedly civic goals of civic engagement, because it substitutes loyalty to the globe (defined around progressive policy goals) for loyalty to country. The campaign for Global Citizenship demonstrates most clearly that the transformation of *service-learning* into *civic engagement* results in an education that not only hollows out traditional civic literacy but also actively disaffects students from love of their country. Civic engagement is worse than service-learning precisely because it now encompasses and encourages such actively anti-civic movements. (94)

It is important to note here that no direct evidence is ever cited showing that global higher education, service-learning, or any of the other educational endeavors labeled "New Civics" actually inspires disloyalty to country or denotes lack of patriotism. Instead, the framework of liberal educators as part of an anti-American global elite is simply assumed and carried forward.

Another troubling rhetorical move also requires attention—the construction of a rhetorical relationship between New Civics and violence on campus. This is a particularly disturbing rhetorical move, one that can be put to use to devastating effect against civic educators who teach prin-

ciples of collective action and community engagement. In an editorial published on February 6, 2017, on the website *RealClearEducation*, Peter Wood (2017) develops this rhetorical framework in response to the February 1st protests at UC Berkeley over Milo Yiannopoulos's speaking engagement: "New Civics, your time has come. We see you taking your selfies in the light of the arson-lit fires in Berkeley. President Trump. I'm glad you noticed. What we do next is indeed the question. But clearly, the status quo in higher education cannot stand" ("Berkeley Ablaze"). I pause here to consider this rhetorical move because it underscores the importance of recognizing how work in rhetoric and composition studies and communication, work clearly linked to the New Civics in NAS's report, is subject to being aligned with acts of campus violence in order to advance a hard-right educational agenda. Curiously, despite their daily presence in the national news, Wood's article fails to mention the hate crimes carried out on college campuses following the election, nor the numerous, peaceful protestors at the Berkeley protests. The point, of course, is not to discuss campus violence or peaceful protest, but to further a rhetoric of suspicion against a range of programs that fall under the capacious category New Civics.

It is important that rhetorical educators recognize *Making Citizens* as a compendium of right populist arguments that can be mobilized against our work, especially work in service-learning, community engagement, and the global turn. The report's specific identification of Rhetoric and Composition programs and courses with the work of New Civics positions our field as part of a radical conspiracy to sow disloyalty to America among students. Unfortunately, the report also gives us a sense of how scholars in our field will be portrayed as intellectuals through its exceptionally disturbing depiction of Veronica House, Associate Faculty Director for Service-Learning and Outreach in the Program for Writing and Rhetoric at the University of Colorado, Boulder. Following the rhetorical tactics of David Horowitz's *Discover the Networks*, the report places professor House's faculty photo next to a bio that states, in bold, "her presence registers the New Civics' infiltration of introductory and remedial writing programs" (282). Such rhetoric lets us know that our work and our identities as faculty are not above being described in frightening terms. As rhetorical educators with commitments to community engagement, global education, and civic literacy, scholars and teachers working in rhetoric and composition studies and communication should not take these claims lightly, but rather formulate our own agonistic responses.

At the time of writing, it is difficult to tell how much traction these arguments will get. Given the expansive scope of global higher education, it would perhaps be surprising if we saw wide-scale defunding of global education programs. However, it is important to note, as I mentioned in the preface of this book, that anti-globalism has become a rallying cry for the far-right and has found a ready audience in the presidential administration of Donald J. Trump. In fact, while a small point, it is worth noting that Stephen Bannon, Trump's senior political advisor, not only oversaw the publication of articles in *Breitbart* denouncing global education as a conspiracy, but also produced the documentary film *The Conservatives* for the Young Americas Foundation, a conservative youth organization. This documentary focuses specifically on being a conservative student in a liberally dominated university and provides arguments for American exceptionalism and against global education. Thus, while arguments against global education have used similar rhetorical tactics since the 1980s, both the networks of circulation and the influence of those arguments have expanded.

Conclusion

This brief look at the development of several important discourses of global higher education efforts since the passing of the NDEA illustrates, I hope, the complex set of political and ideological commitments that are implicated in calls for global higher education. There are, of course, more ideological commitments than those outlined here, and no approach to global education is without particular political commitments and particular understandings of the political subject it seeks to produce. The significant emphasis on disciplinary knowledge and expertise we see in the NDEA and the IEA has, since the 1990s, been connected with both an increased emphasis on ethical education (such as Nussbaum's cosmopolitan education) and an increased emphasis on preparing students to compete in a global economy. Our current moment is perhaps best characterized not as a progression toward a more ethical global higher education, but as a site where ethical, disciplinary, nationalist, and economic discourses for global higher education can be interwoven into the fabric of global higher education initiatives. Each of these discourses brings with it its attendant vision of students as global citizens, visions that I will argue in the next chapter can be productively challenged by transnational rhetorical citizenship.

I have provided a rhetorical analysis of these discourses of global higher education here not only to illustrate a problem, but also to illustrate how rhetoric can provide educators and students with tools for critically questioning the seemingly neutral and perennially positive term "global citizen" and the interests it is used to support. Discourses of security, economy, cosmopolitan ethics, and disciplinarity are not simply problematic at the level of theory, but more importantly at the level of curriculum, as they possess the power to create antagonism and contradiction at the local level of curricular design. Global higher education is an argument for a particular type of civic curriculum, but curricula are dynamically constituted and sustained by local pedagogical practices rather than just by philosophical ideals. It is perhaps, then, less politically risky to advance a broad call for or launch a critique of a global curriculum than to participate in designing and implementing global curricula at specific institutions, since such participation places educators in situations where negotiation and compromise can create political contradictions. For example, it is quite easy at the curricular level for courses that present critical perspectives on inequality and global justice to be paired with courses in disciplines such as international finance in ways that undercut their critical content. The political risks that come with designing global curricula are particularly significant for rhetorical educators due to rhetorical education's marginal place in the undergraduate curriculum. Rhetorical educators not only face the task of critically positioning transnational rhetorical education within a context of economic, ethical, and disciplinary discourses that shape global curricula, but also the task of articulating alternative forms of citizenship, global engagement, and global pedagogy.

At the same time, the recent and vigorous attacks on global higher education make the rhetorical ground shaky for the transnational rhetorical education that I am arguing for here. Rhetorical educators in the global turn in higher education, as we have seen, find themselves on difficult terrain. Rhetoric is subordinated to twenty-first-century communication skills, obscured in discussions of cosmopolitan interaction, overlooked in the broader discourse of higher education, and viewed as suspect on the political right for its ties to action and engagement. Rhetoric can be seen by the political right as overtly politicized education, while at the same time being reduced to a set of communication skills that are abstracted from power by forms of global higher education rooted in liberal cosmopolitanism. What is important to note here is that specific visions of citizenship and civic engagement pro-

duce visions of communicative practices that must be engaged by rhetorical educators. I offer no easy way to assimilate these visions with those of our field here, but rather an argument that rhetorical education can provide students with tactics for engaging in the ceaseless conflict of citizenship and for positioning themselves ethically and politically toward the lives of others who are enmeshed in conditions of global exclusion and inequality.

Notes

1. For an authoritative historical overview of the development of international education in America, see Robert Sylvester's (2002, 2003, 2005) trilogy of articles "Mapping International Education: A Historical Survey 1893–1944," "Further Mapping of the Territory of International Education in the 20th Century (1944–1969)," and "Framing the Map of International Education (1969–1998)."
2. See Thomas Schlereth (1977) *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought: It's Form and Function in the Ideas of Franklin, Hume, and Voltaire* for a discussion of cosmopolitan anxieties.
3. See Margaret C. Jacob's *Strangers Nowhere in the World: The Rise of Cosmopolitanism in Early Modern Europe*, Pauline Kleingeld's *Kant and Cosmopolitanism: The Philosophical Ideal of World Citizenship*, Michael Scrivener's *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in the Age of Revolution and Reaction 1776–1832* for representative intellectual histories.
4. Noah W. Sobe (2012), in his chapter on "Cosmopolitan Education" in *The Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitan Studies*, argues that Nussbaum "has perhaps made the most significant contributions to translating the normative concepts of cosmopolitanism as 'allegiance to humanity' into concrete educational recommendations and revisions" (270).
5. For an excellent discussion of the NDEA and The International Education Act of 1966 and its influence on global higher education, see Vestal (1994) *International Education: Its History and Promise for Today.*
6. For an overview of "global citizenship education," see UNESCO's (2014) recent report "Global Citizenship Education: Preparing Learners for the Challenges of the 21st Century." Jessica Enoch's (2010) article "Composing a Rhetorical Education for the Twenty-First Century: TakingITGlobal as Pedagogical Heuristic" provides an excellent discussion of TakingITGlobal and rhetorical education.
7. See Hovland (2006) *Shared Futures* for a helpful contextualization of the development of global programs of liberal learning during the period of the culture wars. See also Donald Lazere's (2005) "The Contradictions of Cultural Conservatism in the Assault on American Colleges."

8. Major foundations like the Heritage Foundation and the John Birch Society have pursued their own anti-global education efforts. These efforts are also supported by several organizations of conservative academics, some of whom have connections to hard right news sources. *Dissident Prof*, which was founded by Mary Gabor is an example. Gabor, a PhD in English, has written multiple articles for *Breitbart* on global education in colleges and universities and in the Common Core. However, arguments against global education can also be found on conservative higher education sites that feature writing by more established academics, such as *Minding the Campus.*

9. The methodology of the report is interesting, especially given its citation of sources like "Rate My Professors" to substantiate one of its claims. A more thorough study of the report would need to be conducted to pass judgment on its scholarly rigor, however.

10. See the often-cited "Summer Institute of Civic Studies-Framing Statement" (2007) by Harry Boyte et al. For an example of New Civics initiatives and foundations, see the Spencer Foundation's New Civics Initiative, which is described on their website in "The New Civics Program Statement."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Council on Education. 2011. *Strength Through Global Leadership: US Higher Education in the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

——— 2003. "Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide." Prepared by Madeleine F. Green and Christa Olson. Washington, DC: American Council on Education Center for Institutional and International Initiatives. American Council on Education.

Anderson, Mary Jo. 2013. "Common Core Goes Global." *Crisis Magazine*, November 20, 2013. Accessed June 3, 2016. http://www.crisismagazine.com/2013/common-core-goes-global.

Appiah, Kwame. 2007. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton.

Bonikowski, Bart. 2016. "Three Lessons of Contemporary Populism in Europe and the United States." *Brown Journal of World Affairs*. 23, no. 1: 9–24.

Butler, Judith. 2009. *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* New York: Verso.

———. 2004. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. New York: Verso.

Canovan, Margaret. 1999. "Trust the People!: Populism and the Two Faces of Democracy." *Political Studies*. 47: 2–16.

Caporaso, James A., and James H. Mittelman. 1988. "The Assault on Global Education." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 21, no. 1: 36–44.

Cicero. 2000. *On Obligations*. Translated by P.G. Walsh. *Oxford World's Classics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Council on Foreign Relations. 2012. *U.S. Education Reform and National Security*. Independent Task Force Report No. 68. Joel I. Klein and Condoleezza Rice, Chairs. New York: Council on Foreign Relations.

Di Leo, Jeffrey R., Henry A. Giroux, Sophia A. McClennen, and Kenneth Saltman. 2014. "Introduction: Neoliberalism, Education, Terrorism." In *Neoliberalism, Education and Terrorism: Contemporary Dialogues*, edited by Jeffrey R. Di Leo, Henry A. Giroux, Sophia A. McClennen, and Kenneth Saltman, 1–35. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Discover the Networks. 2005. "Guide to Navigating DTN." *Discover the Networks. Org*. February 14, 2005. Accessed June 3, 2014. http://www.discoverthenetworks.org/viewSubCategory.asp?id=1872

Eisenhower, Dwight D. 1958. "Statement by the President Upon Signing the National Defense Education Act." *The American Presidency Project*. September 2, 1958. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=11211

Enoch, Jessica. 2010. "Composing a Rhetorical Education for the Twenty-First Century: TakingITGlobal as Pedagogical Heuristic." *Rhetoric Review*. 29, no. 2: 165–185.

Foucault, Michel. 1984. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." Translated by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 76–100. NY: Pantheon.

Frontpage Magazine. 2015. "2016: What Lies Ahead?" *Frontpage Magazine*. December 3, 2015. Accessed January 2, 2016. http://www.frontpagemag.com/fpm/260966/2016-what-lies-ahead-frontpagemagcom.

Gelernter, David. 2012. *America-Lite: How Imperial Academia Dismantled Our Culture (and Ushered in the Obamacrats)*. New York: Encounter Books.

Giroux, Henry A. 2014. "Militarizing Higher Education, Neoliberalism's Culture of Depravity and Democracy's Demise After 9/11." In *Neoliberalism, Education and Terrorism: Contemporary Dialogues*, edited by Jeffrey R. Di Leo, Henry A. Giroux, Sophia A. McClennen, and Kenneth Saltman, 36–66. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Harris, Joseph. 2012. *A Teaching Subject: Composition Since 1966*. 2nd Edition. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Hovland, Kevin. 2006. *Shared Futures: Global Learning and Liberal Education*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

———. 2014. "Global Learning: Defining, Designing, Demonstrating." *NAFSA*. 2014.

Hudzik, John K. 2011. "Comprehensive Internationalization: From Concept to Action." *NAFSA*. 2011. Accessed June 13, 2015. https://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA_Home/Resource_Library_Assets/Publications_Library/2011_Comprehen_Internationalization.pdf.

Jacob, Margaret C. 2006. *Strangers Nowhere in the World: The Rise of Cosmopolitanism in Early Modern Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, Lyndon B. 1966. *Special Message to the Congress Proposing International Education and Health Programs*. February 2, 1966. The American Presidency Project. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=27848.

Kleingeld, Pauline. 2013. *Kant and Cosmopolitanism: The Philosophical Ideal of World Citizenship*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kitzhaber, Albert. 1967. "The Government and English Teaching: A Retrospective View." *College Composition and Communication*. 18, no. 3: 135–141.

Laclau, Ernesto. 2005. *On Populist Reason*. New York: Verso.

Lazere, Donald. 2005. "The Contradictions of Cultural Conservatism in the Assault on American Colleges." *Cultural Studies*. 19, no. 4: 415–422.

Martin, Jerry L. and Anne D. Neal. 2002. "Defending Civilization: How Universities are Failing America and What Can Be Done About It." American Council of Trustees and Alumni. Washington, DC.

Musil, Caryn McTighe. 2006. "Assessing Global Learning: Matching Good Intentions With Good Practice." Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

NAFSA. 2013a. "Trends in U.S. Study Abroad." *NAFSA.org*. Accessed March 2, 2015. http://www.nafsa.org/Policy_and_Advocacy/Policy_Resources/Policy_Trends_and_Data/Trends_in_U_S__Study_Abroad/.

———. 2013b. "Study Abroad Participation by State: Academic Year 2012–13." *NAFSA.org*. Accessed March 2, 2015. http://www.nafsa.org/Policy_and_Advocacy/Policy_Resources/Policy_Trends_and_Data/Trends_in_U_S__Study_Abroad/.

———. 2003. "Securing America's Future: Global Education for a Global Age." *NAFSA.org*. Accessed March 2, 2015. http://www.nafsa.org/Policy_and_Advocacy/Policy_Resources/Policy_Reports/Securing_America_s_Future/.

National Association of Scholars. 2017a. *Making Citizens: How American Universities Teach Civics*. Prepared by David Randall. National Association of Scholars. Accessed January 30, 2017. https://www.nas.org/articles/making_citizens_how_american_universities_teach_civics2.

———. 2017b. "Radical Activists Hijack Civics Education, Study Finds." *NAS.org*. January 10, 2017. Accessed February 2, 2017. https://www.nas.org/articles/radical_activists_hijack_civics_education_study_finds_civics_turned_into_fr.

National Council of Teachers of English. 2013. "NCTE Framework for 21st Century Curriculum and Assessment." *National Council of Teachers of English*. February, 2013. Accessed January 2, 2016. http://www.ncte.org/governance/21stcenturyframework.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 1997a. *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 1997b. "Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism." *The Journal of Political Philosophy*. 5, no. 1: 1–25.

———. 2002. "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism." In *For Love of Country?*, edited by Joshua Cohen, 3–20. Boston: Beacon.

Nye, Joseph Jr. 2004. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.

Parker, Robert. 1979. "From Sputnik to Dartmouth: Trends in the Teaching of Composition." *English Journal*. 68, no. 6: 32–37.

Schlereth, Thomas. 1977. *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought: It's Form and Function in the Ideas of Franklin, Hume, and Voltaire*. South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Scrivener, Michael. 2007. *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in the Age of Revolution and Reaction, 1776–1832*. London: Routledge.

Skaggs, David. 2014. "Higher Education as a Matter of National Security: Can a Democracy Plan Ahead?" *Liberal Education*. 100, no. 1. (Winter). American Association of Colleges and Universities: https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/higher-education-matter-national-security-can-democracy-plan-ahead.

Sobe, Noah W. 2012. "Cosmopolitan Education." In *Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies*, edited by Gerard Delanty, 267–275. London: Routledge.

Sylvester, Robert F. 2002. "Mapping International Education: A Historical Survey 1893–1944." *Journal of Research in International Education*. 1, no. 1: 90–125.

———. 2003. "Further Mapping of the Territory of International Education in the 20th Century (1944–1969)." *Journal of Research in International Education*. 2, no. 2: 185–204.

——— 2005. "Framing the Map of International Education (1969–1998)." *Journal of Research in International Education*. 4, no. 2: 123–151.

———. 2007. "Historical Resources for Research in International Education (1851–1950)." In *The Sage Handbook of Research in International Education*, edited by Mary Hayden, Jack Levy, and Jeff Thompson, 11–24. London: Sage.

Tye, Kenneth A. 2009. "A History of the Global Education Movement in the United States." In *Visions in Global Education: The Globalization of Curriculum and Pedagogy in Teacher Education and Schools*, edited by Toni Fuss Kirkwood-Tucker, 3–24. New York: Peter Lang.

UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. 1993. "Vienna Declaration and Program of Action." *United Nations Human Rights: Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights*. Accessed June 3, 2017. http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/Vienna.aspx.

UNESCO. 2014. "Global Citizenship Education: Preparing Learners for the Challenges of the 21st Century." Paris: UNESCO. Accessed June 6th, 2014. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002277/227729E.pdf.

U.S. Department of Education. 2012. *Succeeding Globally Through International Education and Engagement: US Department of Education International Strategy*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Accessed June 12, 2014. https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/internationaled/international-strategy-2012-16.pdf.

Vestal, Theodore. 1994. *International Education: Its History and Promise for Today*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Wallace Brown, Garrett and David Held. 2012. "Editor's Introduction." *The Cosmopolitanism Reader*, edited by Garrett Wallace Brown and David Held, 1–14. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Wan, Amy J. 2014. *Producing Good Citizens: Literacy Training in Anxious Times*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press.

Wood, Peter. 2016. "My Counsel to President-elect Trump on American Higher Education." *NAS.org*. December 5, 2016. Accessed January 2, 2017. https://www.nas.org/articles/my_counsel_to_president_elect_trump_on_american_higher_education

———. 2017. "Berkeley Ablaze: The New Civics in Action." *Real Clear Education*. February 6, 2017. Accessed May 5, 2017. http://www.realcleareducation.com/articles/2017/02/06/berkeley_ablaze_the_new_civics_in_action_110114.html.

Wullweber, Joscha. 2015. "Global Politics and Empty Signifiers: The Political Construction of High Technology." *Critical Policy Studies*. 9, no. 1: 78–96.

Making Room for Rhetorical Education in the Global Curriculum

Unlike the cosmopolitanism that often characterizes global higher education, I do not argue here for an ethical or normative vision of global citizenship. Instead, I argue for the role of rhetorical education in empowering students to recognize how rhetorical practices constitute and reproduce forms of citizenship and open up opportunities for transnational forms of civic association and solidarity. While resisting critiques from the right that global education should be replaced with a nationalist alternative, I also argue that rhetorical education should also point to the risks that come with accepting global citizenship as a goal of higher education. Central to these risks is the risk of advancing understandings of global communication that paper over conditions of conflict, precarity, and locality that shape rhetorical practices.

In the first chapter of *A Rhetoric of Motives*, Kenneth Burke (1969) offers an anecdote that captures the problematic relationship between knowledge, power, and precarity, one that also illustrates the risks of global citizenship. Burke relates a fictional conversation between two characters named Prone and Preen. Preen writes to Prone about "a meeting where like-minded colleagues would be present and would be all proclaiming their praise of science" and Prone replies asking if "John Q. Militarist Imperialist" will be invited (26). Preen responds, "Doesn't

he get in everywhere, unless he is explicitly ruled out?" (26). Burke then cuts in:

> He does, thanks to the ways of identification, which are in accordance with the nature of property. And the rhetorician and moralist become one at this point where the attempt is made to reveal the undetected presence of such an identification. Thus, in the United States, after the second World War, the temptation of such an identification became particularly strong because so much scientific research had fallen under the direction of the military. To speak merely in praise of science, without explicitly dissociating oneself from its reactionary implications, is to identify oneself with the reactionary implications by default. Many reputable educators could thus, in this roundabout way, *function* as 'conspirators'. (26)

I point to this example because it captures the way in which identification, even with positive terms such as global citizenship can, in the context of global higher education, lead to a range of identifications and "reactionary implications" (26). As the last chapter hopefully revealed, global citizenship and global education can produce a range of identifications between cosmopolitan perspectives and economic exceptionalism, militarization, and cultural hegemony that rhetorical educators should question.

At the same time, however, it is important to note that the conflicts produced in global education are not simply the result of a poor understanding of global exigencies by faculty and students. Rather, as Burke says in introducing the anecdote of Preen and Prone, "however, 'pure' one's motives may be actually, the impurities of identification lurking about the edges of such situations introduce a typical Rhetorical wrangle of the sort that can never be settled once and for all, but belongs to the field of moral controversy where men properly seek to 'prove opposites'" (26). As the last chapter illustrated, a wide range of identifications are "lurking about the edges" of global higher education and global citizenship, some of which can play the role in advancing neoliberal discourses of economic and national security and by doing so potentially reproduce the conditions of precarious life for others around the world. I argue in this chapter that as rhetorical educators we face not only the task of critically responding to discourses of global higher education, but also the task of articulating critical alternatives. The transnational rhetorical citizenship I argue for here is rooted in the impure relationship between rhetoric and precarity

rather than in normative understandings of communication that seek to arrive at consensus and bracket out sources of cultural and political conflict.

In *The Available Means of Persuasion: Mapping a Theory and Pedagogy of Multimodal Public Rhetoric*, David Sheridan, Jim Ridolfo, and Anthony Michel (2012) note that "rhetorical education inscribes learner's subjectivities. …There is no neutral way to teach rhetoric that does not touch the subjectivities of those involved. The question is what kind of subjectivities do we want to encourage?" (118). To answer this question in a global context requires us to think critically about the ways that we define citizenship in our discussions of rhetorical pedagogy and how these definitions might, for better and for worse, be aligned with discourses and interests like those we encountered in the last chapter and their attendant visions of students as global citizens. To argue for the role of rhetorical education in global higher education asks us to define what we mean by rhetorical citizenship and the particular type of rhetorical subjectivity that we wish to cultivate. In arguing for "transnational rhetorical citizenship" rather than for the term "global citizenship," my intention is to critique the "ambience" (Wan 2014) of global citizenship, an ambience that contributes to its ability to be aligned with a variety of political intentions and discourses. In addition to providing an alternative to ambient visions of global citizenship, transnational rhetorical citizenship provides us with tools of inquiry, performance, and ethics that can enable us to critically confront the discursive and material conditions that configure our and others' citizenship or their exclusion from normative citizenship.

Rhetorical Citizenship and the Priority of Pedagogy

While rhetoric has a long pedagogical tradition, there are few models to draw upon for tracing out a pedagogy of transnational rhetorical citizenship. A handful of scholars have argued for rhetorical visions of critical cosmopolitanism (Darsey 2011; Jarratt 2011; Kuehl 2014), but most work here, like work in rhetorical citizenship, focuses more specifically on theorizing the basis for these forms of citizenship than transmitting them through teaching. If we turn to political philosophy, we can also find models of global communication and engagement, but here also we find the complete absence of a pedagogical tradition. What is striking in contemporary philosophical cosmopolitanism, as in traditions of Stoic and Kantian cosmopolitanism, is that while communication is crucial to the cosmopoli-

tan project, there is no discussion of how cosmopolitans or transnationals cultivate their capabilities. For political philosophers in the Deliberative Democracy tradition, for example, global citizenship is rooted not as much in the recognition of universal humanity and reason as in procedural processes of deliberation that can transcend cultural borders and lead to consensus. John Rawls's (2001) *The Laws of Peoples*, for example, outlines an understanding of ethical and political deliberation across cultural boundaries in search of an overlapping basis for consensus. Likewise, Jürgen Habermas (1998), in *Between Facts and Norms* (1998) and *The Post-National Constellation* (2001) argues that "practical reason no longer resides in universal human rights, or in the ethical substance of a specific community, but in the rules of discourse and forms of argumentation that borrow their normative content from the validity basis of action oriented to reaching understanding" (1998, 297). Habermas argues for deliberative fairness as a means of shaping a "common political culture" through which various cultural perspectives can overlap and seek consensus (1998, 514). The work of Rawls and Habermas is often used to advance understandings of global governance (Held 2010) that entail political structures for political debate and participation. While this work has been critiqued on the grounds that it ignores the conditions of real politics (Mouffe 2005; Geuss 2008), I would argue that it also seeks to solve rhetorical problems with philosophical tools, and in doing so obscures the importance of the pedagogical tradition of rhetoric.

Of course, rhetorical education takes place organically in many places that do not resemble classrooms, as a wide range of work on literacy (Brandt 1998; Gere 1994), and social movements (Hauser and Whalen 1997; Morris 2000; Malesh and Stevens 2009; Tilly 2008) teaches us. At the same time, however, while rhetorical education appears organically within a range of communities and political collectives, there are limits to the organic metaphor's scope. I would suggest that one of these limits is reflected in the institutional dimensions of the modern university rather than in the broader context of global politics and ethics. This institutional dimension is, of course, the preference of the theoretical over the pedagogical.

Within the academic world of political and critical theory, rhetoric is evoked as both a condition for global politics and ethics and as a grounded or "grounding" art that locates the global within local contexts. As I will illustrate in this chapter, political and critical theory often lean heavily on understandings of communication and rhetoric as central

to their understandings of global engagement. While their theoretical programs are often significantly different, they all share a sustained lack of interest in the pedagogical spaces where rhetorical agency and capabilities might be fostered. Rhetoric appears, in contrast, as a tool to be used, rather than as a capacity cultivated through forms of rhetorical education that take place inside and outside of classroom walls.

The absence of rhetorical education in these theoretical discussions is predicable given the disciplinary neglect of pedagogy from scholarly publishing in these disciplines. But for those of us who claim rhetoric as our primary affiliation, the absence of pedagogy should strike us as exceptionally odd. As Jeffrey Walker (2011) has argued in *The Genuine Teachers of the Art: Rhetorical Education in Antiquity*, defining rhetoric as

> an 'art' concerned with critical analysis and theory, seems more useful as the basis for a credible academic enterprise. Indeed, it is hard to imagine any teaching of rhetorical skill divorced from the critical/theoretical enterprise that would not be vapid. But without the teaching enterprise … the critical/theoretical enterprise has little point. What is the critical/theoretical study of persuasive practices *for*, if not the production of a *rhêtôr*? Without that point of application… rhetoric ceases to be a distinct disciplinary practice and becomes simply a kind of counterpart of literary studies, a critical hermeneutic or philosophical theory or 'rhetoricality,' detached from the training of actual speakers or writers. (2)

Walker's argument raises two important points to explore in the context of global citizenship. The first is in regards to theoretical arguments for global citizenship or cosmopolitanism that invoke rhetoric and communication. Without a robust understanding of rhetorical education, it is difficult to understand how the political discourse and rhetoric called for can take place beyond the context of the academy or among a few public intellectuals. For all of the assumptions about pedagogy failing to constitute an authentic field of academic inquiry, rhetorical pedagogy must take place for these types of critical discourses to take a foothold.

Second, because pedagogy has tended to be diminished in the modern university as an intellectual field, especially pedagogy in rhetoric and communication, we find rhetorical pedagogy almost entirely missing from the literature on global higher education. For all of the contemporary talk about rhetoric and "communicative skills," institutional incentives, disciplinary assumptions about pedagogy, and institutional assumptions about the status of research disciplines continue to diminish the role of pedagogy

and make it difficult for pedagogical arts such as rhetoric to gain a foothold. This is one potential reason that the programmatic and institutional literature on global higher education underlines the need for rhetorical capacities without a corresponding understanding of rhetorical education.

While rhetoric has been heavily theorized outside of our disciplines, especially in literary studies, political philosophy, and media studies, rhetorical education has often been completely ignored by these disciplines. A few brief examples can help illustrate this point. In critical theory, we might look at the organizational power and rhetorical power that Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2000) align with the multitude in *Empire* and ask "what are the processes of rhetorical education necessary to coordinate, sustain, and animate practices of critical resistance in an age of biopower?" Looking at sociological theories of cosmopolitanism, such as the work of Ulrich Beck (1999) in *World Risk Society*, we might ask, "what types of rhetorical education might foster the ability of average citizens to break through the exclusionary discourses of technocracy and politically engage risk as a domain of public discourse?" Looking at Spivak's (2012) recent work on "aesthetic education" and globalization, we might ask "how might rhetorical education and aesthetic education come together to resist structures of colonial reason and foster critical practices of aesthetic recognition and political response?" We might turn to Walter Mignolo's (2000, 2012) argument for a critical cosmopolitanism constructed through practices of critical "border thinking" (2000, 736) at the borders of nations and communities and ask, "what types of rhetorical thinking would promote recognition of the permeability of political borders and forms of rhetorical invention that enact forms of critical linking and solidarity?"[1] While each of these questions would require more space to pursue than I have here, it is enough here to say that though these questions are worth considering the disciplinary conditions of the contemporary research university don't allow for them to be considered in many of the disciplines that take part in the project of critical, political, or social theory. Rhetorical scholarship is certainly interdisciplinary, but traditional understandings of pedagogy mean that rhetorical education is often not.

Even when we point to manifestations of rhetorical practice, we often do so outside of discussions of learning and pedagogy. To say that this is not to oppose the classroom to public discourse, but to question what we might learn if we brought them together more fully. What might we learn if we took the pedagogical work that happens in public spaces and social

movements and brought it into not only our classrooms but our universities as a joint site of pedagogical and theoretical inquiry? A broad range of scholars in rhetoric and composition and communication have asked this question and designed classes that integrate the rhetorical education of collectives and movements with classroom practices of rhetorical education.[2] We have also seen recent calls for a renewed rhetorical education, such as we see in the 2012 "Mt. Oread Manifesto on Rhetorical Education." I would like to expand this discussion by adding an additional question: in what ways might bringing theoretical discussions of rhetoric, rhetorical practices of global engagement, and the pedagogical tradition of rhetoric together enable rhetorical educators to challenge normative frameworks of global communication and citizenship within the normative context of higher education? In this sense, I am arguing that it is neither sufficient to simply develop a critical theory of rhetoric nor to bring "real-world" rhetorical practices into our classrooms as exemplars of global communication and rhetoric without acknowledging that our teaching takes place within a normative space of learning shaped by a range of global discourses and ideologies. The question is not "how can the rhetorical education of our classrooms reflect or embody real-world, critical rhetorical engagements," but rather "how might our rhetorical pedagogies trouble normative frameworks of learning and their attendant understandings of citizenship?"

This question is particularly important during a time when we have witnessed a significant global turn in higher education. As we have seen, global higher education initiatives and programs often project lists of communicative skills that are framed by normative visions of students as global actors or global citizens. Students, as global citizens, draw on knowledge of other languages and technological skills to gain experience communicating across a range of global communication platforms and networks. Such skills, as the logic goes, enable these students to take part in a globalizing work force and forge an identity as a global citizen. While the depictions of technology and global citizenship we have seen are relatively recent, they reflect the traditional contours of cosmopolitan thought—technology creates global exigences and provides a means of delineating the productive and technological skills necessary to respond to the exigence. The global reach of these technologies brings us into contact with distant others and also provides a means for engaging in reciprocal acts of ethical communication and collaboration. In a historical sense, this same argument has existed alongside a variety of earlier technologies, including technologies of printing. I raise this point not to insist that claims about

technology and normativity are a normal part of globalization, but rather to suggest that our own articulations of global citizenship—raised by organizations like NCTE—often take place within a matrix of ideological and political frames that can foster or thwart our pedagogies.

As I have argued, rhetorical educators in the global university find themselves occupying a difficult terrain. We see rhetoric used by scholars in other disciplines as part of their theoretical arguments for concrete political practices of critique and performative resistance, but without a pedagogical dimension. At the same time, we also see a broad pedagogical movement for global education that reflects an impoverished understanding of rhetoric by presenting it as global communication skills that are undertheorized, abstracted from contexts of power, and rooted in a discourse of technological opportunity rather than to practices of rhetorical education. We also face a problem of scale. Here, the role of service-learning and transnational, collaborative pedagogical initiatives are also important to consider. Service-learning courses can play an important role in making the abstract descriptions of global communication skills we see in the global higher education literature more concrete.[3] In addition, transnational collaborations like those pursued by Alyssa O'Brien (2011), who runs Stanford University's *Cross-Cultural Rhetoric Project*, can place students in contexts where they learn to communicate effectively across cultural borders.[4] These projects can go a long way toward providing the students who take part in them with opportunities to learn concrete rhetorical practices for transnational engagement, but such programs are often much smaller in scale than large-scale efforts towards internationalizing the curriculum.

We clearly need more programs and initiatives like the Stanford program, but I want to suggest that we also need to recognize that, on many other campuses, such initiatives reach a relatively small number of students. In addition, while service-learning has become a common civic initiative across many US two- and four-year colleges and universities, the proportion of service-learning courses to courses in the traditional classroom also limits the scope of these initiatives. Efforts to internationalize the curriculum are often pitched at a much higher scale, so rhetorical educators should pursue and map out forms of transnational rhetorical education that take place within traditional classrooms as well as within community and civic partnerships. At the same time, as David Coogan (2006) has persuasively argued, service-learning courses need to be complemented by materialist rhetorical pedagogies that enable students to analyze and critically understand "how the materiality of discourse inter-

sects with human agency at unique, historical moments and produces changes that communities can really see" (669). Such a pedagogy requires not only placing students in "authentic" sites of rhetorical performance, but also providing them with rhetorical tools for "discovering the arguments that already exist in the communities we wish to serve" (689). Both within the context of service-learning and outside of service-learning, we need robust pedagogies of rhetorical analysis that enable students to critically analyze transnational rhetorics and that lead students toward practices of critical performance and political and ethical positioning.

I raise these points because authenticity and service can be mobilized in support of a variety of institutional ends, some ideological, some political, and some material. Programs of community engagement and service-learning can become outward manifestations of global higher education programs and be used for institutional capital and prestige at a moment when "going global" is a distinguishing trait of the contemporary university. My argument here is not that service-learning and other initiatives are not important; on the contrary, my argument is that they can be coopted by rhetorics of authenticity, or authentic civic engagement, that overshadow an entire range of rhetorical capacities necessary for students to critically understand and productively engage in transnational rhetoric. Practices of rhetorical inquiry, like those I trace out here, can point students toward an understanding of how their rhetorical and ethical engagement within communities are shaped by a discursive context or "scene of address" (Murray 2007, 420) that precedes their arrival and plays a constraining role on their rhetorical practices, while also opening up possibilities for resisting these constraints.

Pedagogies of global contact, service-learning and community engagement all work toward this critical goal. However, it is also important that we recognize the authenticity of students' own positions as the subjects of global higher education just as much as we argue for the necessity of engaging them in authentic spaces and practices of transnational rhetoric. In this sense, I am calling for seizing upon the pedagogical resources of rhetorical education in order to promote students' rhetorical agency and participation in authentic sites of transnational engagement, while also arguing that rhetorical education should provide students with critical processes of inquiry that enable them to recognize and respond to their own positionality within transnational discourses. This means recognizing not only the rhetorical knowledge and practices that we want to endow our students with, but also the experiences, knowledge, and ethical/political perspectives our students bring to sites of global education.[5]

Rhetorical Citizenship and Pedagogy

Rhetorical citizenship, largely theorized in work in communication, provides a useful framework, but also risks ignoring pedagogy. In "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship," Robert Asen (2004) seeks to move toward an understanding of citizenship as "a *mode of public engagement*": "In drawing attention to citizenship as a process, a discourse theory recognizes the fluid, multimodal, and quotidian enactments of citizenship in a multiple public sphere" (191). Asen's discourse theory recognizes how specific practices can constitute forms of civic belonging that transcend legal and rights-based definitions of citizenship. For Asen, rhetorical citizenship can reorient us to everyday communicative acts of citizenship that form and sustain civic communities, as well as to the ways in which citizenship can be exercised by those who are not recognized as citizens (Asen 204). In the introduction to their collection *Contemporary Rhetorical Citizenship*, Christian Kock and Lisa Villadsen (2014) draw on Asen's understanding of citizenship as a public modality to argue for a theoretical and pedagogical project of rhetorical citizenship. But here pedagogy is only referenced, and never fully explored.

While research on rhetorical citizenship reorients us to an understanding of citizenship as a rhetorical process, it often makes only passing mention of the role of pedagogy in fostering this process.[6] This omission is important because it seems to tacitly imply that access to participation in public discourse can, in the absence of rhetorical education (whether inside or outside of the classroom), lead to public persuasion and agency. At the same time, calls for the renewal of rhetorical education have been plentiful over the past two decades and have spanned both communication and research in rhetoric and composition studies (Petraglia and Bahri 2003; Glenn et al. 2004; Hauser 2004; Keith and Mountford 2014). Interestingly, these calls are often framed by a sense of loss and a call for renewal. In the introduction to their collection *The Realms of Rhetoric: The Prospects for Rhetoric Education* (2003), Deepika Bahri and Joseph Petraglia call for a revival for rhetorical education, but admit that, "as an important and substantial course of undergraduate study, rhetoric is largely unavailable on our campuses" (7). These calls are often framed around a sense that the study of rhetoric has been diminished in the university and turned, as Robert Connors (1991) once put it, into a "permanent underclass—'composition teachers': oppressed, ill-used, and secretly despised" (56). Calls for rhetorical education from communication have often

pointed to the overemphasis of communication scholarship on analysis of public discourse and to how rhetorical education is underemphasized. Gerard Hauser (2004) raises the stakes of neglecting rhetorical education in his article, "Teaching Rhetoric, Or Why Rhetoric Isn't Just Another Kind of Philosophy or Literary Criticism": "When Athenian commitments to *paideia* are subordinated or even cleansed from rhetoric, its centrality to society's ongoing negotiation over how we shall act and interact—to politics—is either lost or ignored. This is the place of rhetoric in education that must be recovered" (41). Important recent calls for rhetorical education, such as the "Mt Oread Manifesto on Rhetorical Education" seek to bring scholars and educators in communication and rhetoric and composition studies together to advance a renewed rhetorical education in the contemporary university. What makes this recovery project so challenging, however, is it now involves scholars who share a common tie to rhetorical education but who inhabit different academic fields.

It is also important to recognize the marginalized, agonistic positioning of rhetoric and composition in the context of global higher education, especially in the context of advancing arguments for transnational rhetorical education across disciplinary lines. In his essay on rhetorical education's "Identity Crisis," Petraglia (2003) suggests that this tension creates a particularly difficult situation for rhetorical education: "The challenge for rhetoric is thus maintaining a disciplinary center, even as it is taught interdisciplinarily" (170). To do this, Petraglia argues that not only must rhetorical education be rooted to rhetorical theory, but that it is "incumbent on rhetoric education to distinguish itself from other 'rhetoricizing' moves in the academy" (169). Following this argument, unpacking transnational rhetorical education requires us to articulate rhetorical education in ways that both point to our field as an academic discipline and our art as a transdisciplinary art.[7] This is no easy task. Unlike our colleagues who often have the luxury of contributing to global higher education initiatives from positions of disciplinary recognition, rhetorical educators cannot assume an immediate recognition of their disciplinary contributions.

The disciplinary marginalization or absence of courses in rhetoric and composition in global higher education programs also requires untangling the relationship between composition and rhetorical education. Deepika Bahri and Joseph Petraglia (2003) suggest that many "discontents in rhetoric studies" voice concerns that placing rhetoric in composition courses places might make it "occupy the lowest rung on the academic hierarchy" and that such courses might reduce rhetorical pedagogy to "its

shallow and formulaic form" (3). They argue, however, that despite these criticisms "it is clear that any attempt to develop a course of study in rhetoric must engage composition and public speaking space that have, after all, proven their tenacity" (3). In composition, this concern over ownership, can be observed in Douglas Hesse's (2005) CCCC Chair Address, "Who Owns Writing?" Hesse argues that while it is difficult for any one group to claim ownership of writing, those who teach writing should claim to be "stewards" of writing (355). Hesse argues that part of recognizing our stewardship role stems from the recognition of the point that "all sorts of interests would organize writing" and that the motives behind these interests are "always cropped and framed by worldviews as basic as what constitutes the good society and what makes the good life" (354). For Hesse, the research expertise and experience of writing teachers and writing researchers make those in our field the likely stewards of writing in our culture. This includes writing in the civic sphere as well as in the classroom. Hesse voices concern that composition courses that bring in public discourse often "have students write about the civic sphere, not in it" (350) despite the fact that "writing in the civic sphere is now manifest as a self-sponsored activity to a greater extent than it ever has been" (353). While rhetoric is taught across a range of different courses and departments, Hesse's statement challenges rhetorical educators to think about who gets to speak on behalf of rhetorical education and what departments or programs get to claim stewardship of rhetoric and rhetorical education.

Yet, while research on rhetorical citizenship from communication and research in composition studies are distinct intellectual traditions, they share important areas of overlap that can contribute to our understanding of rhetorical citizenship and agency. Public writing scholarship from composition studies is particularly important in terms of rhetorical citizenship because it offers a more critical understanding of the effects of rhetorical pedagogy on the real-world public agency of students. In particular, public writing pedagogy addresses a key aspect of rhetorical citizenship that is often ignored, the types of rhetorical education that lead to effective forms of public participation. While "The Mt. Oread Manifesto on Rhetorical Education" ultimately recommends replacing composition courses with "an integrated curriculum in rhetorical education" (2014, 3) composition scholarship in public writing has already played an important role in bringing public rhetoric and participation to a variety of writing classrooms, including first-year composition classrooms.

The "public turn" (Mathieu 2005, xv) in composition studies has located civic writing practices not only in the expansion of digital networks but also within the networks that shape community organizations, civic associations, and local advocacy groups (Mathieu 2005; Parks 2009; Welch 2008; Cushman 1998). Consequently, a significant strand of research from the mid-1990s to now has been devoted to critically analyzing the relationship between the classroom and public space (Eberly 2000; Wells 1996; Ervin 1997; Rice 2012; Weisser 2002; Gogan 2014; Rivers and Weber 2011). If we survey the literature on public writing pedagogy, we also find significant discussion of authenticity in public writing. We find arguments for teaching a range of "authentic" public genres—zines and counter-public genres (Farmer 2013), activist multimodal texts (Sheridan et al. 2012), street newspapers (Mathieu 2005), community published texts (Parks 2009), public service announcements (Selfe and Selfe 2008), and genres found in service-learning or community literacy spaces (Coogan 2006; Heilker 1997; Long 2008). Each of these genres gains its authenticity through its "publicness"—it's capacity for circulation and efficacy in a realm of public discourse outside of the classroom. In addition, work in composition on multimodality and public rhetoric (Alexander 2006; Alexander and Rhodes 2014; Sheridan et al. 2012; Dubisar and Palmieri 2010) clearly speaks to work on youth engagement, digital media, and political participation. In this way, the focus of public writing scholarship on authentic contexts and genres of public writing not only addresses Hesse's call for more authentic writing assignments and more meaningful forms of rhetorical and political participation, but can also speak to work across other disciplines.

While research in communication has usefully expanded our understanding of rhetorical citizenship as a process, public writing research and pedagogy captures rhetorical citizenship as an educational process more fully by exploring the potential possibilities and barriers students encounter as they enact rhetorical citizenship.[8] The relationship between access and participation is important because it plays a role in configuring both students' rhetorical practices and civic identities. As Amy Wan (2014) has argued, particular assumptions about citizenship and civic participation can overlook differences in cultural and national citizenship and the role they play in constraining students' agency. Wan gives the example of a student "without legal residency or who feels like he or she has tenuous citizenship status" to argue that "a class that calls for the promotion and cultivation of citizenship might mean that the student already has an

impossible task to accomplish" or "even put a student in jeopardy by asking him or her to enter a public arena that they might prefer to avoid" (153). Wan's example has significant implications for the type of transnational rhetorical education and transnational rhetorical citizenship I am arguing for. We need, in this case, a more critical understanding of the relationship between rhetorical citizenship and legal citizenship, as well as a rhetorical pedagogy that can provide strategies and tactics of civic engagement that are not rooted to one particular legal or cultural form of citizenship.

I bring this research in communication and composition studies together in order to argue that approaches to rhetorical citizenship and public writing can be not only mutually beneficial but can also be critically aligned in ways that enable rhetorical educators to claim space in the global curriculum. At this time, in the literature and programs of global higher education, the little of rhetoric that is present, which appears under the guise of "global communication skills," is owned largely by disciplines outside of communication and composition and rhetoric and is often organized by interests that have different conceptions of rhetoric. To claim stewardship of transnational rhetorical education requires us to conceive of the interdisciplinary contributions of rhetoric as a civic art while arguing for the necessity of what we teach. We cannot claim stewardship by simply importing global contexts into our curriculum, and we cannot claim stewardship by pointing to the rhetorical practices that take place outside of our classrooms and arguing that they reflect our theories. Claiming stewardship of rhetoric in the context of global education requires us to simultaneously draw transnational rhetorical practices outside of our classroom into our classroom, dynamically synthesize them with our rhetorical theories, and develop transnational rhetorical curricula that can foster our students' rhetorical agency in global contexts. In other words, we have to develop transnational rhetorical curricula that have impact and use them to argue for the advantage of rhetorical education in equipping students for global engagement.

Yet, looking closely at the "Mt. Oread Manifesto," we see some of the critical questions that we raised when we looked at programs and proposals of global higher education in the last chapter. As we analyze this vision of rhetorical citizenship, we can see specific understandings of student identity and agency in public space. Particularly interesting is the idea of shared criteria for different rhetorical capacities such as "authentic" assignments and a "strong ethical understanding" (4). As in many statements of

outcomes and intentions, questions such as "which ethical understanding?" and "what assignments are authentic" are more assumed than answered. In a sense, this is a consequence of the conventions of the genre, which is not only brief but assumes that these distinctions will be worked out elsewhere. But the problem that we face as rhetorical educators is that these finer details, especially between fields, are often not worked out. Calls for renewed rhetorical education like the "Mt. Oread Manifesto" are necessary, vital, but they often call for a level of interdisciplinary response that is overwhelming. The key example of this in the manifesto is its insistence that this type of rhetorical education would require replacing composition courses and introductory communication courses with "an integrated curriculum in rhetorical education … in order to develop citizen participants, not simply future employees or more literate students" (2014, 3). For many in composition studies, while this proposal could bring about a more unified curriculum, it either neglects a large body of scholarship on public writing or encourages a distinction between writing and rhetoric in the context of a curriculum change that *could* occur but is perhaps less likely to occur across many campuses.

At the same time, in rhetoric and composition studies, important bodies of work have been devoted to analyzing transnational rhetoric (Dingo 2012; Hesford 2011), understanding cosmopolitanism or global citizenship in the context of "translingual practices" and transcultural practices (Canagarajah 2013; Guerra 2004), and the impact of postcolonial studies on composition (Lunsford and Ouzgane 2004). This work is essential because it provides a much-needed focus on students, their identities, experiences, languages, and agency. This work provides significant resources for forging a transnational rhetorical pedagogy. In fact, the marginal position of composition in the university as a discipline make the stakes of arguing for transnational rhetorical education quite high. It is quite easy, given the expansive task of defining a global curriculum at the institutional level, for composition courses and research in composition's global turn to be overlooked by global higher education initiatives because composition is associated with basic skills courses. The important, though somewhat unsettling, conclusion I am drawing here is that rhetorical educators must articulate the processes, knowledge, and tactics of transnational rhetorical education against as well as with the wide range of interpretive and communicative practices that are outlined in global higher education initiatives. Rhetorical educators need to look for and exploit strategic points of entry, points where our disciplines can contribute the most, and develop compelling arguments for

our contributions. This requires the engagement of transnational rhetorical educators at the local level of global curriculum development, but also scholarly engagement with research on students and global engagement and with global higher education initiatives.

Envisioning and Contesting the Ideal Orator of Global Higher Education

Looking for strategic points of entry into global higher education initiatives requires rhetorical educators to articulate the rhetorical capacities students will need for transnational engagement, while also articulating more critical alternatives for transnational citizenship. To do this, however, rhetorical educators need to make space for more robust opportunities for rhetorical education both in the global higher education movement and in the university at large. We do this at a time when efforts toward rhetorical education, such as those in public writing classrooms or basic courses in communication, often struggle for disciplinary recognition. The authors of the recent "Mt. Oread Manifesto on Rhetorical Education" argue that the diminishment of rhetorical education has been brought on by this split between English and Communication, and argue for rhetoricians in communication and rhetoric and composition to come together to "work toward an integrated vision of rhetorical education," noting that by failing to do so "we deny our students, as well as society, an essential resource for political and social progress" (2). The manifesto seeks to stake out the outcomes of rhetorical education while also calling for a sustained effort to develop rhetorical education as a more recognized field of study. Like scholarship on youth and civic engagement and discussions of twenty-first-century literacies (NCTE 2013; Yancey 2009; New London 1996; Selfe 2007) the manifesto draws on the expansion of opportunities for public writing through digital communication as an exigency for rethinking rhetorical education: "Thanks to technology and the expansion of modes and modalities of public communication, the civic dimension of the rhetorical tradition is plainly crucial to producing students with the communicative capabilities needed in this world" (2). What is striking about the "Mt. Oread Manifesto," however, is the intensive emphasis it places on civic participation as the outcome of rhetorical education and how it contrasts this emphasis to academic and vocational literacy.

For the authors of the manifesto, the goal of rhetorical education is to "develop citizen participants" (3), and this goal requires participatory pedagogies that ensure that the "assessment of speaking and writing is nei-

ther merely skills-oriented nor limited to often simplistic national standards of 'civics education,' but grounded in a holistic, contextualized approach to public meaning-making" (4). Looking at the vision of rhetorical participation outlined in the manifesto, we see a vision of rhetorical citizenship, one that can be understood not only as rights and protections granted by the state, but also as enacted through different rhetorical capabilities. We can see this most clearly in the manifesto's description of the world it feels rhetorical education could bring into being. The manifesto "seeks a world in which":

> average citizens can perform rhetorical analyses of the discourse around them and ask productive questions of politicians, employers, business and community leaders, and each other, as fellow citizens; all stakeholders in public life feel motivated and competent enough in their communication skills to advance an idea in the public sphere and engage in meaningful deliberation about ideas; students are exposed to authentic projects and audiences that connect them to the public sphere, rather than artificial, textbook-driven, assignments; citizens recognize the limits and possibilities of a given mode of communication for their purpose and the needs of the audience and situation; business and political professionals trained in rhetoric are insightful, creative problem-solvers who understand why compromise is vital to a republic and how collaboration grounded in a strong ethical understanding serves the public good. (3–4)

The world described by the manifesto is thus one where rhetorical education inculcates civic agency in students who are able to exercise forms of rhetorical citizenship that enact change. Rhetorical education provides students with authentic experiences in public participation that prepares them for lives of civic participation in the public sphere that works toward the public good.

When we compare this rich tradition to the decontextualized depictions of communication and rhetorical practice we see in the literature of global higher education, we cannot help but feel a sense of loss. While the turn in global higher education toward "global capacities," or what globally prepared undergraduates can "do" (Hovland 2014) is promising, the vision of students as global communicators is unfortunately overly simplistic. An entire range of rhetorical capacities are blackboxed in vague descriptions of "global communication skills." These skills are articulated in many different documents from global higher education organizations and across a range of different programs, but I will turn here to their articulation in the AAC&U and NAFSA's 2014 joint report "Global Learning: Defining, Designing, Demonstrating." This report, which seeks to help

global educators develop a "shared vocabulary" (2) and to map out goals for global learning, presents a "Global Learning Rubric" that seeks to outline the capacities that students as global citizens should possess.

The "Global Learning Rubric" exemplifies the broad and vague communication skills that are characteristic of many global learning programs. The rubric lists six outcomes for global higher education. A global learner:

> (1) articulates their own values in the context of personal identities and recognizes diverse and potentially conflicting positions vis- à-vis complex social and civic problems; (2) gains and applies deep knowledge of the differential effects of human organizations and actions on global systems; (3) understands the interactions of multiple worldviews, experiences, histories, and power structures on an issue or set of issues; (4) initiates meaningful interaction with people from other cultures in the context of a complex problem or opportunity; (5) takes informed and responsible action to address ethical, social, and environmental challenges; (6) applies knowledge and skills gained through general education, the major, and cocurricular experiences to address complex, contemporary global issues. (Hovland 2014, 6)

The communicative keywords listed in the "Global Learning Rubric"— "articulates," "understands the interactions of multiple worldviews," "takes informed and responsible action," "initiates meaningful interaction"—paper over a range of rhetorical capacities and rhetorical knowledge necessary for students to meet the outcomes the rubric describes.

Essentially, the problem with such descriptions of global communication skills is that they frame global communication outside of the multilayered rhetorical spaces that they take place in. Communication becomes embodied in the image of the student who uses the ethical and disciplinary perspectives that they formed through global education to address and cooperate with others. In a sense, the problem with the description above is that students cannot pursue the global interaction described without rhetorical capabilities, but there is little space in the curriculum for rhetorical education. Looking at the communicative keywords above from the perspective of rhetoric leaves us with several important questions. *What rhetorical tactics should students possess to make value-based claims to audiences grappling with social and civic conflicts? What tactics of analysis and performance should students possess to understand and engage global systems or respond to systemic exigencies? What tactics of analysis capacitate students to understand how discourse and power shape global issues and to recognize opportunities for addressing or contesting global discourses? What types of rhetorical knowledge must students possess to recognize opportunities for cross-cultural interaction and problem-solving?*

What types of rhetorical ethics might promote "responsible action" and what tactics of analysis and performance are prerequisite for addressing ethical, social, and environmental challenges? What is the relationship between knowledge and the analytical and performative tactics often mislabeled as "skills" and how do they capacitate students for addressing global issues?

I ask these questions not simply to point out that rhetorical education is missing from global higher education initiatives but to illustrate how communication is treated as a neutral conveyance for the knowledge and insights gained in other classes. In addition to papering over of rhetorical processes, descriptions of communication in global higher education initiatives like this one often present a profound absence of a sense of place. What is striking about outcomes like those outlined above is the simplicity of the model of communication that they develop or imply. As the various policy documents and literature in the previous chapter illustrated, communication in these documents is often presented as a one-way act on the part of the student, who is idealized as being able to engage effectively with others to solve global problems. In terms of the context of this communication, we most often find mentions of students negotiating differences in values with distant others. In an important sense, what is missing in these descriptions of global communication are the very things we associate with public discourse—access, public agency, circulation of texts, and communicative contexts.

The vague, placeless communicative outcomes we see in global higher education should move rhetorical educators to define their own outcomes for transnational rhetorical education. I develop the outcomes below as a starting point in order to illustrate how rhetorical educators might agonistically engage vague discussions of communication in global higher education. Documents like the "Global Learning Rubric" above can serve as opportunities for communicating the rich resources of our work to others. Given the depth of what scholars in rhetoric and composition and communication have to offer, the list below seeks to reconfigure the outcomes of global higher education from the vantage-point of rhetorical education.

A rhetorical education for transnational rhetorical citizenship should enable students to:

(1) recognize the situatedness of global issues in their own local, national, and virtual communities and recognize opportunities for engaging in rhetorical action on global issues.
(2) rhetorically analyze transnational rhetorical exigencies and the national, local, and international discourses surrounding them so that they can critically question and engage political, corporate, and community stakeholders.

(3) develop strategies for rhetorically analyzing conflicting values surrounding global issues or communities and performative strategies for engaging, confronting, or adapting to these conflicting values.

(4) develop knowledge of the rhetorical ecologies of global issues, including how rhetorical texts circulate and constitute publics, counterpublics, and other collectives

(5) develop rhetorical strategies for understanding the rhetorical construction of cultural difference, diversity, and material inequity, as well as performative tactics for rhetorically engaging others within and across different cultural communities, publics, and counterpublics

(6) develop critical rhetorical knowledge of genres, mediums, and media utilized for civic action on global issues in a variety of contexts and develop experience composing in these genres and mediums

(7) develop critical capacities for rhetorical ethics rooted in critique in order to recognize and respond to the discursive conditions of precarious life and citizenship.

(8) develop critical capacities for understanding and negotiating translingual encounters in addition to pursuing education in a foreign language.

Like the outcomes of the "Mt Oread Manifesto," these outcomes present a rhetorical education that equips students with analytical, ethical, and performative capacities. Rhetorical education provides analytical capacities for understanding the rhetorical cultures of global issues—the rhetorical tactics, lines of argumentation, ideological discourses, networks of circulation, and the genres and mediums that make up global civic engagement. In addition, rhetorical education can empower students to recognize situated opportunities for rhetorical engagement in their own local, national, global, and virtual communities and to develop capacities for rhetorical performance that enable them to seize upon these opportunities.

The list of outcomes above serves as an initial attempt to unpack the rhetorical capacities blackboxed by vague descriptions of communication. My intent here is not to present a model or ideal, however. Integrating rhetorical education into global higher education will also require rhetorical educators to practically illustrate how rhetorical education can travel across the global curriculum. This process will, again, manifest itself in different ways in different institutions and require locally situated arguments for rhetorical education. A fully developed transnational rhetorical education cannot be achieved in one class and should be pursued in a variety of classes across a variety of disciplines. This will require rhetorical

educators to work with their colleagues in other disciplines to develop curricula that respond to the constraints and opportunities of their own institutions.

One key example of such work can be found in the significant body of research on translingualism, and how it challenges some of the movement's key ideologies of language. A significant amount of the discussion of communicating across borders, a common trope of global higher education discourse, focuses on foreign language instruction and broadly defined, though often disciplinarily vacuous, definitions of intercultural communication skills. In both cases, while unstated, the assumption seems to be that students targeted will be monolingual and perhaps American university students. Resisting monolingual assumptions about rhetoric and writing is an important task for rhetorical educators. In composition studies, Bruce Horner and John Trimbur (2002) have argued against the traditional tendency for composition studies to be shaped by an "English Only" curriculum. Horner and Trimbur question the "tacit language policy" of the modern college curriculum, a policy shaped in a context where "the historical formation of the first-year composition course is tied tightly to a monolingual and unidirectional language policy that makes English the vehicle of writing instruction in the modern curriculum" (623). Noting that the modern curriculum is "more cosmopolitan" (623) than it has been in previous eras, Horner and Trimbur argue for the need for "an internationalist perspective capable of understanding the study and teaching of written English in relation to other languages and to the dynamics of globalization" (624). In this sense, arguments for increased instruction in languages outside of English are an important part of global higher education initiatives, and can provide important opportunities for collaboration between rhetoricians and language scholars and teachers.

Critical approaches to language, especially work in translingualism, can deepen our understanding of transnational rhetoric by orienting us not simply to the borders between languages but instead to the interaction among languages. In his expansive work on translingualism, Suresh Canagarajah (2013) develops an ecological understanding of language, one that challenges our understanding of the borders between global and local space. Canagarajah argues against what he calls "a *monolingual orientation* to communication" (1) and for a translingual understanding of language that recognizes that "communication transcends individual languages" and that "communication transcends words and involves diverse semiotic resources and ecological affordances" (6). Canagarajah

positions translingualism against what is often characterized as a "multilingual" approach, one that "typically conceives of the relationship between languages in an additive manner" (7). For Canagarajah, "the term *multilingual* doesn't accommodate the dynamic interactions between languages and communities envisioned by the translingual" (7). Canagarajah argues that "Those who are considered monolingual are typically proficient in multiple registers, dialects, and discourses of a given language. … Therefore, all of us have translingual competence, with differences in degree and not kind. To turn Chomsky (1988) on his head, we are all translinguals, not native speakers of a single language in homogeneous environments" (8). Canagarajah's argument does not preclude the importance of developing fluency and confidence in multiple languages, but rather points us to practices of "hybrid" language use—"codemeshing, crossing, and polyglot dialogue" (8)—that are central to understanding language in a space of globalization.

Translingual pedagogy, as Canagarajah suggests, can speak to global education in important ways. He suggests that "translingual practices might provide a more complex understanding of competence for global citizenship" (13). His own understanding of "dialogical cosmopolitanism" (193) draws on practices of translingual negotiation, which he connects to Kwame Appiah's (2007) discussion of cosmopolitan practices (193). Because translingual practices require a negotiation of linguistic and cultural differences, they serve to foster "a rooted cosmopolitanism, one based on a firm grounding on one's location, biography, and interests" (196). While I have argued for a different framework than cosmopolitanism, I follow Canagarajah and other translingual scholars here in arguing for a more critical, translingual approach to language in global higher education. I also note that such work should also challenge scholars working on rhetorical education and rhetorical citizenship to critically engage our own monolingual assumptions. In this sense, to understand transnational rhetoric means to recognize how rhetorical practices are shaped not only through the circulation of texts, forms, ideas, and feelings, but also languages, tactics of translingual negotiation, and understandings of linguistic competence.

At the same time, however, it is important to note that many of the arguments made against the monolingual assumptions of US higher education and for translingual approaches have been advanced outside of the more expansive and macro-level conversations occurring about global higher education and the internationalization of the curriculum. Yet, the

need to engage these conversations is absolutely vital to the pedagogical and political projects of translingualism and rhetorical pedagogy. Multilingual arguments for foreign language instruction can be mobilized by a variety of different educational interests, with foreign language instruction being mobilized particularly powerfully in discourses of national security (Wible 2013). For example, Section 8 of the *International Studies in Higher Education Act of 2003* provides an interesting, if troubling vision of this relationship, as it calls on the Secretary of Education to "study and report to Congress on foreign language heritage communities of U.S. residents or citizens, particularly those that include speakers of languages critical to U.S. national security." While we might expect foreign language instruction to be treated in this way in this act, comprehensive internationalization efforts utilize similar discourse. The American Council on Education's (2003) *Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide*, for example, also clearly points to the role of language instruction in promoting national security interests and staffing military and government agencies (16). These two brief examples are supported by many, many more, including those we encountered in the last chapter. My point in raising them is not to argue that translingual approaches have missed this important context, but rather to argue that as they argue for the political and pedagogical project of resisting monolingualism in composition, they must also recognize that multilingualism is often used to advance nationalist interests. The approach to language instruction that we see in calls for international and global higher education most often present us with visions of US students who are either capacitated to serve US interests or who are, in contrast, capacitated to communicate across borders in order to build a more cosmopolitan and peaceful world. While both programs of internationalization and global higher education certainly recognize the presence of international students on US campuses, their linguistic goals are pointed largely toward monolingual US students and preparing these students to communicate across borders.

From Cosmopolitan Ethics Toward an Ethics of Transnational Rhetorical Citizenship

In addition to discussions of outcomes and capacities, global higher education is shaped significantly, as we have seen, by discussions of ethics. I turn now to the project of cultivating transnational rhetorical ethics through capacitating students with rhetorical tools of inquiry and critique.

Following Judith Butler's discussion of rhetoric, ethics, and precarity, and returning to the question of normative citizenship, I want to suggest that rhetorical education can enable rhetorical educators and students to ask "under what rhetorical conditions is it possible to conceive of higher education as providing opportunities to rethink the nation as an exclusive site of citizenship and under what conditions am I being positioned as a subject as part of this process?" This question inverts the relationship between communication, ethics, and politics we find in much global higher education literature. For example, in the AAC&U "Global Learning Rubric," we learn that "a global learner articulates their own values in the context of personal identities and recognizes diverse and potentially conflicting positions vis-à-vis complex social and civic problems" (6). Here, as in cosmopolitan understandings of dialogue, student subjects approach the global with a set of ethical values and an ethical communicative practice of giving recognition to the values of others, even if they happen to disagree with those values. But the tools and processes these students need to recognize the scene of address that calls upon them to articulate their values, or, as Butler puts it "give an account of themselves" are left unaddressed (2005, 10). The vision of pluralism and agonism in the rubric are laudable, but, as we have seen, such an understanding of communication is one in which ethics precedes communication or action, or where the goal is to foster a communicative practice reflective of our ethics.

That the rhetorical and the ethical could be intertwined processes, or that the rhetorical could constitute the conditions of the ethical does not seem to be a possibility within the "Global Learning Rubric" and in many other depictions of communication in global higher education literature. The idea that one might form ethical judgments within specific scenes of address or within rhetorical practice, or that rhetorical practices might shape our understandings of ethical judgments is nowhere to be found. Yet, it is this intertwining of ethics and rhetorical action that is central to the rhetorical tradition and the critical understanding of rhetoric that Butler (2005, 2012) develops in her discussion of precarity and ethics. This intertwining is also one that we find throughout the history of rhetoric. For example, in his description of Isocrates's rhetorical education, Takis Poulakos (1997) has shown that Isocrates's rhetorical education was one that synthesized the rhetorical and the ethical. Poulakos argues that "he called for a political oratory that would integrate choices about values with choices about action and that would advocate choices of action based on the best moral and political alternatives. Political oratory, in other

words, rested for Isocrates on the capacity to undertake an ethico-political inquiry, a deliberation by means of which ethical choices illuminated decisions about action and choices regarding political action illuminated decisions about ethical commitments" (68). This mutually engaged process of ethics and politics allows us to recognize how rhetorical choice requires an inquiry into the discursive conditions that structure choice itself.

While ethical arguments for global higher education correctly identify the role of education, they often do so in ways that fail to capture how ethics and rhetoric are intertwined processes of action. In an interview with S.J. Murray, Judith Butler has argued that

> rhetoric establishes the ontological conditions of the subject. I only acquire a certain 'being' in relation to another who impinges upon me and interpellates me, and I do not live or survive as a being without the primary care of others. This seems to be true from the perspective of subject formation. But this insight bears with it ethical implications as well. If I cannot be responsible without being responsive, and I cannot be responsive unless I am appealed to or addressed in some way, that means that who I am is bound up with the question of ethics, and further that the scene of address is a presupposition of both becoming a subject and becoming ethical. (Murray 2007, 420–1)

Rhetoric and ethics are not, in this reading, oppositional practices, but instead responsive to a scene of address that precedes us as subjects and constitutes a field in which we position ourselves and fashion our own subjectivities out of the materials available to us.

Drawing on Foucault's (1997) discussion of critique and subjectivity, Butler argues that as subjects we are opaque to ourselves because we are shaped in "the context of relations that are partially irrecoverable to us" (2005, 20). For Butler, this not only means that we are dependent upon others—a common grounding in ethical theory—but that we are also formed within a set of political and social relationships that have come to form normative frameworks. Because of this, Butler, following Foucault, forges a relationship between rhetoric, normativity, subjectivity, and critique. Bringing normativity to bear on rhetoric does not imply that our subjectivity and responses to others are predetermined, however: "In this sense, we are not deterministically decided by norms, although they do provide the framework and the point of reference for any set of decisions we subsequently make. This does not mean that a given regime of truth

sets an invariable framework for recognition; it means only that it is in relation to that framework that recognition takes place or the norms that govern recognition are challenged and transformed" (2005, 22). These norms serve as the conditions of our very recognition as subjects and our recognition of others: "the 'I' has no story of its own that is not also the story of a relation—or set of relations—to a set of norms. … The 'I' is always dispossessed by the social conditions of its emergence" (2005, 8). Such an understanding of ethics is fundamentally as rhetorical as it is moral, as it requires acts of rhetorical invention that use the imperfect tools of practical wisdom. Practical knowledge, or phronesis, is constituted outside of ourselves, even as it is productive of ourselves as rhetors and subjects and shapes our responses to others.

Butler's understanding of the relationship between rhetoric and ethics points our attention to ethics within the scene of address. Ethics are not fully determined by the scene of address, but such scenes work to construct our frames of reference, even as we exercise our power to position or reposition ourselves in relation to them. We thus approach ethics as a reflexive process, one that requires not only positioning ourselves within a framework of norms and values, but also one that requires critique as a condition of critical agency. Following Foucault, Butler (2005) envisions critique as a "reflexive practice" (16) of "ethical self-making" (17) that takes place within a framework of codes and norms that previously exist. Critique, "exposes the limits of the historical scheme of things, the epistemological and ontological horizon within which subjects come to be at all" (17). While this preexisting context shapes us as subjects, it does not determine us as subjects. Reflexivity and critique enable us to position ourselves critically and ethically to the norms and relations of power that precede us.

This understanding of rhetoric and ethics provides important tools for developing our understanding of rhetorical education in a context of globalization and transnationalism. We can recall here our discussion of citizenship from the first chapter. There, I argued that rhetorical education can provide students tools for critically questioning not only the normative horizons of their citizenship, but also how their citizenship is invoked in rhetorical discourses. Here, simply shifting the terms of the scholarly conversation about normative citizenship is not enough to challenge the normative hegemony of the concept and its exclusionary practices. Instead, following Butler (2001, 2005) and Foucault (1997), we recognize that the scene of address of my citizenship precedes me and dispossesses me of

the ability to define this aspect of myself and my formation as a subject. Citizenship is a normative set of relationships to power that I did not chose and which I have to make and remake myself in relation to.

This does not mean that I do not have agency, or that my identity as a citizen is fully determined. Nor does it mean that I bear no responsibility to those not offered the protections of citizenship or rendered disposable by the very state that invests me with my own citizenship. Rather, it means that critique, as an act of rhetorical/ethical inquiry and positioning entails questioning my own formation as a citizen subject, even as I question how this subjectivity is used to dispossess others. Critique, as Foucault and Butler both argue, requires "courage" and is therefore "akin to virtue" (Foucault 1997, 43). Foucault argues that critique has, at its center, "a bundle of relationships that are tied to one another, or are to the two others, power, truth, and the subject" (47). Critique in this sense is a relation of the self to relations of power and discourse. At the same time, Foucault continues, "Critique is the moment by which the subject gives himself the right to question truth on its effects of power and question power on its discourses of truth" (47). In charting out an understanding of rhetorical citizenship, employing this understanding of critique can enable us to recognize and explore obligations and opportunities for rhetorical citizenship as a form of critical questioning and response.

Such a critical understanding of rhetorical citizenship is vital in contexts of globalization and transnational networks. Instead of presenting global citizenship as a philosophical choice or educational outcome, as we see in cosmopolitan theories, or positing it as an expanded sense of civic virtue, we are led instead to question the conditions under which such an understanding of citizenship becomes possible. Under what rhetorical conditions do transnational association, collectivity, and belonging appear and how do they open up possibilities for positioning ourselves in relationship to citizenship while at the same time perhaps challenging its normative sovereignty? Such an approach does not supplant national citizenship or overthrow normative citizenship, but it does draw our attention to citizenship as a framework for rhetorical, ethical, and political recognition and the rhetorical conditions of address that make this recognition possible.

Rhetorical citizenship might be productively understood not as just the participatory and receptive processes of rhetoric or discourse among citizens (Kock and Villadsen 2014, 13), but also as practices of self-making and action that take place in the context of preexisting rhetorical

frameworks that make recognition possible and possible to be transformed. Here, citizenship cannot only be invoked rhetorically, even by those who lack its juridical protections and normative identities, but can also in certain conditions create openings for forms of association and solidarity that are positioned against citizenship even as they work within its framework. Critique, in this sense, requires courage to subject oneself to the force of normative and legal citizenship even as one takes part in the "desubjugation" of (Foucault "What is Critique?," 47) oneself from the "politics of truth" that frame it (47). By turning our attention to the discursive conditions that precede us and to the virtues of critique, such an ethics can move us past the notion of cosmopolitan ethics as a choice or as a political alternative. Such an ethical disposition is deeply rhetorical and can be aligned effectively with rhetorical ethics.

In his *Rhetorical Ethics and Internetworked Writing*, James Porter (1998) draws on postmodern understandings of ethics to define rhetorical ethics not as "a particular moral code" but as "a set of implicit understandings between writer and audience about their relationship" (66). For Porter, this approach acknowledges the role that philosophical ethics has played in subjugating rhetoric to ethics and in presenting rhetoric as a barrier to ethics, while arguing that ethics is simultaneously active within acts of writing. Rhetorical ethics "addresses the *should* of writing activities: What *should* the writer do? From the writer's point of view, ethics has to do with determining (and perhaps even changing) the principles or codes that establish, maintain, and guide relations between writer and audience and with considering the political and ethical consequences of our composing" (69). Rhetoric, because its relationship to audience, is thus already an ethical endeavor from the start.

In a series of important articles, John Duffy (2014, 2017) builds on Porter's rhetorical ethics, while arguing that we need a more substantial ethical foundation that postmodern ethics allows for. For Duffy (2017), "As teachers of writing, we are *always already* engaged in the teaching of rhetorical ethics" (230). Duffy bases this relationship between writing and ethics, like Porter, on the relationship between writer and audience, "which necessarily and inevitably moves us into ethical reflection and decision-making" (230). Here, again, ethics and the choices of the writer converge—to choose as a writer implies a relationship between writer and reader. Duffy argues for the role of virtue ethics in helping students

conceive of themselves as making good ethical choices as writers. Noting that postmodern ethics and deontological and consequentialist ethics do not provide "an adequate account of how writers define themselves ethically as they make choices" (230), Duffy argues for "rhetorical virtues," or "discursive practices of virtue," such as "honesty, accountability, generosity, and other qualities" (235). Such virtues "reflect the traits, attitudes, and dispositions we associate with a good person speaking or writing well" (235). Duffy argues that these virtues are not immutable and are subject to being contested and critiqued by other conceptions of virtue, including global conceptions (239). Virtue, for Duffy, provides a conceptual vocabulary for rethinking "writing and rhetoric as constructive arts" (244) that move us beyond postmodern critique and toward a more constructive rhetoric.

What we see in both Porter and Duffy's work is a conception of ethics rooted in the relationship between rhetor and audience. The closeness of this relationship leads both to recognize the ethical and the rhetorical as intertwined in practice, even though they hold different ideas about the foundations of this ethical practice. What I want to suggest in response is that their privileging of the moment of rhetorical choice needs to be expanded to include the scene of address that frames our recognition of and our relationship to audiences. In other words, we need a different starting point for rhetorical ethics than the moment of rhetorical choice because that moment of choice is constituted by rhetorical practices, discursive frameworks, and rhetorical networks that precede the arrival of the rhetor on the scene and provide the materials for invention with which the rhetor works.

For example, as I will explain in the next chapter, we encounter images of human suffering brought to us through transnational networks as a normal part of globalization. If we make the simple choice to circulate those images through social media, through a tweet or Facebook post, for example, we are faced with ethical decisions between writer and audience, but our decisions are shaped by rhetorical conditions that long preceded our encounter of the image. We are faced with certain questions. Will my circulation of the image promote an ethical response? Does my circulation reproduce or encourage visual frames that make a spectacle of human suffering (Hesford 2011) or are suspect in other political or ethical ways? Through the simple circulation of the text we are enmeshed within a network of relationships that connect us to many more actors than ourselves

and our audiences. We might find ourselves connected, for example, to photographers, news editors, the subjects of the image, and other spectators. In addition, we also find ourselves enmeshed with rhetorical frameworks and practices that precede our choices—cultural frameworks of recognition, compositional practices embedded within cultural frameworks, technological affordances that enable certain processes of circulation while precluding others. This brings about other concerns. For example, my circulation of the image, despite my motives, might take part in the process of making the image more likely to appear across social media platforms or take part in making the image and others like it appear more often in image searches.

Another example, one that I often use with students, can be found through the simple process of conducting two Google Image searches, one for "European Poverty" and another for "African Poverty." I have conducted this search with students on dozens of different computers, and each time the result is the same—European poverty brings up multiple graphs, charts, and screen shots from economic or policy documents and a few images of impoverished Europeans in the first three to five pages of images; African poverty brings almost no graphs, charts, or documents but rather a screen composed almost entirely of images of human suffering and helplessness, often privileging images of children. This is one small example of how the moment of rhetorical choice—in this case the choice to use or circulate an image—is prefigured by a scene of address that shapes and constrains rhetorical practices. The extensiveness of this prefiguring is such that I would argue that we need a more critical understanding of rhetorical ethics.

In her own work on ethics and images, Butler (2005) argues that the scene of address configures the visual plane. Drawing on Levinas's understanding of the primacy of the response to the face of the other as central to ethical recognition, Butler argues that

> the possibility of an ethical response to the face thus requires a normativity of the visual field: there is already not only an epistemological frame within which the face appears, but an operation of power as well, since only by virtue of certain kinds of anthropocentric dispositions and cultural frames will a given face seem to be a human face to any one of us. After all, under what conditions do some individuals require a legible and visible face, and others do not? Thus, embedded in that language is a set of norms concerning what will and will not constitute recognizability. (2005, 29–30)

Because recognizability and ethics take place against a set of norms beyond my choosing, critique, contra Duffy, can be seen, as Foucault has argued as "akin to virtue," but perhaps also as productive of the rhetorical conditions in which rhetorical virtues can be articulated and critiqued. My understanding of the "traits, attitudes, and dispositions" of a "good person speaking or writing well" (Duffy 235) is not simply framed by my practices as a scholar or teacher in the field of rhetoric and composition studies. Rather than starting from virtues embodied in pedagogy, what Duffy calls "our collective knowledge about what it is to be a good writer, making good choices" (239), I would argue instead for a turn toward the network political, normative, and material relationships that make the good and personhood recognizable. Understanding these conditions is crucial to rhetorical education, as they provide us with an understanding of the subjectivities available to teachers and students and possibilities for resisting these subjectivities. Critique, in this sense, is not a condition of pure skepticism, nor is it hostile to constructive dialogue. Rather, it is a reflexive practice by which we and our students can begin to grapple with how our subjectivities as rhetors and citizens are produced and how we might use rhetoric to contest this production as part of our own rhetorical/ethical practices.

Such an understanding of rhetorical ethics is important for understanding the type of transnational rhetorical citizenship that I am advancing. First, it resists understandings of global education as producing "cosmopolitan virtue" (Turner 2002, 47) by highlighting the network of relations that shape the normative construction of global citizenship.[9] As the last chapter hopefully demonstrated, both rhetorical educators and students should be equipped with tactics for critiquing normative visions of global citizenship and national citizenship. Here, transnational rhetorical citizenship can be understood as a term that seeks to capture acts of rhetorical/ethical self-making brought about through processes of rhetorical critique, performance, and reflection. Transnational networks, with their global "flows" (Appadurai 1996, 37) of people, texts, goods, materials, and values, create openings within normative frameworks of citizenship that offer opportunities for critique and engagement. Unlike the detached set of communication skills we see in the literature of global higher education, rhetorical education can provide opportunities for rhetorical invention and reflexive self-making that draw normative visions of the global and the national into question, even as they recognize their constraining effects on rhetorical practices and subjectivities.

To say this is not to dismiss the process of formulating outcomes for transnational rhetorical education. Rather, it is to argue that a central part of any rhetorical education that would call itself transnational is fostering critical rhetorical perspectives that enable students to understand how some human beings and some human issues become recognizable and proximate through rhetorical practices, both those normative practices that precede and shape our rhetorical subjectivities and those by which we remake our subjectivities and contest and supplant the planes of social vision available to us. Such an approach honestly captures the scene of education as a scene of address and involves students in the process of ethically and rhetorically responding to their interpellations as transnational subjects, citizens, and so on, through practices of education.

RHETORICAL EDUCATION AND VIRTUE

In an educational atmosphere shaped by calls for global citizenship, we must ask what type of rhetorical education might foster students' understanding of, engagement in, and positioning among processes of globalization. What does it mean to speak of rhetorical education in an era of permeable borders that bring us closer to others not only in terms of proximity but also in terms of political and ethical obligations? How can rhetorical education—a process historically rooted to preparing students to participate in the civic life of bounded communities such as the polis—be expanded to respond to the increasingly porous nature of national and local borders? How might rhetoric's civic tradition be expanded to include those who may be not only citizens of different nations, but also those denied citizenship (the immigrant, the refugee) or those dispossessed of citizenship (the stateless)? How do we think rhetoric's traditional relationship to civic virtue (arête) at a time when globalization has reshaped the national borders and cultural boundaries that have traditionally figured the ground of virtue?

I raise these questions not simply to introduce the arguments of this chapter, but because current calls for restoring, redefining, and reintegrating rhetorical education in the university continue to carry forward understandings of citizenship, borders, and civic virtue. In his argument for bringing rhetoric back to the academy as a "course of study," David Fleming (1998) captures how citizenship continues to serve as a goal of rhetorical education. Fleming's characterization is worth quoting at length:

> The goal of this multiform education (integrating theory practices, and inquiry) remains, I believe the formation of the good rhetor, the person who has mastered the 'knowledge' of speaking and writing well, and who is conceived first and foremost as a free and equal member of a self-governing community. ...To revitalize rhetorical education, we need to recapture this focus on the language user as citizen. ... This education would also be inherently moral, although the virtues sought would be primarily discursive ones, such as fluency, adaptability, and civility. (184–5)

While I admire Fleming's call for a "paideutic" (180) rhetorical education that aims to "strengthen in its students certain ethically framed, action oriented-intellectual capacities" (180), the question, as we have seen in the previous chapter, of how ethical and action-oriented capacities are framed and defined is paramount.

Virtues such as "fluency, adaptability, and civility" can be constructed to support a wide range of political and ideological perspectives and practices. Adaptability, for example, can certainly be defined as a rhetorical capacity in keeping with the tradition of Quintilian's "good man skilled at speaking" (vir bonus dicendi peritus) but it could just as easily be framed in terms of global economy or national security. Discursive virtues, even when rooted to the rhetorical tradition, can be easily configured within existing frameworks of global higher education that may conflict with our own critical understandings of rhetoric. Even understandings of civil discourse, including Sharon Crowley's (2006) brilliant study of civil discourse as a critical response to fundamentalism, can be reread or framed in ways counter to their intent. Civility, here, could easily be reconfigured as tolerance, rather than as a reciprocal relationship between speakers based on shared rhetorical practices. Or, perhaps more menacingly, civility could be reconfigured as what Wendy Brown (2006) has called "civilizational discourse" (178) in her *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in an Age of Identity and Empire*. Civility, in this context, might exercise what Brown calls "the dual function of civilizational discourse, marking in general what counts as 'civilized' and conferring superiority on the West" (178). Tolerance, as a civil discourse, or a marker of civility can, in this case, be used to designate some groups as uncivil and "legitimize liberal politics' illiberal treatment of selected practices, peoples, and states" (179). Virtues, even rhetorical virtues, are subject to being seized and reframed in ways that we may not anticipate. This is perhaps why, as we have seen, cosmopolitan virtue and ethics can sometimes be invoked in the same contexts as discourses of national security and economic hegemony.

In saying this, I am not suggesting that such rhetorical virtues are not worth pursuing, but rather that they also require, as Foucault (1997) and Butler (2001) have argued, critique as virtue. While visions of civic virtue have been a central part of rhetorical education, they have never been stable but rather a site of contestation and struggle for the hegemony of a particular vision of citizens and their relation to power. In the rhetorical tradition, understandings of arête—a difficult-to-translate word often used to signify virtue or excellence—not only change through the history of Greek antiquity, but are also reshaped as part of a political process of democratic reconfiguration. In his classic *History of Education in Antiquity*, Marrou (1956) illustrates how understandings of arête change from Homeric Greece to the age of the Sophists and are later revised again by Plato. In his discussion, Marrou asserts that previous understandings of arête as valor achieved on the field of military conflict or on the athletic field were transformed later into visions of excellence "expressed… in political action" (47). For Marrou, "The Sophists put their talent as teachers at the service of this new ideal of the political ἀρετή: the training of statesmen, the formation of the personality of the city's future leader" (47). Here, arête changes with the cultural, political, and pedagogical shifts of the time and is operationalized in new ways.

Josiah Ober (1989), in *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens* provides a more critical, political reading of the transformation of arête. Rather than simply reflecting a political or pedagogical shift, arête, along with other key concepts in Athenian political culture, was seized and redefined by the Athenian people as part of shaping a new democracy. Ober's discussion of "Athenian public rhetoric" as a "complex mix of elitist and egalitarian tactics" (388) points to the role of rhetoric as contesting and shaping a language of democracy out of the available language (339). Part of this process was "subversion and appropriation of the terminology and ideals of aristocrats" among them arête (339). Virtue, in this sense was not simply a philosophical precept but a contested term that was subject to seizure and rearticulation. Marrou and Ober both help us recognize that to argue for rhetorical virtues is to argue from a cultural position, one that can be contested and renegotiated through critical rhetorical practices. As we have seen in the previous chapter, populist rhetoric, such as that employed by organizations like the National Association of Scholars, shows us that this process of seizure and rearticulation can recast our rhetorical virtues as conspiratorial vices. In discussing rhetorical virtues, we must conceive of them as sites of rhetorical struggle and contestation, rather than outcomes, and present them not instead of critique but alongside critical practices.

Janet Atwill's (1998) reading of the relationship of civic virtue and rhetoric as techne provides, I would argue, helpful tools for tracing out the relationship between virtue and critique. In *Rhetoric Reclaimed*, Atwill develops a rhetorical understanding of virtue as a ground of contestation. She argues that "Even a cursory look at the conflicting characterizations of rhetoric by Plato, Protagoras, and Isocrates, suggest what is at stake is less the virtue of either rhetoric or rhetorician than the terms in which virtue, rhetoric, and knowledge are cast. For Protagoras and Isocrates, a well-marked boundary between subjects and objects of knowledge is difficult to find, and virtue is neither a private attribute nor an external standard" (19). As Atwill shows, the rhetorical instruction of Isocrates and Protagoras "is neither disinterested knowledge nor a specific political and ethical ideal. Moreover, though both Protagoras and Isocrates acknowledge that their instruction is tied to the production of character, ethos is not guided by a single model of the subject or judged by a single model of virtue. Their instruction has more to do with the polis than the individual soul, and it is far more likely to disrupt standards of value than to serve them" (21). This vision of subjectivity and civic virtue is contrasted to Plato's more dominant vision of virtue as "choice" and "individual self-determination" (158). For Plato, Atwill continues "what is at stake is the control and reproduction of limits by which fate, necessity, virtue, and subjectivity are defined. The extrication of subjectivity from contexts opens the way for conceiving the subject as a standard, interchangeable unit defined—as Plato depicts it—by personal choice. Such a model of subjectivity assumes that human choice may transcend matrixes of obligations, rewards, roles, habits, and activities" (158). In contrast, for sophistic rhetoric in the Protagorean or Isocratean tradition, virtue and the production of character through rhetorical education take place within a matrix of sociopolitical conditions that transcend the individual without, however, precluding the individual's agency.

What Atwill's argument illuminates is the relationship between situated rhetorical performances and virtue, which provides a different understanding of rhetorical virtue than Quintilian's *vir bonus*. In her discussion of Cicero, Atwill suggests that the vision of rhetorical practice in Cicero's rhetoric "remains committed to rhetorical success, not ideal models. Quintilian's question concerning the orator's commitment to virtue as opposed to rhetorical success would most likely never have occurred to the characters in *De Oratore*. Although rhetorical success may be enhanced by a virtuous character, virtuous character without rhetorical success would be no model of virtue at all" (38). Virtue, in this sense, is understood as

connected to situated performances of rhetoric that are aimed at rhetorical success and focusing on rhetorical success does not preclude rhetorical virtue. To teach rhetoric in this way, as Atwill argues, means that "what is at stake for teachers is less the transmission of specific material than the renegotiation of students' own symbolic capital. The skills involved in such a process include the appropriation of a habit of vigilance that is alert for indeterminacies and points of intervention in existing systems of classification. Enabling students to 'seize the advantage' in specific rhetorical contexts amounts to inviting them to be a part of constructing standards of value and advantage in their cultures" (210). Teaching rhetoric thus becomes an occupation with tremendous stakes, as rhetorical education equips students not with a set of predefined virtues or values, but rather with a set of critical capacities for contesting and shaping the systems of power and knowledge that form the groundwork for values, virtues, and rhetorical success.

We can easily see the resonances between the "habit of vigilance" Atwill describes and the discussion of critique as virtue explored by Foucault and Butler. In her explication of Foucault's understanding of critique, Butler describes the process of critique in strikingly similar terms, arguing that "not only is it necessary isolate and identify the particular nexus of power and knowledge that gives rise to the field of intelligible things, but also to track the way in which that field meets its breaking point, the moment of discontinuities, the sites where it fails to constitute the intelligibility for which it stands. What this means is that one looks both for the conditions by which the object field is constituted, but also for the limits of those conditions, moments where they point up their contingency and transformability" (2001, 316). Being vigilant for opportunities for rhetorical intervention requires a rhetorical education that provides tools for unpacking and critiquing prevailing understandings of knowledge and value, as well as tools for seizing upon opportunities for contesting and transforming knowledge and values. As I have argued so far, citizenship is such a system of classification and value, but also a field that reaches its breaking point through processes of globalization.

To explore rhetorical citizenship at this time means that as rhetoricians we must also examine our own predispositions to link citizenship with virtuous visions of the good orator. For example, in shaping his argument for rhetoric as a "course of study" in the university, Fleming describes the "good rhetor" as "first and foremost … a free and equal member of a

self-governing community" (184). In addition, work on discursive and rhetorical citizenship has tended to define rhetorical citizenship as a practice of an already existing designation of citizenship. Kock and Villadsen (2014), for example, define rhetorical citizenship through a conception of rhetorical agency that is understood as "citizens' possibilities for gaining access to and influencing life through symbolic action" (10). While their understanding of rhetorical citizenship encompasses collective and individual dimensions of citizenship, their focus on rhetorical rights as a dimension of rhetorical citizenship is interesting. They assert that "We citizens have a right to expect that public rhetoric helps us identify, understand, and reflect on issues of common concern—by providing information and reasons that call on us to engage public issues and assist us in developing informed views on them" (16). The formulation "we citizens" is fascinating here, as is the normative dimension specified by this statement. While I find their discussion of rhetorical citizenship compelling, we are left with specific questions—*what power secures this right?, who is recognized as a rhetorical citizen in this context?, what forms of knowledge?, what forms of recognition?*

I raise these questions not to draw the projects of rhetorical education or rhetorical citizenship into question, but to underline the stakes of theorizing rhetorical education through the framework of citizenship. More specifically, to return to the animating question of this book, how might the political and ethical conditions of precarity complicate the understandings of belonging, citizenly subjectivity, agency, and knowledge that are reflected in visions of rhetorical citizenship? This question leads to other, related questions that are vital for scholarship in rhetorical citizenship to explore. What do conditions of statelessness, immigration, and political violence do to shape rhetorical agency? What rhetorical practices, agency, even rights are possible when subjects are no longer "we citizens?" How might rhetoric be used to not only question citizenship but perceive opportunities for rhetorical intervention that transform citizenship? How might rhetoric question, even resist exclusionary practices of normative citizenship without adopting normative visions of global citizenship? How do we account for the ways that people who lack recognition as national or normative citizens or who are dispossessed of their citizenship mobilize collective rhetorics of democracy and citizenship in arenas of public discourse located within national borders?

Globalization makes it necessary to critically interrogate our understandings of rhetoric and its relationship to citizenship. Understandings of citizenship grounded solely in the nation-state often ignore the effects of globalization, on civic communication, while understandings of global citizenship often reduce rhetorical practices to a vision of ethical dialogue that ignores how legal and normative citizenship conditions transnational rhetoric. In this sense, I present transnational rhetorical education and transnational rhetorical citizenship not as normative replacements for civic visions of rhetorical education, or easy replacements for normative citizenship, but as terms that reflect processes of rhetorical, political, ethical, and material contestation. Transnational rhetorical citizenship is a shorthand term for the processes of rhetorical and ethical positioning that precede our encounters with globalization and global others—the conditions and networks of culture and power that shape our agency and our ability to recognize others and be recognized—and the rhetorical agency we have to reposition ourselves in relationship to these conditions.

The term "transnational rhetorical citizenship" reflects both a condition and an agency; but, drawing on rhetoric's identity as a pedagogical enterprise, it is also a site of pedagogical engagement. Following Butler, we might understand transnational or "global circuits" (2012, 137), as a material and discursive network that confronts us and positions us within a set of political and ethical obligations that we do not choose. For Butler, "consent is not a sufficient ground for delimiting global obligations that form our responsibility" (137). We encounter images, texts, people, and rhetoric beyond our local communities and national borders, but are at the same time compelled to formulate ethical and rhetorical responses from our own spatial and cultural position. Such recognitions of our obligations to others, "are possible by virtue of visual and linguistic translations, which include temporal and spatial dislocations" (137). At the same time, flows of people through transnational networks reconfigure our understandings of the local and mobilize invocations of citizenship and its boundaries. Transnational rhetorical citizenship is therefore invoked and expanded here not as an extension of national citizenship (Kuehl 2014), but as, rather, a gap between rhetoric and national citizenship opened up by transnational or global networks.

In their discussion of undocumented activists singing the national anthem in Spanish, *Who Sings The Nation State?*, Butler and Gayatri

Chakravorty Spivak (2010) point to the importance of recognizing citizenship as a site of what Butler calls "performative contradictions" (66). An example of such a performative contradiction can be seen in invocations of civic identity and uses of civic rhetoric by those denied or dispossessed of citizenship. Without dismissing or ignoring the rhetorical practices of citizens, we can also look to examples like we find in the rhetorical protests of the activists they discuss as examples of rhetorically seeing and seizing upon critical openings in the field of discourse on citizenship. Butler argues that "Once we reject the view that claims that no political position can rest on performative contradiction and allow the performative function as a claim and an act whose effects unfold in time, then we can actually entertain the opposite thesis, namely that there can be no radical politics without performative contradiction. To exercise a freedom and to assert an equality precisely in relation to an authority that would preclude both is to show how freedom and equality can and must move beyond their positive evaluations" (66). This understanding of perfomative contradiction allows us to push rhetorical citizenship beyond the boundaries of national citizenship without having to fall back upon forms of cosmopolitan universalism (however pure or impure) for a normative foundation to shore up our rhetorical practices. Transnational rhetorical citizenship names the performative contradiction of rhetorical citizenship in a space of transnational networks.

When we recognize that the way we use rhetoric to "do citizenship discursively" is constrained but not fully determined by the legal, political, and cultural boundaries of national citizenship we can begin to perceive our rhetorical obligations to others, the material and rhetorical forces that shape our citizenship and our recognition of others, and our rhetorical agency for repositioning ourselves and forming collective relationships that transcend the boundaries of national citizenship. To argue for such a vision of rhetorical citizenship requires articulating a critical vision of rhetorical performance, rhetorical ethics, and rhetorical space. At the same time, it calls us to not only attend to examples of transnational rhetorical citizenship but also to leverage these examples for rhetorical education. To conclude this chapter, I turn now to an example that reflects the performative and ethical and dimensions of transnational rhetorical citizenship I have mapped here, the work of the collective DreamersAdrift.

DreamersAdrift and the Awkwardness of Citizenship

Legal or normative citizenship is only one dimension of citizenship, and transnational rhetorical practices can manifest themselves across a range of different people whose citizenship or lack thereof is constituted by different political and legal systems. To illustrate transnational rhetorical citizenship as a set of critical, inventional capacities, rhetorical ethics, and performative contradictions, I turn now to the work of a collective of activists known as DreamersAdrift. The rhetorical work of DreamersAdrift, a collective of intersectional activists pursuing social justice for Dreamers through art and education, powerfully illustrates how practices of rhetorical citizenship can draw the performative contradictions of citizenship into relief. I want to suggest that the work of groups like DreamersAdrift have much to teach rhetoricians about the relationship between rhetoric and citizenship.

As I write this, DACA, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, has recently been placed on the legislative chopping block by the presidential administration of Donald J. Trump. At a recent DACA rally on my campus, I listened as multiple students from my own university and community chose to exercise rhetorical citizenship and virtue from a space outside of legal citizenship. Watching these students reveal their undocumented status and use their narrative rhetoric to establish solidarity with and provoke action from our community on a blistering Birmingham afternoon, I was struck by how these rhetorical citizens, like many other Dreamers across the country provide a powerful example of the relationship between rhetoric, critique, and virtue. As we have seen, Foucault's (1997) understanding of critique as virtue involves not an autonomous process of self-making, but rather a process of "desubjugation," which can lead a subject to risk "its deformation as a subject, occupying that ontologically insecure position which poses the question anew: who will be a subject here, and what will count as a life" (Butler 2004, 321). This understanding of virtue and the risks it brings is clearly observable in the work of many collectives of Dream Activists, including the artists and activists who make up DreamersAdrift.

In looking at what this group has to teach us about rhetorical citizenship and rhetorical education, I am not seeking to develop a formal case study or piece of rhetorical criticism here, nor am I am seeking to argue for the primacy of "real-world" rhetorical practices in place of other forms of rhetorical knowledge. Instead, I am following my own ecological understanding of public rhetoric and the classroom spaces of rhetorical education, one

that seeks to understand the complex dialogue between practices of public rhetoric and rhetorical education. In their study of the rhetoric of student activists who took part in the Irvine 11 protests at a speech given by Michael Oren, the Israeli Ambassador to the United States, Jonathan Alexander and Susan Jarratt found that courses in writing instruction and rhetoric were "*not* well regarded" by the student activists they studied (541). Beyond the work of our courses, Alexander and Jarratt call on rhetoricians to pay significant attention to the composing and communication that students take part in outside of the classroom and its relationship to our own classrooms. They conclude, "Future studies of rhetorical education should encompass the curricular and the co-curricular, the formally sponsored and the self-sponsored, as mutually informing resources if research in rhetoric and writing studies is to contribute vitally to a collective struggle for cultural understanding and peaceful coexistence" (2014, 542). DreamersAdrift provides a key example of transnational rhetorical citizenship that speaks to the rhetorical capacities and ethics that I have traced out in this chapter, while also resisting easy categorization as an example of global citizenship; and, as we shall see, a pedagogical example.

As they describe their work, "DreamersAdrift is a media platform led by undocumented creatives with the goal of taking back the undocumented narrative through videos, art, music spoken word, and poetry. DreamersAdrift was established in October 2010 by four undocumented college graduates: Deisy Hernandez, Fernando Romero, Jesus Iñiguez, and Julio Salgado" (2010).[10] Since the formation of DreamersAdrift, Jesus Iñiguez, and Julio Salgado have also expanded their work through becoming members of the organization CultureStrike, a network of artists who "dream big, disrupt the status quo, and envision a truly just world rooted in shared humanity" (2010). The amount of media produced by the founders and other contributors is extensive and takes advantage of the affordances provided by a range of different media platforms, including the collective's website, YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter. I want to focus here on one specific video series entitled *Undocumented and Awkward*, while also drawing on a range of other print and visual media developed by the collective.

The discursive practices of Dreamers have been the subject of important scholarly work across a variety of fields, including work in rhetoric and communication (Cisneros 2013; Morrissey 2013; Chávez 2013) and composition studies (Ribero 2017). In presenting this analysis, it is important to recognize that scholarly readings of collective action can take over the narratives of social movement organizations. I point to *Undocumented*

and Awkward here because of how well it resists this subject position as well. Instead of reading my own understanding of rhetorical education onto DreamersAdrift, I am seeking here to engage in what Krista Ratcliffe (1999) has termed processes of "rhetorical listening" (196). For Ratcliffe, rhetorical listening "is a performance that occurs when listeners invoke both their capacity and willingness (1) to promote an *understanding* of self and other that informs our culture's politics and ethics, (2) to proceed from within a *responsibility logic*, not from within a guilt/blame one, (3) to locate identification in discursive spaces of both *commonalities* and *differences*, and (4) to accentuate commonalities and differences not only in *claims* but in cultural logics in which those claims function" (204). Ratcliffe's understanding of rhetorical listening resonates with the understanding of transnational rhetorical citizenship ethics I have traced out in this chapter, as it acknowledges how discourses shape the scenes upon which we work out our relationship with others as we engage in rhetorical and ethical practices.

To view *Undocumented and Awkward* as a rhetorician is to observe the relationship between critique, rhetoric, and ethics being played out within a rhetorical ecology of citizenship. Through a series of reenacted scenarios, each episode positions viewers within a space where rhetorics of privilege, whiteness, and blindness configure understandings of normative and legal citizenship that cast the protagonists outside of local communities and associations. As viewers, we are positioned as spectators to the characters' struggles to make and remake their collective belonging and solidarities within scenes of address that are configured by powerful discourses of normative citizenship. *Undocumented and Awkward* pursues the intersectional tactics analyzed by scholars such as by Chávez and Morrisey, advancing a politics of "undocuqueer" resistance. The term "undocuqueer" comes from a series of artworks created by DreamersAdrift founding member Julio Salgado. In her analysis of this series, Carrie Hart (2015) quotes Salgado's understanding of this intersectional politics: "Salgado's specific use of the term 'undocuqueer' marks an unwillingness to separate undocumented and queer experiences and identities. He describes how, in a literal sense, the work of his project is to document people who are both 'undocumented and a part of the LGBTQ community… two communities that are systematically oppressed by the conservative right'" (3). *Undocumented and Awkward* often stars Salgado dramatically enacting moments where normative and legal citizenship create situations of exile on the level of daily politics, association, and friendship.

As Christina Beltrán has argued in her essay on Dream activism and "the queering of democracy" (80), "Radical DREAMers have used new social media to queer the movement, expressing more complex and sophisticated conceptions of loyalty, legality, migration, sexuality, and patriotism than those typically offered by politicians, pundits and other political elites. Yet alongside their defiant attitude toward state power, DREAM activism *also* humanizes the victims of a neoliberal political system that seeks to create 'a borderless economy and a barricaded border'" (81). Rhetorical practices of reclaiming are central to this process. In a recent post on the DreamersAdrift website entitled "An Open Letter to our 'Allies': Stop Telling Us What We Can and Can't Identify As," Luis Nolasco and Yessica Gonzalez describe intersectional rhetorical tactics of recapturing terms such as "illegal" and resist objections to the use of these terms by allies. Defending their "reclaiming" of terms like "illegal," Nolasco and Gonzalez's argument bears quoting at length:

> First and foremost, we are tired of being apologetic. We are reclaiming the use of the word similarly to the LGBTQ community reclaiming "queer" and "faggot." We know and understand the history behind the words and agree that their function has been to oppress us as people of color and as immigrants. Yet why is it socially unacceptable for us, as directly impacted individuals, to use the words as a means of identity reclamation? What do you, as an ally, have to lose by me calling myself an illegal?
>
> Telling people to stop calling themselves illegal comes from a place of privilege and access to knowledge, whether academia or your politicization process. You see, we've always been illegal. Growing up, the first time we told our status, we weren't undocumented. We were fucken illegal. We've been "coming out of the shadows" to the vecinas and the people in our communities. This is the word that has been accessible to us. And in identifying as "brown illegal queers," we are saying fuck you to the status quo and other systems that have been used against us as individuals.
>
> In a sense, when we reclaim these words in an affirmative way, we give the middle finger to white supremacy. In the words of Assata Shakur, "Nobody in the world, nobody in history, has ever gotten their freedom by appealing to the moral sense of the people who were oppressing them." (2016)

This statement captures, I believe, one of the key pedagogical functions DreamersAdrift, which is to create a rhetorical culture of critical alliance that calls not only for political solidarity but reflexive participation.

What is striking about *Undocumented and Awkward* is not simply how discourses of normative citizenship exclude the subjects from the rights, duties, and political agencies of citizenship, but instead how citizenship serves as a site of conflict that limits forms of community, association, and belonging that could potentially challenge normative citizenship. In addition, *Undocumented and Awkward* also illustrates how academic discourses can position members of the collective outside of communities of dissent that could and perhaps should be allies. In their letter, Nolasco and Gonzalez underline one of the key points of reflexive practice invoked across a variety of texts produced by DreamersAdrift—the relationship between academic discourse, critique, and processes of critical alliance. I want to look at two specific episodes of *Undocumented and Awkward* that underline this problem and that ask academics who would theorize and critique their work to ethically question their assumptions.

The eighth episode of the first series of *Undocumented and Awkward* is captioned "Problem Addicts. We run into them ALL the time. Sometimes, they're allies. Sometimes, they're DREAMers as well." The episode begins with two members of DreamersAdrift, including Julio Salgado, portraying themselves reading on a set of bleachers. They are interrupted by a community college student played by Jesus Iñiguez, who is wearing a green hat with a red star and who recognizes them from the videos his "Chicano/Latino studies professor" showed in his class on immigration. Salgado and his friend explain that they make the films to educate viewers and express their thanks to the college student only to find that the student inserts himself in between them on the bleacher and begins to lecture them on the problems of their approach. The student explains that he viewed the videos as "problematic" and that they "were very exploitative of undocumented people" (2012). When Salgado replies that he and his friend are undocumented, he points to the student's t-shirt and says "I see you are undocumented too," to which the student says, "No, No I'm just wearing the shirt in solidarity with my undocumented people, you know what I'm saying?" After explaining that the videos were not funny, the student then begins to lecture Salgado and his friend against what he considers their "passive" approach (2012). He claims, "you guys are not being activists in the way that activism should be. You guys should be more angry, especially as undocumented people." When Salgado argues that they actually are angry, the student explains that they are passive because they are "pro-DREAM act." He then says, "fuck the dream act, dude! That's the

most problematic thing about what you guys do. You guys are advocating for a piece of legislation that supposed to funnel our youth into the arms of the imperialistic tendencies of this nation, man" (2012). Following this remark, the student uses the example of military recruiters and argues that passage of the DREAM Act would fill the high schools with even more of them. Salgado and his colleague try to explain their tactic, but the student continues to talk over them.

As the student continues to explain the error of their ways to them, Salgado and his friend mention repeatedly that they will try to take his insights into consideration. Unfazed, the student explains that they will have to "mix it up a bit" and become more activist. When Salgado's friend tries to explain that "it's a different form of activism, media activism," the student says "you guys have to be out on the streets." When they explain that they do attend protests, the student asks if they have been arrested, then remarks, "I've been arrested for you guys." Salgado explains that "undocumented people, when they get arrested, they kind of risk a little more than you do," at which point the student says that he sounds "hostile" and continues, still unfazed, to explain that the dream act is a "first world problem." After several historically dubious comments from the student, Salgado's friend then explains that the DREAM act is the only path to legalization at the time, to which the student responds, "why would you even want to be legalized in this country man?" Salgado asks "are you giving up your citizenship pretty soon?," and the student responds, again, that he cannot because he is in college. Salgado then says he needs to continue reading, and says, ironically, "it was nice having this civilized conversation with you." Salgado's friend assures the student that they will take his views into consideration, and then the student tells them "fucking revolution man!" and points to the red star on his hat and says "fucking red star motherfucker. Where's your red star?" Salgado responds that he left his at home, and his friend responds that his is in his wallet. After leaving, the student then returns and tells them that he is doing a project for his immigration class and that he would "love it if I can get an interview from you guys." At this point, Salgado and his friend turn to face the camera and we hear the repeated refrain of each video: "Awkward." This episode powerfully captures the relationship between discussions of resistance and activism within the academy and the lived experiences of those taking part in the movement. Within the space of this six-minute video, Iñiguez portrays the academic privilege referenced by Nolasco and Gonzalez. This clash between theory and the lived experiences of DREAM activists recurs at

several points throughout the substantial body of media created by the collective.

In the first episode of the second series of *Undocumented and Awkward,* we watch as a Salgado and others reenact the meeting of a group of college students sharing their stories in a circle as they begin their work in a summer class.[11] The caption for the video describes it as illustrating "Those awkward moments when you go to an expensive university and share things about yourself that others don't understand" (2015). The instructor begins by saying "Welcome everyone. It's so great to have such a diverse group of people for this summer session" and then notes that "this is an inclusive and safe space so everyone should feel comfortable sharing where you come from and a little bit about yourself so we can really connect and get to know each other" (2015). At this point, students break into smaller groups and begin to share their experiences with other students. Reflecting the coalitional politics of DreamersAdrift, the video presents the experiences of students from a variety of backgrounds. In one key scene, we are introduced to the conversation of one of the small groups in medias res, as one of the members explains that her parents immigrated from Peru and that her mother works as a housekeeper and her father works for a moving company. Another student then turns to her and says "Oh my God! I'm from Peru too. Like, how did you come?" The student answers, "Well, I came on a tourist visa" when the other student interrupts her and says "are you still a tourist?" and then says "So you're illegal?" In reply, the undocumented student corrects her by saying "I'm undocumented." At this point, a male student played by Julio Salgado, and wearing a shirt that says "Undocumented, Unafraid, Unapologetic," says "Oh my God, so that's like a thing! I've got a shirt" and he and another student begin to have a conversation about Urban Outfitters, with Salgado's character mentioning that "I think they make like really hip clothes for movement-y stuff" and then saying "I didn't know it was like a thing." When the student mentions that she would not be able to afford the t-shirt, Salgado's character says, flippantly, "oh, that's awkward." In another group, we are introduced to a student who tells of her family's crossing through the desert only to be met with another student's remark that he understands because he once ran a 5-K in hot weather. The group's discussion then turns immediately to running 5-K races. At the close of both of these scenes, the camera captures how the group's conversations immediately position the undocumented students on the periphery. At the end of the episode, as the instructor praises the group for their

work, the camera circles around the room to reveal the undocumented students sitting in silence as other students make remarks like "I feel like such a good person." Here, feeling and affect are used to illustrate how discourses of inclusivity and awareness can, despite their intentions, replicate the exclusivity of normative citizenship.

I point to these two episodes because they offer exceptional insights for rhetorical educators and students who are exploring transnational visions of rhetorical citizenship. I would like to underline two key points here. First, bringing activist rhetorics into the global classroom can provide students with an expansive understanding of the rhetorical strategies used to engage transnational forms of precarity like we see in the threat of deportation or detainment that the DreamersAdrift face. If, as Foucault has argued, critique as virtue risks the self by questioning the very norms that define the self and give it stability, then the rhetorical practices we witness as viewers are certainly exhibiting a form of virtue. At the same time, the videos position viewers, especially those outside of the "undocuqueer" community, within a space of rhetorical listening that requires cultivating the ability to recognize the complexities of ethical solidarity and being an ally. We witness episodes where ethical engagement and solidarity are undercut by a failure to recognize how the conditions of normative citizenship have configured the scene of address. Ultimately, I point to this example because it underlines both the rhetorical capacities and rhetorical ethics necessary to engage in transnational sites of struggle and rhetoric.

Conclusion

Throughout this chapter, I have argued that for the necessity of unpacking the rhetorical capacities and rhetorical knowledge obscured in vague descriptions of "global communication," as well as for the necessity of providing students with tools of rhetorical inquiry and listening that can foster their rhetorical ethics. I would like to close by noting that the transnational rhetorical education that I am calling for requires not only different outcomes of global higher education, but also, as Atwill has argued, a different type of global classroom. In their afterword to the collection *Rhetorical Education in America*, Wendy Sharer and Margaret Lyday (2004) pose the question "What role(s) should rhetorical education play in the formation of national and international identities?" (205). In tracing future directions for rhetorical education, they then note that students

need the capacities to "analyze and participate in the rhetorical activities of local, national, and international discourse communities" and that "future teachers of rhetorical education in America need to consider how to incorporate global contexts into their curricula" (205). The words "global contexts" are particularly important in this statement, as they provide us with an opportunity to develop a distinction between contexts and content. That there is a desire in our field to bring global content or global issues into our writing and rhetoric classrooms can be clearly seen in composition readers such as June Johnson's *Global Issues, Local Arguments* and Maria Jerskey's *Globalization: A Reader for Writers*. Both of these readers bring a range of global controversies, risks, and issues to the writing classroom, particularly the composition classroom. Such readings are important to expanding students' understanding of global issues, and my argument here is not that these readers are not useful. But the public spaces of communication—the places where transnational rhetorical engagement happens—need to be given just as much attention as the global content we bring into our courses.

In addition, readers such as these can, despite their noble intentions, leave us with a pedagogical vision of ourselves as bringing the global into our classrooms and into our students' lives as writers. Our classrooms become, in this model, spaces where we bring the global to students and where they then have an opportunity to think critically about global issues and respond to them as individuals. Within such classrooms, students might encounter perspectives from other cultures that challenge them to reflect critically on their own cultural positioning. This model has important resonances with Stoic cosmopolitanism, particularly with the internalization of the global that is embodied by the Stoic circles of obligation. Martha Nussbaum (1997) provides a succinct description of them:

> The first one is drawn around the self; the next takes in one's immediate family; then, in order, one's neighbors or local group, one's fellow city-dwellers, one's fellow countrymen. Outside all these circles is the largest one, that of humanity as a whole. Our task as citizens of the world will be to 'draw the circles somehow toward the center' making all human beings more like our fellow city dwellers, and so forth. (9)

We can see the focus on individual understanding and ethics in this description clearly reflected in the descriptions of these readers. For example, the description of *Globalization: A Reader for Writers*, states "The writers,

scholars, artists, journalists, and activists represented in this reader transcend globalization as a theme, challenging students to see globalization as a term that they need to define for themselves." The challenge for students to define globalization for themselves reflects this pulling inward, or drawing circles toward the center that we see in cosmopolitan ethics.

I am not necessarily arguing against this process. Instead, I am arguing for another starting point, another set of circles. Rather than encountering the global from the outside and drawing it in, the transnational rhetorical pedagogy I am arguing for challenges students to recognize how globalization has permeated the borders of the local, national, virtual, and familial places that make up their lives. This point is as practical as it is theoretical, as it recognizes the pedagogical difficulty we encounter when we present issues of global politics, policy, and risk to students and ask them to argue about them. While such projects certainly bring global content to the writing and rhetoric classroom, they also project a particular vision of students as global actors and their rhetorical agency, specifically their ability to personally respond to global perspectives brought into the classroom and to engage in academic and public discourse on them.

If, as Susan Buck-Morss (2003) has argued, addressing the global public is "a performative act" that "aims to bring about that which it presumes" (22), then classrooms focused on global issues ultimately become enactments of the global public. Our classrooms become global spaces with requisite global identities for our students, and these spaces and identities ultimately shape the means and ends of our global curricula. To argue for transnational rhetorical education and the goal of transnational rhetorical citizenship, is to argue for a particular vision of students' and educators' subjectivity and agency. In the case of *Shared Futures*, for example, the vision of global undergraduate education is supported by a philosophy of liberal education that encourages students to develop a cosmopolitan ethics, increased global knowledge, and experience with global engagement. A writing course that is framed by understandings of cosmopolitan citizenship, for example, might be framed, whether explicitly or not, on conceptions of the "ethical encounter," where students encounter texts from other cultures and value systems and take part in discussions about them and write in response to them. In this model, the classroom becomes a space of cultivating cosmopolitan ethical perspectives, broadening global awareness, and conceiving of possible actions. Student agency in this classroom reflects primarily an individualist ethical engagement, which can have a direct impact on the curriculum of the course, as we have seen in Nussbaum's argument

in favor of promoting classrooms that inculcate a universal, cosmopolitan subjectivity over a classroom that is shaped around specific cultural or national identities. Assignments in a class such as this might ask students to respond to global texts, and even reflect upon how they speak to their own values, while perhaps diminishing opportunities for public engagement and rhetorical performance.

I have taught courses like the one I describe, courses where students have encountered films such as Siddik Barmaq's devastating *Osama*, texts on issues such as global poverty such as Peter Singer's (1999) "The Singer Solution to World Poverty," and a variety of literary texts that were written in politically repressive political systems. In many cases, these courses have provided rich opportunities for students to broaden their ethical perspectives and global awareness, and their writing has reflected this. However, looking back on these courses, I cannot help but worry that the courses provided an opportunity for students to cultivate awareness of systemic political problems without providing them with compelling examples of the rhetorical tactics that could be used to address them or helping them see opportunities for participation. In this way, the student who responded to *Osama* by telling me that they were incredibly moved by the film but that they did not know "what to do about it" is expressing the limits of rhetorical agency that my class had defined through its focus on "broadening students' global awareness." That is not to say that we did not discuss possible action that we could take, but rather that our discussion was not paired with opportunities for rhetorical inquiry or performance, but rather just affective response. There is, of course, nothing wrong with a course like this, but I would argue that without courses in rhetoric that provide students with processes of rhetorical ethics and inquiry we risk advancing forms of global citizenship that abstract issues and Others from their political and ethical contexts.

Notes

1. See the *Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitan Studies* (2012) for an overview of these perspectives, as well as Held and Wallace Brown's *The Cosmopolitanism Reader* for a range of key texts on philosophical cosmopolitanism.
2. See Welch (2008) *Living Room,* Mathieu (2005) *Tactics of Hope*, and Rivers and Weber (2011) for representative examples. In addition, see Malesh and Stevens (2009) for insight into how social movements can be brought into the classroom.

3. See Campus Compact and the AAC&U's *Shared Futures* for excellent examples of programs that integrate service-learning and civic education.
4. See O'Brien (2009) "Global citizenship and the Stanford Cross-Cultural Rhetoric Project" and also see the project website: https://ccr.stanford.edu
5. In my own (2015) discussion of public writing and civic education in the basic writing classroom, I have referred to students' prior experiences, knowledge, and perspectives as the "incomes" of public rhetoric (22).
6. See Susan Miller (1993) *Textual Carnivals: The Politics of Composition*, James Berlin *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges 1900–1985*, and Joseph Harris (2012) *A Teaching Subject: Composition Since 1966* for representative histories of composition's subjugation in the university.
7. See Gaonkar (1993) and Schiappa (2001) on the debate over "Big Rhetoric" and "Little Rhetoric."
8. That research in public writing pedagogy and research from communication studies on rhetorical citizenship have not been brought together before speaks to significant disciplinary distinctions that have stemmed from what Mountford (2011) has called the "divorce" between rhetoric and composition studies and communication.
9. Turner defines cosmopolitan virtue by arguing that "Cosmopolitanism can both express a set of virtues (care for other cultures, ironic distance from one's own traditions, concern for the integrity of cultures in a hybrid world, openness to cross-cultural criticism and so forth), and embrace a love of country as a republican commonwealth that ought to be shared by all. If there is now widespread acceptance of the relevance of human rights legislation, then in principle perhaps we can accept a set of obligations that logically underpin those rights. The notion of 'cosmopolitan virtue' is a general description of such cultural and moral obligations" (60).
10. The many web-texts of DreamersAdrift, including the series, "Undocumented and Awkward" can be found on their website: http://dreamersadrift.com
11. See also "Las Politically Correctas" by DreamersAdrift: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I-A5m_KKrKk

Bibliography

Alexander, Jonathan. 2006. *Digital Youth: Emerging Literacies on the World Wide Web*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Alexander, Jonathan, and Susan C. Jarratt. 2014. "Rhetorical Education and Student Activism." *College English*. 76, no. 6: 525–544.

Alexander, Jonathan, and Jacqueline Rhodes. 2014. *On Multimodality: New Media in Composition Studies*. Urbana, IL: NCTE Press.

American Council on Education. 2003. *Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide*. Prepared by Madeleine F. Green and Christa Olson. Washington, DC: American Council on Education Center for Institutional and International Initiatives, American Council on Education.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Appiah, Kwame. 2007. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton.

Asen, Robert. 2004. "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. 90, no. 2. (May): 189–211.

Atwill, Janet. 1998. *Rhetoric Reclaimed: Aristotle and the Liberal Arts Tradition*. Cornell University Press.

Beck, Ulrich. 1999. *World Risk Society*. New York: Polity.

Beltrán, Christina. 2015. "Undocumented, Unafraid, and Unapologetic: DREAM Activists, Immigrant Politics, and the Queering of Democracy." In *From Voice to Influence: Understanding Citizenship in a Digital Age*, edited by Danielle Allen and Jennifer S. Light, 80–104. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berlin, James. 1987. *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900–1985*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Brandt, Deborah. 1998. "Sponsors of Literacy." *College Composition and Communication*. 49, no. 2: 165–185.

Brown, Wendy. 2006. *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Buck-Morss, Susan. 2003. *Thinking Past Terror: Islamism and Critical Theory on the Left*. New York: Verso.

Burke, Kenneth. 1969. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Butler, Judith. 2001. "What Is Critique? An Essay on Foucault's Virtue." In *The Judith Butler Reader*, edited by Sara Salih with Judith Butler, 302–322. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

———. 2004. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. New York: Verso.

———. 2005. *Giving an Account of Oneself*. New York: Fordham University Press.

———. 2012. "Precarious Life, Vulnerability, and the Ethics of Cohabitation." *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*. 26, no. 2: 134–151. JSTOR.

Butler, Judith, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. 2010. *Who Sings the Nation-State?* London: Seagull Books.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 2013. *Translingual Practices: Global English and Cosmopolitan Relations*. New York: Routledge.

Chávez, Karma R. 2013. *Queer Migration Politics: Activist Rhetoric and Coalitional Possibilities*. Carbondale, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Cisneros, Josue David. 2013. *The Border Crossed Us: Rhetorics of Borders, Citizenship, and Latina/o Identity*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Connors, Robert. 1991. "Rhetoric in the Modern University: The Creation of an Underclass." In *The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary*, edited by Richard Bullock and John Trimbur, 55–84. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Coogan, David. 2006. "Service Learning and Social Change: The Case for Materialist Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication*. 57, no. 4. (June): 667–693.

Crowley, Sharon. 2006. *Towards a Civil Discourse: Rhetoric and Fundamentalism*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Cushman, Ellen. 1998. *The Struggle and the Tools: Oral and Literate Strategies in an Inner City Community*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Darsey, James. 2011. "Toward a Non-Stoical Cosmopolitanism." *Advances in the History of Rhetoric*. 14, no. 1: 129–138.

Dingo, Rebecca. 2012. *Networking Arguments: Rhetoric, Transnational Feminism, and Public Policy Writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Dubisar, Ally M., and Jason Palmieri. 2010. "Palin/Pathos/Peter Griffin: Political Video Remix and Composition Pedagogy." *Computers and Composition*. 27: 77–93.

Duffy, John. 2014. "Ethical Dispositions: A Discourse for Rhetoric and Composition." *JAC: A Journal of Rhetoric, Culture, and Politics*. 34, no. 1–2: 209–237.

———. 2017. "The Good Writer: Virtue Ethics and the Teaching of Writing." *College English*. 79, no. 3: 229–250.

Eberly, Rosa. 2000. *Citizen Critics: Literary Public Spheres*. Carbondale, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Ervin, Elizabeth. 1997. "Encouraging Civic Participation Among First Year Writing Students; or, Why Composition Class Should Be More Like a Bowling Team." *Rhetoric Review*. 15, no. 2. (Spring): 382–399.

Farmer, Frank. 2013. *After the Public Turn: Composition, Counter-Publics, and the Citizen Bricoleur*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Fleming, David. 1998. "Rhetoric as a Course of Study." *College English*. 61, no. 2. (November): 169–191.

Foucault, Michel. 1997. "What Is Critique?" Translated by Lysa Hochroth and Catherine Porter. In *The Politics of Truth*, 41–81. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Gaonkar, Dilip Parameshwar. 1993. "The Idea of Rhetoric in the Rhetoric of Science." *Southern Communication Journal*. 58, no. 3: 258–295.

Gere, Anne Ruggles. 1994. "Kitchen Tables and Rented Rooms: The Extracurriculum of Composition." *College Composition and Communication*. 45, no. 1: 75–92.

Guerra, Juan C. 2004. "Emerging Representations, Situated Literacies, and the Practice of Transcultural Repositioning." In *Latino/a Discourses: On Language, Identity, and Literacy Education*, edited by Michelle Hall Kells, Valerie Balester, and Victor Villanueva, 7–23. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Geuss, Raymond. 2008. *Philosophy and Real Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Glenn, Cheryl, Margaret M. Lyday, and Wendy B. Sharer, eds. 2004. *Rhetorical Education in America*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Gogan, Brian. 2014. "Expanding the Aims of Public Rhetoric and Writing Pedagogy." *College Composition and Communication*. 65, no. 4: 534–559.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1998. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Translated by William Rehg. Cambridge, MA: MIT University Press.

———. 2001. *The Postnational Constellation*. Translated by Max Pensky. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harris, Joseph. 2012. *A Teaching Subject: Composition Since 1966*. 2nd Edition. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Hart, Carrie. 2015. "The Activism of Julio Salgado's *I Am Undocuqueer!* Series." *Working Papers on Language and Diversity in Education*. 1, no. 1: 1–14.

Hauser, Gerard. 2004. "Teaching Rhetoric: Or Why Rhetoric Isn't Just Another Kind of Philosophy or Literary Criticism." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*. 34, no. 3: 39–53.

Hauser, Gerard A., and Susan Whalen. 1997. "New Rhetoric and New Social Movements." In *Emerging Theories of Human Communication*, edited by Branislav Kovacic, 115–140. New York: State University of New York Press.

Heilker, Paul. 1997. "Rhetoric Made Real: Civic Discourse and Writing Beyond the Curriculum." In *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition*, edited by Linda Adler-Kassner, Robert Crooks, and Ann Watters, 71–77. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Held, David. 2010. *Cosmopolitanism: Ideas, Realities, and Deficits*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hesford, Wendy. 2011. "Global Turns and Cautions in Rhetoric and Composition Studies." *PMLA*. 121, no. 3: 787–801.

Hesse, Doug. 2005. "2005 CCCC Chair's Address: Who Owns Writing?." *College Composition and Communication*. 57, no. 2: 335–357.

Horner, Bruce, and John Trimbur. 2002. "English Only and U.S. Composition." *College Composition and Communication*. 53, no. 4: 594–630.

Hovland, Kevin. 2014. *Global Learning: Defining, Designing, Demonstrating*. NAFSA.

Jarratt, Susan. "Sophistopolis as Cosmopolis: Reading Postclassical Greek Rhetoric." *Advances in the History of Rhetoric.* 14, no. 1: 65–82.

Keith, William, and Roxanne Mountford. 2014. "The Mt. Oread Manifesto on Rhetorical Education 2013." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly.* 44, no. 1: 1–5.

Kock, Christian, and Lisa Villadsen. 2014. *Contemporary Rhetorical Citizenship.* Leiden, NL: Leiden University Press.

Kuehl, Rebecca A. 2014. "Extending Civic Rhetoric: Valuing Rhetorical Dimensions of Global Citizenship in Civic Education." In *Contemporary Rhetorical Citizenship*, edited by Christian Kock and Lisa Villadsen, 291–308. Leiden, NL: Leiden, University Press.

Long, Elenore. 2008. *Community Literacy and the Rhetoric of Local Publics.* West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

Lunsford, Andrea, and Lahoucine Ouzgane eds. 2004. *Crossing Borderlands: Composition and Postcolonial Studies.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Malesh, Patricia, and Sharon McKenzie Stevens. 2009. New York: State University of New York Press.

Marrou, H.I. 1956. *A History of Education in Antiquity.* Translated by George Lamb. University of Wisconsin Press.

Mathieu, Paula. 2005. *Tactics of Hope: The Public Turn in English Composition.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton Cook.

Mignolo, Walter. 2000. "The Many Faces of Cosmo-polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism." *Public Culture.* 12, no. 3: 721–748.

———. 2012. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Miller, Susan. 1993. *Textual Carnivals: The Politics of Composition.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Minnix, Christopher. 2015. "Basic Writers in Composition's Public Turn: Voice and Influence in the Basic Writing Classroom." *Journal of Basic Writing.* 34, no. 1: 21–43.

Morris, Aldon. 2000. "Reflections on Social Movement Theory: Criticisms and Proposals." *Contemporary Sociology.* 29, no. 3: 445–454.

Morrissey, Megan E. 2013. "A DREAM Disrupted: Undocumented Migrant Youth Disidentifications with U.S. Citizenship." *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication.* 6, no. 2: 145–162.

Mouffe, Chantal. 2005. *On the Political.* London: Routledge.

Mountford, Roxanne. 2011. "A Century After the Divorce: Challenges to a Rapprochement Between Speech Communication and English." In *The Sage Handbook of Rhetorical Studies*, edited by Andrea A. Lunsford, Kirt H. Wilson, and Rosa Eberly. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412982795.

Murray, S.J. 2007. "Ethics and the Scene of Address: A Conversation with Judith Butler." *Canadian Journal for Continental Philosophy.* 11, no. 2: 415–445.

National Council of Teachers of English. 2013. "NCTE Framework for 21st Century Curriculum and Assessment." *National Council of Teachers of English.* February, 2013. Accessed January 2nd, 2016. http://www.ncte.org/governance/21stcenturyframework.

New London Group. 1996. "A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures." In *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*, edited by Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis, 9–37. New York: Routledge.

Nolasco, Luis, and Yessica Gonzalez. 2016. "An Open Letter to our 'Allies': Stop Telling Us What We Can and Can't Identify As." *DreamersAdrift.* February 12, 2016. Accessed, October 1st, 2017. http://dreamersadrift.com/featured1/an-open-letter-to-our-allies-stop-telling-us-what-we-can-and-cant-identify-as.

Nussbaum, Martha. 1997. "Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism." *The Journal of Political Philosophy.* 5, no. 1: 1–25.

O'Brien, A.J. 2011. "Global Citizenship and the Stanford Cross-Cultural Rhetoric Project". *Journal of the NUS Teaching Academy.* 1, no. 1: 32–43. http://www.nus.edu.sg/teachingacademy/article/global-citizenship-and-the-stanford-cross-cultural-rhetoric-project/.

Ober, Josiah. 1989. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Parks, Stephen. 2009. "Strategic Speculations on the Question of Value: The Role of Community Publishing in English Studies." *College English.* 5, no. 71: 506–527.

Petraglia, Joseph. 2003. "Identity Crisis: Rhetoric as an Epistemic and a Pedagogic Discipline." In *The Realms of Rhetoric: The Prospects for Rhetoric Education*, edited by Joseph Petraglia and Deepika Bahri, 151–170. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Petraglia, Joseph, and Deepika Bahri, eds. 2003. *The Realms of Rhetoric: The Prospects for Rhetoric Education.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Porter, James E. 1998. *Rhetorical Ethics and Internetworked Writing.* Greenwich, CT: Ablex.

Poulakos, Takis. 1997. *Speaking for the Polis: Isocrates' Rhetorical Education.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Ratcliffe, Krista. 1999. "Rhetorical Listening: A Trope for Interpretive Invention and a 'Code of Cross-Cultural Conduct'." *College Composition and Communication.* 51, no. 2: 195–224.

Rawls, John. 2001. *The Law of Peoples.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ribero, Ana Mileno. 2017. "Citizenship." *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition Studies.* 31–45. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rice, Jenny. 2012. *Distant Publics: Development Rhetoric and the Subject of Crisis.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Rivers, Nathaniel, and Ryan P. Weber. 2011. "Ecological, Pedagogical, and Public Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication.* 63, no. 2: 187–218.

Salgado, Julio. 2012. "Undocumented and Awkward: Episode 8." *Youtube*. January 4, 2012. Accessed June 5th, 2016. https://youtu.be/4h2shmNkpHE.

———. 2015. "Undocumented and Awkward Season 2.0" *Youtube*. May 12th, 2015. Accessed June 5th, 2016. https://youtu.be/I5hvMBm5xGE.

Schiappa, Edward. 2001. "Some Thoughts on the Critiques of Big Rhetoric." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*. 34, no. 3: 260–274

Selfe, Richard J., and Cynthia L. Selfe. 2008. "'Convince Me!' Valuing Multimodal Literacies and Composing Public Service Announcements." *Theory into Practice*. 47: 83–92.

Selfe, Cynthia L. 2007. *Multimodal Composition: Resources for Teachers*. New York: Hampton.

Sharer, Wendy B., and Margaret M. Lyday. 2004. "Afterword." In *Rhetorical Education in America*, edited by Cheryl Glenn, Wendy B. Sharer, and Margaret M. Lyday, 198–208. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Sheridan, David, Jim Ridolfo, and Anthony J. Michel. 2012. *The Available Means of Persuasion: Mapping a Theory and Pedagogy of Multimodal Public Rhetoric*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

Singer, Peter. 1999. "The Singer Solution to World Poverty." *The New York Times Magazine*. 5 (September): 60–63.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 2012. *An Aesthetic Education in an Era of Globalization*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tilly, Charles. 2008. *Contentious Performances*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Turner, Brian S. 2002. "Cosmopolitan Virtue, Globalization and Patriotism." *Theory, Culture, and Society*. 19, no. 1–2: 45–63.

Walker, Jeffrey. 2011. *The Genuine Teachers of This Art: Rhetorical Education in Antiquity*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Wan, Amy J. 2014. *Producing Good Citizens: Literacy Training in Anxious Times*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press.

Weisser, Christian R. 2002. *Moving Beyond Academic Discourse: Composition Studies and the Public Sphere*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois, University Press.

Welch, Nancy. 2008. *Living Room: Teaching Public Writing in a Privatized World*. New York: Heinemann.

Wells, Susan. 1996. "Rogue Cops and Health Care: What Do We Want from Public Writing?" *College Composition and Communication* 47, no. 3: 325–341.

Wible, Scott. 2013. *Shaping Language Policy in the U.S.: The Role of Composition Studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. 2009. *Writing in the 21st Century: A Report from the National Council of Teachers of English*. National Council of Teachers of English. Accessed June 2, 2016. http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Press/Yancey_final.pdf.

Seeing Precarity: Rhetorical Citizenship, Global Images, and Rhetorical Ethics in the Global Classroom

There is perhaps no more typical example of our daily encounters with the global than our experiences viewing images of distant others, often images of their suffering. Such images point to not only the need to ethically and rhetorically respond, but also at times are used to underline the limits of our agency. I open this chapter with the well-known example of the photo of Omran Daqneesh and its wide circulation through media outlets because it captures the tension I would like to explore here between rhetorical and ethical spectatorship and rhetorical agency. In August of 2016, following Russian airstrikes supported by the Assad regime, news outlets circulated the image of five-year-old Omran Daqneesh, bloodied and sitting in shock in an ambulance after being rescued by the Syrian aid organization White Helmets. The image circulated rapidly, immediately being picked up by news agencies as well as activism campaigns. *The Syria Campaign*, for example, circulated an email the day after the bombing with a letter from the photographer, Mahmoud Rislan, a media activist and war photographer who lived beside the attack. Rislan says, "Today when I woke up to see the whole world using the photo and talking about it I thought to myself, I hope all photos of children and attacks in Syria go viral so the world knows what life is like here. If people know what it is like maybe the war will stop, the bombing will stop" (2016). During the days and months that followed, the image of Omran Daqneesh's image quickly achieved "iconic" status (Hariman and Lucaites 2007, 1).[1] His image was

circulated widely throughout mass media, remixed by a range of graphic artists, street artists, and cartoonists, utilized in a wide variety of memes, and embedded in a variety of online and print media frames. The rhetorical force of Omran's image is undeniable, as is the photographer's hope that the power of this image can impel forms of ethical response and political action around the world that could stop the war. Part of the force of Omran's image and the photographer's message can be found in the sense of obligation and political agency they require. Such obligations raise significant political and ethical questions for spectators, including questions of our responsibility as viewers, and questions of our responsibilities as people who "use" and circulate the image through various mediums and networks.

Soon after the publication of this image, predictable critiques of the agency of the image and spectatorship began to circulate across editorial pages of a variety of news outlets and across social media. In an article published on August 18 in *The Daily Beast*, Michael Weiss and James Miller (2016) develop the typical critique of the political agency of iconic images, noting that "like The Falling Soldier or the Burning Monk, this could become the face of the Syrian war. In the end, though, this image is unlikely do much to ameliorate the suffering of Aleppo" (Weiss and Miller). Scott Lucas, founder of the news site EA Worldview and a professor at the University of Birmingham put this point more bluntly by tweeting, "Omran, your photo will be this year's pic that moved the world. Don't get hopes up, they will soon be unmoved again" (Lucas). I call these critiques predictable because they have become part of public discourse regarding images of suffering or political violence. There are, of course, different motivations for these critiques, including not only indicting spectators and users of the image for their both their failure to produce political action and their political naiveté, but also motivating spectators to break the cycle of inaction through a rhetoric of shame. While these critiques have become somewhat typical, they are not, however, trivial, as they reflect deep problems of rhetorical agency and rhetorical ethics in an age of global media.

Over the past 30 years, a wide range of critical work in visual culture, art, media studies, and transnational politics has examined the problematic ethics and politics of circulating and consuming images of global suffering.[2] Working in and across these different disciplines, many scholars have argued that despite the powers of sentiment generated by these images they fail two important tests. First, such images often fail the *test of*

representation by portraying victims as abstract representations of specific social problems or issues and within a Western gaze of pity or compassion that lacks political agency. Second, such images fail the *test of agency* by being unable to generate sustained political engagement through affect. We can see each of these tests in the image of Omran Daqneesh, whose image was utilized without his reciprocal recognition or consent as an icon of the Syrian civil war and whose image was almost immediately criticized as politically inadequate to mobilize action and as generating consumption and circulation practices that were ethically suspect. This point has been recently brought home by the devastating last messages posted to Twitter by those trapped in Aleppo in the days before it fell to pro-government forces. Despite the circulation of images such as the image of Omran Daqneesh months earlier, several messages remind us of the failure of the international community and the failure of international will to respond. At the same time, however, the test of agency points to a need for political action of an almost inconceivable scope and effect for average viewers, especially those who consume and circulate these images outside of activist collectives and advocacy networks that might empower them to respond.

In this chapter, I argue that images of global suffering and violence constitute one of the key challenges for rhetorical educators responding to the global turn in higher education. Images of human suffering and political violence are certainly not the only images that flow through transnational networks, but their extensive prevalence, along with the problems of recognition, representation, and agency they bring, cannot help but challenge our understanding of the global turn in higher education and the role rhetorical education can play in it. I argue here that a central part of transnational rhetorical education must be the everyday experiences of the global, including the consumption and circulation of global images, that play a role in shaping our students' visions of the global and their perceptions of their agency within it. We need a critical pedagogy of rhetorical spectatorship that can equip our students with tactics that enable them to negotiate the relationship between viewing global images, rhetoric, and action.

While spectatorship of global suffering and political turmoil has often been critiqued as self-indulgent, even pornographic, recent critical work on photography has argued for spectatorship as a civic practice. I draw here specifically on the work of Ariella Azoulay (2008, 2015), who has argued that photography, particularly photography of catastrophe, provides the opportunity to engage in forms of civic belonging that can

challenge forms of political sovereignty that exclude and oppress others (2008, 14). I argue that the type of citizenship that Azoulay presents, a "citizenship of photography" (2008, 104), is ultimately a form rhetorical citizenship, as it calls for spectators who are able to not only critically analyze images, but who can engage in acts of rhetorical invention and performance that reconfigure the image and challenge its previous uses and frames. Azoulay's work helpfully identifies how images can be used to create alternative, engaged communities outside of the divisions inscribed by nation-states. In this way, her work enables us to envision more concrete understandings of transnational citizenship. As a public rhetoric teacher, however, I seek to add another dimension to Azoulay's work— the dimension of rhetorical education. I argue that rhetorical educators can play a particularly important role in equipping students with strategies of critical spectatorship that can enable them to perceive not just their ethical responsibility but also opportunities for rhetorical invention and rhetorical citizenship.

Digital Participation and Global Citizenship

As the contemporary literature on global higher education discussed in the second chapter of this book illustrates, the exigency for fostering students' global communication skills is often framed as a response to the shrinking of borders brought about through the internet and new media. Educational policy statements, including those in our own field, often point to the relationship between technology and increased opportunities for global communication. In her NCTE report "Writing in the 21st Century," Kathleen Yancey (2009) points to the expansion of digital communication technologies in creating "a new era in literacy, a period we might call the Age of Composition, a period where composers become composers not through direct and formal instruction alone (if at all), but rather through what we might call extracurricular social co-apprenticeship" (5). In this important sense, students' interactions in online writing environments can expand the audiences of their work, while also opening up new alternatives for writing in the public or civic sphere (Hesse 2005, 350). Work in rhetoric and composition has explored the political and ethical dimensions of photography (George and Shoos 2005; DeVoss and Platt 2011; Rutz 2010; Fleckenstein 2009; Hesford 2011), as well as its pedagogical dimensions (Palmieri 2012; Gamber 2010; Wysocki 2000). In addition, multimodal pedagogy has often been examined and

theorized within the framework of preparing students for acts of global communication (New London Group 1996; Hawisher and Selfe 2000; Selfe 2007). Composition and rhetoric scholars are, of course, not alone in making these claims. A range of empirical and theoretical research on youth and civic engagement points to the role of digital media in opening up global audiences and fostering students' civic participation and agency.

In their work on the *Youth and Participatory Politics Survey Project*, Cathy Cohen and Joseph Kahne (2012) found that even when young people "were highly involved in nonpolitical, interest-driven activities" their participation in online networks makes them "*five times* as likely to engage in participatory politics and nearly *four times* as likely to participate in all political acts, compared with those infrequently involved in such activities" (ix). For many scholars researching youth and civic engagement, social media provide opportunities for youth to pursue new forms of citizenship that enact forms of political belonging and participation that are not necessarily constrained by traditional party politics. Kahne et al. (2015) have argued that networks have opened up the opportunity to redefine "participatory politics" as "forms of political action that seek to advance peer-to peer forms of organization and to evade elite dominance in politics, regardless of those elite's partisan affiliation" (42). Social media and activism researcher Lance Bennett (2008) has argued that this type of participatory politics reflects a new way of understanding citizenship. Bennett argues that traditional understandings of citizenship have reflected what he calls the "dutiful citizen," who "participates in government centered activities," feels that "voting is the core democratic act," gains their information from mass media, and joins "civil society organizations and/or expresses interests through parties" (14). In contrast, he defines the practices of citizenship we see in youth political activity as "actualizing citizenship"—citizenship "favoring loosely networked activism to address issues that reflect personal values" (14). Ethan Zuckerman, director of MIT's Center for Civic Media and a founder of Global Voices, an alternative, volunteer-based global news organization argues digital media promote forms of political participation, what Zuckerman calls "participatory civics" (2014, 156), that are shaped around individual interests rather than by "broader adherence to political movements and philosophies" (157).While each of these theorists argue that these looser, interest-driven forms of political participation allow us to conceive of new forms of citizenship, each also points to the enduring distinction between participation (often referred to as voice) and influence.

Toward the end of their report for the *Youth Participatory Politics Research Project*, Cohen and Kahne (2012) underline this important distinction:

> there is a risk that proponents of participatory politics, including youth themselves, will fail to focus on the distinction between voice and influence. We should be clear: we do not want to undervalue the significance of voice, especially for youth who are in the process of developing their political identities. At the same time, we recognize that the promise of a democratic society is predicated on the belief that political actors have more than voice. They must also have influence. (37–8)

The relationship between voice and influence, for Cohen and Kahne, as for many other scholars in the area of youth and political engagement, is one that makes civic education necessary. For Bennett, one of the roles of education is to help students bridge these two different paradigms so that young citizens can understand how "their concerns can gain public voice within the conventional arenas of power and decision making" (21). There is a need, in other words, to understand and draw on the "self-actualizing" political practices of youth so that we can enable them to understand how their political action can have public influence. Others in this area have also noted the necessity of enabling youth to understand how their online engagement could translate into political agency.

Like Cohen and Kahne and Bennett, Zuckerman (2013, 2014) points to the necessity of civic education to empower people to leverage platforms that provide them with a public voice for influence and change. Zuckerman has also cautioned against technological utopianism, and shows how social media can bring specific dangers that can constrain our global knowledge and participation even as it brings new possibilities for engagement. For Zuckerman, pursuing interest-driven politics through digital media can result in what he refers to as a "pointillist public sphere," where "it's easy to pay attention to the small range of topics you and your friends are interested in, but where it requires a great deal of work and conscious effort to see the bigger picture" (2014, 165). Zuckerman draws on research that illustrates how our experiences with social networks can trigger their algorithms to actually limit our exposure to international or global news and issues (165). Developing an effective civic education requires tapping into students' understanding and experience of participatory media, but also challenging students to critically understand how this media can constrain

as well as promote civic participation. This means not only drawing on students' experience with networked forms of civic participation and voice, but also working alongside students to enable them to transfer this experience to different domains of political discourse and influence.

The emerging forms of citizenship studied by Bennett, Zuckerman, and others clearly reflect new ways of understanding citizenship based on forms of rhetorical performance, or participation. This work points to the emergence of new forms of civic identity and belonging that have developed outside of the typical confines of party or even national politics. Given the emergence of these newer forms of political identification and participation, it is not surprising that media scholars like Zuckerman (2013) have argued for forms of "digital cosmopolitanism" that expand civic identity and participation beyond the nation (24). The question of how these new forms of civic identity and new forums of participation can foster influence or meaningful acts of public participation and engagement is a more difficult one. Toward the end of an article that traces out the need for a new civics, Ethan Zuckerman argues that "while there are vast unanswered questions about how participatory media may change civics, there is a pressing and concrete question: How should we teach civic participation to a generation of 'digital natives?'" (2014, 165). This question is perhaps even more challenging in a global context, where many of the most readily identifiable opportunities for civic participation or influence, such as letter-writing, signing petitions, and sharing information through social media, can seem too limited in terms of their influence.

In a recent blog post that touches upon the rhetorical research of his MIT colleague, Edward Schiappa, Zuckerman (2012) points to the role of participatory media in expanding our understanding of civic education: "If we want to prepare people to be effective citizens, we need to think about teaching this new civics as well as older forms of civic participation. Citizens need to do more than watch or read about the issues and then vote. They need to know how to report, to advocate, to coordinate, to propose and test solutions." For Zuckerman, ancient rhetoric and contemporary civic media can play mutually informative roles in empowering people to participate in acts of civic engagement.

I pause here to consider this research because it underlines two important points. First, it points to engaging our students' experiences of digital participation and voice as a starting point for rhetorical citizenship. This is particularly important in the context of global higher education, as many

programs and initiatives of comprehensive internationalization tend to focus on bringing global texts, perspectives, and issues *to* the classroom rather than on students' experiences with global media and culture. Second, this research underlines the necessity of rhetorical education for helping students recognize and seize upon opportunities for moving from voice to influence. While digital media allows for new forms of civic belonging and enactment to emerge, these forms still face the problem of exercising persuasion and influence. This research points to alternative understandings of civic engagement located in the everyday digital media practices and experience of youth. However, the digital forms of cosmopolitanism or global citizenship outlined in this research also illustrates a tendency to position the relationship between political power and digital citizenship abstractly, often without an explanation of the role that the consumption and circulation of media play in constructing "frames" of recognition and response (Butler 2009, 64) to distant others, those brought closer to us through the circulation of images, narratives, and representations through global digital media.

As Butler (2009) argues in her discussion of "Torture and the Ethics of Photography" in *Frames of War*, "whether and how we respond to the suffering of others, how we formulate moral criticisms, how we articulate political analyses depends on a certain field of perceptible reality having already been established. The field of the perceptible reality is one in which the notion of the recognizable human is formed and maintained over and against what cannot be named or regarded as human" (64). In regards to the forms of digital civic participation outlined by Bennett, Zuckerman, and others, I agree that digital media have expanded our understanding of civic participation and opened up new avenues for rhetorical citizenship. However, we need a critical rhetoric and ethics that can enable students to not only recognize digital media as opportunities for participation, but also recognize how such media condition their perceptions of the global and their recognitions and responses to others. For that, we need rhetorical practices, and rhetorical pedagogies of transnational spectatorship.

The Problems of Transnational Spectatorship

Circulation of images of global suffering through transnational and virtual networks can promote the formations of what Arjun Appadurai (2013) has called "communities of sentiment" (63) and what Richard

Rorty (1989, 185) described as forms of solidarity rooted in sentiment, but often such images are on the receiving end of vociferous critiques.[3] While non-governmental organizations are often the targets of these critiques (Hesford 2011; Dogra 2012), critiques of the relationship between sentiment, awareness, and agency are, as we have seen, directly pointed at publics and citizens of nation-states as well. As the immediate responses to Omran Daqneesh's image illustrate, public spectators not only encounter a wide range of global images, including images of suffering, but they do so in a context shaped by a deep distrust in images. This context is troubling, as it places spectators in a double-bind, one where they are subjected to a continuous stream of images of global suffering that flow through transnational media networks but also to a seemingly endless barrage of critiques of the inadequacies of their own ethical and political responses. Spectatorship, in this sense, becomes a process of recognizing our own shameful inadequacy in the face of the spectacle of human suffering.

These positions reflect a dominant trend in political and aesthetic critiques of images of suffering and have shaped photographic criticism from the nineteen-seventies until this day. The prevalence of these critiques and their stakes for photography are captured in the title of the first chapter of Susie Linfield's (2010) *The Cruel Radiance: Photography and Political Violence*: "A Little History of Photographic Criticism; or, Why Do Photography Critics Hate Photography?" Among these critiques, some of the most powerful and troubling have pointed to the exploitative role of photographing and spectating events of global suffering (Sekula 1984; Berger 1980; Sontag 1977, 2003). These critiques are often traced back to the influence of Susan Sontag, whose work has played an immensely important role in shaping generations of works skeptical of the photography of suffering. In *On Photography* (1977), Sontag argues that repeated exposure to atrocity images can "anesthetize" viewers (20). In an often-cited passage, Sontag argues that "the same law holds for evil as for pornography. The shock of photographed atrocities wears off with repeated viewings … The sense of taboo which makes us indignant and sorrowful is not much sturdier than the sense of taboo that regulates the definition of what is obscene" (20). Over 25 years later, in *Regarding the Pain of Others*, Sontag (2003) returned to this topic to argue that the proliferation of images of suffering constructs not action but a misunderstanding of sympathy for action. For Sontag, "Our sympathy proclaims our innocence as well as our impotence. To that extent, it can be (for all our good intentions) an impertinent—if not an inappropriate—response" (102). The

suffering we see in images can make us passive spectators who are driven to view the images in order to gratify our own desires. In this sense, we become complicit consumers of global suffering.

Writing in 1972, John Berger (1980) argued that "photographs of agony," such as photographs of the Vietnam war, create a sense of the viewers "moral inadequacy," but that this sense can either be "shrugged off" or placated by "a kind of penance," such as donating to a charitable organization (40). For Berger, "in both cases, the issue of the war which has caused that moment is effectively depoliticized. The picture becomes evidence of the general human condition. It accuses nobody and everybody" (40). Berger argues that the weakness of channels of legitimate political engagement in American society leads to the political function of using these images to create awareness and action being dissipated and to the images themselves losing their political power.

These positions reflect a dominant trend in political and aesthetic critiques of images of suffering and have shaped photographic criticism from the 1970s until this day.[1] While critiques of atrocity images are still commonplace, a new generation of photography theorists and critics have emerged to challenge positions such as Sontag and Berger's and to argue for the political agency and ethical necessity of viewing images of suffering and political violence (Azoulay 2008; Linfield 2010; Roberts 2014). In *The Cruel Radiance: Photography and Political Violence*, Susie Linfield (2010) argues that critiques such as Sontag's seek an "uncorrupted, unblemished photographic gaze that will result in images flawlessly poised between hope and despair, resistance and defeat, intimacy and distance" (45). Such a relationship does not exist in photography, according to Linfield, and the practice of looking at images of suffering and violence can never be "pure": "making, and looking at, pictures that portray suffering will always be a highly imperfect and highly impure activity" (44). However, as Linfield argues throughout her book, labeling images of suffering and political violence as pornographic is an insufficient political response itself, as it is ultimately, "a desire to not look at the world's cruelest moments and to remain, therefore, unsullied" (45). Against this label, Linfield argues for a turn toward viewing images of political violence and suffering in context: "we the viewers must look outside the frame to understand the complex realities out of which these photographs grew" (51). This requires an active role for the spectator, who "can *use* the photograph's ambiguities as a starting point for discovery" and approach images as "part of a process—the beginning of a dialogue, the start of an investigation—

into which we consciously enter" (29–30). Viewing images of political violence in this way opens up the door to a more complex understanding of the relationship between sympathy, understanding, and action.

Ariella Azoulay's landmark *The Civil Contract of Photography* (2008) argues for reconceiving the relationship between photographer, subject, camera, and spectator as a civil contract (23) and as constituting what she terms a "citizenry of photography" (104). Photography, for Azoulay, enables individuals to "establish a distance between themselves and power in order to observe its actions and to do so not as its subjects" (105). Drawing on Giorgio Agamben's theory of the "state of exception," Azoulay argues that practices of photography—both productive and consumptive—are "actually the exercise of citizenship—not citizenship imprinted with the seal of belonging to a sovereign, but citizenship as a partnership of governed persons taking up their duty as citizens and utilizing their position for one another, rather than for a sovereign. The camera in the hands of the citizen is indifferent to the question of whether or not the injured persons who are photographed are citizens 'of' a state. The camera recognizes them as citizens of what I call the citizenry of photography" (104). Rather than viewing photographs of atrocity as exploitative or pornographic, Azoulay (2015) argues for their role in promoting habits of spectatorship that establish forms of civil connection that challenge official discourse and visual regimes that cast victims of state violence in specific roles, such as refugee (223). Like Butler, Azoulay argues that our responses to images of global suffering can be a critical form of exercising the right to question and interrogate the discursive frames that shape the conditions of our citizenship and/or exclusion.

In *Civil Imagination: A Political Ontology of Photography* (2015), Azoulay outlines the capacity of the spectator to resist visual frameworks that work against those excluded from citizenship and to engage in acts of invention that speak back to these frameworks. She argues that "every time a spectator faces a photograph of constituent violence and sees that which is photographed as a fait accompli, an event that is finished, an event to which the spectator is an outsider—the spectator exercises law-preserving violence…. Instead of taking the usual critical position and indicting them, the spectator can participate in the event of photography employing the civil faculty that contests the distancing of the plaintiff at the moment of photography, and the spectator's own distancing at the moment of viewing" (231). This process, for Azoulay, becomes one of politically, and I would argue rhetorically, questioning the visual frames

that condition access to normative citizenship and the political representation of those photographed. In addition, this process also leads the spectator to rhetorically question and negotiate the rhetorical practices that are used to constitute their own citizenship. Azoulay refers to this process as "the right not to be a perpetrator": "Breaking out of this circular relationship requires that we treat photographs taken in a disaster zone as the basis for reconstructing the photographic situation, whose boundaries never correspond to the frame of the photograph. Using photographs differently allows us to imagine a *new*—or renewed—human rights discourse, which besides the traditional assistance to a population designated as violated, stands also to benefit the citizens ruled alongside the violated population" (245). Azoulay's insight here opens up spectatorship to processes of rhetorical invention that can lead students, I argue, past the feelings of helplessness that they encounter when looking at images of global suffering and toward inventional processes through which they can engage such photographs ethically and rhetorically.

Azoulay's work points toward an understanding that spectatorship, or "looking" can be a civic act that invites further discourse and action, and this aspect of her work resonates with work on photography in rhetoric and composition studies. Her understanding of the civic agency of photography depends on the rhetorical agency, knowledge, and capacities of the agents of photography, including spectators. She seems to require viewers who not only possess the requisite rhetorical knowledge to respond or identify with images of atrocity in a particular way, but also viewers who will view the images as an invitation to discourse and action. This brings us back to a question that has been asked several times and in several ways throughout this book, "where do people cultivate these civic, rhetorical capacities?" Clearly, she is developing theoretical and critical arguments rather than pedagogical arguments, but nevertheless we see in her calls for critical spectatorship the need for pedagogy.

Work in rhetoric and composition adds the importance of rhetorical pedagogy to this discussion by pointing to the fact the visions of civic agency of photography endorsed by Azoulay, Linfield, and others require the cultivation of particular tactics for producing, consuming, remediating, and rhetorically acting upon images of suffering and atrocity. The civic subjects of photography they speak of require critical rhetorical tactics for viewing and producing images. In *Spectacular Rhetorics,* Wendy Hesford (2011) takes up both atrocity images and decontextualized representations of human rights, arguing for the development of "intercontextual"

reading practices that can engage the politics of images and representation. For Hesford, "to read intercontextually is to identify in a composition or performance the internal references to other texts or rhetorical acts, to become reflective about the social codes and habits of interpretation that shape the composition or performance's meaning and that it enacts, and to comprehend how texts are formed by the institutions and the material contexts that produce them and through which they circulate" (11). Hesford's work outlines how images are embedded in rhetorical practices and rhetorical cultures (both visual and textual) that shape and constrain how they are viewed, understood, and acted upon, while the intertextual reading she defines and exhibits provides tactics of pushing back against these constraints and articulating other positions.

Hesford's critical analysis of human rights rhetoric provides an example of what Kristie Fleckenstein (2009), in her *Vision, Rhetoric, and Social Action in the Composition Classroom*, has shown to be the synthesis of "ways of seeing" and "ways of speaking" in social action (11). Fleckenstein argues not only for the necessity of recognizing the "visual habits" and "rhetorical habits" that shape the way we see images, but also the necessity of understanding how "ways of speaking and ways of seeing combine to reinforce particular goals for social action and particular tactics for achieving those goals" (11). Importantly, Fleckenstein points to the need to "go beyond critical analysis of images" to examine how viewers rhetorically "endow individual images with meaning, significance, and power" (163). Fleckenstein's argument reflects arguments in composition research on multimodality that have stressed the need to move beyond visual analysis and toward the production of visual texts. Mary Hocks (2003), in "Understanding Visual Rhetoric in Digital Writing Environments," points to the necessity of balancing both the critique and production of visual texts. For Hocks, writing teachers can create a "balanced rhetorical approach" by giving "students experiences both in the analytic process of critique … and in the transformative process of design, which can change power relations by creating a new vision of knowledge" (644–5). This balance of critique and production is particularly important when students construct multimodal texts that invent and represent the global. As I will argue below, students' use of atrocity images in multimodal projects on global issues imports the ethical and political problems of these images into their projects, but it also offers opportunities for a rhetorical education that can enable students to cultivate habits of critical spectatorship crucial to transnational rhetorical citizenship.

STUDENT SPECTATORSHIP AND THE DIFFICULTIES
OF RHETORICAL AND ETHICAL RESPONSE

As we have seen, the circulation of visual images through transnational networks creates what Butler has described as "ethical obligations that are global in character and that emerge both at a distance and within relations of proximity" (2012, 134). In courses where students not only see global images, but engage in active responses to global images that require them to critically analyze, respond, and even utilize these images in their own work, such images serve as a central opportunity for students' rhetorical education. Global images, especially those that illustrate the conditions of precarious life, invoke not only an ethical relationship, but also a context of political action, and students' use of these photographs provides important insights into their "habits of seeing and speaking" (Fleckenstein 10) the global. At the same time, however, the ubiquity of images of precarity, their mundane character presents challenges for cultivating students' rhetorical ethics and agency.

Of course, like some photography critics, we could simply ask students not to view such images, or perhaps provide them with a prescriptive ethics of viewing and using such images. Several years ago, while discussing global images and the problems of spectatorship with colleagues, a colleague responded by asking, "why should we spend time having students work with these images? Why not get them involved in working in a more authentic public context instead?" While I agree we should engage students in authentic public contexts, I want to suggest here that the binary of "inauthentic images" versus "authentic rhetorical context" is a false one. The discussion of rhetoric and the scene of ethical and political address that I have advanced thus far in this book underlines this point. Quite simply, the daily, hourly circulation of global images, often images of human suffering and precarity, shapes the scene of address in global classrooms and shapes students' rhetorical choices by configuring their horizons of agency and ethics. To illustrate this point, I want to start by pointing to a particular problem that I have often seen in students' multimodal compositions.

As a rhetorician who teaches transnational issues in my classes, I have often found, despite our discussions of representation and rhetorical ethics, that decontextualized images of human suffering, those images that

use individual or collective groups of humans to signify global issues, consistently find their way into my students' projects. Often, the same image is repeated across multiple student projects. As a simple exercise to illustrate this point, I often tell my students that I will pull up a black-and-white image of African children reaching upwards for aid within the first 10 rows of images by searching "global poverty" in Google Images. I have conducted this search across dozens of computers, and each time the image recurs. There are two things that I find striking about the image. First, the image is used frequently across a range of student projects in my own and other faculty in my program's classes. Second, the image is actually the representation of "poverty porn" on Wikipedia's entry for that term. And yet, my students, and I, are moved by the image despite its ubiquity. At the same time, however, by reinforcing a philanthropic frame of vision, I find that the image has a direct effect on my students' ability to conceive of rhetorical action or inquiry outside of giving or becoming aware.

A brief analysis of a student project that uses decontextualized images of global poverty can help illustrate the challenges posed by the ubiquity of images of suffering. I have chosen a project uploaded in 2009 and freely available on YouTube, entitled, "The Extreme Poverty in Haiti." There are many projects like this one that students have created for classes on YouTube, and the creators of these projects range in age from middle school to college. "The Extreme Poverty in Haiti" captures the relationship between rhetorical ethics, spectatorship, and performance that I have discussed above. The caption describes both the project and the author's growing investment in the issue of poverty in Haiti: "This was a … project I did for my English class. At 1st I didn't really take it seriously. I didn't know much about Haiti, all I knew was Wyclef Jean was born Haitian. But after I started doing the project & getting to know my topic I realized this was something that HAD to be addressed to the public & ppl need to be aware of what's going on. Haiti is a country in the caribbean which is considered to be in the American continent. This extreme poverty is happening not too far from us North Americans. Please spread the word, raise awareness, do whatever you can do to help" (Makaveli 2009). The caption reveals the student's growing connection to Haitian poverty and how the project reflects a key moment in the student's global learning, one in which he moved from not taking the project seriously to feeling a personal investment. Interestingly, as I will discuss in more detail below, students often bring an affective dimension to their projects, one shaped by their

encounters with the images they view and select. At the same time, however, students often struggle with a sense of rhetorical agency and the ability to formulate rhetorical and ethical responses.

When we click play on the project, we discover a slideshow that presents images of poverty in Haiti interspersed with short bits of text from the author that provide background on Haitian poverty and create emotional emphasis. The project also presents a short video clip from the now defunct news source Global Vision that focuses on the practice of making "dirt cookies" in Haitian villages where malnutrition is rampant. The slideshow incorporates audio in the form of a musical soundtrack, including the song "How to Save a Life" by The Fray, but does not use voice-over narration. Instead, the audience is presented a montage of images and text designed to move them to recognize the state of the poverty and take up the project's call to action, which is to donate and raise awareness. The images are, indeed, powerful, and illustrate genuine physical and emotional suffering, and they are woven together in a way that is clearly designed to evoke sympathy and shock in the face of extreme poverty. While the student's project illustrates a variety of issues to be explored and reexamined, I want to focus primarily on the relationship between the images and the project's call for action.

Though the project presents information from the student's research on poverty in Haiti, including the number of those living poverty and the number living in rural communities without access to basic facilities, the images of poverty presented are almost all of children and include images of children who have endured not only poverty but physical abuse. The student also chose images of young men who have been killed in the streets. The montage effect of the project emphasizes the dehumanizing conditions of poverty in a variety of ways, but what is perhaps important to note is how the images of these children are utilized as a metonym for Haitian poverty and how this metonymic relationship is presented without context. One set of slides illustrates this relationship. The first slide states "Surviving in the poor ghetto slums of Haiti is increasingly difficult with overcrowding and disease widespread." The student's text is followed by images of four young men lying dead in the streets. I point to this sequence to illustrate the rhetorical ethics of images of global suffering used outside of their context. While the image is powerful, the faint blue writing at the bottom of the image takes us to the website Haiti Information Project (HIP), which is a site devoted to "Keeping the memory alive of those who have fallen in the name of social justice in Haiti" (HIP). HIP describes itself as

a "non-profit alternative news service providing coverage, analysis and research of breaking developments in Haiti," and states that it covers stories often not covered by mainstream news sources. If we follow this image through a Google Image search, we find that the young men pictured in the image were not victims of overcrowding and disease, but of political violence at the hands of the Haitian police in 2004. My intent here is not to criticize the student, but to point to the ethical implications of the process that might have led the student to put this text and image together in sequence. While images on the web are dynamic and have been recategorized since 2009, many of the images that the student used for his project can be found through a simple word search for Haiti. When this image is entered back into Google Image search, it comes up with the best guess of "Haiti" for the search term.

When we move to the student's call to action, in which he asks us to "all donate together" and to "keep raising awareness," another issue of rhetorical ethics arises—the role of the writer and the plane of vision produced by the relationship between image and audience. Images of children utilized in global public rhetoric are powerful, but they imply a particular visual gaze, one in which the helplessness of the child configures the relationship to the audience, who has agency, money, and (presumably) empathy. In this project, the student poses a question to set up his call to action that I immediately recognize as a teacher of public writing: "What can you do?" The question implies agency on behalf of the audience, who, in this case, possesses both the money and the communication outlets to help the helpless. In itself, such a question is not inappropriate, as it underlines a sense of responsibility for other human beings, seeks to move respondents from empathy to action, and provides a sense of civic agency on issues that often occupy a space of expert discourse and specialized knowledge.

What this sequence illustrates is that the use of image searches can produce a logic of equivalence and a particular gaze through a lack of contextual information. Image search features present students with a multitude of images of suffering, human rights abuses, poverty, and tyranny to choose from for projects on global issues, but the ethical problems posed by these search engines are not only the fault of the search engines. In addition, it is important to also recognize how examples of civic media that students consume construct a transnational rhetorical culture, one with rhetorical moves, including the development of pathos, that can easily impact students' choices. Such civic media can provide students with workable and

analogous tactics that they can utilize for public rhetoric on global and domestic issues, but they can also limit and constrain students' rhetorical agency.

The student's project illustrates several ideas about the global engagement and global action that are common to many online campaigns. First, the project positions the audience as a group of viewers who need to be made aware of the severity of the poverty in Haiti in order to see the necessity of responding. The pathos of the images is thus directly related to the conception of the audience's lack of awareness and the need to emphasize the extent of the poverty to move the audience. The images and the author's call for his audience to keep raising awareness are inseparably joined to an understanding of the relationship between affect and action. Given the role of social media technology in amplifying messages, the author is not completely wrong to assume the role of raising awareness. What is missing, however, is the complex relationship between awareness and action, and there seems to be an assumption that being made aware of the extent of the poverty through exposure to its images is enough to prompt action capable of sharing the problem. Once again, the student is not simply off-base here, an extensive range of research on youth and digital media has shown that sharing information across social networks can promote not only awareness and action, but can also be a predictor of deeper engagement in civic life (Cohen and Kahne 2012). Instead of simply critiquing these projects, we might look at them as examples of the limited range of actions that students might perceive as available to them as rhetorical citizens. Such perceptions can serve as a starting point for engaging students in critical reflection on how their habits of seeing shape their opportunities for rhetorical citizenship.

When we examine projects like "The Extreme Poverty in Haiti," we see students who, more than likely, have had little opportunity to use images in the context of arguments designed to publicly persuade others to engage in political or ethical action. Our students do come to us with experience circulating images and texts through social media, but circulating images and messages constructed by others and experience using images for political or ethical affect are different processes, and the latter requires a significant and patient rhetorical education. While a variety of courses across the global curriculum, such as courses on global poverty or global ethics, might expose students to texts with politically and ethically damaging representations and give students theoretical and practical tools of critique, there are few places in the curriculum where students are asked

to utilize images for political argument. Analyzing, and critiquing are essential, but they are not enough to prepare students for rhetorical performance. For that we need rhetoric classrooms that foster students' rhetorical ethics through processes of performance as well as analysis.

RHETORICAL ETHICS IN THE TRANSNATIONAL, MULTIMODAL CLASSROOM

It is quite easy to find numerous student projects that use atrocity images as part of their persuasive tactics on YouTube, Prezi, Slideshare, Storify and a variety of other platforms and hosting sites used for multimodal projects. Simply typing in the search terms "global poverty class project" will, in most cases, reveal a number of student projects from a variety of grade levels and classes that use images of political violence and global suffering to persuade. Even a cursory glance at these projects will reveal that images they use are often decontextualized and more often than not used for emotional effect rather than to inform the author's argument. The presence of these decontextualized images, often used for pathos and often within a framework of raising awareness or donating, directly implicates our students and perhaps ourselves as teachers in discussions of precarity and the representation of suffering. The prevalence of decontextualized images of suffering, atrocity, and political violence in student projects points to the necessity of a multimodal rhetorical pedagogy that enables students to encounter, understand, and utilize such images ethically. I want to argue here for what critics like Sontag, Berger, and others might consider a dangerous pedagogy: a rhetorical pedagogy that immerses students in problems of visual representation that occur in their own rhetorical, multimodal performances. Instead of accepting the ethical binary of "looking/not looking" (Möller 781), I argue for a pedagogy that acknowledges looking at this ubiquitous experience of globalization, a pedagogy that enables students to critically reflect upon their consumption, reproduction, and circulation of images of global others, while also seizing upon their experiences with images as opportunities for rhetorical invention and inquiry.

While the decontextualized series of visual images presented by search engines like *Google Images* may make the use of such images more convenient or perhaps even more likely, the ethical and political implications of their use are faced by their users, our students, rather than by the technol-

ogy or platform. As Bruce McComiskey (2004) has argued, "modes and technologies of communication, *qua* inanimate objects, cannot be described as ethical or unethical; only their users and the uses to which they are put can be described in this way" (198).

At the same time, the constraining force of medium, genres, and platforms cannot be overlooked. In their *The Available Means of Persuasion*, Sheridan et al. (2012) advance Porter's rhetorical ethics by adding the dimension of materiality in multimodal composing and by arguing for the role of rhetorical education in fostering students' rhetorical ethics. They argue that "to ethically practice multimodal rhetoric, we need to account for a confluence of material, cultural, and semiotic concerns… The ethical is bound up in the material" (126). The ethics of multimodal public rhetoric are thus shaped by not only the "semiotic resources involved (spoken words, photographs, and design elements)" but also by the "specific technologies involved" (125). Sheridan, Ridolfo, and Michel argue that "education has a role to play in facilitating the ethical use of multimodal rhetoric" and that "as a starting point, teachers can foreground rhetorical-ethical analysis in the classrooms and can reveal how considerations of ethics intersect with the material-cultural concerns of mode and medium" (141). This important point, I would argue, is central to the ideas that inform the transnational rhetorical citizenship I have advanced so far, as it draws attention to how our ethical subjectivities are shaped by the scenes of address and symbolic and material networks that precede our practices as rhetors.

In their *Just Advocacy*, Hesford and Kozol (2005) argue that "reading or seeing human rights violations locates the viewer, the reader, and the witness within local and global communities. Pedagogically speaking, we might ask whether or how representations prompt self-reflexivity about the politics of viewers' historical, cultural, and social locations?" (11). I want to expand this question by asking how rhetorical pedagogy might foster reflexivity and ultimately involve students in forms of self-critique of their practices of spectatorship. Drawing on an example from my current classroom, I argue here for forms of reflexivity and critique that are grounded in students' responses to their own rhetorical performances.

Projects like "The Extreme Poverty in Haiti" reflect a fascinating transnational ecology made up of interwoven strands of students' experiences with public genres, global discourse, global images, and global content in academic classes. The a-contextual use of images and video, discourses of awareness, and philanthropic calls to action that we see in the student project are, I would argue, not always failures on the part of

students or on the part of teachers who assign visual and multimodal global projects. In addition, while some projects could reflect a desire to please a teacher invested in global issues, to assume that this is always their motive is unfair to students who may be genuinely affected by the images they encounter. As I will illustrate here, it is important not to rule out the affective dimensions of such projects, as they provide opportunities for pedagogical engagement and invention.

In a recent honors composition class, I began the course by structuring a critical opportunity for my students to explore their own practices of spectatorship and composing with images. In the first week of class, I asked my students to compose a short public service announcement on global poverty using PowerPoint. My directions were purposefully vague: while providing just enough information for them to complete the assignment effectively.

> *This assignment is not a formal assignment, but rather a thought experiment. Because it is a thought experiment, you will find that I give you much less formal guidance here than you will find on the assignment sheets for your writing projects. The idea here is to **make** and then **reflect** on what you made. Have fun with the making, but know that we will learn a whole lot through the reflection process.*
>
> *The Task: create a one-minute public service announcement (PSA) in PowerPoint that informs your audience about global poverty and directs them to an aid organization. Your job is to use rhetoric and visual rhetoric to move your audience to check out the work of the organization.*
>
> *To Do This You Will Need To: (1) Gain some brief background knowledge on global poverty to help introduce the issue to your readers. (2) Find and use compelling images that move your audience to consider acting. Any image source is fine for this project: Google Images, Flickr, etc. (3) Design 3–4 slides with images and text that help you make and emphasize your point. You will need: A Title Slide; Body Slides: these introduce your main points and work to move your audience. Call to Action Slide: a concluding slide that helps your audience know how to act*

Students had around a week to complete the assignment, which was then followed by a short reflexive assignment that asked them to reflect upon the choices that they made as the composed the presentation.

When I received the projects, I found not only many well-designed and thoughtful projects on global poverty, but also a range of images that I had encountered before in student projects, including the image of African

children reaching for aid that I mentioned above. Conducting a simple analysis of the images, I found that 25 students had used 194 images throughout their projects. Of those images 46% directly represented children, and only 13% made reference to the country of origin of the image or provided additional context. Each of the projects led to a concrete call to action, often donating, and each employed a variety of modes to construct its meaning, including aural, text, visual, and spatial modes. Compositionally, PowerPoint dictated some of the design decisions for students, as many of my students were not used to creating custom slides in the program. However, some projects excelled in terms of design.

When I received students' reflections, I found that all of my students had used image search engines to find images for their projects, which seemed to be expected. 76% used Google Images, 12% used Bing, and 12% did not report. According to media theorist Donna Lee (2004), *Google Images* retrieves images "based on a number of factors including relevance of the file name, tag, caption and surrounding text, number of links to the image, number of 'hits' or views that image has received" (8). Because retrieval is based on user-generated factors, she argues that "*Google Images* offers an opportunity to uncover 'cultural codes' present in virtual space" (9). We might say that while popular image search engines like *Google Images* offer our students a large body of decontextualized global images they also offer opportunities for recognizing and examining the "visual habits" (Fleckenstein 11) that constrain perceptions of global exigencies. As I read students' reflections, it became apparent that students were attempting to create thoughtful and ethical work, with several students indicating that they employed strategies like choosing images that did not portray helplessness, scrolling down the pages of Google results to find images that were not used frequently in an attempt not to reproduce images that were used often, and focusing on images of hands rather than faces to avoid issues of representation. Most of the projects, however, used images of suffering that were decontextualized metonyms for the issue of global poverty.

Taking up students' reflections and responding to them, I used this initial assignment as the starting point for a critical discussion of transnational rhetorical citizenship and spectatorship. In class, students analyzed their images in groups and discussed how they utilized the images. Our discussions led us to consider the questions that I have explored in this chapter—questions of forging ethical obligations at a distance, questions about how to develop good habits of visual citizenship, and questions

about how the material networks of transnational images shaped our agency and ways of seeing. Through this process, we began thinking about how material networks and interfaces shape our ability to see others and formulate an ethical, rhetorical, or political response. Following this assignment, and a rhetorical analysis assignment of a multimodal text, we then took up the issue of the influence of material interfaces again by working in groups to conduct content analysis of a randomized sample of Google images that were retrieved when we typed in key words about poverty. Five groups of students viewed, developed codes for, and coded over 150 randomly selected images in order to document the patterns of representation that they observed. Through this process, students began to think critically about how these ubiquitous, ambient clouds of images were structured and how they positioned them to take up particular ethical and rhetorical responses.

During this time, to help students think about spectatorship and privilege, students viewed episodes of the *Global POV Project* developed by professor Ananya Roy (2016) and her students in the Blum Center for Developing Economies at the University of California at Berkeley.[4] Roy and her students have created a series of multimodal videos that employ the animated drawings of one of her students, Abby VanMuijen, and offer critical, situated arguments that complicate students' roles as spectators and agents of global poverty. In the video presentation entitled "Who Sees Poverty?," for example, Roy and her student VanMuijen complicate the first world gaze that is often constructed through images of suffering by critically positioning their own identities and privileges within their discussion of global poverty. While this project employs images and recreations of the scene of global poverty and those who suffer, it also seeks to use the same visual medium to present a reordering of the "common sense" that is constructed by images of global poverty and suffering.[5]

Through this course design, students were immersed in rhetorical, ethical practices that asked them to critically, reflexively analyze the rhetorical scene of address that shaped their ways of seeing precarity and the global. In this sense, rather than teaching rhetorical ethics at the completion of a project, I would argue that rhetorical citizenship is better fostered through processes that engage students in reflective practices of self-critique. In constructing such practices, it is not necessary to lead students into a logic of guilt or blame, but rather to foster their understanding of how the conditions that precede our response and shape what we see imply rhetorical and

ethical obligations that we can resist through powers of critique. The barrage of human suffering offered to students through the simple act of typing in "global poverty" into an image search engine need not exhaust agency nor lead to a critical response that would ask us to ignore the presence of these images. Instead, they can be moments for critical rhetorical education that can sponsor forms of transnational spectatorship and citizenship.

Conclusion

As writing and rhetoric teachers, we know that invocations of the global are always acts of rhetorical invention and performance situated in particular cultural, social, and political contexts. Such invocations have ethical and political stakes for our students and others, and serve as a reminder of the importance of our work to the global civic goals of the university. While rhetoric and writing courses are largely ignored in calls for global higher education, students' rhetorical performances of the global, in all of their political and ethical complexity, underline the importance of rhetorical education to global higher education. In the conclusion to their study of execution photographs, Diana George and Diane Shoos (2005) suggest that while "popular debates and politics can become flattened in the visual, an equally important part of our argument is that this is not inevitable" (607). In the same spirit, I would like to conclude by suggesting that while images of global suffering do sometimes lend themselves to problematic even pornographic viewings, this too is not inevitable, and that rhetorical education can provide students with tools that can enable them to understand images of suffering in their political and ethical complexity and use them as a springboard for meaningful, reflexive action.

Notes

1. Hariman and Lucaites define "iconic photographs" as directly related to invocations of citizenship: "In short, images in the public media display the public to itself. They also put the state and other institutions on display and valorize some behaviors over others. Thus, the icons offer performative guides for public judgment and action, although not on behalf of a single political idea" (12). They continue by arguing that "In every case, the iconic image interpolates a form of citizenship that can be imitated" (12).

2. Images of suffering and political violence have been given various names, such as "photographs of agony" (Berger 1980, 37), "intolerable images" (Rancière 2009b, 102), "images of suffering" (Sontag 1977, 20), "atrocity pictures" (Roberts 2014, 54).

3. In addition to Rorty, see Hannah Arendt's discussion of spectatorship as a form of political action and participation in her *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy*.

4. See Roy's webpage UCLA's Institute on Inequality and Democracy for the videos in this series: https://challengeinequality.luskin.ucla.edu/globalpov/

5. Students' content analysis of a random sample of images of global and local poverty not only revealed a number of revealing codes, but served to further our discussion of rhetorical spectatorship and civic responsibility and provided opportunities for developing strategies of critical spectatorship that prepared them for using images more critically in their future projects.

Bibliography

Appadurai, Arjun. 2013. "How Histories Make Geographies: Circulation and Context in a Global Perspective." In *The Future as Cultural Fact: Essays on the Global Condition*, 61–70. New York: Verso:.

Arendt, Hannah. 1982. *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Azoulay, Ariella. 2008. *The Civil Contract of Photography*. Translated by Rela Mazali and Ruvik Danieli. Boston: MIT Press.

———. 2015. *Civil Imagination: A Political Ontology of Photography*. Translated by Louise Bethlehem. New York: Verso.

Bennett, W. Lance. 2008. "Changing Citizenship in the Digital Age." In *Civic Life Online: Learning How Digital Media Can Engage Youth*, edited by W. Lance Bennett, 1–24. Boston: MIT Press.

Berger, John. 1980. "Photographs of Agony." In *About Looking*, 37–40. New York: Pantheon.

Butler, Judith. 2009. *Frames of War: When Is Life Grievable?* New York: Verso.

Cohen, Cathy, and Joseph Kahne. 2012. *Participatory Politics: New Media and Youth Political Action*. Oakland, CA: Youth and Participatory Politics Research Network. Accessed February 15, 2015. https://ypp.dmlcentral.net/publications/107.

DeVoss, Danielle Nicole, and Julie Platt. 2011. "Image Manipulation and Ethics in a Digital-Visual World." *Computers and Composition Online*. (Fall): http://cconlinejournal.org/ethics_special_issue/DEVOSS_PLATT/.

Dogra, Nandita. 2012. *Representations of Global Poverty: Aid, Development and International NGOs*. London: IB Tauris.

Fleckenstein, Kristie S. 2009. *Vision, Rhetoric, and Social Action in the Composition Classroom*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press.

Gamber, Cayo. 2010. "From Photographs to Elegies: Engaging the Holocaust in a Writing Course." *Teaching English in the Two Year College*. 37, no. 3. (March): 243–255.

George, Diana, and Diane Shoos. 2005. "Deflecting the Political in the Visual Images of Execution and the Death Penalty Debate." *College English*. 67, no. 6: 587–609.

Haiti Information Project. n.d. "About Haiti Information Project." Accessed July 9, 2015.

Hariman, Robert, and John Louis Lucaites. 2007. *No Caption Needed: Iconic Photographs, Public Culture, and Liberal Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hawisher, Gail E., and Cynthia L. Selfe. 2000. *Global Literacies and the World Wide Web*. New York: Routledge.

Hesford, Wendy. 2011. *Spectacular Rhetorics: Human Rights Visions, Recognitions, Feminisms*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hesford, Wendy, and Wendy Kozol. 2005. "Introduction." In *Just Advocacy? Women's Human Rights, Transnational Feminism, and the Politics of Representation*, edited by Wendy Hesford and Wendy Kozol, 1–32. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Hesse, Doug. 2005. "2005 CCCC Chair's Address: Who Owns Writing?." *College Composition and Communication*. 57, no. 2. (December): 335–357.

Hocks, Mary. 2003. "Understanding Visual Rhetoric in Digital Writing Environments." *College Composition and Communication*. 54, no. 4: 629–656.

Kahne, Joseph, Ellen Middaugh, and Danielle Allen. 2015. "Youth, New Media, and the Rise of Participatory Politics." In *From Voice to Influence: Understanding Citizenship in a Digital Age*, edited by Danielle Allen and Jennifer S. Light, 35–58. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leahy, Anna, and Deborah Rindge. 2004. "English 116: Freshman Seminar-Writing and Photography." *Composition Studies*. 32, no. 2. (Fall): 109–130.

Lee, Donna. 2004. "(Where) Are Disabled Girls in Virtual Space?: Representation of Disability 261 and Gender in *Google Images*." *Critical Disability Discourses*. 4: http://cdd.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/cdd/article/view/34900/32616.

Linfield, Susie. 2010. *The Cruel Radiance: Photography and Political Violence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Makaveli, Henry. 2009. "The Extreme Poverty in Haiti." *Youtube*. July 11th, 2009. Accessed June 30th, 2015. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wUUhA0BeEWI.

McComiskey, Bruce. 2004. "Visual Rhetoric and the New Public Discourse." *Journal of Advanced Composition*. 24, no. 1: 187–206.

Möller, Frank. 2009. "The Looking/Not Looking Dilemma." *Review of International Studies*. 35, no. 4: 781–794.

New London Group. 1996. "A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures." In *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*, edited by Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis, 9–37. New York: Routledge.

Palmieri, Jason. 2012. *Remixing Composition: A History of Multimodal Writing Pedagogy*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Ranciere, Jacques. 2009b. *The Emancipated Spectator*. New York: Verso.

Rislan, Mahmoud. "I Took the Picture of Little Omran in Aleppo." *The Telegraph*, August 19, 2016. Accessed December 12, 2016. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/08/19/i-took-the-picture-of-little-omran-in-aleppo.

Roberts, John. 2014. *Photography and Its Violations*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rorty, Richard. 1989. *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Roy, Ananya. 2016. *The #GlobalPOV Project*. UCLA Luskin Institute on Inequality and Democracy. Accessed June 12, 2017. https://challengeinequality.luskin.ucla.edu/globalpov/.

Rutz, Paul. 2010. "What a Painter of 'Historical Narrative' Can Show Us About War Photography." *Kairos*. 14, no. 3. (Summer). http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/14.3/topoi/rutz/index.htm.

Sekula, Allan. 1984. *Photography Against the Grain: Essays and Photo Works 1973–1983*. Nova Scotia: The Press of the University of Nova Scotia College of Art and Design.

Selfe, Cynthia L. 2007. *Multimodal Composition: Resources for Teachers*. New York: Hampton.

Sheridan, David, Jim Ridolfo, and Anthony J. Michel. 2012. *The Available Means of Persuasion: Mapping a Theory and Pedagogy of Multimodal Public Rhetoric*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

Sontag, Susan. 1977. *On Photography*. New York: Picador.

———. 2003. *Regarding the Pain of Others*. New York: Picador.

Weiss, Michael, and James Miller. 2016. "Omran Daqneesh's Face Can't Fix a War." *The Daily Beast*, August 18, 2016. Accessed September 24, 2016. https://www.thedailybeast.com/omran-daqneeshs-face-cant-fix-a-war.

Wysocki, Anne. 2000. "Writing Images: Using the World Wide Web in a Digital Photography Class." In *Weaving a Virtual Web: Practical Approaches to New Information Technologies*, edited by Sibylle Gruber, 161–175. Carbondale, IL: NCTE.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. 2009. *Writing in the 21st Century: A Report from the National Council of Teachers of English*. National Council of Teachers of English. Accessed June 2, 2016. http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Press/Yancey_final.pdf.

Zuckerman, Ethan. 2013. *Rewire: Digital Cosmopolitans in the Age of Connection.* New York: Norton.

———. 2014. "New Media, New Civics?" *Policy and Internet.* 6, no. 2: 151–168.

———. 2012. "What Ancient Greek Rhetoric Might Teach Us About New Civics." *My Heart's in Accra.* Posted November 19, 2012. http://www.ethanzuckerman.com/blog/2012/11/19/what-ancient-greek-rhetoric-might-teach-us-about-new-civics/.

Dwelling in the Global: Rhetorical Education, Transnational Rhetorical Ecologies, and the Locations of the Global

In his installation "Bridging Home," constructed for the Liverpool Biennal of 2010, the Korean artist Do Ho Suh, positions a traditional Korean home between two nondescript British Buildings. On the building to the left of the traditional house, the artist stenciled the following: "There are 3951 people for every km² in this city. Do you like your neighbors?" The juxtaposition of these two architectural styles is striking, and creates an immediate sense of cultural tension and contrast, but the position of the traditional Korean home creates a range of possibilities of interpretation: Did the home fall out of the sky, as in another exhibit by Suh, "Falling Star?" Did it grow out of the two British buildings? Was it constructed by immigrants seeking a home in a city of increasingly limited urban space? Is it being pressed out of existence by the two buildings? While there is nothing to assure the viewer that any of these conjectures is correct, holding out the possibility of each interpretation is valuable as it opens up various possibilities for understanding the relationship between the global and the local. Holding that the traditional style home was dropped, for example, orients us toward a different understanding of globalization—perhaps one that captures the rhetoric of novelty and unexpectedness that often attends political discussions of immigration—than holding that the home was an outgrowth of the two buildings, which might point to the role in which a long history of globalized labor and capital have shaped the British economy.

Suh's installation captures the multinational history of Liverpool, one of Europe's most historically diverse cities; but, like other examples from his vast catalog of exhibited work, the installation, entitled "Bridging Home," is also a rhetorical provocation, one that uncomfortably imposes the presence of the Other and alters our understanding of public space. Suh's installation captures, as well as any other piece of contemporary political art I know of, the relationship between globalization, locality, precarity, and rhetorical practice. Viewed in the context of global higher education, Suh's installation reminds us that the global is both situated locally and rhetorically enacted, rather than simply "over there" or "beyond borders." This is important, as it reminds us that programs like study abroad, courses that involve international travel or service, and courses that are focused primarily on texts from different nations, capture only a very small part of what Arjun Appadurai (1996) has called the "flows" of globalization—"the ideas, ideologies, people and goods, images and messages, technologies and techniques" that move across cultures—and the "disjunctures between the various vectors characterizing this world-in-motion that produce fundamental problems of livelihood, equity, suffering, justice, and governance" (5). Placing this installation within a largely working-class city—that is, not the financial powerhouse of London—also opens up the possibility to think about how we might conceive of the exigence created by the installation in our own communities, towns, cities, and campuses.[1]

I point to Suh's installation because it captures, for me, an understanding of the global as situated within public rhetorical ecologies (Edbauer 2005; Rivers and Weber 2011) that draw together events, experiences, and discourse from a variety of international, national, local, and virtual contexts. Drawing on the vision of globalization represented by "Bridging Home" might inspire rhetorical educators to develop courses in global rhetoric that examine these global engagements in our own local surroundings. While our locations—the different towns, cities, and campuses we inhabit—will have differing opportunities and histories for us to explore, we can enable students to more fruitfully see and seize upon opportunities for global engagement by providing rhetorical tools that enable them to understand the spaces in which the global is articulated. As I hope to show through my exploration of my own city, Birmingham, Alabama, with my students, rhetorical education can provide students with capacities for understanding global public rhetoric as being situated within specific and dynamic rhetorical ecologies, rather

than within static understandings of global or local space. Rather than arguing for classrooms that embody the idea that, as the catchphrase goes, "the global is always local," I will argue for classrooms that engage students in understanding how national, international, virtual, local, and borderland discourses are articulated within specific sites of rhetorical engagement or specific rhetorical ecologies.

I explore this rhetorical understanding of the global and local through a discussion of an advanced composition class I taught in 2014, which challenged students to explore the global issues, communities, and rhetorics of Birmingham, Alabama. Though rich in the history of activism and politics, Birmingham might strike many across the country as an unlikely candidate as a global city. Drawing on Jenny Edbauer's (2012) understanding of rhetorical ecologies and her practice of teaching "inquiry as social action" (195), I developed a course designed to engage my students in the process of exploring how a range of global rhetorics—local, consumerist, religious, political, artistic, culinary—play out in descriptions of Birmingham as a global city, in the rhetorical practices of local communities, and in the rhetorical politics of the state. I present this course as an example of a course that leverages the power of rhetorical education to provide students with capacities for recognizing opportunities for global engagement, rhetorical possibilities for action, and transnational rhetorical citizenship. Such courses can, I argue, present students with a complex understanding of how rhetoric takes place not simply at the level of state or local policy, but also within the everyday lives of communities. They can also provide students with an understanding of how global rhetorics from a variety of sites (national, international, virtual, local) overlap across rhetorical ecologies and create opportunities for participation and persuasion. What I hope readers find here is not a classroom presented as an ideal model—the course certainly had its limitations, missteps, and problems—but instead an example of transnational rhetorical education that fosters transnational rhetorical citizenship by beginning with students' everyday experiences of globalization.

RHETORICAL ECOLOGIES AND TRANSNATIONAL SPACE

As I argued in the introduction, understanding rhetoric is essential for global higher education because rhetorical practices locate the capacities, values, and knowledge of global education in performative spaces. To say

this is not to remove acts of global imagination or theory from the discussion, but rather to acknowledge that rhetorical practices are performances within localities deeply shaped through globalizing processes. I want to resist an over-simplified understanding of rhetoric as a localizing agency for philosophical or political values or arguments. What I mean here is a sense of rhetoric as a site of articulating deliberative claims about universal rights, values, or post-national identities. Such understandings of rhetoric have a tendency to leave practices of invention and inquiry out of their discussion and treat rhetoric as a means for locally articulating political and philosophical arguments for cosmopolitanism and human rights.

For example, Seyla Benhabib (2008) has developed a deliberative approach to human rights claims in the lectures collected as *Another Cosmopolitanism*. Benhabib productively troubles the visions of Westphalian national sovereignty by insisting that "democratic iteration"—"linguistic, legal, cultural, and political repetitions" of norms and values (48) can serve as the basis for a more grounded understanding of cosmopolitanism. Benhabib argues that "My answer to the question as to how to reconcile cosmopolitanism with the unique, legal, historical, and cultural traditions and memories of a people is that we must respect, encourage, and initiate multiple processes of democratic iteration" (70). Benhabib's work locates deliberative theories of cosmopolitanism within specific contexts. Deliberative practices of iteration articulate cosmopolitan norms and human rights in local contexts, dynamically voicing, adapting, and transforming them. Here, rhetorical processes serve the project of theory-building by helping to resolve the tension between universal values and local performances of those values. In place of an understanding of cosmopolitanism based on shared humanity, we have shared spaces of deliberative practices that help people make "sense of an authoritative original in a new and different context" (48). Through engaging in normative practices of deliberation and iteration, agents reconfigure and make sense of norms in ways that also reshape their understandings of themselves (67). My argument here is not that such iterations do not take place, but rather that both the inventional processes that lead to such iterations and the specificity of the rhetorical agents involved are never addressed.

Another example of how rhetorical processes are used to mediate between cosmopolitan visions and local contexts can be found in Bruce Robbins's (2013) *Perpetual War: Cosmopolitanism from the Viewpoint of Violence*.[2] While coming from significantly different critical traditions,

Robbins and Benhabib share an interest in rhetorical practices as mediating between universal and situated or rooted forms of cosmopolitanism. Robbins's depiction of rhetoric works, in a sense, as an attempt to salvage a form of cosmopolitanism:

> Rhetoric, as I understand it, is an inevitable sign of partiality or belonging. To be shown to be using rhetoric undercuts the cosmopolitan's claim to exist in a pace of extraterrestriality or detachment. This argument does not count as a crippling critique, however, if one believes, as I do, that there is no such thing as cosmopolitanism in the strongest sense—that, as I've said, all cosmopolitanism involves some mode or degree of belonging, however minimal or reluctant. But if this critique is not damning, neither is it trivial. If no cosmopolitanism is pure, this doesn't mean that all cosmopolitanisms are equal. (49)

For Robbins, "partial and imperfect cosmopolitans are the only cosmopolitans" (53), and rhetoric both "dirties cosmopolitanism and allows us to think of it as wielding a certain power" (71). Here, rhetoric is helpfully aligned with local contexts of belonging, belief and culture, but once again the focus does not include an understanding of agency beyond that of the public intellectuals Robbins discusses. In addition, the rhetorical processes of invention that make for dirty forms of cosmopolitanism are largely missing from the conversation.

While I agree in ways with both Benhabib and Robbins about the power of rhetoric to locate the global, I want to suggest that we need a more expansive and productive understanding of how rhetorical practices are both shaped by and shape global space. We need an understanding of how the cultural, symbolic, and material processes that shape our understandings of the global and local shape and are shaped by rhetorical invention and the circulation of rhetorical texts through transnational networks. Such an approach speaks directly to the relationship between rhetoric and the scene of address for politics and ethics. We need, as Arjun Appadurai (1996) has argued, ways of understanding the roles of rhetoric in the globalizing processes that result in the "production of localities" (178). Here, I argue that understanding transnational space as a space of transnational rhetorical ecologies can enable us to complicate visions of global communication and explore pedagogical alternatives.

Benhabib and Robbins both usefully show how rhetoric fosters practices of global engagement and citizenship, but neither offer a satisfac-

tory account of the bidirectional flows of rhetorical texts, practices, cultures, and agents that shape the terrain of rhetorical invention. Such flows shape the rhetorical ecologies that make up the conditions of rhetorical practices. Such a shift is one toward a transnational understanding of rhetorical practice and citizenship, as it shifts our focus from the place to the network (Dingo 8). In her important essay on rhetorical ecologies, Jenny Edbauer (2005) argues that in an ecological model of rhetoric "place becomes decoupled from the notion of *situs*, or fixed (series of) locations, and linked instead to the in-between en/action of events and encounters. Place becomes a space of contacts, which are always changing and never discrete. The contact between two people on a busy street is never simply a matter of those two bodies; rather, the two bodies carry with them the traces of effects from whole fields of culture and social histories. This is what it means to say the social field is networked, connected, rather than a matter of place, sites, and home" (10). Edbauer reads the ecological understanding of rhetoric against and with understandings of the rhetorical situation, such as Lloyd Bitzer's classic formulation. In contrast to Bitzer's depiction of the rhetorical situation, Edbauer argues that "a given rhetoric is not *contained* by the elements that comprise its rhetorical situation (exigence, rhetor, audience, constraints). Rather, a rhetoric emerges circulating in the social field" (14). What rhetorical ecologies capture are the processes through which rhetorics travel across networks, picking up traces of other rhetorics, and leaving the traces on other texts and places.[3]

In this important sense, "rhetorical ecologies are coordinating processes, moving across the same social field and within shared structures of feeling" (20). In contrast to a relatively fixed understanding of rhetorical space and place, reconceiving rhetorical spaces as ecologies can enable us to "recognize the way rhetorics are held together trans-situationally, as well as the effects of trans-situationality on rhetorical circulation… In other words, we begin to see that public rhetorics do not only exist in the elements of their situations, but also in the radius of their neighboring events" (20). In their article "Ecological, Pedagogical, Public Rhetoric," Nathanial Rivers and Ryan Weber (2011) use the metaphor of contamination to capture the interactions that occur in rhetorical ecologies. For Rivers and Weber, "the concept of rhetorical ecology emphasizes the symbiotic nature of texts, including the way texts, events, and feelings influence or 'contaminate' one another. Much as a virus moving from one species to another creates a genetic link between the two, the contagion

and energies moving through texts mean that all rhetorics are inherently infected by other rhetorics" (193–4). To go back to Bruce Robbins's understanding of rhetoric "dirtying" cosmopolitanism, we might say, rather that cosmopolitanism as a rhetorically invoked concept has not only never been clean, but is rather a term that is subject to dirtying through its travels through rhetorical ecologies.[4] To claim its impurity through rhetoric works to advance a cosmopolitan theory but does not capture the traces the rhetoric of cosmopolitanism leaves on transnational ecologies or the traces transnational ecologies leave on cosmopolitanism. In other words, rhetorical ecologies enable us to recognize the networks of events, feelings, rhetorical texts, histories, and institutions that shape the emergence of a social field of discourse and make recognitions of transnational rhetorical citizenship as a subject position possible.

Rivers and Weber (2011) point to the pedagogical implications of rhetorical ecologies for public rhetoric classrooms. Arguing for both pedagogies of rhetorical analysis and performance, they suggest that investing students in the creation not only of public arguments, but also in the creation of "mundane" (187) texts that accompany them helps students recognize "how publics are formed through the concatenation of texts over time" (212). Immersing students in rhetorical ecologies, "engages students in the analysis of the historical and material while also focusing their efforts on local institutions and publics—keeping in mind both the ecological power of institutions and the hope they as students might foster about their ability to transform these institutions" (212). Drawing on an analysis of distributed agency in the Montgomery Bus Boycotts, Rivers and Weber show that publics emerge through dense ecologies that connect a range of actors across time and space through the circulation and coordinating power of rhetorical texts.

Rhetorical ecologies orient us to the trans-situationality of texts, but how might we understand ecologies in the context of global networks? Here, the connection between rhetorical ecologies and what Arjun Appadurai (1996) has discussed as the global "production of locality" (178) needs to be made more explicit. In addition, developing this connection can also provide a more in-depth understanding of the problem of proximity and distance raised by Judith Butler. At the same time, such an understanding calls forth, as Rice (2012), Rivers and Weber (2011), and others have argued, rhetorical pedagogies that engage students in place-based inquiry. What I will suggest here is that exploring the relationship between globalization and locality expands our opportunities for exploring transnational rhetorical citizenship with our students.

Drawing on Benedict Anderson's argument regarding the role of the imagination in shaping the "imagined communities" that constitute the nation, Appadurai (1996) argues in his classic *Modernity at Large* that locality is "primarily relational and contextual rather than … scalar or spatial" and that it is "a complex phenomenological quality, constituted by a series of links between the sense of social immediacy, the technologies of interactivity, and the relativity of contexts" (178). Writing almost 15 years later, Appadurai (2013) notes that this understanding of the local has become "relatively easy to accept" (68). In "How Histories Make Geographies," he points to localities as "temporary negotiations between various globally circulating forms," noting that "they are not subordinate instances of the global, but in fact the main evidence of its reality" (69). What is important here, I would argue, is not an understanding of the "global as the local," but rather the process through which global and local are negotiated and constructed in specific contexts.

For Appadurai, understanding this process requires us to "distinguish the problem of circulation from the problem of connectivity" (2013, 65). This distinction is also key to understanding the problem of "proximity and distance" (2012, 137) in Butler's discussion of precarity. Appadurai argues that "there can be periods or contexts marked by a high level of connectivity without a high level of circulation" (65). However, our current moment is one in which "we live in a world where both are at very high levels" and that "the politics of value may be regarded as emerging in the friction between circulation and connectivity in the social life of things" (65). This space of increased connectivity and the circulation of ideas, images, and texts, should lead us to explore "*the relationship between the forms of circulation and the circulation of forms*" (64, emphasis in original). His description of this field of inquiry is worth quoting at length:

> Forms such as novels, films, and newspapers meet well-established circulatory paths and circuits of religion, migration, and trade. But other cultural forms, such as ballet, animation, fashion photography, and grassroots political activism, create circuits of circulation which did not exist before. Thus, the twenty-first century is witnessing new tensions between the actual circulating cultural forms and the emerging, partially formed circuits or networks that shape and cover the multiple paths of circulation. This dual structure of global cultural forms also generates what we may call the 'bumps' or obstacles in regard to many cultural flows. (64)

Writing with expanding the research paradigm in anthropology in mind, Appadurai nevertheless provides an understanding of circulation that resonates with and productively expands our understandings of rhetorical ecologies. Appadurai (2013) expands our understanding of rhetorical circulation by pointing to how the circulation of forms (e.g. genres and technologies of communication) is dynamically related to forms of circulation. Edbauer's (2005) argument that "a rhetoric emerges already infected by the viral intensities that are circulating in the social field" (14) can be productively expanded using Appadurai's understanding of the global circulation of forms. In addition, Rivers and Weber's (2011) understanding of the "symbiotic nature of texts" or "the way texts, events, and feeling influence or 'contaminate' one another" (193–4) can also be expanded to include the relationship between globalization and the production of localities.

For Appadurai, as for Butler, the circulation of images is a key example:

> For the world, the complexity of global cultural flows has had deep effects on what I once called the "production of locality" and the production of local subjectivity. These flows and networks confound older models of acculturation, culture contact, and mixture, since they also brought new materials for the construction of subjectivity. The traffic of images of global suffering, for example, creates new communities of sentiment, which introduce empathy, identification, and anger across large cultural distances. (2013, 63)

In this important sense, the shared feelings that often shape rhetorical ecologies can emerge through dynamic interactions between globalization and the production of localities and rhetorical subjectivities. Here, material value and processes, feeling, imagination, forms, texts, networks of circulation, and localities shape the ecologies of rhetorical practice and education in an age of globalization. While rhetoric, as Benhabib (2008) and Robbins (2013) have argued, locates the global within the local, it does not do so as a neutral form or practice, but rather as an emergent art located within an ecology of circulating texts, forms, events, feelings, attitudes, and politics.

Given this understanding of rhetorical ecology, we cannot help but question the visions of global communication we see in global higher education literature. There, we see calls for a set of capacities for articulating values, recognizing shared problems, and collaboratively working toward solutions, often by utilizing twenty-first-century communication tools to interact and bridge the distance with others. What is left out of such visions

of communication is the recognition of how rhetoric and communication emerge from within rhetorical ecologies that take part in the production of localities and subjectivities that make them always already global. Such an ecological understanding of transnational networks and the global production of the local points to the need for a critical rhetorical education, one that provides students with not simply communication strategies or rhetorical techniques, but also a critical understanding of how their roles as rhetorical citizens emerge within ecologies that are shaped by transnational networks.

Rhetorical citizenship in an age of globalization entails not only an understanding of rhetorical capacities and practices, but also an understanding of rhetoric as an analytical framework for critically approaching the dynamic relationship between transnational networks, rhetorical ecologies, and practices of rhetorical citizenship. This involves questions of political agency and ethics that require a reflective dimension, as we have seen in our discussion of rhetorical ethics. Rhetorical education emerges, as rhetoric, within a complex rhetorical ecology of its own, one shaped deeply by the processes of globalization that produce the localities of rhetorical education, including our own campuses. As more and more institutions of higher education define their missions in global terms, and as these terms become increasingly contested by political forces outside of the university, it will become more and more important to understand global higher education as a complex rhetorical ecology traversed by a range of sometimes overlapping, sometimes conflicting discursive networks.

The City as a Space of Transnational Rhetorical Ecologies

In *City of Rhetoric*, David Fleming (2009) has argued that in contrast to rhetorical practices political philosophy has exhibited a "profound topophobia," that the "placeless" character of political theory has limited our understanding of how place shapes the everyday politics and rhetorics that shape people's lives (31). While political liberalism and republicanism have traditionally provided impoverished accounts of place in politics, Fleming argues that postmodern political theory has also "failed to provide us with reliable *ground* on which to build ordinary political life" (31). In response to postmodern theories of global space, Fleming argues that "we need to remind ourselves that globalization, migration, and multipositionality do

not exhaust the contemporary spatial experience. Still prominent in our social imaginary are literal *places* where we come together, as citizens, to manage the world we hold in common" (34). For Fleming, the city is "a neglected but potentially important scene of human politics and civic education" (58). The city serves as a "middle-sized public" that locates rhetorical and political practice between the "very small and very large, the face-to-face primary group, on the one hand, and the maximally diverse cosmos, on the other" (201). The city is thus a nexus between the global, national, and local and provides a rich set of opportunities for public engagement.

In addition to being theorized as a middle-sized public, the city has also been theorized as a more accurate model of public discourse than consensus-based understandings of community. In his discussion of community in *A Teaching Subject*, Joseph Harris (2012) argues against utopian visions of community based on consensus, such as Pratt's (1991) "contact zones," and for the use of the "metaphor of the city" as a way of conceptualizing a multiplicity of communities and discourses that live side by side. Harris argues "Most talk of utopias scares me. What I value instead is a kind of openness, a lack of plan, a chance to be among others and to choose my own way. It is a kind of life that I associate with the city—with the sort of community in which people are brought together more by accident than by shared values. A city brings together people who do not so much choose to live together as they are simply thrown together, and who must then make the best they can of their common lot" (145). The thrown quality of being in the city, with its place of coming together and its places of conflict, with its sense of wholeness as a place and the multiplicity of places within the city that make it, at the same time, fragmented, brings us back to Do Ho Suh's image of the traditional Korean home ensconced between two British industrial buildings. It also brings us back to an ecological understanding of rhetoric, one where rhetorical ecologies are animated by a range of discourses, texts, images, feelings, and identities that come to shape our dwelling in particular places.

In their collection, *City Comp*, Bruce McComiskey and Cynthia Ryan (2003) argue for the importance of the city as a place that can sponsor the inventional activity of composition students. Their excellent description of the city as a rich site of composing warrants quoting in full:

> City spaces, then, are rich material and ideological resources for composition students who are attempting to situate important personal and social issues in context. Specifically, students can look at city spaces as rhetorical constructs that offer ample opportunities to engage in dialogues with histories (i.e. how has the past been represented through city museums and

monuments, and whose narratives have been committed through these representations?), citizens (i.e. what spaces have been appropriated for community interaction and private reflection?) and issues (i.e. what physical structures and urban plans have resulted from local debates and controversies?). Urban spaces, then, are texts (recall de Certeau); and through composition pedagogies that incorporate vital city environments into classroom discourses, students learn to compose urban spaces, either accommodating, resisting, or negotiating existing narratives that give meaning to their cities (13).

McComiskey and Ryan's characterization of the city as text is particularly interesting in the context of Harris (2012) and Fleming's (2009) understanding of the city as a place where publics are generated and constituted by rhetorical practices that respond to the exigencies of living together. Such exigencies are dynamic, and speak to an understanding of the city as palimpsest, as a text constantly being written and rewritten not only in the temporal sense of its history, but also in the spatial sense by the various rhetorical publics that are constituted throughout the city and who claim a particular place in the city.

Patterns of migration, cultural flows, and global investment and industry make cities places of often interpenetrating and overlapping transnational ecologies. While not all cities are of the scale and scope that geographer Doreen Massey (2007) identifies with global or "world cities" (*World City*)—think of London and New York—many of the cities that we live in—large and small—have been shaped by patterns of globalization that have, as Harris (2012) has argued, thrown individuals from a variety of cultures together. This happens in the largest and the tiniest of metropolitan areas. For example, Morristown, Tennessee, the tiniest of cities, has been a site of immigration from Mexico due to the presence of jobs at several manufacturing and processing plants. The experiences of the global in this town and the tensions that it creates have even been captured in a documentary film about immigrant labor endorsed by Howard Zinn, entitled *Morristown: In the Air and Sun.* I point to Morristown as an example not because it is unique, but because it reflects how even the smallest of our cities and towns have been shaped by globalization and have become places of global rhetoric and global engagement. Because of the extensive reach of globalization, rhetorical educators can seek out opportunities for rhetorical education in their own cities and towns, even if they live outside of a major or mid-sized metropolitan area.

By focusing on the transnational rhetorical ecologies of the cities and towns our colleges and universities inhabit, we can enable students to break beyond understandings of the global as both "over there," as something they encounter if they are fortunate enough to study abroad, and as "texts from a distance," a set of cultural texts that are brought into the classroom for discussion. At the same time, by exploring the transnational rhetorical practices of the city with our students we can also complicate the simple binary between the global and the local, and the tendency to valorize the local at the expense of the global. Instead, we can encourage students to explore global and local as porous and interpenetrating by pointing to how a variety of cultural, political, economic, ideological, and other discourses pour into the transnational rhetorical practices within cities. Such an understanding of the situatedness of transnational rhetorical education points to what Massey (1994) has described as a "progressive concept of place" (155):

> what gives a place specificity is not some long, internalized history but the fact that it is constructed out of a particular constellation of social relations, meeting and weaving together at a particular locus. If one moves in from the satellite towards the globe, holding all those social relations and movements and communications in one's head, then each 'place' can be seen as a particular, unique, point of their intersection. It is, indeed, a *meeting* place. Instead, then, of thinking of places as areas with boundaries around, they can be imagined as articulated moments in networks of social relations and understandings, but where a large proportion of those relations, experiences, and understandings are constructed on a far larger scale than what we happen to define for that moment as the place itself, whether that be a street, or a region or even a continent. And this in turn allows a sense of place which is extroverted, which includes a consciousness of its links with the wider world, which integrates in a positive way the global and the local. (154–5)

For Massey, such an understanding of global and local space captures "a global sense of the local, a global sense of place" (156). I draw on Massey's work here because it adds a global dimension to the rhetorical cities described by Fleming (2009), Harris (2012), and McComiskey and Ryan (2003).

At the same time, however, the global has come to be identified strongly with the virtual spaces of participation and contact made available through

digital technology. As cultural geographer Saskia Sassen (2003) has shown, many accounts of globalization and digital technology have tended to proceed as though "digitization entails an absolute disembodying from the material world" (16). For Sassen, such a claim ignores the position of the digital and the material as a "borderland" between the local and the global. She argues that technology in the context of the city allows for the development of "a new type of cross-border political activism, one centered in multiple localities yet intensely connected digitally. This is in my view one of the key forms of critical politics that the Internet can make possible: a politics of the local with a big difference—these are localities that are connected with each other across a region, a country, or the world. The fact that the network is global does not mean that all that gets enacted in that network has to happen at the global level" (26). Sassen's work challenges us to attend to not only grounded understandings of the global within our own communities, but also to the interactive relationship between the global and the digital. Following this argument, the city can be seen as a rhetorical space that is constituted beyond its geographical borders.

I am not, however, calling for a celebration of globalization as an opportunity to introduce students to "new" cultures or pluralist, cosmopolitan understandings of their cities as "global communities." Such an argument ignores the political and ideological conflicts that shape and constrain global engagement in the city. Exploring the transnational rhetorical practices of our cities, towns, and campuses requires understanding how the "global sense of the local" that Massey explores is one that is shaped by conflicts as well as communities and that these conflicts are embodied, constituted, reconstituted, and addressed by rhetorical practices that often synthesize the global and the local. The conception of transnational rhetorical space that I am arguing for here is thus no more the product of a local community than it is a global discourse. Transnational rhetorical space is not simply a space where global ideas and experiences are articulated locally. Rather, transnational rhetoric and transnational rhetorical education are multidimensional practices that can not only be adapted to particular localities but bridged and expanded to a range of other publics. Rhetoric is a performative art, and performances are rooted to particular places and publics, but it is also an inventional art, one which allows for the cultivation and importation of a range of ideas, subjectivities, and experiences into local practices.

Birmingham, Alabama and Transnational Rhetorical Ecologies

Ecological approaches to rhetoric complicate the typical scenarios of global communication we see in global higher education literature. Often, this literature envisions global citizens as solving problems, mediating differences in values, and persuading others. While each of these goals is important, an ecological, rhetorical perspective can productively expand these understandings of global communication. As Rivers and Weber (2011) argue, "While solutions or persuasion might occur within the ecology, the point remains that other effects—neither solutions or persuasions—occur as well. Thus, the model of the rhetorical ecology admits that the rhetoric and writing to emerge from our pedagogy produces a range of effects, some large and some small, some risky and some rewarding" (549). Shifting our focus from typical scenarios of global communication towards an "amalgamation of processes and encounters" (Edbauer 2005, 8) can enable us to conceive of students exploring a range of other transnational rhetorical interchanges. But taking such an approach asks us to design a different type of global classroom than those outlined in the literature of global higher education.

Earlier in this book, I argued that perhaps our strongest arguments for integrating rhetorical education into global curricula will come from our classes. Here, I would like to explore my attempt as a rhetorical educator to put some of the goals of transnational rhetorical education that I have outlined into practice within the global context of my home city, Birmingham, Alabama. In an advanced composition class entitled "Writing Global Birmingham," I challenged students to conduct fieldwork in the city using a variety of methods—oral history, ethnography, spatial analysis, archival research—in order to explore the city as a site of global rhetoric and politics. While students in this course were free to design their own projects, I also challenged students to learn the research methods they might utilize through a semester-long miniature case study of Islam in Birmingham. Through this case study, I sought to introduce students to the way in which local rhetorical practices are shaped and constrained by a variety of global, national, local, and virtual discourses and to challenge students to understand the city as a space of global political conflict as well as community.

In designing this class, I sought to respond to Nedra Reynolds's (2007) argument in *Geographies of Writing* that rhetoric and composition develop

ways of "keeping the material and metaphorical interconnected, acknowledging that the real and the imagined are dependent upon one another" (46). For Reynolds, "neither material conditions nor imaginary places are constructed out of time and place, and objections to territoriality need to acknowledge that places too—and not just identities—are always in flux" (46). The advanced composition course I describe here thus challenged students to think critically about the metaphorical and material realities that are invoked when we attempt to write Birmingham as a global text. In asking students to explore Birmingham as a site of transnational rhetoric, I sought to challenge students to understand Birmingham as a both a real and imagined global space, and to encourage students to examine the rhetorical practices that take place within the "borderlands" (Reynolds 2007; Lunsford and Ouzgane 2004) of local publics within the city.

In their analysis of Birmingham as a space of composing, my colleagues and former colleagues, Tracey Baker et al. (2003), explore the teaching of writing in Birmingham. They note, importantly, that "there is no single Birmingham, no 'reality' that we could all isolate and describe, not starting point on which we could all agree" (21). They argue, instead, that "Birmingham is a complicated city, rife with contradictions: Southern, but not; industrial, but not; racist, but not" (26). Baker, Jolly, McComiskey, and Ryan's article focuses on the history of the city and the myths of Birmingham that are constructed both in discourse at the city and state level and in the discourse of our university, the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB). The complexity and multiple identities for the city that they note are complicated further when we, as Massey suggests, move to the level of the global and trace the city's relationship to other places around the globe.

As my students and I soon found out, both industry and UAB have played a significant role in drawing influxes of people and capital from around the globe. In addition to the UAB Global program that I discussed in the introduction to this book, UAB's well-known and highly respected medical school draws undergraduate and graduate students to the university from over 80 different nations. This diversity is celebrated throughout the university's publications and website. In the 2014–15 booklet "Information for International Students," UAB is described as "consistently ranked as one of the top 12 most diverse campuses in the U.S., with students from more than 80 countries coming together to learn" and Birmingham is described as "a modern city with a multicultural population" ("Information"). Students at UAB do have the opportunity

to informally encounter other students from different nations, and the diversity of the university is well known among the students. For a global educator, this environment is a luxury, but often one that can get lost in language that simply celebrates diversity. In designing my course, I wanted to push students beyond such celebrations and toward a more critical understanding of the rhetorical practices of being global within the particular rhetorical ecologies of a university and city.

At the same time, because many of my students were from Birmingham, and none hailed from another country, I also sought to engage my students in discussions of how perceptions of Birmingham, the "myths" of place that Baker, Jolly, McComiskey, and Ryan (2003) discussed, might impact our exploration of the city as a global place. Many of my students noted experiences with friends and acquaintances from outside of the region who assumed that Birmingham was backwards and provincial, and questioned how their own projects might address these beliefs. Birmingham's rich history of civil rights activism can, in this case, play a dual role, one of both mythologizing the city as a center of civil rights struggle and also as a racist and backwards place that would be the last place that we might think of as cosmopolitan. In this important sense, one of the most important goals of my class was to encourage students to understand the notion of "global Birmingham" not as a static identity or as wishful thinking, but rather as a space of overlapping and conflicting rhetorical ecologies, one that their research and projects could play a role in engaging.

Since many of my students grew up in Birmingham or the region, the course drew on students' experiences of living in Birmingham and their knowledge of local culture to inform our work. However, the course also sought to place students in encounters with global communities in the city that were unfamiliar to them and to challenge students to attend to the material, geographical, and rhetorical boundaries that separated them from these communities. Many of my students, for example, noted how their culinary experiences had brought them into contact with global cultures in the city, but few mentioned interpersonal interactions with immigrant communities, international students, or global cultural institutions. I did not consider this a failing of my students, but rather an opportunity to explore how rhetorical and material practices create barriers between ourselves and others in the city, and how these practices can be examined and contested. In the description and narrative of the course that follows, I hope to capture how the possibilities and tensions of transnational rhetorical education might play out within the city and how the city can serve as a space of transnational rhetorical ecologies.

From the Virtual to the Global to the City

Following Sassen, my course invokes an understanding of the digital and the material as mutually constitutive of global space. "Writing Global Birmingham" began by inviting students to explore their relationship with the global by critically examining the scope of their global knowledge. Drawing on Zuckerman's (2013) suggestions for examining our individual media habits (*Rewire* 269) students began the course by examining the sources of their global news and tracking their global news consumption over a one-week period. Students were asked to keep a log of each international news story they encountered, the place or medium where they encountered the story, the title of the story, the country or city in which the story took place, and (if necessary) the subject of the story. Through the process we discovered several significant findings about the reach of our global awareness and media consumption. First, almost 50% of the news that we encountered came from Facebook. Very little of this news came from local sources or dealt with global issues in the local context of the city, and ultimately the news collected ended up repeating a very limited version of the week's top stories. Students' logs noted some of the ongoing military incursions in Ukraine, for example, but missed quite a few key occurrences, such as events in the ongoing civil war in Syria. Perhaps what we were most struck by is how our logs replicated Zuckerman's claims about the constraining effects of social media algorithms on our exposure to international news. Based upon our network of friends, the media that we had shared on Facebook in the past, and other metadata collected by Facebook, we were presented with an excellent example of the "pointillist public sphere" (2014, 165) that Zuckerman describes. As a teacher who has taught global issues for many years, I realized that this assignment might lead to unproductive forms of student guilt, or the loose sentiment that students needed to be more "globally aware," so I provided students with opportunities to build on their processes of global news coverage through the development of strategies for using RSS, Twitter, and other digital mediums to expand our global news coverage.

With an understanding of how our exposure to the global is constrained in online spaces, I then introduced students to a group study of Islam in Birmingham. After discussing our prior knowledge of Islam as a religion, Islamic culture, and the Islamic community in Birmingham, I asked students to look at portrayals of Islam in national media and the effects of this media discourse on local discourse. We began by examining Ali Ayan

Hirsi's "The Islamist Last Stand," within the rhetorical context of Islam in Birmingham. This assignment was designed to help students understand the way in which global discourses have concrete rhetorical and material impacts in local communities. Hirsi's essay, published in *Newsweek* in 2012, was accompanied by the now infamous *Newsweek* cover "Muslim Rage," which sparked a range of responses in the national media and on social media sites, such as the "Muslim Rage" Tumblr site, which satirizes the mythic Muslim rage portrayed on the cover and in the article.[5] The closely cropped image of two Muslim males in a state of excitement—we are given no context for this image, so this rage could have just as easily been an image of joy—paired with the all caps, block text of the headline "MUSLIM RAGE" served as a sensational context for Ali's argument. Ali, author of *Infidel*, and a former member of the Dutch parliament, argues in the accompanying article that Islam is, at its core, a violent religion, and uses her rhetoric deftly to paint Muslim rage in broad strokes, implicating almost all Muslims in the process.

After a crash course in rhetorical analysis, I asked students to not only analyze Ali's rhetoric but to draw on her rhetoric as a jumping-off point for a process of inquiry into how her ideas might reflect or conflict with those in our local community and region. Students conducted a wide range of web searches, some for academic studies of Islam in the Deep South, some for local news and magazine articles on Islam in Birmingham, some for web page of our local mosques and Islamic societies, and some for social media from these and other societies. Students brought many documents to one another's attention, including a range of news accounts that discussed incidents of Islamophobia, anti-Islamic sentiment, positive portrayals of local Imams, and attempts to pass anti-Sharia law bills at the state level. Through this process, students were introduced to Islam in Birmingham as a community within the specific rhetorical and political ecologies of the city. Students were then asked to write a rhetorical analysis that examined the relationship between Ali's rhetoric and a variety of rhetorical perspectives on Islam in Birmingham.

One Student, Stephanie Thomas, looked at the relationship between Ali's rhetoric and recent attempts in the Alabama legislature to pass an anti-foreign law bill aimed at stigmatizing Muslims. In her essay, she takes Ali's rhetoric to task for oversimplifying Islam into categories of violent and non-violent, but then reads her rhetoric in two important contexts. First, she argues that the anti-foreign law bill reflects not only a nation-wide trend of Islamophobia but also a legacy of racism in the South. She writes: "Recent

actions taken against Islam in the US reflects those that have always happened in the historically prejudiced South. As an example, Alabama's own Senator Gerald Allen, has proposed to the Courts of Alabama, 'The Sharia Law Amendment.'" By positioning this issue as reflective of traditional acts of racism in the South, the student develops a powerful argument in a local context, as it pits the law against a legacy of civil rights work that has come to be a key myth of the city.

However, while deftly interweaving rhetoric like Ali's and this state bill together, she also links these arguments to prominent web-texts on the Birmingham Islamic Society's webpage that address these fears about Islam and violence for the broader community.[6] The Birmingham Islamic Society has two such statements accessible from their main page, one written right after 9/11 and the other written right as we were beginning our class on ISIS. She argues,

> In response to these killings, The Islamic Society of Birmingham, Alabama initiated the public statement: "The Islamic Society would like to reiterate its condemnation of the un-Islamic and morally repugnant violence of the so called 'extremist group', ISIS" (Garrison). Putting this into perspective, this is a little unnerving to think that a mainstream American religious group, a well involved, community driven group of loyal Americans in the state of Alabama feel the need to "reiterate" their stance on blatant terrorism that is in fact carried out by the tiniest possible fraction of perceived "Islamists." ISIS is an example of this fraction. The truth is that the Birmingham Islamic Society and others   around the United States have to fight the prevailing stereotypes that deem their people, as a whole, murderous and conspiring.

Stephanie's essay reveals, for me, Massey's "global sense of the local," as the student examines how discourse in the national media reflects and shapes political values that have impact on the rhetorical practices of global collectives and publics in the city. She points to how perceptions of Islam as a source of global terror in national media have significant impacts on the rhetorical practices of local Islamic communities, but also to how the image of the city forged in the civil rights era might be used to shape a variety of rhetorical responses to Islamophobia. In her semester reflection, she notes that while she is drawn to the idea of global citizenship, she feels that the entrenched racism in the Deep South makes the idea of Birmingham as a cosmopolitan city hard to fathom. While her perspective is not one that would be likely to be held out as an exemplar

of cosmopolitan or liberal pedagogy, it captures, I think a more concrete understanding of the relationship between place and politics.

Like this project, many student projects examined how conceptions of Islamophobia played out within the city. Many students also focused on the relationship between the sensationalist image on the cover and how it embodied Ali's rhetoric. At the exact same time that students read and responded to Ali's article and the *Newsweek* cover, Ali was asked to come and give a lecture at Yale University. The Yale Muslim Student Association protested her visit and attempted to block her talk. My students read the message posted on their Facebook page and discussed the rhetorical and political implication of blocking her visit. Given their powerful response, we sought to understand how Muslim students at our own university might respond to Ali's rhetoric and the *Newsweek* cover. Working in groups and as a full class, we developed, vetted, and critically analyzed a set of interview questions for members of a local Muslim organization.

Our questions asked members of the organization to respond directly to the *Newsweek* cover, as well as to discuss the work of the organization and how it has "worked to combat prejudices at our university and in the community" against Islam. Students' interview notes revealed a range of different responses to these questions, but a specific pattern began to emerge in the answers. While each of the organization's members noted the inaccuracy of the stereotypical image on the *Newsweek* cover, many of the respondents also noted that the mission of the organization was not politicized, nor did the organization work to confront such stereotypes politically on campus. Instead, what emerged was the repetition of the rhetorical tactic of illustrating the similarities between Muslim students and other undergraduates and educating the campus community about Islam through contact. As one student's notes stated, the role of the organization was not to "fight anything" but to "celebrate similarities in the community not the differences." In addition, when asked about the Birmingham community, several of the respondents mentioned that they had grown up in the community and that they considered it "friendly" and a "melting pot."

Our interactions with members of the organization challenged us as a class to think critically about the assumptions we made about Muslim students' rhetorical responses to Islamophobia and rhetoric like Ali's. In lieu of more overt acts of political protest, we found a variety of other ways in which the students sought to engage other students rhetorically. While the Yale MSA and other national groups employed a more directly political rhetorical

frame, the students we interviewed sought to respond to fear of Islam and Islamophobia through a rhetoric of everyday life and a rhetorical frame of sameness. Later on, when we interviewed a researcher and advocate who examines hate crimes against Muslims in Alabama, however, we encountered a different rhetorical framework or strategy. Here, instead of a rhetoric of education and sameness, we found a rhetorical framework deeply rooted in human rights and social justice. When a student asked the advocate if her attitude and message were rooted in tolerance, or an attitude of live and let live, the response was kind but blunt, with the advocate noting that the we needed to work toward a more just and equal culture where people, despite their religion, are entitled to rights and protected by the rule of law. The interview provided us with a more directly political and agonistic rhetoric, but at the same time gave us an opportunity to contrast this rhetoric to the rhetorical tactics of the members of the local community organization and think about how these very different rhetorics reflect the conditions and constraints of ecologies of rhetorical practice.

From this interview, we then moved toward constructing a survey of non-Muslim students on UAB's campus that would enable us to understand the types of attitudes toward Muslim students and faculty we might encounter on our campus. Our survey sample, 31 respondents, is too small to warrant any significant generalizations or conclusions. However, the process of constructing the survey deepened students' understanding of the rhetorical contexts of Islam on campus. Constructing the survey was perhaps the most difficult task we faced. It involved students in a close analysis of the student body of our institution as a potential audience and in the process of grappling with issues of representation, both of the audience of the survey and of the depictions of Islam and Muslims that were in the survey. The survey sought to gauge our audience's knowledge of Islam, their perceptions of both Islam and Muslims, and their attitudes toward depictions of Muslims in the media. The representation of the audience in the survey questions created a particularly difficult rhetorical situation for our class, as we grappled with how to address common stereotypes without embedding assumptions about our audience. We struggled, for example, about how to present the *Newsweek* "Muslim Rage" cover in our survey, as we felt that our audience might feel uneasy if we simply asked them to respond to the image. One student suggested that we remove the words "Muslim Rage" and have readers caption the image so that we could see the relationship between the image and the audi-

ence's perception of its message. In developing the survey, we grappled with the process of reconstructing the rhetorical ecologies of Islam on our campus. I point to the survey here not as an element of a broad qualitative study, but as a method for immersing students into the overlapping publics and rhetorics surrounding this issue.

This miniature and brief case study, provided students with a rich understanding of the overlapping rhetorical communities surrounding Islam in Birmingham, and helped illustrate how a variety of global, national, and local discourses can meet within a transnational rhetorical ecology to construct the conditions of precarity for members of our community. Students noted the impact of the miniature case study often in their semester reflections. Several particularly honest students noted that their experiences with our interview subjects brought their assumptions about Muslims to the fore and challenged them to confront them.

While this miniature case study is not in any way representative, it provided my students with a rich understanding of the complexity of Islam in Birmingham, as well as an understanding of how rhetorical issues play out in the lived places of the campus and the city. While a more extensive case study would have been needed to capture a fuller sense of the complexity of this locally situated global tension, this project did manage to introduce students to an understanding of how global issues are situated within rhetorical ecologies that link the global, national, local, and virtual. In contrast to transnational rhetorical situations that exist "out there" to be addressed, we found, in Edbauer's words, "co-ordinating processes, moving across the same social field within shared structures of feeling" (9). Importantly, our encounters challenged us to push beyond simple understandings of globalism and localism and toward an understanding of how rhetorical ecologies consist of various transnational, national, and local discourses moving across shared spaces.

Exploring Birmingham as a Transnational Ecology

When students began to submit prospectuses for their own explorations into the city, I began to see that our class was going to engage a variety of senses of the global. Students were asked to conduct field or archival research in the city that would enable our class to deeply understand the global publics and places of Birmingham. Their projects were designed to be exhibited in a digital medium for the class in an effort to make it easier for students to share their work with one another

and also in an effort to challenge students to think critically about the politics of rhetorical and visual representation. Several students explored work with particular communities, such as local immigrant communities, while other students explored the relationship between global cultural practices within the context of the city, including projects that explored the tension between global religious practices such as Tibetan Buddhism, Paganism, and Greek Orthodoxy in a predominantly Anglo-American protestant city. Others explored the relationship between global cultural practices and consumerism, such as the work of a student who contrasted his practice of yoga with its commercialization. While each of these projects presented interesting discussions of global rhetorics in the city, I want to point to two particular projects that illustrate, I think, uses of rhetorical inquiry as a form of social engagement and action, a form of understanding the multilayered transnational rhetorical ecologies of their cities.

The first project is an oral history project on the Liberian immigrant community in Birmingham, a small community of immigrants in the city. The student who conducted the project, Pamela Morton, gathered several oral histories from this community, and from these histories developed an analysis of how the racial identities of her subjects created a sense of tension with identities they had developed in their home cultures. The student's semester reflection states this tension beautifully:

> While most of them had no issue with being labeled the term "Black", they found it frustrating that their cultural and ethnic differences were being ignored. They wanted their nationalities to be acknowledged instead of being lumped into one group based on skin color. However, I found that they chose to live and socialize in close knit communities rather that expose themselves to the many other groups in Birmingham. In all, I felt that regardless of ethnic origin or racial makeup people tend to feel comfortable when they are surrounded by people of similar lifestyles. I think that while Birmingham is a global community during the day, at night we separate into or own social circles. We seek out new ways of learning and living, but we all want to be comfortable while doing it.

Pamela's description of the close-knit Liberian immigrant community in Birmingham was further developed in her oral history project, where she examines her position as a researcher and discusses the initial concerns of the community members she worked with about how they would be represented. Throughout her project, the relationship between her

subjects' race and culture remains a key tension that shapes their lives within the city.

In her oral history project, Pamela chronicles the tensions that arise between her interview subjects' cultural identities and their perception not as Liberian but rather as black within the Birmingham community. Pamela's oral history project locates a rhetorical tension between representation of national culture and race. The oral histories she provides are revealing in that they illustrate how the Liberian immigrants she interviewed traverse back and forth between the places of their own "close-knit communities" and the places in the city that make up their day-to-day lives. Pamela's project and her reflection on her own access to this situated global community identifies what Juan Guerra (2004) has called "transcultural repositioning," a "rhetorical skill" that Guerra argues "members of our community must self-consciously regulate and not simply enact intuitively, if they wish to move back and forth with ease and comfort between and among different languages and dialects, different social classes, different cultural and artistic forms. If enacted critically, transcultural respositioning can open the door to different ways of seeing and thinking about the increasingly fluid and hybridized world that is emerging around us" (8). Through her rhetorical inquiry, Pamela locates how the global and local operate in tension and how her interview subjects mediate this tension through their own public rhetoric.

Another student, Teresa Davis, developed a project that looked at how labor practices in the steel industry in Birmingham brought immigrant laborers into conflict with poor white workers initially, but then together in support of opposing the nefarious practice of using convict labor in the foundries and mines. Teresa examined how the steel industry, the industry central to Birmingham's survival and thriving became a site of conflict over global immigration and race. She argues that "Immigrants encompassed a gray area; although they shared much of the appearance of being white, they were generally not considered to be either white or black." Because of their position in this gray area, many immigrants were, as she argues, seen "as a problem comparable to free blacks; they were more competition for steady jobs." These late nineteenth-century views toward immigrants were challenged, she argues by the move to use convict labor. Teresa's project points to the way in which race became malleable rhetorically due to the perceived need for whites and European immigrants to band together to oppose convict labor, which replaced

their jobs with a form of "slavery." She argues, "The same held true for European immigrants; as described previously, in order to strengthen the political interests of whites, Europeans had been assimilated into the white race." Convict labor, as Teresa shows, allowed the citizenship status of African Americans to continue to be undermined even while that of Greek, Italian, and other immigrants was granted. Teresa's project points to how current conceptions of Birmingham as a global city paper over a complicated history of immigration and race relations in the city, a history central to understanding Birmingham's role as a central location in civil rights struggle. Her project, in this sense, captured Massey's understanding of a *global sense of place* by deftly identifying how global capitalism produced local conflicts that continue to shape attitudes toward race in the city.

Of course, not all student projects explored the transnational rhetorical ecologies of Birmingham with the same amount of depth, and a few even struggled to break the cosmopolitan frame or vision that celebrates diversity and contact without a more critical process of questioning their ideological and rhetorical underpinnings. Such a frame can prove hard to resist, as it offers a compelling ethical vision of the world, though one often shorn of the politics of place and everyday life. While this cosmopolitanism was attractive, especially initially, to many of my students, I felt that my role as a rhetorical educator was to probe the limits of this perspective with students, especially its tendency to obscure sources of political conflict with descriptions of ethical dialogue and encounter. In many ways, as I learned by polling students on the first day of class, cosmopolitanism or global citizenship was an easy sell, as nearly all of my students indicated that they would view themselves as global citizens. By engaging students in inquiry into the global flows and communities of their own city in this course, I attempted to challenge students to understand how depictions of the global, including depictions of global communities and global cities, often neglect the politics that shape particular ecologies of rhetorical practice.

CONCLUSION

I have presented this course not as a model but as an example of an approach to transnational rhetorical education that encourage students to see transnational rhetorical citizenship as situated within rhetorical ecologies of global life in our cities, towns, and campuses. Throughout this discussion, I have also sought to expand our understanding of rhetorical

ecologies by pointing to their ability to dialectically interweave various "effects, enactments, and events" (Edbauer 9) from global, national, local, and virtual contexts. I believe that this approach can provide students with a much more nuanced and complex understanding of the condition of globalization and global engagement, one that can enable them to perceive more opportunities for rhetorical participation and agency. This approach provides a much-needed alternative to approaches to global higher education that have tended to treat global communication as either transnational border crossing, a matter of second language acquisition, or as a matter of engaging global institutions. While each of these dimensions of global education is important, courses that invest students in analyzing transnational rhetorical ecologies can help them understand how globalization creates a global sense of locality in their towns and cities. Reconceiving the typical distinction between the global and the local in this way can provide students with a more complex understanding of transnational networks and how they shape rhetorical and civic practices.

Notes

1. For a link to images of this installation, please visit the Do Ho Suh's website hosted by Lehmann Maupin: http://www.lehmannmaupin.com/artists/do-ho-suh.
2. See also Robbins's (1999) *Feeling Global: Internationalism in Distress*.
3. For key discussions of rhetorical ecologies beyond those cited in this chapter, see Marilyn M. Cooper (1986) "The Ecology of Writing" and Margaret Syverson *The Wealth of Reality: An Ecology of Composition*.
4. In his *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, Kwame Appiah refers to a similar process of "cosmopolitan contamination," a process through which globalization contaminates national forms of belonging and identity (101).
5. In *Rewire: Digital Cosmopolitans in the Age of Connection*, Ethan Zuckerman points to the Muslim Rage Tumblr site as an example of digital cosmopolitanism.
6. See the Birmingham Islamic Society's webpage: http://www.bisweb.org. At the time of publication, the organization's "An Open Letter Condemning ISIS" was still prominently displayed on the home page.

Bibliography

Appadurai, Arjun. 2013. "How Histories Make Geographies: Circulation and Context in a Global Perspective." In *The Future as Cultural Fact: Essays on the Global Condition*. 61–70. Verso.

———. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Baker, Tracey, Peggy Jolly, Bruce McComiskey, and Cynthia Ryan. 2003. "Myth, Identity, and Composition: Teaching Writing in Birmingham, Alabama." In *City Comp: Identities, Spaces, Practices*, edited by Bruce McComiskey and Cynthia Ryan, 21–37. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Benhabib, Seyla. 2008. *Another Cosmopolitanism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Butler, Judith. 2012. "Precarious Life, Vulnerability, and the Ethics of Cohabitation." *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*. 26, no. 2: 134–151.

Cooper, Marylin M. 1986. "The Ecology of Writing." *College English*. 48, no. 4: 364–375

Davis, Teresa. 2015. "*Forged in Inequality: The Rhetoric of Birmingham's Convict Leasing Program*." Honors Thesis. The University of Alabama at Birmingham.

Edbauer, Jenny. 2005. "Unframing Models of Public Distribution: From Rhetorical Situation to Rhetorical Ecologies." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*. 35, no. 4: 5–24.

Fleming, David. 2009. *City of Rhetoric: Revitalizing the Public Sphere in Metropolitan America*. New York: SUNY Press.

Guerra, Juan C. 2004. "Emerging Representations, Situated Literacies, and the Practice of Transcultural Repositioning." In *Latino/a Discourses: On Language, Identity, and Literacy Education*, edited by Michelle Hall Kells, Valerie Balester, and Victor Villanueva, 7–23. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Harris, Joseph. 2012. *A Teaching Subject: Composition Since 1966*. 2nd Edition. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Lunsford, Andrea and Lahoucine Ouzgane eds. 2004. *Crossing Borderlands: Composition and Postcolonial Studies*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Massey, Doreen. 2007. *World City*. New York: Polity.

———. 1994. *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

McComiskey, Bruce and Cynthia Ryan. 2003. "Introduction." In *City Comp: Identities, Spaces, Practices*, edited by Bruce McComiskey and Cynthia Ryan, 1–20. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 1991. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession*. 33–40. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25595469

Reynolds, Nedra. 2007. *Geographies of Writing: Inhabiting Places and Encountering Difference*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rice, Jenny. 2012. *Distant Publics: Development Rhetoric and the Subject of Crisis*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Rivers, Nathaniel and Ryan P. Weber. 2011. "Ecological, Pedagogical, and Public Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication*. 63, no. 2: 187–218.

Robbins, Bruce. 2013. *Perpetual War: Cosmopolitanism from the Viewpoint of Violence*. Durham, Duke University Press.

Robbins, Bruce. 1999. *Feeling Global: Internationalism in Distress*. New York: New York University Press.

Sassen, Saskia. 2003. "Reading the City in a Global Digital Age: Between Topographic Representation and Spatialized Power Projects." In *Global Cities: Cinema, Architecture, and Urbanism in a Digital Age*, edited by Linda Krause and Patrice Petro, 15–30. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Syverson, Margaret. 1999. *The Wealth of Reality: An Ecology of Composition*. Southern Illinois University Press.

University of Alabama at Birmingham. *UAB Global*. University of Alabama at Birmingham. Accessed May 5, 2015. http://www.uab.edu/global/.

Zuckerman, Ethan. 2013. *Rewire: Digital Cosmopolitans in the Age of Connection*. New York: Norton.

———. 2014. "New Media, New Civics?" *Policy and Internet*. 6, no. 2: 151–168.

Conclusion: Rhetorical Education and the Local Production of Global Higher Education

Recently, I worked as a faculty mentor to a group of talented undergraduates as part of a global health care case contest sponsored by the School of Public Health on my campus. This contest invited undergraduate and graduate students to take part in a spontaneous three-day case study and develop and pitch an innovative solution to a global health problem. Their proposal not only needed to be well-founded but also to culturally sensitive and persuasive for a panel of expert judges. The undergraduate students I worked with were quite brilliant and had developed a proposal for a self-funded sanitation system in the Indian countryside. Given that I was working with students who were not from this community and who had just been given a case study of the area a day before, I felt uneasy about the context of the assignment. In addition, having no background in public health, I was a bit nervous about what I could offer to the students. Within the first five minutes of our first meeting, however, it became clear to me that what we needed to work on were the rhetorical tactics of their proposal. Over our brief two meetings, we discussed audience expectations, the political context of the rhetoric, how their rhetoric might be aligned with the rhetoric of NGOs, and a host of other rhetorical issues. At the same time, we discussed issues of cultural representation, spectacle, victimization, and the need to portray the subjects of the case study with dignity. While the students showed a commitment to rhetorical ethics and I certainly found the project interesting, I could not also help but be somewhat troubled in other ways.

As a rhetorician, I found myself in admiration of opportunities for rhetorical performance that the case-study contest provided, and I was, once again, impressed by the disciplinary reach and resources of powerful academic programs like our School of Public Health. As a writing program director, I questioned whether such resources would be available for similar events or programs in my own department. Perhaps more troubling, however, was my realization that students were engaging, however briefly, in transnational rhetorical exchanges through their work in Public Health, but there were few opportunities for them to pursue courses in rhetoric and communication, given the intensity of their plan of study. In this sense, while this encounter left me hopeful about the role that rhetorical educators can play in fostering students' capacities of transnational inquiry and rhetorical performance, it also underlined the difficulty of making room for rhetorical education in global higher education.

While many global higher education programs have traditionally focused on border-crossing experiences such as study abroad, the arguments for global higher education and "comprehensive internationalization" that we encountered at the beginning of this book point to an understanding that the global must be infused into the entire undergraduate curriculum. I have sought to underline the vital importance of rhetorical education for mapping out a critical, performative, and ethical rhetorical education that can respond to forms of cosmopolitan global education and nationalist forms global education. However, because "communication skills" or rhetorical skills can be projected as generalized skills capable of being taught across the disciplines, there is little room at the moment for rhetorical education in the global curriculum. Global higher education initiatives have, largely without our insights, defined the rhetorical capacities necessary for our students to engage in global life. At the conclusion of *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education*, I want to seize upon this shared exigence in order to map out two potential projects that scholars and teachers in rhetoric and composition studies and communication should pursue—(1) institutional analysis and critique of rhetoric and communication in localized global education programs, and (2) cross-disciplinary pedagogical research that examines nascent rhetorical education in global classrooms and that looks for opportunities for disciplinary advocacy.

My argument throughout this book has been that rhetorical education can offer tactics of global engagement that can empower students with a sense of their agency to rhetorically address a world indelibly

marked by globalization. We have encountered global higher education from its earliest roots in philosophical cosmopolitanism to recent efforts toward "comprehensive internationalization," and we have engaged contemporary efforts toward global higher education both critically, by examining the political and ethical motivations that compel them, and productively, by seeking to rearticulate global higher education from the vantage-point of rhetorical education. Hopefully, readers have noticed that, while outlining outcomes of global higher education myself, I have sought to address these outcomes in terms of the experiences of the students and teachers that they reflect. Readers will have noticed that, in many cases, I have sought to present critical approaches to key aspects of transnational rhetorical education, including rhetorical ethics and transnational rhetorical ecologies, rather than present a heuristic or a set of principles. This speaks, for me, to an understanding of rhetoric as a situational art that intertwines analysis and performance for political action while also providing tools for ethical reflection on the effects of action. My argument pits rhetoric and rhetorical education against specific syntheses of ideology and motive in global higher education and points to rhetorical education maintaining an agonistic relationship with global higher education. In an era of comprehensive internationalization and its synthesis of ethical, political, and disciplinary motives, rhetorical educators must find ways of challenging articulations of global higher education that would limit the impact of our discipline and make us complicit with political ideologies with which we may not wish to align ourselves.

Framing Transnational Rhetorical Education

Throughout *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education*, I have attempted to address these problems in the process of tracing out the outcomes and practices of transnational rhetorical education and grounding these practices in the work of students. I have argued that classes in transnational rhetorical education at a variety of levels—from Freshman English to advanced undergraduate and graduate courses—can become some of our best arguments for the vital role rhetorical education can play in global higher education. On my own campus, for example, sharing the course design and experiences of teaching transnational rhetorical education in my classes has allowed me to critically connect with the work of my colleagues who are engaging students in a variety of rhetorical performances

in courses on ethnography, digital media, and conflict. While talking about our classes across the curriculum may seem like a small act, one with perhaps limited impact, such talk can become powerful "vernacular rhetoric" (Hauser 1999) that can go a long way on our campuses toward reshaping the conception that we have little to offer global higher education other than helping students write their papers for classes on global issues. At the same time, as I argued in the second chapter of this book, we face the problem that while the spaces for rhetorical education in the contemporary university are limited, a broad range of disciplinary programs are working with students on projects that have to strike us as rhetorical performances.

For example, many of us who work on college campuses, have, I suspect, witnessed the growth of digital media or media studies programs that engage students in a variety of rhetorical performances, such as documentary filmmaking. The rise in these programs is encouraging in one sense, and somewhat daunting in others—encouraging in that they point toward a move toward public argument and rhetorical performance, daunting in that they bring processes of analysis and performance that receive immediate recognition from faculty and administrators. Many rhetorical educators may recognize that the processes of rhetorical performance and analysis that these programs offer are remarkably similar to or have even been integrated into our own pedagogies. As a rhetorical educator, I have often found myself sharing a moment with a colleague or two in media studies programs, for example, where we recognize that we are pursuing similar processes and using similar toolkits only to feel that my own work in transnational rhetorical education is confined to my classes, while my colleagues' has more opportunity to be integrated into initiatives that garner more campus-wide recognition. Disciplinary cultures and the struggle to receive disciplinary recognition are, of course, slow processes, and global higher education initiatives can be a reminder of how our disciplines can be positioned as a disciplines that provide basic skills that are pre-civic or pre-global engagement.

These struggles will play out in different ways and different institutions, and institutional and even departmental politics can play a role in constraining the roles of transnational rhetorical educators and their influence on global initiatives on specific campuses. This will take smart, tactical work behalf of rhetorical educators, work that cannot be boiled down to a set of principles or idealized tactics. What we can explore, in conclusion, however, are strategies for using our own rhetoric to reframe how our

discipline's contributions to global higher education are envisioned or framed. In *The Activist WPA: Changing Stories About Writing and Writers,* Linda Adler-Kassner (2008) draws on framing analysis to argue that "Using the concept of framing—that is, the idea that stories are always set within and reinforce particular boundaries …—it is possible both to examine how the same telescoping phenomenon of storytelling is occurring around writers and writing instruction today. That is, there are different stories circulating about writing and writers that build cumulatively to form larger narratives" (4). Adler-Kassner reminds us that while frames are powerful and shape and constrain rhetoric, as teachers of writing and rhetoric we possess the ability to resist these frames, to "think and act strategically to change the frames around those discussions and the stories emanating from them" (180) and to forge "alliances and try to use those as a basis from which to develop shared values that then extend to messages through which we communicate our ideas to others" (169). Following Adler-Kassner, my claim here is that the role of rhetorical education in global higher education is constrained by the force of the stories that get told about rhetoric and writing, both nationally and across our campuses, and that, if rhetorical education is to contribute to global higher education, we need to strategically seize upon opportunities for reframing the role of our discipline.

We need to articulate the importance of rhetorical education, while also seizing upon key opportunities for forging alliances and using them to construct new frames for the role of rhetorical education. While some of these alliances are across our campuses, many are as close as our own departments. As we form such alliances, we need to be conscious of the fact that in building common ground with colleagues in other disciplines, we still need to argue for the specific contributions of our own rhetorical theories and pedagogies while recognizing shared methods, motives, and values. We also need to cultivate tactics for agonistically engaging discourses, ideologies, and pedagogies of global higher education while not creating antagonism against ourselves and the rhetorical education we have to offer. While, as Adler-Kassner has argued, framing or storytelling is ultimately local work (92), I will point here to several different sites of cross-curricular engagement that I hope many readers will recognize as opportunities for reframing or rearticulating the role of rhetorical education in the global higher education initiatives happening on their campuses. There are many more sites of engagement than I can hope to cover here, but I hope to offer some key practices and some possible points of

cross-curricular engagement, along with some specific examples, that serve as strategic opportunities for articulating the importance of rhetorical education in global higher education.

My own institution, which I briefly described in the last chapter, is a research 1 state university that is known regionally and nationally for its outstanding medical school and STEM programs. This institutional emphasis is essential for understanding my institution's global education program within its institutional context and history. When you visit my institution's "Global" page, which is linked to the main menu of my university's website, you find the definition of global citizenship that we encountered in the introduction to this book, but also links to news stories and my institution's global institutes. You also find lists of courses that are categorized as contributing to my institution's global mission.

The pages on this site display contributions from a variety of colleges and units, but the page reflects the global contributions of medical and professional programs and programs in the social sciences more fully than programs in the humanities. For example, while some literature courses from English are listed among the globally focused courses, no regularly offered courses in rhetoric or our professional writing program are, and when visitors click on the research tab for examples of globally minded research, no research from English is present, though one of my colleagues has routinely published on rhetoric and global health. In fact, most of the research listed comes from STEM fields and professional programs in the Health Sciences. This context shapes opportunities for transnational rhetorical education and for building alliances at my institution. Institutions that are traditionally humanities focused, or rooted firmly in liberal education, will offer different constraints and opportunities. Institutions that act as feeder institutions for defense industries might be under other constraints. Understanding our opportunities to exert influence in global higher education requires that we understand global higher education within the dynamics of our institution's discourse, history, and politics.

Institutional Research, Disciplinarity, and "The Ethics of Possibility"

While I have traced out a critical approach to transnational rhetorical citizenship and education, I want to conclude by turning toward the more extensive project of making room for rhetorical education in global higher education

initiatives on our own campuses. I look specifically here at processes of analyzing the institutional possibilities for transnational rhetorical education and provide a heuristic for institutional analysis of global higher education initiatives. I then draw on this process to trace out rhetorical tactics for forming institutional, cross-disciplinary allies that can help further and protect the work of rhetorical educators in the global turn. I argue that this project requires us to critically examine the political underpinnings of global higher initiatives on our own campuses, but also to form institutional allies that can help transnational rhetorical educators to respond to attacks on their work from outside and inside the academy.

While global higher education efforts are often articulated at the macro-level of national higher education organizations and the administrations of colleges and universities, ultimately efforts to internationalize the curriculum or integrate global learning depend on interdisciplinary cooperation and integration. As I have argued earlier, global higher education and academic disciplines have a complex and sometimes troubling relationship. David Harvey (2009) and others have shown how disciplinary forms of cosmopolitanism have advanced forms of colonialism and imperialism.[1] In addition, as de Oliveira Andreotti et al. (2012) have argued in the introduction to their *Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education*, such programs, despite their aims, can produce and reproduce frameworks of colonial reason. They suggest that "despite claims of globality and inclusion, the lack of analysis of power relations and knowledge construction in this area often results in educational practices that unintentionally reproduce ethnocentric, ahistorical, depoliticized, paternalistic, salvationist, and triumphalist approaches that tend to deficit theorize, pathologize, or trivialize difference" (1). The discussion of students' encounters and uses of images of global suffering in violence in Chap. 4 illustrates just how easily such logics can be reproduced, even when our intentions as educators are good. Given these stakes, responding to programs that aim to create disciplinary integration in global higher education requires rhetorical educators to not only formulate a pedagogical response but also to extend the critical-analytical project of unearthing and examining how rhetorics of disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity have shaped and continue to shape global higher education. This is particularly important if precarity should serve as the rhetorical, ethical, and political exigence of global higher education and if we are to develop a critical argument for the role of rhetorical education in fostering students' capacities for understanding and responding to conditions of precarious life and the systems of power that sustain them.

As scholars of rhetoric we are well poised to critically question the discourses of internationalization and integration that shape contemporary global higher education initiatives. As I have argued, this means pushing beyond the nominalist controversies that we see in the programmatic and scholarly literature and turning our attention to how discourses of security, sovereignty, ethics, rights, nationalism, and economy are operationalized in practice. In practice, global higher education balances a range of different motives and allegiances, some of which, as we have seen, have particularly troubling ties to the systems of power that produce the conditions of precarious life for others. For rhetorical educators committed to resisting these ties, it is important to ask specific questions about the interests and motives underlying efforts toward globalizing or internationalizing the curriculum. What does it mean, for example, for rhetorical educators committed to the project of resisting political and economic policies that create and reproduce precarious life to be part of an integration process that brings their discipline together with other disciplinary initiatives that are supported by national security initiatives or institutions of global capitalism? What might it mean for these same rhetorical educators to take part in global higher education programs or efforts to internationalize the curriculum with scholars in other fields whose work is funded by military investment or global corporations?[2] What might it mean to teach critical rhetoric in a context where the rhetoric of diversity and global citizenship are used to advance university capital; through, for example, efforts to bring in international student head-hunting agencies?

Questions such as these are crucial at this time. Despite accusations that the academic left is using global education to sow disloyalty to America, the disappearance of global higher education from the American University is highly unlikely. However, as we have seen, global higher education is a site of agonistic conflict where a variety of interests compete, and where troubling relationships can be forged. To critically interrogate and engage this agonistic field, we need tools for examining the relationship between disciplinarity, power, and precarity as it plays out across individual institutions. The heuristic that I develop below is a first step toward developing these tools. At the same time, however, we also need to recognize that asking such questions commits us to a political-ethical perspective that brings with it its own risks. Returning to Foucault's understanding of critique as virtue, we might recognize that critically questioning efforts toward integrated global learning and internationalizing the curriculum

will take courage and require strategic alignments with other faculty who share in the project of resisting the systems of power that create and recreate precarious life.

At the end of his essay "The Future as Cultural Fact," Arjun Appadurai (2013) provides an argument for turning toward disciplinary practices as a means of ethically resisting systems of power that produce and exploit global inequity. He argues that disciplinary knowledge confronts two conflicting ethical projects—"the ethics of probability" and "the ethics of possibility" (295). The ethics of probability is ultimately related to the immoral practices of disaster capitalism or "generally tied to the growth of a casino capitalism which profits from catastrophe and tends to bet on disaster" (295). In contrast, Appadurai calls on his own discipline of anthropology to pursue the ethics of possibility, "those ways of thinking, feeling, and acting that increase the horizons of hope, that expand the field of the imagination, that produce greater equity in what I have called the capacity to aspire, and that widen the field of informed, creative, and critical citizenship" (295). Such an ethics, he argues, should lead scholars in a variety of disciplines to "commit ourselves to a partisan position, at least in one regard, and that is to be mediators, facilitators, and promoters of the ethics of possibility against the ethics of probability" (299). Importantly, he argues that "For those of us who still work in and from the academy, this ethical argument cannot be applied abstractly or in those domains from which we are most distant or disconnected. It must begin at home: in our institutions, our disciplines, and our methods" (300). Rhetorical education is well-positioned to promote an ethics of possibility. Rhetorical education can provide critical tools and processes for locating discussions of global exigencies and identities within rhetorical ecologies that span the global and the local. Rhetoric provides a way of moving from knowledge and awareness of global people and issues toward tactics for analysis and performance that can foster critical forms of transnational agency. At the same time, rhetoric provides a toolkit for reflexively analyzing discourses of global ethics and citizenship and recognizing their ability to shape the scenes of address from which we rhetorically engage global life.

And yet, as I have also argued, rhetorical educators occupy a marginal place in global higher education and do not enjoy the level of disciplinary recognition of disciplines like anthropology. Thus, I want to add to Appadurai's argument by tracing out a rhetorical heuristic for critically examining, locating, and seizing upon opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration toward the shared project of an ethics of possibility in global

higher education. While Appadurai has focused most specifically on the relationship between disciplinary knowledge, research, methods, and ethics, I suggest here that rhetoric's identity as a pedagogical art can provide significant opportunities for extending the ethics of possibility to the classroom. In addition, I want to suggest that both rhetoric and composition studies and communication have significant research traditions that focus on pedagogy in ways that other disciplines do not, and this research can create opportunities for rhetorical educators and scholars to play important roles in moving global higher education beyond vague depictions of communication skills and toward more critical, rhetorical pedagogies. As we have seen, the close relationship between the rhetorical and the ethical is one that undergirds the conditions of our responses to precarity. In this sense, the vision of transnational rhetorical citizenship and rhetorical education I have argued for should, hopefully, be readily observable in Appadurai's ethics of possibility. Here, I want to draw again on the understanding of rhetorical ecology to trace out the critical roles rhetorical educators can play in engaging global higher education initiatives on their own campuses.

In addition to helping students understand the role rhetorical ecologies play in the production of localities, we need also to develop tools for analyzing the production of the global higher education as a locality on our own campuses. Understanding global higher education initiatives as ecologies can orient us to the flows of texts, organizational representatives, capital, faculty, students, discourses, and ideologies that shape articulations of global higher education on our own campuses. Such an ecological analysis can provide not only opportunities for engagement, but also openings for critical questioning, reform, and resistance. The heuristic I develop here draws on the work of one of the most powerful and influential actors in the movement for comprehensive internationalization, the American Council on Education (2003), specifically their expansive blueprint *Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide*, which we first encountered in Chap. 2. Drawing on a rhetorical analysis of both the network of stakeholders outlined in this report and the report's depiction of the communicative capacities of the international curriculum, I trace out a set of key questions rhetorical educators can use to perceive both opportunities for engagement in global educational initiatives and opportunities for critique.

The ACE's efforts toward internationalizing higher education are reflected in both their extensive research, including their guidebooks for college and university administrators, and also through the work of their

ACE Internationalization Laboratory project, which has worked with over 100 institutions. This project works with college and university administrations to "assemble an internationalization leadership team on campus," "analyze current internationalization activities and articulate institutional goals" and "formulate a strategic action plan to take internationalization efforts forward" (ACE). *Internationalizing the Campus*, a key publication for this project, serves as a "practical guide for higher education administrators and faculty engaged in internationalizing their institution" (v). In tracing out the stakeholders of internationalization, the report follows the troubled terrain mapped out earlier in this book, noting that the effort will involve stakeholders with a variety of different interests, including liberal education, economic and career interests, multiculturalism, and national security and foreign policy interests (12–16). Noting the problem of conflicting goals among stakeholders, the report argues that internationalization programs can bring stakeholders together: "Different goals for internationalization can, however, mutually reinforce rather than conflict with one another. For example, efforts to internationalize career-oriented fields can also result in students' developing intercultural communication skills that are useful in working with people of different cultures within the United States" (12). Policy discourse like should remind us of Appadurai's discussion of the ethics of probability versus the ethics of possibility and the broader ethical responsibilities of disciplinary practices.

As a rhetorical educator committed to critically and productive engaging systems of power that create the conditions of precarious life, I find myself asking "do I want my goals to 'mutually reinforce' these other goals, especially those that are supported by material and symbolic resources derived from national defense and international investment and finance?" I cannot help but notice how, once again, communication is reduced to a neutral art that mediates between two very different motives and politics, even as it simultaneously advances their goals. As I noted in the introduction to this book, the vision of transnational rhetorical education that I outline here is not one that everyone will agree with politically or pedagogically. To return to Appadurai once again, I would note his insistence that pursuing the ethics of possibility from within the academy calls for us to take up a "partisan position" (2013, 299) within our disciplines, and my own position is clearly partisan. In contrast to calls for smoothing over conflicting goals for global or transnational education, I want to insist upon the necessity of a continuous process of critique and

reflection on the part of global educators, while also pointing to the central role that rhetorical educators can play in this process. Rhetorical scholars and educators need to not only critically engage the rhetoric of internationalization and global higher education, but also push back against the impoverished depictions of communication that accompany them. This latter point is crucial, as communication can become, as in the example above, a neutral term operationalized for goals and interests that come into conflict with our own ethics and politics.

To understand this process requires us to critically analyze the discourses of internationalizing the curriculum and global higher education as part of a larger ecology of discourses, intentions, and effects. In her work on ecologies and composition studies Margaret Syverson (1999) has argued that ecologies of composition are made up of "interrelated complex systems": "Readers, writers, and texts are interdependently specified and embedded in particular historical, cultural, and physical ecologies. These ecological systems have dynamic self-organizing properties that cannot be adequately understood through analysis of individual components or processes" (183). While I have argued for a transnational understanding of rhetorical ecologies as a key element of transnational rhetorical education and citizenship, understanding internationalization and global higher education as an ecology can help us recognize the interdependent relationships these programs reflect and constitute. These include the range of discourses, roles, feelings, and motives that animate the distributed networks of internationalization or attempts to globalize the curriculum. Such an approach can enable us to understand these processes as "distributed" (183) across a range of actors and point to how systems of internationalization can become "self-organizing" or "emergent" processes (183) through "situated practices and activities that structure the composing situation and unfolds over time" (183). Tracing out the rhetorical ecologies of internationalization is ultimately local work, so rather than offering an ideal model, I offer instead a heuristic, or a set of critical questions intended to support the work of rhetoricians engaging the global turn and internationalization efforts on their campuses. The following questions are developed in response to key sections of ACE's (2003) extensive "Questions to Guide an Institutional Review," which are found in *Internationalizing the Campus*:

"Articulated Commitment: Mission, Goals, and Vision" (91).

1. *How are students positioned in global higher education programs or in discussions of internationalization?*
2. *How are students portrayed as outcomes of global curricula and internationalization? What specific economic, ethical, and/or national projects are students portrayed as advancing?*
3. *How is student agency rhetorically framed in discussions of outcomes? What general and specific capacities will students possess?*

"The Environment for Internationalization" (91).

1. *How are specific student populations positioned as subjects of globalization or the internationalization of the curriculum? That is, how are specific populations, such as international students, rhetorically portrayed as advancing or reflecting globalization or internationalization?*
2. *How are connections to local, national, and international organizations and businesses influential in shaping the symbolic, material, and curricular environments of globalization or internationalization programs?*

"Strategy" (92).

1. *If the institution has a strategic internationalization plan, how are faculty and students portrayed within the plan?*
2. *How does the plan map out the core institutional efforts, those efforts to which the institution will devote the most resources? How are these efforts rhetorically articulated and justified?*
3. *How does the university rhetorically align its internationalization programs with its institutional history and mission?*
4. *How is assessment of communication or rhetorical capacities outlined in the strategic plan?*

"Structures, Policies, and Practices" (92).

1. *How is the administration of the global or internationalization effort structured and what is the rhetorical, pedagogical, and political relationship to faculty? Is the effort primarily top-down, or is it portrayed as a joint effort among faculty?*

2. *How are efforts to enlist faculty participation presented? In addition, what institutional resources and incentives are in place to further the program or effort?*
3. *How are the programs marketed to students in order to encourage participation?*
4. *How are the programs marketed to faculty in order to encourage their participation?*
5. *What is the relationship between programs and their funding, both institutional and extra-institutional? In what positive or troubling ways might the rhetoric of internationalization, including rhetorics of global citizenship be aligned with this funding?*

"The Curriculum and Co-Curriculum" (93).

1. *How are courses in general education, including first-year writing courses, positioned as part of or ancillary to internationalization or global education programs?*
2. *What specific academic programs on the campus have global or international programs and how do they portray their outcomes and their students and faculty as advancing these outcomes?*
3. *What particular points of synthesis and conflict might be observable between different internationalization or global education initiatives within specific programs or disciplines?*
4. *How are students within these programs positioned as communicators, writers, or new media composers?*

"Campus Culture" (94).

1. *How does the institution publicize internationalization efforts?*
2. *What is the overall presence of internationalization or global education efforts on campus?*
3. *In what ways are internationalization or global higher education efforts connected to the larger community surrounding the university? How are the programs perceived and how might these perceptions shape the campus culture?*

These questions are designed as starting points that may lead towards robust local efforts of what James Porter et al. (2000) have called "institutional

critique," a process of analyzing "institutions and rhetorical designs—mapping the conflicted frameworks in these heterogeneous and contested spaces, articulating the hidden and seemingly silent voices of those marginalized by the powerful, and observing how power operates within institutional space—in order to expose and interrogate possibilities for institutional change through the practice of rhetoric" (631). Such a process, as the questions above illustrate, involves embracing an agonistic approach to institutional rhetoric, one that does not take efforts of disciplinary integration and attempts to mediate conflict as a problem to be solved but as a rhetorical tension to be engaged.

A few examples can help illustrate this point. First, higher education research has shown that lower-income students rarely study abroad (Salisbury et al. 2009, 133). If a university rhetorically frames study abroad as a central form of promoting students' global citizenship, then it is possible to create the environment for a two-tiered system of internationalization based on financial inequities among students. It is also important to examine how rhetorics of global citizenship and global knowledge are distributed and emerge differently throughout the campus ecology of internationalization or global higher education. For example, as I have argued earlier, internationalization efforts can privilege specific disciplines while virtually ignoring others or positioning them as prior or ancillary to global education. In addition, specific bodies of students, especially international students, can be positioned within globalization efforts in ways that are troubling. The presence of corporate recruiters for international student recruitment organizations on many campuses has made a wide range of faculty uncomfortable. These programs can be folded into the university's global initiatives and aligned with the rhetoric of their global outcomes.

Rhetoric and Composition and Communication in the Global Turn

Given the sometimes troubling alignments that global higher education and internationalization initiatives can produce, the rhetorical work of institutional critique is necessary. At the same time, as I have argued throughout this book, critiquing global higher education efforts is necessary but must be complemented by the process of rearticulating global higher education and internationalization in ways that advance the value of our disciplines while also taking part in an ethics of possibility. This

means that we need to use institutional critique not as an end in itself but as a means toward identifying key openings for our own critical interventions. One of the key strategies for pursuing this work is for rhetoricians in English Studies and Communication to take the lead in researching, theorizing, and assessing the rhetorical skills outlined in global higher education initiatives on our own campuses. Such an approach requires the type of interdisciplinary engagement called for in the "Mt. Oread Manifesto on Rhetorical Education." A central challenge will be working across disciplinary borders to develop a common, if sometimes conflicting, language of rhetorical education that spans our methodological and theoretical borders.

Such joint work is especially necessary because both rhetoric and composition and communication are often marginalized in global higher education efforts and literature. As we have seen, global communication skills and capacities are ever present on the list of global educational outcomes, but rarely are scholars in these disciplines consulted in developing these lists or envisioning the pedagogies that could lead to them. Thus, while we need to recognize opportunities for integrating rhetoric throughout the global curriculum, we also need, as Doug Hesse 2005, Joseph Petraglia (2003), David Fleming (1998) and others have argued to make claims to our own disciplinary expertise and "ownership" (Hesse) of rhetoric. Craig Rood (2016) has recently argued in "The Gap Between Rhetorical Education and Civic Discourse" that "more—though surely not all—communication rhetoricians should devote scholarly attention to rhetorical education. Doing so need not constitute a betrayal of communication rhetorician's scholarly identity; on the contrary, it can help us become better versions of ourselves" (137). Rood points to research on transfer of knowledge as an opportunity for communication rhetoricians to study how rhetorical education may or may not promote further and future public discourse. Rood's question is particularly important, as it is one that scholarship on public rhetoric or public writing pedagogy in composition studies needs to explore in more depth. What might it mean to pursue such a question jointly? Such a project would require a sustained interdisciplinary collaboration between rhetoricians across the two disciplines; but, though we share a few journals, there are few models available for such joint research or pedagogical projects.

Macro-level depictions of global communication skills and twenty-first-century literacies, like those we see across global higher education literature, point to the cultivation of these skills across the disciplines and across the entire undergraduate curriculum. In this sense, we can begin to see an

underdeveloped and somewhat inchoate Big Rhetoric of the global turn. Such recognitions of the need for communication, however impoverished, provide openings for engagement, critique, and articulation of more substantial rhetorical capacities and pedagogies. To assert our disciplinary knowledge requires a significant process of collaboration among rhetoricians in communication and rhetoric and composition. Like the "Mt. Oread Manifesto" many contemporary calls for collaboration among rhetoricians located in English and Communication have often pointed to rhetoric's identity as a civic art as an exigence for joint research and pedagogy (Mountford 2011, 16). What I would like to add is that the scope of the global higher education movement, combined with its tendency to ignore rhetorical education while positing communication as a key outcome, should serve as significant impetus for rhetoricians in English writing studies, and communication to work together to bring our expertise to discussions of students' global capacities.

I want to conclude by suggesting that there is not only a need for such a project but models for such a project that are in place through research in both Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC), Communication Across the Curriculum (CXC), and Speaking Across the Curriculum (SAC). Drawing on the example of this cross-curricular pedagogy and research, we might develop arguments for bringing our expertise to bear on descriptions of "global communication skills" advanced in the national literature and on our own campuses. Working together, rhetorical educators can provide not only more complex and nuanced understandings of rhetoric and communication but also more complex pedagogies for transnational rhetorical education. While such a call might seem somewhat utopian, I want to insist that one area in which we might pursue concrete, meaningful collaborations is a joint process of curricular research on global writing and oral communication. As rhetoricians, we might collaborate by researching how written, multimodal, oral, and other modalities of rhetoric are used in courses that advance the global or international curricula of our colleges and universities. Interdisciplinary working groups of scholars in our disciplines might conduct institutional and pedagogical research that examines the analytical, performative, and reflexive uses of rhetoric across the curriculum. Such a project might have a research and a pedagogical outreach function, both of which can illustrate what our disciplinary expertise has to contribute to understandings of global communication and pedagogy.

Research in Speaking Across the Curriculum, Communication Across the Curriculum, and Writing Across the Curriculum provides models for

such a collaboration, though these projects are often pursued as separate scholarly and pedagogical projects (Morello 2000, 100). Despite their disciplinary separation, however, SAC, CXC, and WAC have each faced similar institutional hurdles, encountered disciplinary questions, and advanced (at times) similar arguments for their importance. At the same time, scholars in rhetoric and composition and communication have drawn on across the curriculum models to advance arguments for cultivating student's civic rhetoric. Anthony Fleury (2005) has argued that a central goal of CXC should be developing pedagogies that cross disciplinary borders in order to cultivate students' civic capacities (74). Arguing against the "compartmentalized specialization" of Composing in the Disciplines (CID), Fleury argues for "communication against the disciplines": "If communication in the disciplines is designed to facilitate specialized knowledge, communication against the disciplines is designed to facilitate liberal education by having students question received wisdom, practice an array of communication styles, and play with established communication conventions" (73). Scholars in both rhetoric and composition studies and communication argue for the necessity of work that advances understanding of our disciplines across the various disciplines, schools, and departments that make up our campuses. Deanna P. Dannels and Amy L. Housley Gaffney (2009) call on CXC scholars to pursue "cross-curricular advocacy," arguing that CXC is at a "critical juncture" and that "if we do not embrace advocacy as a scholarly and instructional mindset, the discussion will happen without us in places such as writing programs, assessment offices, and teaching and learning centers" (142). Dannels and Gaffney point to the expansion of WAC programs to include communication in their purview, and note that "many of them are expanding without the expertise of a communication scholar in order to meet their needs" (142). In the global turn in higher education, both rhetoric and composition studies and communication face the need for this type of advocacy.

While there are many models of WAC and CXC that can inform the project of cross-disciplinary pedagogical research, research on WAC and genre is particularly promising, as it grounds pedagogical research in students' rhetorical performances in response to assignments. In *Everyday Genres: Writing Assignments Across the Disciplines*, Mary Soliday (2011) presents a team-based investigation into the genres assigned in a Writing Across the Curriculum program at City College New York (3). While Soliday's conclusions are highly important, I want to concentrate here on the design of

her study. Central to Soliday's method is the formation of working groups of composition faculty and faculty across the disciplines that collected and examined samples of writing assignments in courses from a variety of disciplines. By developing these working groups, Soliday and her colleagues were able to collect, analyze, and critically approach the genres of a variety of fields and their relationship to students' access to academic discourse and their abilities to transfer knowledge across contexts.

As colleges and universities continue to articulate the communicative capacities of their global curricula, what might we learn if scholars in rhetoric and composition studies and communication formed working groups with faculty pursuing global education across the curriculum in order to collect and analyze samples of how rhetoric and rhetorical education take place in these courses? While the goals of WAC, CXC, and SAC are often articulated separately, combining our knowledge and designing such a project of institutional research could deepen our and our institutions' understanding of how rhetorical instruction actually takes place in the classroom and how this instruction complicates as well as connects to the vague outline of communication skills that we often find in institutional global missions and strategic plans. At the same time, such a collaboration can bring greater recognition of our own disciplinary expertise and provide opportunities for fostering a productive culture of rhetorical pedagogy on our campuses.

I call for projects like this one as a way of spanning the gap between broader calls for interdisciplinary ownership of rhetoric and concrete examples of collaborative pedagogical and theoretical engagement. In this case, rhetoricians in both of our fields find themselves often on the outside of conversations about global curricula, even when those conversations have to do with rhetorical education or outcomes. Yet, when we look at outcomes mapped out in guides to internationalization and in the global higher education literature, we cannot help but see a substantial body of rhetorical knowledge that needs to be unpacked and taught. As I have argued earlier, one of the key problems for rhetorical educators is that our areas of expertise and pedagogy are framed in these reports as broad skills that are shared by the entire curriculum in ways that the disciplinary knowledge of disciplines like Medicine, Anthropology, Geography, Business, and so on are not.

For example, in its listing of "International/Intercultural Competencies" the American Council on Education provides a summary list of competencies, noting that it is "not exhaustive" (106) but nevertheless reflective of

the broader literature. The report notes that attempts to trace out the competencies "students need to become world citizens and succeed in today's global workforce" (106) are difficult to pin down because of the "interdisciplinary nature of competencies" (106) and notes that "Each field brings to the debate its own perspectives and there has been little discussion among them" (106). Drawing on this broad literature, the guidebook traces out the following competencies:

Knowledge

- Knowledge of world geography, conditions, issues, and events.
- Awareness of the complexity and interdependency of world events and issues.
- Understanding of historical forces that have shaped the current world system.
- Knowledge of one's own culture and history.
- Knowledge of effective communication, including knowledge of a foreign language, intercultural communication concepts, and international business etiquette,
- Understanding of the diversity found in the world in terms of values, beliefs, ideas, and worldviews.

Attitudes

- Openness to learning and a positive orientation to new opportunities, ideas, and ways of thinking.
- Tolerance for ambiguity and unfamiliarity.
- Sensitivity and respect for personal and cultural differences.
- Empathy or the ability to take multiple perspectives.
- Self-awareness and self-esteem about one's own identity and culture.

Skills

- Technical skills to enhance the ability of students to learn about the world (i.e., research skills).
- Critical and comparative thinking skills, including the ability to think creatively and integrate knowledge, rather than uncritical acceptance of knowledge.

- Communication skills, including the ability to use another language effectively and interact with people from other cultures.
- Coping and resiliency skills in unfamiliar and challenging situations. (106–107)

These three areas of knowledge, attitudes, and skills are broad, but I reproduce them here to illustrate how each of these areas touches upon rhetorical practice, even when communication is not directly referenced. Throughout this book, I have sought to provide concrete examples of how transnational rhetorical education can productively engage and unpack the rhetorical skills that are blackboxed in statements like these. For example, rhetorical inquiry, as we saw in Chaps. 4 and 5 can introduce students to processes of research that go far beyond the depiction of "technical skills" outlined above.

At the same time, we need to know more about how faculty pursue goals such as these in classes across the disciplines. Studying how such instruction takes place on our campuses can provide us with opportunities to reclaim the role of our disciplines as centers of expertise on communication and rhetoric. While I have focused my own critique here on the policy literature of organizations like the American Council on Education, we might also realize how this national literature interacts with the institutional goals and material realities of our own institutions in the agonistic ecology we call global higher education or internationalization. Because these organizations work with hundreds of institutions across the country, many readers will find the language of capacities we see above reflected in the language used by global higher education initiatives on their own campuses.

But how might we trouble or even rewrite these capacities from the perspective of our disciplinary knowledge and expertise? The list below, which draws on the ACE's list of capacities provides an initial attempt.

Knowledge

- How is rhetorical analysis utilized to enable students to understand global issues, exigencies, and events?
- What types of composing and rhetorical performance (written and oral) are assigned in global classrooms across a wide range of disciplines?

- How is effective global communication envisioned in different disciplinary contexts and what types of rhetorical instruction are used to foster it?

Attitudes

- How are rhetorics of political and ethical responsiveness cultivated in courses across the curriculum?
- How are rhetorics of diversity, tolerance, and multiculturalism enacted, reinforced, and resisted by faculty through the construction of their curricula and assignments?
- What rhetorical strategies and tactics are cultivated in students for responding to difference and conflicting values or political positions?
- In what ways are rhetorical scenes of address approached, especially in relationship to issues of representation, global images and spectacles, and cultural imperialism?
- How is the relationship between rhetoric, awareness, and action presented in global courses?
- How do assignments that ask students to use rhetoric (whether explicitly called that or not) connected to students' identities? What opportunities are there for reflexive writing and self-positioning?

Skills

- What modalities, platforms, and networks of rhetoric do students encounter in global curricula and what rhetorical capacities do they gain through these encounters?
- In what ways is rhetorical invention being taught?
- What opportunities are there for students to engage in rhetorical dialogue and performance with audiences across borders or cultures and how do these experiences foster their capacities as global communicators?
- How are opportunities for analysis and gaining awareness of global issues connected to students' rhetorical performances, such as writing assignments or multimodal compositions?
- How is transfer of rhetorical or communicative knowledge measured or conceived in global curricula?

These initial questions might serve as the beginning of an interdisciplinary collaboration among rhetoricians in English, writing studies, and communication, but also among faculty across the disciplines. Following Soliday's model, such a study might be tied to outreach across our campuses, including pedagogy workshops and the development of pedagogical resources.

I want to conclude *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education* by insisting that while such collaborative work can be difficult to coordinate, especially given the historical break from rhetoric and composition studies and communication, it is neither idealistic nor implausible. Collaboratively exploring questions like those outlined above on our own campuses can enable us to outline rhetorical curricula that support students' critical practices of transnational rhetorical citizenship, critically engage the rhetoric of global education, and claim a sense of disciplinary ownership of transnational rhetoric and global communication. By drawing on our shared knowledge of rhetoric and our shared vocation as rhetorical educators, scholars in rhetoric and composition and communication studies can begin to confront depictions of students as global communicators with concrete understandings of the rhetorical education necessary for students to understand and respond to opportunities for transnational engagement. Ultimately, it is up to rhetoricians in rhetoric and composition and communication to seek out our own rhetorical interventions in the global higher education movement. My hope is that *Rhetoric and the Global Turn in Higher Education* has shown that taking up this work, however difficult, is vitally important, not only to our own field; but, perhaps even more importantly, to the project of global higher education. As a teachable art that fosters students' civic agency, rhetoric can provide students with tools for critically positioning themselves within a range of discourses that frame them as global or national citizens. At the same time, rhetorical education can provide students with an opportunity to explore the agency they have as rhetorical citizens in a world shaped by transnational networks. Without the rhetorical knowledge and rhetorical agency to more fully understand and perceive opportunities to act on global issues, awareness can lead students to feel that they lack the power to respond. It is in this important sense that rhetorical education can provide not only deeper understanding of global issues and crises but perhaps also a sense of political hope to students who feel powerless to address them.

Notes

1. See also David Harvey's *Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies of Freedom* for a discussion of disciplinarity, politics, and colonialism.
2. For example, the mission of the University of Arizona's Aerospace/Defense/ Homeland Security Program is described on the program's website as follows: "At the UA, our scientists are dedicated to protecting the United States. Research endeavors that focus on homeland security, defense, and aerospace permeate all corners of the institution, ensuring that we meet the strategic needs of our country."

Bibliography

Adler-Kassner, Linda. 2008. *The Activist WPA: Changing Stories About Writing and Writers.* Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

American Council on Education. 2003. *Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide.* Prepared by Madeleine F. Green and Christa Olson. Washington, DC: American Council on Education Center for Institutional and International Initiatives. American Council on Education.

Appadurai, Arjun. 2013. "The Future as Cultural Fact." In *The Future as Cultural Fact: Essays on the Global Condition*, 285–300. New York: Verso.

Dannels, Deanna P., and Amy L. Housley Gaffney. 2009. "Communication Across the Curriculum and in the Disciplines: A Call for Cross-curricular Advocacy." *Communication Education* 58, no. 1: 124–153.

de Oliveira Andreotti, Vanessa, Lynn Mario, and T.M. de Souza. 2012. "Introduction: (Towards) Global Citizenship Education 'Otherwise'." In *Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education*, edited by de Oliveira Andreotti, Vanessa, Lynn Mario, and T.M. de Souza. New York: Routledge.

Fleming, David. 1998. "Rhetoric as a Course of Study." *College English*. 61, no. 2. (November): 169–191.

Fleury, Anthony. 2005. "Liberal Education and Communication Against the Disciplines." *Communication Education*. 54, no. 1. (January): 72–79.

Harvey, David. 2009. *Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies of Freedom.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Hauser, Gerard. 1999. *Vernacular Voices: The Rhetoric of Publics and Public Spheres.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Hesse, Doug. 2005. "2005 CCCC Chair's Address: Who Owns Writing?" *College Composition and Communication*. 57, no. 2. (December): 335–357.

Morello, John T. 2000. "Comparing Speaking Across the Curriculum and Writing Across the Curriculum Programs." *Communication Education* 49, no. 1: 99–113.

Mountford, Roxanne. 2011. "A Century After the Divorce: Challenges to a Rapprochement Between Speech Communication and English." In *The Sage Handbook of Rhetorical Studies*, edited by Andrea A. Lunsford, Kirt H. Wilson, and Rosa Eberly. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412982795.

Petraglia, Joseph. 2003. "Identity Crisis: Rhetoric as an Epistemic and a Pedagogic Discipline." In *The Realms of Rhetoric: The Prospects for Rhetoric Education*, edited by Joseph Petraglia and Deepika Bahri, 151–70. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Porter, James E., Patricia Sullivan, Stuart Blythe, Jeffrey T. Grabill, and Libby Miles. 2000. "Institutional Critique: A Rhetorical Methodology for Change." *College Composition and Communication*. 51, no. 4: 610–642.

Rood, Craig. 2016. "The Gap Between Rhetorical Education and Civic Discourse." *Review of Communication*. 16, no. 2–3: 135–150.

Salisbury, Mark H., Paul D. Umbach, Michael B. Paulsen, and Ernest T. Pascarella. 2009. "Going Global: Understanding the Choice Process of the Intent to Study Abroad." *Research in Higher Education*. 50: 119–143.

Soliday, Mary. 2011. *Everyday Genres: Writing Assignments Across Disciplines*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Syverson, Margaret. 1999. *The Wealth of Reality: An Ecology of Composition*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

The University of Arizona. 2017. "Aerospace/Defense/Homeland Security." *The University of Arizona*. Accessed August 25, 2017. http://www.arizona.edu/information/corporations-businesses/aerospace-defense-homeland-security.

Index

219