

Feature Article

African Universities and Globalisation

Paul Tiyambe Zeleza

Introduction

The challenges that face African universities and intellectual communities are many and daunting. They are simultaneously internal and external, institutional and intellectual, paradigmatic and pedagogical, political and practical. Globalisation, as a process and a project of neo-liberalism, reinforces and recasts these challenges. This essay seeks to map out the dynamics and implications of globalisation for African universities, as well as the gender implications of these changes in terms of factors such as institutional access and the production of feminist scholarship. While women's access to universities has increased, the academic division of labour, which largely confines women to the humanities and social sciences and allows men to dominate the so-called "hard" sciences and "prestigious" professional fields, persists. Staff numbers and resources within the male-dominated disciplines have risen sharply as higher education institutions move frantically toward academic capitalism: market principles of university administration and accountability, pecuniary support and public service. The vocationalisation of universities has intensified the marginalisation of the humanities, which, in turn, has reinforced the appeal of "gender work" in the form of applied gender studies. Thus, the growing ideological dominance of neo-liberalism, the discursive face of what is often understood as globalisation, has far-reaching implications for universities as sites of intellectual production that are both gendered and critical to the production of feminist knowledge. The first sections of this paper locate current trends in gender research and teaching in dominant eurocentric and androcentric globalising processes; towards the end of the paper, however, I speculate about the possibilities for transforming globalisation through feminist teaching and research focusing on African and Africa diaspora communities.

At a basic level, globalisation of higher education refers to the internationalisation of university personnel and programmes in terms of teaching, research, and public service, the ubiquitous triple mandate affirmed in the mission statements of universities. Africa's international academic relations or exchanges flow in two directions: among the African countries themselves and between African countries and countries on other continents. They take several forms, including the physical mobility of academic staff and students, networking in terms of research and libraries, and collaboration in the areas of curricula development, programmes, seminars and conferences, and publications. These are all gendered processes in so far as the flows are embedded in and reproduce social relations constructed around gender, in addition to class and other marked social hierarchies. The essay restricts itself to exploring the linkages of African institutions of higher education outside the continent. [1] It begins by briefly examining the general implications of globalisation for higher education and draws out the gender implications of the transformations spawned by globalisation. Then it explores the patterns of Africa's international academic exchanges with the North. This is followed by an interrogation of the role of the contemporary African intellectual diaspora - the question of the "brain drain." Finally, the essay probes the challenges of Africanising and engendering globalisation processes and discourses.

Higher Education and Globalisation

It is a cliché of our times that we live in an age of globalisation. Stripped of their celebratory or condemnatory verbiage, globalisation discourses refer to the intensification of international connections, contacts, and communication, and the growth of a more

interdependent world integrated by new information and communication technologies. But it is a process fraught with contradictions. The globalisation of financial markets and transnational corporations is accompanied by economic regionalisation and informalisation. Cultural transnationalism is spreading simultaneously with rising cultural chauvinism and fragmentation, while states are said to be declining as they proliferate and increase their internal repressive capacities. At the same time, certainties about the materiality of globalisation are trailed by crises of knowledge about the world in which we live.

The apparently relentless march of globalisation, whether defined as a historical process describing concrete conditions or as an ideological project prescribing particular futures, forces a new reckoning for every sector and institution. Hence, the proliferation of studies on globalisation and the economy, culture, politics, or education. At one level the links between globalisation and higher education are obvious. It would not be an exaggeration to argue that research conducted by the world's universities has helped produce globalisation as a constellation of material and imaginary, spatial and symbolic processes, while globalisation is simultaneously producing new contexts and imperatives for intellectual communities. In other words, universities are both a cause and manifestation of globalisation, in that they have always aspired to be globalised and they are globalising institutions.

More difficult to identify are the specific implications of current processes and projects of globalisation for higher education. Needless to say, paradoxes abound, since there is no agreement on what constitutes globalisation, and the manifestations and trends of globalisation in higher education are in serious dispute as regards their extent, efficacy, and ethics. Universities are experiencing rapid growth in the face of reduced resources; they are prey to too much and too little state intervention; they are research institutions producing an ever-declining share of research; and they are purveyors of internationalisation that penalise international exchanges through differential fees for local and foreign students, for example. Much of the analysis and debate seem to centre around six key trends in higher education that are connected to contemporary technological, economic, and ideological transformations. If the information and communication technologies (ICTs) constitute the motor of these changes, transnational firms drive them, and neo-liberal discourse provides the fuel. I identify the six key trends by dubbing them the six Cs: corporatisation of management, collectivisation of access, commercialisation of learning, commodification of knowledge, computerisation of education, and connectivity of institutions. These trends, of course, are not new, but they have become more urgent and more complex, and they manifest themselves unevenly in different world regions.

Corporatisation of management refers to the adoption of business models for the organisation and administration of higher education institutions. Universities are being pressed into the discourse of accountability and entrepreneurship, this obliging them to undertake new budgetary strategies and to expand and diversify their sources of funds so that they can ostensibly become more efficient, productive, and relevant. Critics point out that the reigning ideology of free market capitalism increasingly sees education not primarily as a social or public good, or as a human right, but as an economic investment. Consequently, universities are increasingly being turned into mills to produce and retool entrepreneurs and information operatives, instead of oases to nurture the values of democratic citizenship.

By collectivisation of access, I mean the growing massification of higher education. The perception that university education should be made available to more people and that it is a lifelong learning process has led to increasing collaborations between universities and various stakeholders. Interventions in university affairs by stakeholders in the public and private sectors have resulted in the reconfiguration (some would say erosion) of traditional notions and values of university autonomy, academic freedom, liberal education, and quality.

The growth in higher education reflects the expansion of the youth population, the growth of middle-class incomes and aspirations, the creeping credentialism in professions and occupations, and the rising demand for knowledge-based skills and jobs. Given the rapid economic changes, the separation between education and career as chronologically distinct phases of life are crumbling, and the two mesh, as one writer colourfully puts it, "as the horizontal and vertical threads of a single piece of fabric, as interwoven, as inextricably combined" (Reinsch, 1996: 593). Thus, universities are adapting to the demands of continuing education for workers in the knowledge-based industries by restructuring their courses, especially by making them part-time and modular. Consequently, universities are becoming more diversified in their programmes and student composition. Already, in some developed countries, older working students outnumber younger students.

Commercialisation of learning refers to the rapid expansion of private universities, the increased involvement of private enterprise in the provision of higher education, and the establishment of "executive" programmes in public universities. Thus we are seeing the rise of what some call the "market-oriented university" (Buchbinder, 1993), the "entrepreneurial university" (Clark, 1995), or the "consumer university" (Barrow, 1997). Besides the spectacular growth of private universities related to the rising demand for higher education and the ever-changing needs of the knowledge-based economy, corporate universities are emerging. These are universities that are created by large industries or transnational corporations "from Disney and McDonalds to Motorola in the USA and Body Shop, British Aerospace and BT in the UK... This is a new idea - but throughout the history of the university there have been different founders of universities - the church, the state and now the large corporations" (Jarvis, 1999: 54).

All these developments reinforce the commodification of knowledge. This is reflected in the increasing production, sponsorship, and dissemination of research by commercial enterprises and for profit institutions or companies established by universities and their academic staff, the tendency to apply intellectual property rights and copyright to research and instructional materials, and the rapid rise in students' fees. The more education and research are regarded as economic investments, the more their costs and returns are calculated according to market and proprietary principles. State subsidies have been reduced or removed in many countries, and student tuition rates have been raised to reflect the "real" costs of tertiary education.

It is not always adequate to attribute all these trends wholly to contemporary globalisation, but in the area of the new information and communication technologies (ICTs), the impact of globalisation seems incontrovertible. The computerisation of education involves the incorporation of ICT into the knowledge activities of teaching, research, and publication. Much of the debate on globalisation in higher education centres on the educational impact of ICT. Opinions differ sharply. The debate has focused on two issues: first, the cost and profitability of online education, and second, its pedagogical benefits. The jury is still out on both issues. Some studies assessing online education indicate that online programmes are neither cheap to produce nor as profitable as originally anticipated. Some are breaking even, some are losing money, and very few are making money (Carr, 2001).

We need to go beyond narrow financial calculations and the polar options of boosterism and rejectionism, as Nicholas Burbules and Thomas Callister (2000) call them. They argue, and I agree, that the positive and negative potential of the new technologies must be faced squarely by universities and academics, with the aim of harnessing the positive, and safeguarding their role as creators and certifiers of authoritative scholarship. Instead of wholesale embrace or dismissal, it is more productive to determine which technologies are useful for which students, for which subject matters, and for which purposes. Engagement with the new technologies allows universities to provide their students with critical

technoliteracy, democratised and customised higher learning, and to help to shape the emerging ICT educational regime, for example, the tension between pedagogical and proprietary norms.

Since they are both repositories of information and media for knowledge production, the new technologies are not merely "delivery systems" that pass through colleges and universities, leaving their core values either unchanged or destroyed. Rather, the new technologies are an integral part of the complex and contradictory changes taking place in the conflicted terrain of higher education. If tapped carefully and creatively, they hold exciting possibilities for removing the spatial and temporal constraints that limit access for non-traditional students, and for promoting student interaction and cooperative learning, pedagogical experimentation, collaborative research, and transnational exchanges. They can blur the distinctions between on-campus and off-campus teaching, between residential and distance education. In short, the impact of ICT is ambiguous because, like all technologies, it is not simply an innocuous tool; rather, its impact depends on its design and the technoculture it embodies and promises, the prevailing structural and institutional contexts in which it performs, and the broader material conditions and social relations in which it is articulated.

Finally, there has been increased connectivity of institutions which refers to the increased emphasis on institutional cooperation and coordination within and across countries, a process facilitated by ICTs, competition from the new corporate interlopers of higher education, the rising costs of maintaining such expensive infrastructures as libraries, and pressures both from students and for internationalisation. International education cooperation involves activities ranging from academic mobility, internationalisation of curricula and programmes, networking and linking arrangements to research collaboration and joint publishing. To be effective, academic exchanges have to be truly reciprocal and mutually beneficial, based on shared planning, implementation, and evaluation processes. Unfortunately, this has not been the case for Africa.

The implications of these transformations on gender are not only complex and contradictory, but also quite varied in different regions and countries. On the one hand, corporatisation reinforces authoritarian and masculinised management styles of higher educational institutions. On the other hand, as the access of women to universities increases, long-entrenched androcentric practices and perspectives come under scrutiny and challenge. Moreover, the flexibilities of lifelong learning appear more accommodating to women's occupational life cycles and experiences and demand reorientations from many men accustomed to more uninterrupted occupational lives. At the same time, however, the marketisation of universities requires academics to work longer hours. This leads not only to higher stress levels, but also reinforces old gender differentiations between men and women based on the unequal domestic division of labour for those with family responsibilities. A key effect of these domestic divisions is that women are disadvantageously placed to work long hours and advance their careers. Furthermore, as the business practice and ideology of flexible production infiltrate the universities, the academy becomes increasingly divided between an elite professoriate with all the privileges of academia, including higher salaries and benefits, and a growing mass of the lumpen-professoriate of part-time, poorly paid academics, among whom women tend to predominate.

These contradictory transformations in university administration and access are also reproduced in other realms of the academic enterprise. As learning becomes increasingly valued for its instrumental value and more emphasis is put on the scientific, technical, and professional fields, the humanities and even the social sciences become further marginalised. Thus, at the very time that feminist scholarship is expanding as a result of the entry of more women in the academy, humanistic knowledge as a whole, in which feminist paradigms, pedagogy, and praxis are lodged, become devalued. In response, many

humanities scholars, including feminists, have sought solace either in more theoretical rigour or applied research. The search for rigour, often spawned by an awareness of being threatened by the "hard" sciences, is evident in the rise of the turgid and difficult rhetoric of postmodernism and postcolonialism, especially in the academies of the North. This has often turned discourses in the humanities, including many feminist writings, into self-referential conversations incomprehensible to the public constituencies they once professed (and sometimes still profess) to speak for. Elsewhere, especially in the South, unease with theoretical naval-gazing and fidelity to the unyielding dreams of development, not to mention the pecuniary demands for survival, lead to the romanticising of relevance, whose consummation is sought, not in social movements, but in consultancies for NGOs and international donor agencies.

In African universities, the emphasis on "Women in Development", "Women and Development" and "Gender and Development", which are different from the more theoretically-driven women's studies departments in the North, clearly indicates how gender research and teaching have become increasingly dominated by market-driven and instrumentalist imperatives. There has been a growing emphasis on gender training models (the language itself is revealing), with atomised, technocratic and formulaic notions of "gender expertise", "gender issues", "gender sensitivity", and so on, eroding any sense of scholarship or teaching about a complex humanistic process. It is especially revealing how postgraduate courses with a specialist focus on gender, or short non-degree certificate courses are becoming more and more common at many African universities.

Similarly complex and contradictory are the gender implications of the processes associated with the internationalisation of university teaching and research and the use of ICTs. Opportunities for international scholarly linkages through travel, collaborations, and networking are often not only differentiated according to gender, but may also have different meanings and consequences for male and female students and scholars. The universalising language that the male-dominated sciences and professions wrap themselves in often makes them less open to serious and sustained engagement with "difference", something demanded of the humanities and fields born out of protracted social struggle, such as women's and gender studies. At the same time, the forces and technologies of globalisation throw into sharp relief the problems and possibilities of transnational feminist scholarship and organising. New solidarities and separatisms are continually being constructed out of the growing circuits of contacts in classrooms, conferences, and publications. Needless to say, the new instructional technologies have gender implications for pedagogy and publishing. As demonstrated elsewhere (Zezeza and Veney, 2000), electronic technology, like most technologies, is deeply underpinned by the social and spatial inequities of gender, class, race, location, and language, which manifest and reproduce themselves in terms of such factors as access, production of content, citation systems, dissemination, and consumption.

Unequal Exchange

There can be little doubt that the linkages and relationships that African universities and intellectuals maintain with their counterparts in the North are decidedly unequal and often unproductive. Some of the links are between consortia or individual institutions and often involve student and staff exchanges, research collaboration, and assistance in the areas of curriculum development, quality assurance, and university management. The popularity of particular African regions and countries as linkage partners for overseas institutions seems to follow the trails of colonial relations. Thus, universities in Anglophone and Francophone Africa have their strongest linkages with universities in Britain and France, respectively. The academic linkage programmes of the other European countries tend to reflect their overall foreign policy ambitions to win new friends and influence educational development in Africa.

The linkages between African and European universities seem to fluctuate according to the contours of political and social transformations within Africa. During the ugly days of apartheid, for example, South African institutions were generally shunned. The academic boycott was of course an integral part of the cultural and economic sanctions against apartheid. Besides using resources from governments and their own coffers, European universities have been adept at using international organisations to foster exchanges with African institutions. For example, under the auspices of the International Association of University Presidents in 2001, four universities from Denmark, Belgium, and the Netherlands established a programme to provide African scholars in 10 East African universities access to full-text articles in 200 online journals (Bollag, 2001). As European unification has deepened, the European Union has become more assertive in formulating foreign policy for its members, including fostering new types of academic cooperation and exchange with both developed and developing countries.

African and European universities have also made good use of UNESCO programmes and networks. One of the most interesting is the UNESCO Chairs Programme, launched in 1991, that facilitates twinning, networking, and other linking arrangements among universities. Funded by UNESCO and the participating institutions, the programme concentrates on "chairs," often visiting professors, around whom a whole range of activities are organised, including research programmes, scholarships and fellowships, and staff and student exchanges. In addition to the large programmes, there are smaller ones organised around the few African studies centres in Europe. One of the most well known is the Nordic Africa Institute in Uppsala, Sweden, founded in 1962. The institute encourages and conducts research and studies on Africa in the Nordic countries, mostly in the humanities and social sciences, and promotes cooperation between African and Nordic researchers. Since 1982, it has also supported a guest researcher programme that brings three to four researchers, mostly from African countries, for two to four months. The guest researchers are expected to work on topics and themes pursued in the institute's research programme. The institute organises some of its major seminars and conferences in Africa in collaboration with local universities and research centres.

It is perhaps with the United States that Africa has its most extensive and complex academic exchanges. With its 4 048 colleges and universities, enrolling 14,8 million students, 2,8 million faculty and staff, and revenues of \$197 billion in 1999-2000, the United States has the largest, richest, most diversified and decentralised higher education system in the world. Also large, diverse, and complex is its international knowledge system. In the late 1990s, 30 percent of all foreign students in the world studied in the United States, although this represented a drop of 10 percent since 1980. There is no doubt that international education constitutes an important feature of the American international knowledge system. Broadly, three types of international education programmes can be identified: student and faculty exchange programmes, short-term training programmes conducted in the United States for foreign officials, and technical assistance for specific projects. For African universities it is the student and faculty exchange programmes that have had the most important impact. Generally, these programmes were developed through the area studies project, which was funded both by state and private sources primarily to serve United States interests.

There are clear imbalances in the flow of students and other academic exchanges between the United States and other world regions, including Africa. The imbalances are evident not only in the total numbers involved, but also in the students' regions of origin and destination, their levels, length and fields of study, and social composition. In 1999-2000, there were 516 438 foreign students in the United States compared to 129 770 American students abroad. While the majority of foreign students came from Asia (54,4 percent), the majority of American students went to Europe (62,7 percent), and only 6 percent went to Asia.

American students abroad were predominantly undergraduate, female, and white, and went for short periods to study the social sciences and humanities, while foreign students in the United States were largely people of colour, graduate, and male, who sought to earn their degrees in the sciences and the professions.

Academic mobility between Africa and the United States lagged far behind the other regions. In 1999-2000, only two African countries were among the top thirty countries sending students to the United States. Kenya led with 5 684 students (at number twenty) and Nigeria with 3 602 (at number twenty-eight). Ghana with 2 127 came in at number forty-five, Egypt with 1 964 at forty-nine, South Africa with 1 962 at fifty, Morocco with 1 607 at fifty-eight, Ethiopia with 1 285 at sixty-three, Zimbabwe with 1 184 at sixty-five, Tanzania with 1 091 at sixty-seven, and Botswana with 1 053 at seventy. Taiwan, fifth on the list, sent nearly one-and-a-half times as many students to the United States as the ten African countries combined. Altogether, Asian countries, led by China, accounted for seven out of the ten leading senders, followed by Europe with 15,2 percent, Latin America 12,1 percent, the Middle East 6,8 percent, Africa 5,9 percent, North America 4,7 percent, and Oceania 0,9 percent.

Even more dismal are the statistics for American students going to Africa. By the mid-1990s, there were 107 programmes, most of them created after 1990, sponsored by sixty-eight institutions and consortia in twenty-three African countries. More than half the programmes were for single semester or summer sessions. In 1999-2000, Africa hosted a mere 2,8 percent of American students. Only two African countries, South Africa and Ghana ranked among the top thirty destinations; 891 American students went to South Africa, while 627 went to Ghana. Similarly, Africa was not a major source or destination for faculty exchanges. African countries accounted for a relatively small percentage of academics visiting American universities: 3 percent, as compared to 37,7 percent for Asia, and 42,3 percent for Europe. The country with the largest number of foreign scholars at American institutions from Africa was Egypt with 640, compared to the leading country China with 11 854. As with the foreign students, most of the visiting scholars were in the sciences and professions.

The reasons for the unequal academic exchange between Africa and the United States are quite obvious. Africa remains low on the list of destinations for American students and faculty largely because of the continent's abysmal image, fed by both Africa's own malfeasance and America's inveterate racism. There are, of course, more specific reasons ranging from institutional disincentives and incompatibilities to bureaucratic hurdles. On their part, African universities are not always enamoured by the American students, who they sometimes find poorly prepared academically and culturally, exhibit intolerable racial and class arrogance, and suffer from the safari syndrome and show more interest in being tourists than students. To many African university administrators, academic exchanges with American universities reek of patronage rather than reflect partnership. For student and staff exchange programmes to be effective and sustainable, genuine reciprocity is imperative.

New patterns of academic exchange and mobility between American and African universities are emerging. Three can be identified: (i) the growth of what is called "transnational" education; (ii) globalisation of American scholarly societies; and (iii) the expansion of online education. First, transnational education often involves the establishment of overseas university branches. While this is not new, the scale is. It is facilitated by the growing privatisation of higher education around the world, a privatisation manifested in the way that branches of American universities are growing rapidly in Africa.

Second, a growing number of American scholarly associations are expanding their global reach by aggressively recruiting foreign members, including those from Africa. To quote Beth McMurtrie: "From the Organisation of American Historians to the American Mathematical Society, the groups have broadened their membership bases and stepped up collaborations

with their counterparts abroad. They recruit foreign scholars to write for their journals, provide technical support for fledgling societies in developing nations, and connect scholars through their Internet offerings. Even scholars that don't try to recruit abroad are finding that more of their members now have foreign addresses" (2000: A53). She attributes this to three factors: American academics are becoming global in their outlook; the collapse of communism opened up communication with Eastern Europe and expanded research there and interest in international research generally; and the powerful impact of the development of the Internet.

Third, international distance education using the Internet is expanding rapidly, which enables American universities to export curricula and instructional expertise, especially in the lucrative fields of science, engineering, and business (Ercolano, 1996). As noted earlier, opinions differ on the potential impact of the new information and communication technologies. The challenges involved in transnational online education - course development, teaching, and certification - cannot be underestimated, although there are several examples of how this can be done. For example, there is the fascinating collaborative curriculum co-development (CCD) project between Tufts University, Makerere University, and the University of Dar es Salaam. Launched in January 2001, the project seeks to connect international relations students at the three campuses through a shared website using asynchronous learning networks. It aims to promote interactive dialogue among students and to give them a richer and more complex appreciation of the variety of credible paradigms for understanding international relations, as well as to encourage them to use information technology as an important learning resource (Robinson et al., 2001).

Intellectual Migrations to the North

Besides the ongoing exchange programmes, a resident African intellectual community in the North has grown rapidly in recent years. The subject of the African "brain drain" to the North has attracted the attention of, and is of grave concern to, African governments, development agencies, civil society organisations, employers, universities, as well many of the professionals and scholars involved. It is a phenomenon that not only affects development prospects in African countries, but also intellectual production and relations, both within and outside the continent. Recent studies show that the African "brain drain" to the North has accelerated. According to estimates, an average 20 000 highly educated Africans have been migrating to the North every year since 1990. The implications for African development have been far-reaching.

The African intellectual migrants are a part of the rising tide of global skilled migration, a category that is not well defined, but is assumed to take many forms, including "brain drain," professional transients, skilled permanent migrants, and business transfers. As Iredale notes, the "geographical circulation of intellectual elites and the resulting de- or multi-nationalisation of knowledge...is a phenomenon of the twentieth century.... A global labour market now exists in some occupations where a person's skill is his/her greatest asset to be bought and sold" (1990: 90). Theoretical explanations for skilled migration range from the micro-level human capital approach that contends that individuals move to maximise gains from the investment in their education and training, to the macro-level structuralist neo-Marxist perspective that emphasises the operations of unequal development between core and periphery countries, and the "structuration" approach that stresses the important role of international agents, regional policies, and global networks. Skilled migration can be examined in terms of its motivation, spatiality, mechanisms, and temporality.

The migration of African intellectuals is a product of conditions in both Africa and the North. Economic, social, political, and educational developments in Africa have conspired to generate emigration pressures, while the skill-selective and wealth-selective immigration

policies of the Northern countries have offered opportunities for highly skilled Africans to migrate. The migration flows have been sustained by the intricate and intense educational networks that link universities in Africa and those in the North, the recruitment drives and inducements of various institutions and organisations, and the cumulative traditions of migration that have emerged as skilled migration, has expanded. Like international migrants from other regions, African professional migrants have increasingly become part of transitional communities involved directly and indirectly in both home and host countries, in ways that have an impact on, to quote Hamilton and Chinchilla "economic and political processes in the sending and receiving countries and relations between them which may reinforce or challenge existing relations of power within and between countries" (1996:198).

African intellectual migration to the North is an outgrowth of complex movements of African intellectuals within and between countries. African intellectuals are members of complex networks linking universities and independent research centres in Africa to those in the North through training, publications, and research funding. Ali Mazrui's (1978) suggestion that African universities functioned as branches of multinational corporations remains apt despite strenuous efforts at indigenisation. In other words, African universities still derive their organisational and scholarly models from the North. Large numbers of students continue to be sent to the North for graduate training; research themes are influenced by Northern fads, while much African research is funded by foundations and agencies from the North; and Northern media dominate scholarly publications and set the standards. It is this complex web of dependent institutional, intellectual, and ideological linkages between Africa and the North that facilitates and sustains the flows of migrant African intellectuals.

This is clearly not peculiar to Africa. Academics, through the very nature of their work and institutional affiliations, belong to potentially globalised and globalising networks. African migrant intellectuals in the North constitute a community that needs to be examined for its own sake, and more importantly, because it offers African scholarship a unique entry and insertion into global research networks and engagements with historic African diaspora communities. It is, in my view, a crucial link in the chain of activities and agencies essential for Pan-African solidarity and struggle. Much of what is known about African migrant intellectuals in the North is anecdotal. Little systematic research has been conducted on their demographic and social composition, occupational and institutional affiliations, let alone ideological orientations and personal inclinations. Comprehensive data and analyses of African migrant intellectuals in the North are essential in order to understand the full magnitude of Africa's brain drain to the North and to devise meaningful policies to deal with it.

One of the few empirical studies on African Ph.D.'s trained in North America between 1986 and 1996 (Pires, et al., 1999), shows that variation in rates of return were conditioned by a complex set of factors from political, economic and institutional factors in African countries, the relative size of African immigrant populations in the United States, the nature of sponsorship, discipline, and age. For example, only 36 percent of those who graduated in the 20-29 year-old age group returned home as compared to 58 percent for those in the 40-49 age group, because older recipients were more likely than the younger ones to have established careers and family responsibilities to which they would return to. There were no demonstrable differences in return rates according to gender, although only 19 percent of the Ph.D. recipients in the survey sample were female.

Rates of return, however, do not tell us everything about the dynamics and impact of the brain drain in this age of growing transnational skilled migrations and improved communication technologies. "We must be cognizant," as Piers et al. argue, "of the possibility that 'return' does not, by definition, accomplish the goals of capacity-building programmes, while 'stay' does not, by definition, vitiate the possibility of contributing to at

least some of the goals" (1999: 36). In short, not all those who return home contribute to Africa's development, nor do all those who stay overseas contribute nothing to their countries' development.

Clearly, the African "brain drain" to the North is part of the complex contemporary processes of intellectual mobility and transformation. As might be expected, the motivations and morality of African academics and professionals traversing the Atlantic and the Mediterranean are in serious dispute. Whatever one's position, they represent an intellectual reality and resource that needs to be acknowledged and utilised. Even if they are not the advance armies of Edward Said's (1993) Third World "voyagers into" the belly of the North, or Ali Mazrui's (1978) Pan-African forces of "counter-penetration", Africa's migrant intellectuals constitute a presence that reflect, and can promote, Africa's global intellectual presence.

In a recent special issue of the journal *African Issues* published by the U.S. African Studies Association, which I co-edited, several authors insist that while the negative impact of African intellectual and skilled labour migrations is often emphasised, it is crucial to examine how the "brain drain" can be turned into a "brain gain" or "brain mobility" and what they tell us about Africa's insertion into contemporary processes of globalisation. These essays explore the conditions, challenges, and potential contributions of the African intellectual diaspora. They show that many of the generalisations about the intellectual migrants are often simplistic. Abdoulaye Gueye (2002), for example, shows that while some African professional migrants in France might prosper, this is not true of those holding doctorates in the social sciences and humanities. For his part, F. Njubi Nesbitt (2002) emphasises that the "double consciousness" of African intellectual migrants in the North produces three "types" of migrant intellectuals: the comprador intelligentsia, the postcolonial critic, and the progressive exile. And Nzegwu Nkiru (2002) documents her admirable labours to use the new information technologies to promote African scholarly production and communication by establishing several online journals.

Africanising and Engendering Globalisation

It is quite evident that the demand for international education in both Africa and the North is expanding, but it is an enterprise facing many challenges. Besides the rapid changes in the field of international scholarship and the emergence of new international education specialities, pressures are building on researchers because of the exponential production and flows of knowledge. Demands on the international knowledge system are expanding faster than the available resources. In navigating these stormy waters, African universities and research centres and networks would be well-served to exploit their own intellectual diaspora, which offers a small way out of the uni-directional globalism of the North and Africa's dependent globalism, which could change the balance of trade in international education.

The rising international migration of Africa's professional elites and intellectuals may indeed be a curse if dismissed and ignored, but it can be turned into a blessing if embraced and utilised. It is generated by, and inserts Africa into, contemporary processes of transnationalisation and globalisation, which follow and reinforce the old trails of Pan-Africanism. The challenge for Africa is how to rebuild the historic Pan-African project, spawned by the global dispersal and exploitation of African peoples over the centuries, by creatively using the current migratory flows of African peoples, cultures, capacities, and visions and the contemporary revolution in telecommunications and travel technologies. It is an old challenge in a new age that requires responses and solutions that are both old and new.

Clearly, academic exchanges between Africa and the North have a long and complicated history. They have certainly helped to build educational capacities and knowledge on both sides of the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. Nevertheless, the relationship has been unequal in terms of both the flows and the benefits. More Africans, for example, have studied in the United States than Americans have studied in Africa, yet the advantages have not always gone to the African side. Certainly, Africans hardly influence American studies the way Americans dominate African studies both in the United States and within Africa itself; terms of debate about Africa, with all their prescriptive baggage, are often set by American Africanists. This, of course, is merely one reflection of the pervasive relations of dependency between Africa and the United States.

I believe it is possible to transform these relations, to improve the terms of academic discourse and exchange between the North and Africa. This requires the establishment of carefully constructed partnerships that embrace all the key constituencies and components of the academic enterprise, that is, on the one hand, the stakeholders - students, faculty, and administrators - and on the other the services - teaching, research, publishing, and dissemination. Building new international partnerships, mediated by Africa's potential allies, including specifically the African historic and contemporary intellectual diaspora, will go a long way toward improving and strengthening the visibility of African research, both on the continent itself and globally, and to turn the brain drain not just into a potential "brain gain" but into "brain mobility". This is essential for Africa's revitalisation and renaissance. Africa and its diaspora have not always effectively mobilised to serve and advance each other's interests, as has been the case, for example, between the Jewish diaspora and Israel, or increasingly, the Chinese diaspora and China. The new African diaspora and their offspring can help invigorate the re-awakened interest in Africa among the historic African diaspora, and serve as a trans-Atlantic bridge, as cultural mediators between the continent and its old diaspora, whose communication and knowledge of each other has largely been through the distorted lenses and prejudices of imperialist and racist media.

Migrant African intellectuals, as cultural producers, have an important and specific role to play in brokering relations between Africa and the North, in blackening the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. They must resist the seductions of the Northern academies to become native ventriloquists, complicit "others" who validate narratives that seek to marginalise Africa. Nor should they let themselves be manipulated as a fifth column in the North's eternal racial wars by disavowing the protracted struggles of historic African diaspora communities for the full citizenship of racial equality, economic empowerment, and political power. They should not be seen solely in the magisterial role of cosmopolitan revolutionaries or the ministerial role of teachers subverting the North through counter-penetration. They are both students and teachers of African and Northern societies, cultural workers and producers who should, in solidarity with historic African diaspora communities, construct knowledges of their multiple worlds that demystify the roots of Africa's and diaspora Africa's oppression and exploitation. These knowledges would seek to empower African and African diaspora communities, to expose and confront the tyrannies of Northern imperial power and Africa's dictators, and to promote respectful intellectual conversation between Africa and the North.

Migrant African intellectuals have a special responsibility to mainstream African scholarship into global scholarship by promoting the consumption of African scholarly texts in the North. Numerous expatriate knowledge networks exist, but few are linked to African countries and none to the continent as a whole. Where they exist, these networks operate as independent, nonpolitical, and non-profitable organisations and conduct their work by maintaining websites and databases of members' data, and organising specific activities such as newsletters, conferences, seminars, and the informal trails of personal contacts. We need the creation of Pan-African intellectual diaspora networks that would link diaspora intellectuals not only to their countries of origin, but also to other countries across the continent.

As we forge these networks we must foreground gender, which has often been ignored or collapsed into the false complementarities of an invented African traditional egalitarianism, whether propagated in the nationalist narratives of Pan-Africanism that are loudly masculine or feminised ones inflected with a desperate search for African difference from Eurocentric paradigms and prescriptions. Critical to the engendering of globalisation is the articulation of clear feminist critiques and constructions of globalisation. It would of course be foolhardy to suggest that there is a singular feminist paradigm on globalisation. There are many feminisms informed by different preoccupations and priorities, reflecting the different histories, locations, and ideologies of the various women's movements in different parts of the world.

Until relatively recently, many studies of globalisation were bereft of gender analysis, of gender as a constitutive force of globalisation. While gender was often erased as integral to the social and economic dimensions of globalisation, attempts were made to unpack its impact on women at the local level. In short, there emerged a divide between what Carla Freeman (2001) has called masculinist grand theories of globalisation and localised analysis of the impact of globalisation on women, that is, feminist critiques of globalisation steeped in ethnographic research. The analytical dichotomy between the global and the local and the absence of gender in many grand analyses obviously limited our overall understanding of the forms, meanings, and trajectories of globalisation. Local studies not only help to humanise the large-scale economic and social transformations associated with globalisation, they also underline the fact that the historical and structural underpinnings and contemporary forms of globalisation are themselves deeply permeated with specific notions about femininity and masculinity and expectations for the roles of women and men. The challenge for feminist research on globalisation is not simply to insert the local into the global, (a procedure which amounts to providing empirical evidence for malestream globalisation theories), but to consider local forms of globalisation as constitutive ingredients in the changing shape of globalisation, whether of trade, commodities, capital, culture, politics, ideologies; in short, to integrate macro and micro levels of analysis, to engender theories of globalisation by examining relationships between and across the analytical levels - spatially of the local, the national, regional, and global -- and socially of the household, community, race, class - all of which are imbricated with gender.

Feminist accounts of globalisation that seek to challenge its dominant scripts often have to walk an analytical tightrope in which the processes of globalisation are simultaneously recognised and deconstructed, so that resistance to them is not utopian and futile. According to Suzanne Bergeron (2001) this can be done by denaturalising global capitalism and seeing it as a socially constructed process and by elaborating the gendered assumptions and effects that are generally invisible in mainstream theories. In short, by showing that globalisation is not an omniscient and unified force, by highlighting the sometimes contradictory relationships among transnational capital, state policy, reproductive labour, and gender relations, it can be demonstrated that women's struggles contest the connected yet "scattered hegemonies" of global economic institutions, patriarchal households, and other structures that support women's exploitation and marginalisation. Thus, it is important not only to see that globalisation discourses are gendered, but that global capital is more vulnerable and contestable than it appears. Moreover, in so far as the state is still very much alive as a meaningful site of power, citizenship, the regulation of markets, and the distribution of resources, while at the same time increasingly circumscribed and interpenetrated by transnational forces, resistance has to be both national and transnational.

The literature on gender and globalisation has exposed the androcentric assumptions that underlie structural adjustment policies and programmes. The differential effects of these programmes on men and women are now well documented. It is critical to explore how neo-

liberal agendas mobilise gender, region, sexuality, class, and race to reinscribe differences and hierarchies, and the diverse and interconnected ways women are organising against the gendered, racialised, and regionalised processes of global capitalist expansion, whether for livelihood needs or around human rights and democracy. In short, it is critical for feminist studies of globalisation to identify and interrogate the local, regional, and transnational scales, the multiple sites and their intersections, through which the global dimensions of restructuring and resistance strategies are refracted and reproduced (Fall, 2000; Rowbotham and Linkogle, 2001; Naples and Desai, 2002).

It is important to recognise the diversity of women's experiences, including women's experiences with globalisation. Differences of class, location, and access to resources and opportunity structures, including education, have continued to differentiate the impact of the contemporary processes of globalisation on African women. Beyond the rural-urban loop of women's mobility, African women are increasingly enmeshed in transborder and transnational circuits of migration and trade that go beyond the traditional interregional trails bequeathed by colonialism. The African women traders and entrepreneurs in the metropolitan cities of the North, not to mention the migrant workers and professionals, including academics, are multiply "territorialised" social actors who are agents of Africa's contemporary globalisation. They intersect with and reinforce Africa's historic diasporas in complex ways, in the process of which they construct new identities and new possibilities for Pan-Africanism. This is to suggest that globalisation and transnationalism are not new for African peoples, including women. The challenge is to decipher the new subjectivities and struggles created by contemporary forms of migration and formations of mercantile and diasporic networks.

Also rich is the literature on African women's resistance and coping strategies through which women have sought to alter or take control of new economic conditions. The growth of women's networks and other women's survival strategies has helped transform women's sense of individual and collective identity as they renegotiate their places in the household, workplace, community, and nation. These struggles and renegotiations challenge the boundaries dividing the global-local and public-private dichotomies, including the boundary between productive and reproductive activities "that are frequently assumed in discussions of powerful global capital 'economic' processes and their fragmented, marginal, and inconsequential 'noneconomic' others" (Bergeron, 2001:996). As Bergeron goes on to show, "studies of women's economic organisation acknowledge that there is not 'one market' but many markets, including some in which women are the major actors and beneficiaries and some that are distinctly noncapitalist" (2001:996).

Conclusion

It seems to me that the challenge for African feminist scholars in examining the impact of globalisation on African polities, economies, and societies, including the higher education sector and intellectual production, is not only to critically interrogate globalisation's effects, but also to strip the theories of globalisation of their Eurocentric and androcentric biases, to show that while indeed powerful, the processes associated with globalisation are subject to contestation, the contestation of alternative visions and values, ideas and imaginations of a global order that is truly equitable and humane for both women and men in the worlds we now call the global North and the global South. In so doing, it can be demonstrated that globalisation of social justice, sustainable development and gender justice has yet to be created. Our task as activist scholars is to fight for it in theory and practice. Specifically, for African intellectuals and universities, the task is to explore the meanings that lie in the crevices of globalisation's accompanying contradictions, to be proactive in rising to the challenges brought about by the new dispensation, by creatively exploiting the new technologies of knowledge production and the mobilities of intellectual capacities

represented by the brain drain, a phenomenon that is by no means new in Africa's long and tortured history of engagement with the North. Out of creative linkages between the old and new African diasporas in the North, and between the latter and intellectual communities on the continent may lie possibilities of Africanising globalisation and globalising Africa that are both unprecedented and productive.

References

- Bergeron, S. 2001. "Political economy discourses of globalization and feminist politics", *Signs*, 26, 4: 983-1006.
- Bollag, B. 2001. "East African Universities Will Gain Journal Access in New Online Project", *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 39 (27): A39.
- Buchbinder, H. 1993. "The Market Oriented University and the Changing Role of Knowledge", *Higher Education*, 26 (3): 331-347
- Burbules, N and Callister, T. 2000. "Universities in Transition: The Promise and the Challenge of New Technologies", *Teachers College Record*, 102 (2): 271-293.
- Carr, S. 2001. "Is Anyone Making Money on Distance Education?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 16 February: A41.
- Clark, B. 1995. *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. Oxford: IAU Press and Pergamon.
- Ercolano, V. 1996. "Exporting Engineering Education", *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 10 December: A60.
- Fall, Y. ed. 1999. *Gender, Globalization and Resistance*. Dakar: AAWORD.
- Freeman, C. 2001. "Is local: Global as feminine: Masculine? Rethinking the gender of globalization", *Signs*, 26, 4: 1007-1037.
- Gueye, A. 2002. "The Dark Side of the African Brain Drain: The Experiences of African Ph.D.s in Social Sciences and Humanities Living in France", *African Issues, Special Issue on The African "Brain Drain" to the North: Pitfalls and Possibilities* (forthcoming).
- Hamilton, N and Chinchilla, N. 1996. "Global Economic Restructuring and International Migration", *International Migration*, 34 (2): 195-227.
- Iredale, R. 1999. "The Need to Import Skilled Personnel: Factors Favoring and Hindering its International Mobility", *International Migration*, 37,1:89-123.
- Jarvis, P. 1999. "Global Trends in Lifelong Learning and the Response of the Universities", *Comparative Education*, 35 (2): 249-257.
- Mazrui, A. 1978. *Political Values and the Educated Class in Africa*. London: Heinemann.
- McMurtrie, B. 2000. "America's Scholarly Societies Raise Their Flags Abroad", *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 28 January: A53.
- Naples, N. and Desai, M. eds. 2002. *Womens' Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics*. New York and London: Routledge.

Nesbitt, F. 2002. "African Intellectuals in the Belly of The Beast: Migration, Identity, and the Politics of Exile", *African Issues, Special Issue on The African "Brain Drain" to the North: Pitfalls and Possibilities* (forthcoming).

Nkiru, N. 2002. "Africaresource.Com: Bridging the Digital Divide", *African Issues, Special Issue on The African "Brain Drain" to the North: Pitfalls and Possibilities* (forthcoming).

Pires, M., Kassimir, R. and Brhane, M. 1999. *Investing in Return: Rates of Return of African Ph.D.'s Trained in North America*. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Reinsch, L. 1996. "New Times Demand New Degree programmes", *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 62 (19): 592-594.

Robinson, P. with Kiondo, A. and Mohamed, H. 2001. "Curriculum Co-Development: Asynchronous Networks for Bringing International Perspectives to Learning", Paper presented at the Carter Lectures 2001, "Governance and Higher Education," University of Florida, Gainesville. 22-25 March.

Rowbotham, S. and Linkogle, S. eds. *Women Resist Globalization: Mobilizing for Livelihood and Rights*. London: Zed Books.

Said, E. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Zeleza, P. 2002. *Rethinking Africa's Globalization. Vol. 1: The Intellectual Challenges*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

ENDNOTES

[1] An extended analysis of the issues broached in this essay can be found in my book, Zeleza (2002).

Paul Tiyambe Zeleza is Professor of History and African Studies and Director of the Centre for African Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He is the winner of the 1994 Noma Award for his book A Modern Economic History of Africa and received the 1998 Special Commendation of the Noma Award for Manufacturing African Studies and Crises.