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Panelist Roster

Colette Mazzucelli (MALD, Fletcher School (Tufts); PhD, Georgetown) teaches at the Center for Global Affairs at New York University, where she has been Adjunct Associate Professor of Global Affairs, since 2005. She is also Adjunct Associate Professor in Political Science, teaching in the distance learning program, at Hofstra University.

Mazzucelli acquired a background in technology-mediated learning while teaching at the Institute of Political Studies Paris and the Budapest University of Economic Sciences. As the recipient of Bosch Fellowships, she was assigned to the Foreign Office in Bonn to assist with the ratification of the Treaty on European Union (“Maastricht”), 1992-93, and was in residence at the American Academy in Berlin, spring 2001. Her most recent publications appear in The Ashgate Research Companion to Political Leadership and The EU in the Global Political Economy. Colette’s research interests focus on, among other things, the role of education in developing strategies for prevention in areas experiencing post-conflict reconstruction and in uses of mobile phone technology in the classroom.

Dr. Lucia Rodriguez serves as the Director of the Global MDP Secretariat at Columbia University, which oversees worldwide programs and activities of the Master’s in Development Practice (MDP), a program designed to train aspiring practitioners to understand and manage integrated approaches to sustainable development challenges across the health sciences, natural sciences, social sciences and management. Dr. Rodriguez has held various positions in education and nonprofit organizations, including the United Nations Association of the USA (UNA-USA), where she worked for nine years and served as Vice President of Education. In that position, she directed, fundraised and scaled-up a program that she founded—Global Classrooms—an interactive and innovative program that is specifically geared towards preparing young people to be the global citizens, leaders and workers that they are. Some of her honors include a Marshall Memorial Fellowship from the German Marshall Fund of the US in 2003.

Dr. Peter N. Stearns is Provost and Professor of History at George Mason University. As Provost at George Mason, Dr. Stearns has worked to expand research capacities, to add or enhance centers of strength in the arts, biomedical research and education, public health, and to increase the global activities and educational goals of the University. He taught previously at Harvard where he was educated, the University of Chicago, Rutgers, and Carnegie Mellon. Dr. Stearns has authored or edited over 100 books, including Educating Global Citizens in Colleges and Universities: Challenges and Opportunities, 2009, which provides practical coverage and guidance in the major aspects of global education including curriculum, study abroad, international students, collaborations and branch campuses, as well as management issues and options.
Workshop Notes

PART 1 - Introductory comments/setup
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Student Feedback
Various students at New York University

AUDIENCE EXERCISE (1)

Think About and/or Discuss with Colleagues:
• What college resources could you tap to help you bring global perspectives to your classes?

PART 2 - How-to Examples

Dr. Peter Stearns
Educating Global Citizens:
1. Encourage students to learn about the world around them:
   • Geography
   • Religious systems
   • International institutions

2. Encourage development of thinking that makes them more open-minded
   • Compare societies around the world

3. Encourage discussion about what responsible behavior citizens should think about in globalized world
   • Global ethics

Dr. Colette Mazzucelli
1st Segment:
• Skype communication to Belgrade, Serbia
• Re: guest’s involvement in Serbian development
• Serbia integrating into European Union

Learning Objective:
• Context specificity
  o Obtain local perspective of Serbia’s challenges
  o Serbia’s goals as part of Europe

2nd Segment:
• Dev Info Database training via Elluminate
• Translates statistics into visual maps

PART 3 - Planning & Preparation (managing activities, etc.)

Ashlinn Quinn
Global Learning Senior Program Specialist
Center for New Media Teaching and Learning, Columbia University

Planning Global Activities:
1. What are course objectives?
2. What is pedagogical goal for this activity?

Goal:
• To have students solve a problem
• To enable students to ask questions

3. What activity is most appropriate?
• Single live session
• Series of sessions
• Small group collaboration
• Asynchronous online activity

Global Collaborative Considerations:
• Provide focus and structure
• Provide background, materials, & topical preparation ahead of Time
• Remember the value is to surface new perspectives; don’t OVER-structure so it becomes only lecture vs. discussion

Dr. Peter Stearns
Encouraging Global Perspectives:
1. Institution needs to provide central resources
2. (Encourage) Faculty (to) do their own pilot investigation
3. What learning outcomes are desired
(thinking skills, opportunities, languages, etc.)

4. What changes might be needed to get there

Dr. Colette Mazzucelli

Example Module Session:
- Play a 4-5 minute YouTube clip illustrating "Nationalism"
- Lecture
- Discussion

Global Resources:
1. Make use of public domain websites
2. Check the schedule of guest speakers at your institution (Office of International Programs)
3. Network – seek out contacts through other colleagues

(References available on pg____20____ of Resource Guide)

Student Feedback
Various students at New Your University

PART 4 - Challenges

Dr. Colette Mazzucelli

Challenges:
- Always expect the unexpected
- When planning use of technology - storyboard each aspect extensively

Skype Activity:
- Test with partners
- Arrange room @ each site where skype can be accommodated (technological infrastructure)
- Locate site where you can be sure desired technology can be used

Avoiding Pitfalls:
- Tremendous amount of prior-planning
- List challenges in advance:
  - Technology
  - Locating partners
  - Allow enough time for each segment (if using multiple technologies)

Remember:
- Technology is always value added, not substitute
- First focal point is classroom instructor
- Technology supports pedagogical goals
- Design for maximum effectiveness

Dr. Peter Stearns
Considerations:
- Some projects will fail
- Faculty devotion necessary
- Provide Central Services

Benefits of Central Services:
- Greets foreign delegations
- Facilitates international contacts
- Shaves time off repetitive tasks
- Provides standard templates (for agreements, etc.)

Ashlinn Quinn
Global Learning Senior Program Specialist
Center for New Media Teaching and Learning, Columbia University

Considerations:
- Different time zones
- Infrastructure

Tips:
- Always test beforehand
- Test audio as well as video

Various Audio Solutions:
- Landline conference call
- Secondary application – i.e., Skype

Tips:
- Enlist someone tech-savvy to help
- Test equipment with a friend
- Don’t delegate everything – it’s important for you to understand what possibilities are

Dr. Lucia Rodriguez
Lessons Learned:
- Time zones
- Broadband connections
- Cultural components of discussions

AUDIENCE EXERCISE (2)

Think About and/or Discuss with Colleagues:
- What are two ways you could bring global perspectives into your classes?

PART 5 - Final Thoughts – ALL GUESTS
Book Excerpt, *Educating Global Citizens in Colleges and Universities*

"Global Resources: Expanding Your Students’ Horizons"
Chapter 11: Conclusion: The Global Mission

Any reasonable list of challenges for American colleges and universities over the next several decades – some ambitious pundits even say for the 21st century, but centuries always turn out to be longer than early-years seers anticipate – includes the need to develop appropriate global orientations central to the core mission. Lists can vary a bit otherwise – some would note lifelong learning as another key challenge, others perhaps accessibility and diversity (related to global issues but, as we have seen, not by any means identical). For some, lists would still include educational technology; and I think we have to keep the difficult balance between teaching and research in the mix. But global is going to show up on the top-five priority list without much question. As, we have seen, virtually every institution over the past 15 years has brought new urgency or range to its global agenda, with few places yet comfortable that they’ve achieved the desired level. An intriguing aspect of the field, as discussed before, is the significant involvement of so many different kinds of institutions, with leadership and innovation coming from many sectors – there are only a few top down advantages in global education in terms of the standard institutional pecking order.

As part of the new prioritization, a great deal of ink has been and will be spilled about creating the global university. Interest grows in institutions of higher education literally around the world. It involves consideration of a range of activities and connections but also new learning goals. It requires serious innovation. It must engage the full range of American institutions of higher education – well beyond the current vanguard.

At the same time, it becomes increasingly obvious that the global university emerges from no single formula, no one dramatic gesture, not just a study abroad office or a new global course. The globally responsible university requires a reorientation of purpose, deep and lasting commitment – but also a wide array of specific actions and activities. It’s the combination of commitment at all levels and the wealth of detailed effort that produces the global outcome. Even the most global university is still in process of development, but the need for a rich mixture is already clear.

Happily (I think) explicit efforts to rank universities in terms of global achievement have not yet developed, but there’s no question that a certain degree of competitiveness can emerge, as institutions compare their global facilities. Up to a point, the spur may be healthy. At the same time, it is unclear how highly the various components of the college and university clientele rate global education in assessing institutions. Accreditation agencies and state boards of higher education may welcome signs of global outreach, but they do not (yet) require them – which is both a relief and a caution, as nonglobal criteria may win an undesirable level of priority simply because they have to be assessed, however mechanically. Corporate leaders increasingly note the desirability of global competence (particularly striking of course is the support for study abroad); but there is a gap here, as with liberal education, between what leaders say and what personnel offices actually emphasize, where global credentials are less systematically sought. Undergraduate applicants now seem to pay fairly close attention to study abroad opportunities, as one of their criteria for institutional choice – even if, in the event, in turns out that many of them do not themselves take advantage of the facilities available. We have seen as well some recent polling results that suggest growing public awareness of international education goals. On the other hand, my institution recently did an opinion survey about what matters, and found that among most groups global achievements fell well down the list – noticeably below research, graduate programs, critical thinking gains for undergraduates, and a few other items, and above only athletic success among the seven criteria available (and my guess is that respondents did not tell the truth about their real valuation of athletics). Of the groups surveyed, only...
undergraduates and applicants themselves placed high value on the global, an encouraging sign for the future, and an indication of awareness of where not only the world, but many careers, are heading. Overall, however, the global area has yet to enter the general evaluation of schools as firmly as might be desired. And, as we have seen, faculty divide over the priority as well.

Complicating the situation still further, as we have also noted, is the inescapable fact that developing an ambitious mix of global endeavors takes an immense amount of work and, in some cases, operates amid undeniable uncertainties. Money is an issue, though happily a serious engagement with global education does not involve costly equipment or facilities – in this sense it’s an easier addition than programs in science or technology. Unrealistic or undesirable expectations for profit sometimes complicate the financial picture, making even moderate costs seem unanticipated. And of course it may be easier to find political support for science or technology goals than for global initiatives, even though the former are much more costly, given the less decisive economic return on global activities and, frequently, some concern about foreign values or policy disputes.

Still, costs are not usually the main point; effort is. Overseeing the contemporary array of global initiatives can be fascinating, but it takes time and mental energy. Decisions about organizational structure are not easy, because of the various offices typically involved, the need to balance coordination and initiative from the ranks, the temptation either to add global initiatives to existing portfolios (which can overwhelm officials from department chairs on up) or to oversimplify the response by entrusting too many responsibilities to a single agency. Global education conferences consistently highlight the extent to which even getting people responsible for the housing of international students together with those dealing with visas and with those dealing with academic advising remains a serious challenge at many institutions, and this can mean inadequate integration of the students and inadequate utilization of their presence for wider educational impact. Departmental activities can be recast, for example with an influx of foreign students whose perspectives are truly valuable but who also require some special attention, quite apart from the demands of actually setting up a program at an overseas branch. Science and technology units at least have a long experience with international clientele; the more recent involvement of economics or management, though educationally salutary in the long run, challenges workloads and prior orientations alike. Learning curves for major outreach efforts can be steep – from infrastructure demands back home to cultural sensitivities in dealing with foreign partners. Simply freeing up time to entertain delegations and maintain suitable presence abroad can be onerous. Global education adds a significant chunk to the functions of senior university officials, as well as to many staffing areas, if the effort is at all serious, whatever organizational mechanisms emerge.

It’s not surprising, in this context, that institutional responses vary, with some schools placing much higher priority on a wider range of global activities than others. It’s impossible, yet, to say that a school without this or that global factor is going to suffer – even the general education conversion, from Western history to world history remains incomplete, not to mention the extremely varied appetites for more ambitious undertakings like joint degrees or foreign branches. For most colleges, global education is still a new frontier (whatever specific precedents may exist, as in earlier study abroad initiatives), and it’s appropriate to experiment, defendable to be a bit cautious, inevitable to venture different degrees of commitment.

This said, the need to do more globally remains an inescapable responsibility, whether the institution is just dipping into the global waters or has a significant portfolio already. Collectively, American higher education should be reaching for more international students and utilizing them better; for more, and more imaginative and curricularly integrated study abroad; for more global
components to curricula generally; for more collaborative activities with foreign partners. Cost and effort are real, but the mounting obligation has even more pressing reality.

The fundamental reasons for the global priority are clear-cut, but they bear repeating in conclusion. Americans, in whatever walk of life, are surrounded by global issues. Any college student, who graduates today without some understanding of the current economic connections between the United States and China, or without some knowledge of the relationships between Islam and Christianity, is insufficiently prepared for effective citizenship – American OR global. The list of essential points can, I admit, easily grow too long, in the hands of a devoted globalist; but even when kept to a manageable minimum, there is a list. And, as we have seen, more than data points are involved. Students must gain some facility in mental habits such as comparison and the capacity to relate the local and the global, if they are to operate effectively, as citizens and often as workers, in the world they will live in.

American institutions of higher education have a special obligation here, and while some of us welcome the challenge there is also a burden involved. Universities across the world are upping the ante on global connections, and while U.S. schools are not behind, there is every reason to respond to this growing pressure. As we have seen, study abroad efforts, international recruitment and branch campuses are not the American province that we once imagined. We owe it to our students, if nothing else, to keep pace with the range and innovation that many international institutions now display. Beyond this, of course, is the accelerating pace of globalization itself (with its complex mix of gains and losses and an equally complicated set of regional responses). More and more students, whether they anticipate this or not, will find themselves in situations where their work, their voting, their leisure interests depend on some awareness of global and comparative history and trends, and American higher education – like its counterparts elsewhere – simply must keep abreast, which means further curricular change and further program innovation.

But there is more, which is where the compensatory challenge comes in – not exactly a new one, but increasingly pressing. While some secondary schools are moving a bit in a global direction, with some new foreign languages and serious world history, most are largely locked into a more conventional framework; and as we have seen, exposure to global issues at the primary level actually retreats. One can hope for change; and indeed a university responsibility, through schools of education and beyond, is to assist in teacher training and curriculum development at all grade levels and also to promote appropriate school district policies and commitments. Even in high school world history, we still have too many teachers thrown into courses for which they have no college training and too many courses that are badly defined in the first place; and the shortage of trained teachers in Chinese or Arabic, for the schools, is already palpable. For the foreseeable future, though, much of what students ideally ought to learn about the wider world – do learn, at least with regard to foreign languages, in the systems of many other nations – before college, have to be addressed, in the United States, at the college level. This means that universities must expect to need segments of general education to bring students more fully up to speed on basic global contexts, and it means (this is not new, just newly urgent) that they need to find ways to motivate more effective foreign language learning, now in languages additional to the standard European array.

More than compensation for K – 12 limitations is involved. A national deficiency in foreign affairs knowledge remains troubling. Media coverage has increased after the parochial withdrawal of the 1990s, but it continues to focus mainly on a few trouble spots, mainly those involving the most immediate U.S. interests, rather than the changing global landscape more generally. The 2008 presidential campaign, in its intense early stages, was noteworthy for a lack of coverage for
candidates’ foreign policy positions beyond the issue of Iraq – despite the fact that several contenders put forth detailed statements, there was little echo in the media or in the seemingly endless parade of debates. Reporters themselves, and presumably the public as well, simply could not escape the habits of seizing on domestic woes, real or imagined – immigration, the economy – rather than balancing them with foreign policy concerns or even, very carefully, putting these issues themselves in international context. ( Virtually nothing was heard about balance of payment issues, for example.) Even though the Bush presidency had been dominated by foreign policy issues, assumptions, and mistakes, the United States seemed still eager to retreat to a national framework as quickly as possible. It is not, of course, the responsibility of higher educational institutions to inject themselves directly into political discussions, save as individual faculty and student groups seek to encourage analysis; over time, however, they do need to help prepare a public that is more attuned to the international issues that will continue to shape the American future.

This in turn involves more than providing better information, through world history efforts and global requirements in general education. It involves working on some deeply-rooted mindsets. The manner of the American invasion of Iraq in 2003 constituted among other things a sad failure for American education, to the extent that it reflected so little learning, at either the policy or the public levels, from what had happened in Vietnam less than 40 years before. It's not the fact of invasion that is in question here: obviously, different people could have different views on whether we should have moved in against Saddam Hussein, with the same levels of international awareness. What is so deeply troubling was the assumption that American presence and values would quickly win over a different people with their own history, their own experience of outside intervention and colonialism; here is where blithe optimism, easily sold to the American public, suggests a set of beliefs about the national role in the world that must be opened to examination and discussion. Reliance on easy American superiority, and I would add ongoing beliefs in a cold war mentality in which we must assume that those who are not with us on all major issues are therefore determined enemies, simply will not position us well for the global opportunities and challenges of the coming years. Higher education must obviously avoid blind partisanship, whatever the views of individual faculty members or administrators; but it must help growing numbers of Americans open some almost knee-jerk mindsets to serious and critical analysis. Here too, compensation is essential.

Many recent reports, particularly from some of the higher education associations, have called for global education programs that might transform the mentality of the American undergraduate. The term can seem grandiose. Its challenge is unmistakable. What the mission involves centers on the kind of compensation needed in the American public, as well as in the preparation of future leaders – whether the issue is sensitivity to the ironically heightened role of foreign languages even amid a sea of English, or the conceptual approach to present and likely future claimants on American foreign policy.

The needs, from several vantage points, are considerable. Few institutions can or should feel comfortable with the global education array thus far developed. The sense of further challenge is unavoidable, and not just for schools newly entering the arena, given the need not just to keep pace with global connections and developments but to address some specifically national deficiencies as well.

Furthermore this is, as we have argued in several chapters, a vital time for the intelligent and imaginative commitment of American colleges and universities to a wider global education agenda, using and extending familiar components, like study abroad, but building new facets as well. Widespread eagerness for American education invites further response; the openness will
not last forever, but long-term as well as short-term gains, in terms of student connections and institutional collaborations, can be generated in the meantime. There is also, without starry-eyed idealism, the chance to help certain regions of the world, if the American approaches are carefully and mutually interactive. Certainly, the chance to build an American image different from that shaped by recent policy moves and consumer blandishments is clearly in the national interest. The moment is defined as well by new barriers set up by the more fearful aspects of contemporary American culture and by narrow policies with regard to the entry of foreign scholars and students. Innovation, in the form of new types of outreach, is essential both to counter the disruption to international ties and, again, to provide a different American face to the wider world. Quite apart from urging more schools to catch up with the leaders in global education – at community college, liberal arts unit, and research university alike, with a special plea to some of the comprehensive public institutions – we need further experimentation and initiative even from the bellwethers.

During the Cold War, after its 1950s intensity began to yield a bit, American institutions of higher education played a vital role in forging new contacts with scholars “behind the curtain,” in the process helping to defuse tensions and promote greater mutual understanding. The challenge and opportunity are at least as great today, in using education and research to forge new links – with the many parts of the world now dubious about elements of American policy – and promote reciprocal clarifications. Dependence on institutional initiative is greater than was the case forty years ago, at least in terms of current federal leadership, but the opportunities are all the brighter for this fact. It’s a high calling, and colleges and universities at various levels can participate in the response.

The domestic mission is vital as well. I believe – can’t prove, of course, and there will be some worthy scholarly dissenters – that fifty or hundred years from now, historians will look back on our period as a time of crucial readjustment between the cold war and a new, multilateral balance among major powers – with the fling of the United States as sole superpower a brief interlude. The rise of China, India, probably Brazil, along with the maturation of the European Union and, possibly, the revival of Russia all constitute significant markers that do not displace tremendous American strength but increasingly complicate national assertiveness, with terrorism an important but ultimately perhaps less significant concurrent development that serves to distract from broader patterns. There are those, of course, who believe that Western economic values will still prove transcendent, that the abundant vulnerabilities in Chinese or Indian political and economic frameworks will constrain their competitiveness. But if the rebalancing theme is at least plausible, as I think is incontestably the case, we need an active educational effort to make sure that Americans understand the nature of change and do not so emphasize parochial positions that the nation’s global standing is needlessly weakened by global ignorance or inability – by global incompetence in short. The same active effort must help Americans distinguish between new complexities and rooted enmities, so that the nation does not greet inevitable changes and competitive challenges as acts of belligerence. The transition, if this is what the current moment turns out to be, is not a simple one, and Americans might well mishandle it. Education, broadly construed, including of course debate about the plausibilities of key scenarios for the global future, has a vital role to play in encouraging the most constructive reactions to change. This is why, beyond the specifics of visa regulations or even global public opinion, we need to extend and deepen the global initiatives in American colleges and universities.

It’s imperative as well to involve a wider range of the academy than has previously been brought into global endeavors. We require specialists, of course. Global education in the United States has progressed on the backs of devoted study abroad offices and international recruiters. We need more of these, and probably additional professional training opportunities for their
preparation. We certainly need particularly devoted faculty, from areas studies programs, the languages, international relations, and increasingly now from global environmentalism and global health as well, to spur collaborative projects and to anchor curricular discussions from general education on up. Arguably, as already discussed, we need to grow another expert area, the global studies coordinator or high-level international affairs administrator who can consolidate specific facets of the larger effort, so that study abroad has more contact with joint degree efforts and other outreach, and both with the management of international students. Hopefully, this survey of key aspects of global education will facilitate this kind of larger coordination, by focusing on the whole field rather than individual operations. But it is increasingly obvious that global education is too complex and too important to be left to specialists alone, however well consolidated and interactive. Global education impinges increasingly on business offices, on registrars, obviously on admissions programs and housing operations. It involves teaching in the sciences and engineering and nursing, and increasingly even in law. Staff and faculty in these areas need a sense of what the global mission is all about, some sense of what some of its key expressions and key issues are. This is why we need efforts to summarize the field in ways that can be used in higher education training and workshops, to bring others into at least serious acquaintance with the global education area and into a position where their ideas and interests can contribute actively to its further development. Global education must become part of the common currency of academic administration, along with tuition and scholarships or retention or assessment. Here too, the preparation of higher education professionals must play a key role.

****

Needs and obligations are very real, but they are only part of the main point. The field of global education highlights the excitement of learning about distant places and global systems. Its progress must be measured not simply in terms of global competency assessments or numbers of students going abroad, though these form part of the story. The excitement comes through in the student, unsure of direction when he came to college, whose exposure to studies of central Asia brought him to spend internship time in the region, before coming home to pursue graduate work that will lead him to NGO involvement in the same area; or the freshman who brings with her to college impressive experience in raising funds for the school system in Sierra Leone, and then parlays this into further international study as an undergraduate; or the student in conflict analysis, undistinguished though adequate as a freshman, who finds the prospect of a community service program in the Philippines after his junior year a potential turning point in his life. The excitement comes through, in other words, in the growing number of students who are taking every advantage of what global education currently has to offer and who are racing ahead, often carving out their own initiatives with global organizations or regional programs literally around the world. It comes through, if less dramatically, in the basketball player who decides to take Arabic, not as a professional commitment but because he knows it will equip him to know more about what’s going on internationally. Or the business student or engineer who adds a global affairs minor from a mixed sense of sheer interest and potential career advantage. Our job, as participants in global education, is to keep up with these students and to challenge them further. And if the excitement of global inquiry has not captured us already, it will surely move and motivate as we work to keep American higher education apace with global change.

References for this book may be found in the supplement to this packet at:
www.starlinktraining.org/Packets2011/Supplement0418.pdf
Ethics and International Relations in Today's Classrooms without Borders

Article originally published in Carnegie Council
Colette Mazzucelli, A. Nicholas Fargnoli
July 14, 2010

Why Ethics in the Study of International Relations?

This essay focuses on ethical issues that students of international relations are likely to confront. Choices made by governing bodies in previous centuries influence our world today in decisive ways. In the new millennium, we face a host of challenges that include political violence, particularly by transnational terrorist networks, aggressive tactics to secure resources, and failed interventions in the midst of genocide and human underdevelopment. As a result of advances in technology that serve both beneficent and malevolent goals, these challenges will redefine the ethical dimensions of international relations and continue to raise ethical questions intrinsic to the field. Ethics is a constant in our studies and a needed focus of our inquiries. Educators—and citizens—are expected to learn about the myriad ways ethics informs our concerns and decisions. Times of global crisis, like the 2008-2009 financial downturn, bring the relevance of ethical questions to our attention in urgent and controversial ways.

The discussion that follows is anchored in historical perspective. Formidable issues present themselves when we analyze competing interpretations of history without giving attention to ethics, because the political sphere is never devoid of moral questions. Those educated to participate in the highest levels of political dialogue should be as attentive to the complexities of these questions as they are to the intricacies of political problems. Ethics provide students with a systematic framework to assess the moral dimension of human behavior and reflect on the role moral evaluation should play in politics. Ethics also shape our character—the kind of person we become through our choices. What we do (or neglect to do) unequivocally reveals who we are individually and collectively.

"Politics will, to the end of history," writes Reinhold Niebuhr, "be an area where conscience and power meet, where the ethical and coercive factors of human life will interpenetrate and work out their tentative and uneasy compromises." Working out such compromises requires a well-educated person, one who possesses the qualities that lay the foundation for a well-formed conscience. "The consciences of persons," write Maguire and Fargnoli, "are marked by greater or lesser empirical sensitivity. If we have the habit of inquisitiveness in the face of moral decisions,
our conscience will be marked by a readiness to ask and pursue questions. If we have experience with diverse moral issues, we will be better able to perceive distinctions when there are differences."

There is a growing literature that places ethics at the center of our understanding of international relations. The resources for educators and students on the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs website provide an easily accessible starting point to facilitate active learning. The Council offers a plethora of online resources, taking advantage of the communications revolution to engage learning communities in the United States and throughout the world. These resources may be complemented by an essential text, Duties Beyond Borders: On the Limits and Possibilities of Ethical International Politics (Hoffmann 1981, 1-43), which illuminates the issues at stake for beginners as well as those already well versed in the field. This volume raises the questions that have stirred debate across generations: "First, is there a possibility of moral choice for statesmen in international relations? And secondly, if one assumes that there is, what are the limits of moral choice?"

The Moral Person and Political Realism

By its very nature international relations must anticipate serious and, at times, dangerous confrontations between nations or groups. Ethnic and ideological differences can erupt into major conflicts. The intimidating complexity of competing narratives distinguishing national and non-state actors alike disturbs the relative tranquility of formal dialogue on ideological differences. Cycles of ethnic conflict and civil war shape confrontations in ways formal dialogue may never anticipate or deter. There are times when these narratives prevent the resolution of differences and instead lead directly to armed conflict.

In his classic analysis, Man, the State and War, Kenneth Waltz searches for the root of conflict in human nature, in the nature of government and in the structure of a system that political realists argue is destined to be dominated by egoistic states. Throughout the centuries political realism portrayed human beings as fundamentally weak, the victims of their own machinations in the drive for power, the protagonists of a tragedy in which the present relives a narrative of the not too distant past. The demise of the former Soviet empire was once celebrated as the end of history, the ultimate triumph of free market capitalism, which classical liberals and modern conservatives assert is the foundation of America's democracy. The 1990s provided a fertile terrain for that narrative to unfold as globalization accelerated and ethnic conflict intensified. The global integration of peoples via markets, services, and technologies proceeded apace with the disintegration of empires and federal states.

In hindsight, the last decade of the 20th century was progressively shaped by competing narratives and resurgent myths, which asked Americans and the world at the start of the new millennium to reassess the domestic character and the global destiny of the "city on a hill." The 21st century had barely started when tradition crashed, figuratively and literally, into the towers of modernity. America's narrative was defined by the Bush presidency for a people who perceived themselves as under siege at home and abroad. Over time the threat of militant jihadism stifled our common sense and undermined the legacy the framers of our Constitution bequeathed to us by radically shifting our legal and moral values.

Matters of equity and justice, of human dignity in the face of adversity and terror, are to be adjudicated morally and not merely politically. In the political realm, moral discernment must not be marginalized. One of the most pressing pedagogical concerns we face when teaching ethics is to avoid the artificial divide between the private and political spheres of morality. Though
distinctions between the two are real and necessary, morality stretches equally into both realms. In the political realm, however, we can act in ways not morally permitted in the private realm. The state can imprison a convicted criminal and deny that person certain rights; individuals acting on their own behalf cannot. "The political order," as ethicist Daniel C. Maguire writes, "has exigencies and complexities that have no part in private life. Thus, moral behavior there will be correspondingly more difficult to judge." Yet because the political sphere is more complicated, as Maguire warns, "the moral dimension tends to be dropped" and as a consequence "politics gets done without conscience." The late Sri Lankan journalist Lasantha Wickramatunga praised conscience as a calling "above high office, fame, lucre and security." Without it, we can easily pursue devious paths of behavior.

Politics without conscience threaten all societies and bypass the minimal requirements of justice. Anyone engaged in making decisions that affect human lives assumes moral responsibility. There are no moral free zones absolving the political strategist from accountability, whether that strategist is a head of state or the head of a terrorist organization. The practice that the end justifies the means, frequently a working hypothesis in politics and the corporate world, must not go unchecked. Ethics as a systematic evaluation of "what befits or does not befit persons as persons" provide a counterbalance to this view. Ethics are a source of conscience, while at the same time, as Nicolas Berdyaev rightly remarks, they should also be "a critique of pure conscience." Conscience is not infallible and thus needs the work of ethics to substantiate its claim. No person or decision or action is beyond ethical assessment.

The Ethical Imperative in Everyday Life

What is presently defined as the worst crisis since the Great Depression had its origins in the years before and beyond 9/11 for which each party, Democrat and Republican, shares responsibility, and must now take ownership, in terms of decisions made in America and consequences experienced in the world. This present moment is a time for a new education in Washington politics and in the teaching of government and international relations. Ours is the opportunity to revisit politics as policy for the people and statecraft, which Niebuhr once defined as, "locating the point of concurrence between the parochial and the general interest, between the national and the international common good."

The ethical imperative alerts us to the necessity of taking a comprehensive or holistic view of the circumstances that confront students in international relations. No moral decision can be judged outside of its context. As the medieval theologian St. Thomas Aquinas argued: "Human actions are good [morally right] or bad [morally wrong] according to the circumstances." Aquinas, however, is not advocating a normless situation ethics where any justification is used to achieve the ends in mind, a seductive temptation that many in power face. The student must always reflect upon the whole set of circumstances when attempting to make a value judgment in the context of intercultural dialogue and divergent narratives. An empathetic appreciation of cultural diversity broadens a student's perception of the realities behind cultural differences and stimulates an interest in recognizing values that others cherish. This appreciation broadens the parameters of one's moral consciousness and, therefore, of one's conscience.

The challenges of a new century, particularly the crisis of failed and failing states, call for a realism that acknowledges the moral responsibility of the state for its citizens. In the age of the industrialized modern state in crisis, legitimacy resides in governments' commitments to, and competencies in, providing basic services—notably security and social justice—to their populations. An inability to do so is the root cause of the state, as represented in the person of its leader, to forfeit legitimacy. A relatively recent and disturbing phenomenon is that the sovereign
state is less and less the final arbiter on its own territory. Increasingly rivals to the legitimate authority of the state establish themselves in a no-man's land that escapes government control. Rival actors to the state thrive on an extensive drug-trafficking trade, which sustains their challenge as parallel governments in these countries. In this context, the delegitimized sovereign state is under attack inside and out. Upholding the ethical obligations of sovereign states in the face of attacks from within their borders is a universal concern in our world today. The most pressing problems of our day can only be addressed in state-to-state dialogue in which respect for the norms of the United Nations Charter is in the forefront.

The resurgence of ethnic conflict and civil war inside states calls our attention to the fact that human nature is frail. No deliberate human activity is devoid of moral accountability, be it in any realm that has the potential to transform society's condition: politics, education, finance, or law. The minimum of justice—rendering others their rightful due as persons—is not subordinate to the state's quest for order in a time of war. Often justice and civil liberties are the first casualties. History teaches us that one state's demise at the hands of its elite or by rival trans-national networks can be a matter of universal concern, as in the case of Afghanistan. This is all the more pressing a reality in our interdependent world. Security threats such as trans-border migration and refugee flows or millions trapped in the inhuman conditions of refugee camps delineate a new geopolitics. Emerging threats posed by global crime networks equipped with the latest information technology are beyond the reach of a single state and its ability to monopolize the legitimate use of force. Sovereignty, like reason, has its limits.

The responsibility of the state to protect is, in this new global system, essentially ethical in its focus on the inherent dignity of the person. The moral imperative of the state to protect its people is unlike the classical security paradigm, in which the internal dynamics of states do not matter. In the latter scenario, the state is an object to be manipulated by the political entrepreneur, and the populace is the victim of the leadership's ambitions. From an instrumentalist perspective, the hierarchy of the pyramid with the power elite at the apex subjects the masses at the base to all that state policy will allow, including genocide. Education and the media are tools of the leadership to be manipulated in the service of the state. Here the ethics of the private life often thrive, divorced from the license of a pervasive and corrupted public space, which debases the multitude to serve the interests of the few.

Teaching International Relations as Moral Responsibility

No one in the field of international affairs can rightly be considered a professional without possessing the skills demanded of the discipline and a commitment to justice and moral values. All deliberate human action—whether performed by an individual or a group, whether originating from a think tank or a private discussion behind closed doors—is the bearer of moral meaning. Rationalizing the effects of political expediency or exercising power in a hegemonic pursuit without regard to the value of human life betrays a practice paralyzed within a moral vacuum. Moral accountability is inextricably linked to political decision-making as it is to all decisions relating to the treatment of human beings. The instructional role of ethics is crucial to the education of all students in international relations. Raising moral consciousness within an educational context affords these students an opportunity to face ethical questions unique to their disciplines. Students must also realize that they are morally accountable for their own actions, especially for those actions that directly affect the welfare of other human beings.

In the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 26 affirms the fundamental right to education, and its role to "promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and…further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of
In Article 19 we may interpret to establish the principle which, in Mazzucellii’s view, may be defined as "freedom from exclusion," in that "everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression. This right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."\textsuperscript{21}

No deliberate human activity is devoid of moral responsibility—in politics, education, finance or law. The classroom of the 21st century has an unprecedented opportunity to evolve as the forum to explore the commonness of our humanity and how it is best embraced. Our ethical concern as educators is to embrace the tensions that drive conflict in the world today—and to understand its dynamics, not just as a matter of political expediency, but as the cornerstone of our commitment to promote justice as participants in and not merely observers of the world in which we live. As such, our local experience may be infused with empathy for the plight of others, whether across the United States, on the Indian subcontinent, or in Rwanda, who inhabit different geographical spaces and times in the same world.

In the traditional hierarchy of the pyramid, which defined power relations in previous centuries, the apex represents expediency. As students of international relations, we may consider Mills’ 20th-century analysis of the power elite in the form of those groups that run the state and dominate society—the corporation, the military, and the government. Expediency is the worst form of pragmatism at the apex. Its injustice can stratify most groups in society, particularly the masses at the base. In our new century, we can include in the power elite non-state actors. The Taliban, for example, undermines the legitimacy of the Afghan state. Our 21st-century imperative in education (public and private) is to invert this pyramid.

Ethical concerns in the classroom should be constructed in such a way as to embrace the confluence of inclusive dialogues. New initiatives like the Ethics Studio at the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs offer the potential use of digitally networked technology (DNT) in the service of citizens across the globe to access in their homes, offices and schools.\textsuperscript{22} Mobile phone use by millions in the developing world suggests unprecedented possibilities for inclusion in the construction of diverse alternative narratives, which give voice to local stories distinct from the broader globalization dynamic (see for example, "Nobody is writing the Kenyan story\textsuperscript{23}"). Carnegie’s vision was of the public library as a national institution open to all across America. In this new millennium, Carnegie’s original vision may be complemented by the availability to millions globally of resources in audio, print and video formats. These resources may readily facilitate worldwide discussions about ethics and international relations. The global classroom is pivotal in an active learning context to achieve results that transcend its academic environment. Innovative curriculum development is evolving in a model that President John Sexton has defined at New York University (NYU) as the "global network university." Its aim is to "maintain human community" as NYU classes, held simultaneously in Abu Dhabi and New York, and networked with other locations in Prague and Buenos Aires, "break the time-space continuum".\textsuperscript{24} Educators as facilitators must be attentive to what transpires in our world. Students as learners must participate in what confronts them in their learning. A classroom without borders expands the horizon of the mind and liberates the prejudices of moral confinement.

Today’s students come to the classroom inundated with information from a myriad of electronic sources. Their assumptions and biases must be explored. The classroom without borders provides a public meeting place where students challenge each other and take responsibility for what they learn. This classroom is a passageway, a bridge, across which education continues throughout our lives. The role of students and teachers alike is to engage with an appreciation of moral values in an objective educated treatment of our subject matter as we explore what is common to all of us. Education is increasingly infused with media content, which can distract
students by leading them into too many conflicting directions at once, discouraging their commitment to any one path. Teaching ethics and international relations in the classroom without borders is a commitment to our growth as human beings in a world in desperate need of humanity during a time of moral crisis.

NOTES
9 Ibid., p. 19.
11 For a discussion of the meaning of morality and the foundational moral experience, see Maguire and Fargnoli, op.cit., pp. 7-17.
14 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* I II q. 18, a. 3. "Ergo actiones humanae secundum circumstantias sunt bonae vel maleae."
20 In *On Moral Grounds*, Maguire and Fargnoli explain that ethics is at the heart of all professions: "Ethics is not an adornment for the professions. The very word 'profession' comes from the Latin fætor, which means to proclaim. The professional proclaims that he or she has two things to offer to the public: special skills and a committed sense of morality" (3).
23 "Nobody is writing the Kenyan story" (2010), ...in pursuit of dreams notes from a dreamcatcher in Nairobi, July 1.
24 John Sexton (2008), "Technology and the University," Big Think.
Copyright © 2011 Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs
Professor Colette Mazzucelli’s Class Activity Using Skype, Dev Info, Elluminate, & Mobile Phone Technology to Connect Internationally

Module 7: The European Union and the Western Balkans (March 24)

Guest Speaker: Nathan Koeshall, Program Officer, Balkan Trust for Democracy, The German Marshall Fund of the United States, Belgrade (via Skype)


**Enlargement Scenario Preparation:** Read the Beach chapter to understand the dynamics of European Union negotiations during the Fifth Enlargement, which culminated in May 2004 with the expansion from 15 to 25 member states.


**Communications**

Skype communications are a regular feature of the syllabus mediated via computer as well as IPhone 4 mobile technology in order to expand our horizons learning in the classroom without borders. Our interactions via Skype are meant to reach areas in the world of personal and professional interest to MSGA candidates as well as to provide additional materials and viewpoints to enhance postings on the Discussion Board.

For those who use *Facebook*, (it is clear to me that there are members who do not), please “friend” me there and consult my profile webpage for daily postings about events in Europe of further relevance to our analysis in the learning community.

Please also join *Atlantic-Community.org* and participate in one (1) policy dialogue each month of relevance to the course. For those members who do not wish to post on the public domain, please email me a comment during the course of the month that contributes to a policy dialogue.

The *Carnegie Council YouTube Channel* provides excellent commentary by practitioners knowledgeable about Europe and transatlantic relations. The Carnegie media resources...
integrated in the course modules aim to bridge theoretical discussions with practical knowledge from experts in the field.

Please access the resources in those modules that reference Foreign Affairs.com to acquire variety and balance in the perspectives about EUrope’s development since the end of World War II.

Please use Twitter to follow policy-related analyses and publications by noted scholars and practitioners of EUrope and transatlantic affairs. We will not use Twitter to post comments during this course.

N.B. The Facebook Chat, SMS to the mobile, and/or one-on-one Skype meetings with Professor Mazzucelli, as opposed to email, are my preferred ways to be in touch in case of questions outside the classroom. This semester my availability is on Wednesdays and Thursdays each week.

In our learning community, technology is not intrinsically good or bad. It is the ways in which Blackboard, Skype (via computer & IPhone 4), Facebook, Atlantic-Community.org, Carnegie Council YouTube Channel, Foreign Affairs.com, Twitter or iTunes University are used, which determine the impact of social networking as an educational tool. Our choice is to use technology to reaffirm diversity and facilitate inclusiveness. As such, we acknowledge the increasing significance of human agency in global affairs, mediated by the technological revolution, which makes us sharpen our intellectual debates in the social constructivist tradition.

Please see (Mazzucelli, 2005) under Module 2, Enlargement Scenario Preparation, for background reading in the elaboration over the past two (2) decades of this pedagogy.

Our efforts during this term have the potential to establish a norm that offers new possibilities in global communications. Our critical exchanges using social networking tools pave the way to a new frontier. The physical borders we redefine in our classroom are those same borders we change in our minds.
IMAGINE A TIME when students in one of the poorest schools in Africa become scientists for a week by measuring the health of nearby forests and comparing their results with data collected by students and scientist around the world. Or when K-12 students at U.S. military bases in remote locations access the collections of the Smithsonian American Art Museum and learn about them from the museum's art educators. Actually, that day is here. Such programs are the vanguard of the Institution’s approach to learning, which focuses on what Claudine Brown, our new assistant secretary for education and access, calls “action-based learning.” In tune with the popularity of digital devices, this form of learning builds on curiosity while emphasizing fundamentals, teamwork and communication.

Our partners in this work include the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, which is recently provided $30 million to create the Youth Access Endowment; it will enable us to connect to a generation of Americans who might not be familiar with the Smithsonian, or who cannot afford to visit our museums in person. The U.S. Department of Education awarded $25.5 million to our National Science Resources Center (supplemented by more than $8 million raised by the center from private donors). This will further enrich our 20-plus years of implementing a comprehensive approach to transforming K-12 science education programs in more than 1,200 school districts in 48 states representing 30 percent of the U.S. student population (see nsrconline.org). In April 2010 the Pearson Foundation committed $2.2 million to support the use of mobile learning approaches. For example, last summer the National Postal Museum and the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden held 21 workshops for teachers and students. Participating teens learned how to curate theme-based scavenger hunts using mobile learning devices.

The Smithsonian has also joined Microsoft Partners in Learning and TakingITGlobal to create a program called Shout. It offers educators and students worldwide the ability to interact with each other and their communities, and online with top scientists and other experts to learn about and take action on environmental issues. One example of Shout is the forest-health measuring described above.

Another leading-edge digital collaboration is the Google Art project, which lets online visitors stroll through the halls of the Freer Gallery of Art – using Google Street View technology – and examine artworks in brushstroke detail through gigapixel imaging.

For more information about the Institution’s digital programs, visit smithsonianeducation.org. We invite you to join us in imagining a future where education is available to the world at the touch of a digital tablet – a future that excites new generations about learning and helping to solve global problems.
2010-2011 Programming Schedule

May 23 – June 20, 2011  Carl D. Perkins Grants: Reporting to the State

June 27 – July 11, 2011  “Helping the Transfer Student Succeed”
EVALUATE “Global Resources: Expanding Your Students’ Horizons”

On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest, rate the video/conference in terms of its value to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of topic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program’s format</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Host</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panelists or Instructors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handouts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical quality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall evaluation of program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local site activities were held ____YES ____NO

1. Institution name: ________________________________

2. My current position is: (circle one)
   a. Faculty   c. Classified Staff/Professional Staff
   b. Administrator   d. Other__________________

3. What did you like most about the videoconference?

4. What could have been done to make it more valuable to you?

5. What topics would you like to see addressed in future videoconferences?

Return to: STARLINK, 9596 Walnut St., Dallas, TX 75243
Fax: 972-669-6699
Email: starlink@dcccd.edu