compounded by the multiple identities that may be claimed by, or ascribed to, all people.

In the subsequent section, the origins and structural positions of multicultural education and international education are compared and contrasted. This leads to a larger discussion on globalization and internationalization, which have distinct meanings that tend to be obscured through the blur of institutional structures that have similar functions but are deliberately called one or the other. Finally, some intersections in language and meaning are offered, along with their implications for learning across cultures, locally and globally.

**Culture**

Many anthropology textbooks distinguish between “big C Culture” and “little c culture” because the word has two meanings that are quite different. Big C Culture refers to the culture concept, which is the sum of human learned and unlearned behaviors and adaptations to physical and social environments. Little c culture refers to groups of people with a salient set of shared cultural traits, such as a technology, aesthetic, language, belief system, group identification, etc. Such groups are (or were) generally situated in, or derived from, a common place and time. The capitalization convention is better left to the textbooks (and will not be used following this paragraph), but the distinction between concept and group is meaningful. Closely associated with the “small c” definition of a culture is “society,” which encompasses the association and interaction of people, whether synergistic or dysfunctional, in a place and time. But as with culture, society has a dual meaning and can also refer to a group of people themselves.

**Historical Construct of Culture**

The culture concept has its origins in the infancy of anthropology as a discipline, arising with nineteenth century evolutionism. At its root, culture applies to human populations some of the principles of the geological uniformitarianism of Lyell (1830–1833), which state that uniform processes have always influenced changes in earth systems and will continue to do so. Following the
lead of early efforts at building comprehensible schemes in paleontology and biological evolutionism, early proponents of anthropology sorted and ordered cultures in a taxonomic framework.

Edward Burnett Tylor is credited with the earliest definition of “culture” (which he conflated with “civilization”) as “that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (1871, 1). His definition was used to support the notion of orthogenetic evolution, which, in the case of culture, defines inevitable progress from savagery through barbarism toward civilization, the latter typified as Tylor’s own white Victorian Anglo-European culture. This was an ethnocentric, racialized view of culture that persisted for generations, fueled colonialism, and justified the extraction of resources for the enrichment of the “civilized” world.

Franz Boas (1920) is credited with a reversal of sorts, embracing a more Darwinian notion of culture change and the genesis of a modern anthropology. He and his intellectual successors promoted cultural relativism, which is essentially a denial of the inevitability of the succession of social evolution and an assertion that people (cultures) develop the physical and social innovations required to flourish in their particular physical and social environments. This comprises a kind of natural selection for social and technological processes and specifically denies mechanistic, uniform, and driven (orthogenetic) processes and progress.

**Postmodern Construct**

The postmodern evolution of the culture concept is seated in the recognition that culture is continuously in flux, never static, and always contested, even within groups. Rather than a static reality, culture is “a space of competing realities...with all but the dominant or hegemonic version getting short shrift” (Moon 2010, 38). Cultural contestation is how societies change. If one needs evidence of contestation, one need only examine the political and social turmoil of the present day, virtually the world over.

Culture is contested among groups—people sharing a range of interests and identities—and subgroups, and because neither is monolithic, it is contested
within groups as well. This means that culture is challenged according to an individual’s or subgroup’s position relative to others, in particular, to empowered or dominant others (e.g., women in a patriarchal society, ethnic or religious minorities relative to a majority culture, immigrants facing natives, the young versus the old).

People, and their interests, are differentiated by any number of characteristics, including (dis)ability, age, sex, gender, education, empowerment, franchise, income, language, nationality, ethnicity, religion, and much more. Each of these traits or identifications may describe a culture. And the contexts of specific places and events give primacy to one identity or another, which then changes in different circumstances. Groups and subgroups that coexist in a place and time make for diversity and create the conditions for communicating or learning across cultures.

*Culture in the International Education Context*

In her reflections on intercultural communications, Doreen G. Moon notes that culture commonly stands in for nationality in that intercultural communication is commonly construed as communication between people belonging to different countries (2010, 38). This same view is emphatically present in the field of international education, which is predominately represented by student mobility across national borders. Thus, students and others are supplied with country fact sheets and books deriving from government or commercial sources; advised on greeting, eating, and etiquette; or prepared for different modes of pedagogy or management. There is good information in these resources and they should continue to be read and written. However, in relying on these sources alone, the uncritical or unguided user is apt to understand culture as something static, monolithic, and harmoniously shared by all members of a nationality or group. One might miss the context of multiple cultures within a nation and the dynamics among cultures historically, thereby dooming the user to interactions and communication that remain fundamentally superficial.
Diversity, Race, and Ethnicity

Diversity emphasizes difference. While the notion of diversity in the United States refers primarily to race and ethnicity, in the academic setting at home and abroad, it has expanded to include many of those characteristics noted above, including those that are in the realms of ideas, adaptations, and biology.

Race is a notion that has drifted over the years, generally emphasizing phenotypic, or observable and physical, characteristics of populations. It is now largely rejected as a scientifically meaningful distinction, although it remains potent in popular use.

Ethnicity refers to identification with a common cultural origin and is often merged with race. Indeed, older usages of the term “race” often coincided with present day usages of ethnicity, nationality, and culture.

Cultural diversity is, of course, present on campuses, in classrooms, and in communities. Tangible and intangible expressions of diversity manifest as cultural identities that are fluid across groups and multiplied per individual according to circumstance and expediency.

Super-Diversity

The fluidity, multiplicity, and contestation of cultures are at the heart of the idea of “super-diversity,” a concept that is gaining currency particularly in the context of British and European ethnic studies (Vertovec 2007). It describes the ways in which diversity has become more complex. For example, immigrant communities become increasingly differentiated among themselves according to factors such as immigration status, migration channels (e.g., worker, student, family member, refugee, etc.), and transnationalism (i.e., linkage with and mobility to country of origin), among others. Both new immigrant and established minority communities are further differentiated by educational attainment, availability of employment, income, local resources, proximity and relationship to other minority groups—which may entail competition for jobs and resources, enmity toward newcomers, or old animosities rekindled in new environs—and responses of local authorities, residents, and service providers (Vertovec 2007). Super-diversity is belied when one speaks of, for example, the “Asian American community” or the “Latino community.”
when dozens of national origins are represented in each and there exist additional internal distinctions of ethnicity, gender, education, wealth, and more.

For years, U.S. Americans were taught to embrace the idea of the "melting pot" in the United States, in which immigrant populations were alloyed together as they assimilated and made the "native" fabric of society all the stronger. The newcomers were categorically expected to learn to love U.S. American cultural icons such as baseball and apple pie. We were taught to value such an amalgam and relish in the multiple flavors encountered in the melting pot, even while barriers to mobility and assimilation were apparent to us. By perpetuating this ideal, we were actually hiding the reality of the melting pot, which is that it was and remains largely a fictional construct made plain by the actual heterogeneity of U.S. society.

**Pluralism, Multiculturalism, Intersectionality, and Inclusion**

The melting pot ideal (i.e., assimilation) aspires to a homogeneous society, or one of sameness. In contrast, pluralism and multiculturalism both describe a heterogeneous society, or one of diversity. According to *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary*, "pluralism" can be defined as a state in which "members of diverse ethnic, racial, religious, or social groups maintain and develop their traditional culture or special interest within the confines of a common civilization." And the formal definition of "multiculturalism" is "relating to, reflecting, or adapted to diverse cultures" (Merriam-Webster). Thus, the metaphor for a pluralistic or multicultural society is a salad bowl, with the constituent parts identifiable and discrete but in close proximity. Pluralism is our reality in the United States and in much of the world.

On a more macro scale, and particularly if viewed from the framework of political philosophy, multiculturalism aims to respond to societal challenges posed by diversity. Outside the United States, multicultural thought emphasizes political and social change. In contrast, the U.S. focus is on educational reform, first and foremost. Multiculturalism opposes assimilation and instead endeavors to preserve group identities and protect endangered identities. Multiculturalism seeks empowerment of the oppressed or neglected, including "immigrants who are ethnic and religious minorities...minority nations (e.g.
Indeed, there exist additional wealth, and more. The idea of the “melted society” was a useful way of understanding society at large, and to love U.S. We were taught to constantly encounter in the nation, apparent from the reality of the Chinese construct made.

Conclusion

Diverse society, or heterogeneous society, or transnational society all describe a Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of diverse members of diverse cultures and civilizations.” Large, reflecting, or interdependent for a society, constituent parts of our reality. In the context of the framework of global challenges and globalized identities, the emphasis is on educational integration and instead of segregated identities. Expected, including minority nations (e.g., Catalans, Basque, Welsh, Québécois), and indigenous peoples” (Song 2016, 1). It might call for group-differentiated rights that propose laws or practices apart from those of the dominant culture, for example tribal autonomy.

A justification for multiculturalism is found in the “politics of recognition” because “identities are formed dialogically” (Song 2016, 3). (The dialogic formation of identity is, in part, what is meant by “contested” culture.) It is harmful for both minority groups and the dominant society if one or both of them are met with indifference or negativity because the machinery of hatred, oppression, and neglect is costly to both. In contrast, it is affirming and enriching to be recognized and valued, and to proffer recognition and value, because all people have the opportunity to rise. Multiculturalism favors freedom from domination and redresses historical injustice (Song 2016).

Multiculturalism and Pluralism in Education

U.S. multiculturalism, which has historically been expressed as educational reform, has its origins in the civil rights movements of the 1960s. By the 1980s, a literature of multicultural education was burgeoning, with the objective of redressing wrongs of an educational system that shortchanged minority and economically disadvantaged communities, in addition to girls and women and the disabled (Gorski 1999). The drive was to create curricula that were inclusive of the histories and achievements of nondominant groups (i.e., those other than heterosexual white Christian men) and catalyze societal change to address inequities between dominant and disempowered groups.

In the context of higher education in the twenty-first century, Dalton and Crosby (2013) differentiate among diversity, multiculturalism, and pluralism, with each characterized by distinct educational approaches and moral bases. Diversity describes major human differences of the mind, the heart, the body, or circumstance. The hallmark of multiculturalism is the development of a means to advance the understanding of diversity through the curriculum or cocurriculum. In Dalton and Crosby’s framework, pluralism goes a step further than multiculturalism (as an ethic or a pedagogy) insofar as it incorporates action-based learning directed toward social justice and is the key educational approach to mobilizing students beyond a passive or indifferent embrace of
multiculturalism. Dalton and Crosby assert that the association of diverse populations or individuals makes a society stronger than one that is not so characterized, a tenet of faith that rings true to any intercultural educator. Likewise, Mannix and Neale (2005) find that through careful consideration of participants’ meta-contexts, teams that are comprised of diverse members lend themselves to enhanced creativity.

Intersectionality

The problematic of multiculturalism is all the more complex because identities of individuals, and groups comprised of similar individuals, are often overlapping or “intersectional,” and thus the marginalized may be further marginalized as one aspect of identity may be privileged above another. For example, the acknowledgement of women in multicultural curricula and women’s issues in civic life aims to redress the dominant male idiom; however, it also specifically acknowledges the white women of the dominant U.S. society, while women of color are submerged as a minor focus relative to the dominant culture (Crenshaw 1991). Women of color are relegated to issues of color, as if communities of color are monolithic (in this instance, not recognizing sex or gender), or marginalized within the community of color itself. Crenshaw adds that, “Because of their intersectional identity as both women and of color within discourses that are shaped to respond to one or the other, women of color are marginalized within both” (1991, 1244). The intersections and marginalization of identities that are often confronted by women of color are also seen in the experiences of international students and those studying abroad.

Intersectionality has specific currency in the field of international education as students and scholars experience an upending of their self-identities, replaced with that of “foreigner” or some apparent phenotypic marker. Immigrant or visiting students of color might be identified with domestic minorities (Olson, Evans, and Shoenberg 2007, 2), while minority students abroad might be identified simply by their nationality (Cornwell and Stoddard 1999, 8; see also chapter 3 of this volume). For example, Willis (2015) describes the double-bind of microaggressions directed toward black women while studying abroad. In white-majority venues, these microaggressions might include the use of terms such as foreign, as foreign, the black, might or monolinearism (Willis 2015 margin).
include a refusal of service or unwanted touching or forwardness. In “heritage” destinations, black women who study abroad may be identified solely as foreigners or U.S. Americans or by invidious distinctions on the basis of the blackness or fairness of their skin. In either scenario, microaggressions might manifest in the form of remarks from non-black peers or the sheer loneliness of being one of a minority among white peers in a foreign land (Willis 2015). In this case, the students’ intersecting identities lead to further marginalization while abroad.

Inclusion

Inclusion is what makes a pluralistic or multicultural society or organization work. Inclusion or “inclusive excellence” is very much in the human resources lexicon of business and academic institutions, as well as society at large. In the context of the workplace, Shore et al. define inclusion “as the degree to which an employee perceives that he or she is an esteemed member of the work group through experiencing treatment that satisfies his or her needs for belongingness and uniqueness” (2011, 1265). Substitute student, scholar, or person for “employee” and group for “work group” and this serves as a fine definition of inclusion for a campus or society.

Internationalization and International Education

“International” is not an old word. Its origins are in the late eighteenth century with Jeremy Bentham using the term while referring to the law of nations (OED 2016b). In its current usage as an adjective, it is chiefly “designating or relating to relations between two or more nations or organizations made up of nations” (OED 2016b). The *Oxford English Dictionary* also notes use of the word when designating one from another country, “frequently in international student” (OED 2016b).

“Global,” by contrast, refers to the orb that is planet Earth, or in different contexts, to universal phenomena. As an adjective, it does not emphasize national boundaries. Some people use “international” and “global” as synonyms, but they are not. International requires the national and one’s location in a bounded nation-state. Global does not; global includes one in the global whole.
In the United States, staff and students who participate in multicultural programming are predominantly representative of the populations that are being served or under study. While in the case of international programs, staff and faculty are predominantly white or international (Noronha 1992, 56) and the majority (73 percent) of education abroad participants are white (Institute of International Education 2016). The same has been said of area studies until recent years, with the predominance of white people (59 percent of area studies graduates in 2015 [Data USA 2017]) studying and objectifying “others” (Cornwell and Stoddard 1999, 19). The advent of area studies was a U.S. and Western post-World War II response to perceived strategic threats posed by the beginning ascendancy of China and the Soviet Union and decolonization in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Fittingly, Cornwell and Stoddard suggested aligning area studies and international studies with postcolonial studies as a means of decentering Eurocentric discourse, which is consonant with a principal goal of multicultural education to decolonize knowledge and learning (1999, 19).

**Interculturalism**

Interculturalism is a key strategy for reconciling the divergences between multicultural and international education. Cornwell and Stoddard consider it to be “the existential manifestation of globalization” and define it as “the application of approaches developed within U.S. multiculturalism to international contexts” (1999, 17). Interculturalism takes into account the mixing of people from different backgrounds, domestic and international, and the skills required for communication.

Borrowing from the field of intercultural communication, interculturalism assumes that there are general principles for interactions across cultures, whether international or domestic. Intercultural communication is generally face-to-face between people of different cultures, but of course, the term can also refer to the study of such communication. It differs from cross-cultural communication, which generally refers to a comparative study of culturally distinct modes of communication and is essentially in the province of ethnology and anthropological linguistics (Gudykunst 2003, pp. vii-viii).
Interculturalism and Multiculturalism

Taylor makes the following distinction: “if multiculturalism in the generic sense includes policies which aim both at recognition of difference and integration, one might argue that the prefix ‘multi’ gives greater weight to the first goal—acknowledging diversity—while ‘inter’ invokes more the fact of integration” (2012, 416). Taylor asserts, for example, that interculturalism is a superior frame for much of Europe, as small countries with unique languages and traditions cope with upsurges in immigration and the homogenizing onslaught of globalization (2012, 420). The editors of the current edition of Learning Across Cultures are in agreement with Taylor, suggesting that interculturalism is an active frame, while multiculturalism leans toward an expository frame.

In trying to distinguish between interculturalism and multiculturalism, Meer and Modood note that many authors promote interculturalism as assuming a “social or convivial ‘openness’ in which communication is facilitated,” versus a tendency toward mere tolerance in the case of multiculturalism (2011, pp. 8–9). However, Meer and Modood conclude that the differences between the two paradigms are insufficient to seal the obsolescence of multiculturalism.

Will Kymlicka is one of multiculturalism’s most vigorous proponents (see Kymlicka 2012). Kymlicka notes that multiculturalism is often lampooned by critics as treating cultural markers of ethnic groups (e.g., samosas, steel drums, and sari) as authentic tidbits to be preserved by ethincs for the consumption by others as a spectacle (Kymlicka 2010, 98; quoting Yasmin Alibhai-Brown). However, Kymlicka counters the critique by returning to the foundations of multiculturalism as a movement that was inspired by struggles for decolonization and civil rights and is based on human rights and an ethos of equality (2010, 100).

Globalization

Internationalization is a response to “globalization,” a twentieth-century description of a process of increasing interrelatedness of economic and cultural relationships and dependencies worldwide (OED 2016a). A process with ancient antecedents evident in imperial histories and the flows of goods, languages, and ideas over the millennia. The process of globalization was, of course, slow when it was undertaken on foot, horseback, or by wind-borne
ships, but as electronic communications have advanced, people have exponentially accelerated the quantity and pace of the information exchange that drives it.

Globalization can be said to diminish diversity through the introduction of cultural homogeneity. For example, Hollywood and Bollywood films are viewed worldwide; English has become a global lingua franca (and the lingua franca of the Erasmus Program, Europe’s crown jewel of internationalization in education); the same burger joint and coffee shop can be found almost anywhere; identical consumer goods are coveted across countries; and more. When the burger chain’s stores in India replace beef with mutton and add masala, that is “glocalization,” a process of changing an exogenous global product to cater to local tastes (Blatter 2017).

**Globalization in Higher Education**

Globalization is characterized by the competition of a global marketplace, while many of the objectives of internationalization seem to be driven by ideals of knowledge production and sharing and the exchange of students, scholars, and resources. Yet de Witt notes that “increasing competition in higher education and the commercialisation and cross-border delivery of higher education have challenged the value traditionally attached to cooperation, such as exchanges and partnerships” (2011, 242). There is not necessarily a true antagonism between the globalization and internationalization of education because objectives have merged as the higher education sector has adapted to the new normal of globalization. This new normal views higher education as a tradable commodity (Brandenburg and de Witt 2011), with institutions competing for shares of international students. Our students are, themselves, commodities in the global education market.

Students are, of course, subject to any of the universal benefits and critiques of globalization. Students benefit from a global education by way of added exposure and experience and the enhanced learning that comes from the immediacy of information transmission. They might be perceived as victims, however, in terms of the erosion of geographic and cultural uniqueness and the subordination of learning and pastoral objectives to corporate and economic
imperatives (even as they are unwitting vectors of such change). Some students and educators view competence in English as a means of advancement; even as other languages become obscure or are overwhelmed with loan words as a result. Some are glad to be able to obtain almost any consumer good from anywhere, while others prefer more heterogeneity in taste and all that can be learned from the preservation of local traditions.

**Cosmopolitanism**

Students are participants in the global scene, but are they global citizens? Woolf describes the notion of global citizenship as an oxymoron because the globe suggests a unity, with its stratosphere, while citizenship denotes belonging to a nation-state bound by borders, of which there are many incised on the globe (2013, 24).

Some authors use the term “cosmopolitanism” as an alternative to global citizenship and the notion of “cosmopolitan” education as an alternative to international or global learning. Cosmopolitanism can imply world citizenship, which entails a taste for world consumption with no particular commitment to world good or a state of mobility and openness to world diversity coupled with a sense of responsibility for world good (Gristwood and Woolf 2013, 12). Gristwood and Woolf choose the latter description, and Woolf further makes the point that the definition of cosmopolitanism, at its core, reduces to an intentional effort at being better educated and learning something of the social (or international) “other” (2013). In turn, this facilitates a better understanding of oneself and one’s own group through the prism of the other and helps one become a better citizen of one’s own country (Woolf 2013). Woolf makes the point that citizenship is an absolute, ascribed status—one is, or one is not, a citizen—while cosmopolitanism is learned and is therefore in the province of education, truly the stuff of learning across cultures (2013, 25).

**Intersections**

This chapter opens with commentary on the ambiguity of the international education lexicon. “Intersections” is, in part, a kinder way of describing it. A brief review of the terms discussed in this chapter follows.
The culture concept suggests that all extrascopic, or external and distinct from the human body, adaptations are in response to and reflect social and physical environments. A culture is a group of people sharing a common origin and location and a set of adaptations, which can include traditions, beliefs, and technologies. A society is similar, but with an emphasis on the interactions among those people.

International and global have overlapping meanings. International suggests crossing borders, and that the one who does so, sojourns among foreign others. Global connotes the universal and can be construed as including oneself at home.

In the context of education, globalization and internationalization intersect to some degree but also diverge significantly. Even in the domain of higher education, globalization cannot be divorced from its market-based meanings. Competition for students, resources, and rankings are inevitably part of any comprehensive internationalization plan, whether explicitly or implicitly.

Multiculturalism and pluralism are much the same in describing a society comprised of many ethnicities. A multicultural society describes a diverse society, but diversity goes well beyond the usual markers of multiculturalism, namely, ethnicity and national origin. Pluralism takes multiculturalism a step further in that it incorporates action-based learning that is directed toward social justice and mobilizing students.

Inclusion is part of the character of multiculturalism and a constructive response to diversity. Intersectionality describes the complexity of super-diversity and the multiple identities and statuses that individuals and groups may carry, negotiate, and contest.

Intercultural, as an adjective, suggests active communication, and interculturalism suggests a dynamism and sensitivity that proponents say is lacking in multiculturalism. Intercultural learning or communication may be a tool to bridge the gap between domestic multicultural learning and international learning. In fact, some authors suggest that intercultural learning is the international counterpart to multicultural. Some authors would argue that while multiculturalism and interculturalism do not modify learning, education,
or communication in precisely the same ways, there is also little practical or applied difference between the two.

A global citizen is an adept at intercultural communication who has assimilated means of communication and empathies that transcend cultural bounds. In a literal sense, a global citizen is also an oxymoron because the global aspect implies a larger sense of unity, while citizenship is defined in relation to the borders surrounding nation-states. Cosmopolitanism denotes an ease and sense of belonging in the world. Cosmopolitan knowledge empowers one to be a better participant and citizen of one’s own nation or culture and, similarly, a cosmopolitan will have learned effective intercultural communication.

The intersections of these and other terms in the international education lexicon can both help and complicate their usage. However, it is important for us to acknowledge these intersections and where they exist in the ongoing dialogue.

Sites of Learning Across Cultures
The aspects of intersections that have been neglected in this chapter thus far include the sorts of interactions that are required for learning across cultures, and the who and where that surround those interactions. The earlier editions of Learning Across Cultures focused on students and scholars on university campuses or programs outside of their home countries and the staff, faculty, and counselors who support them. While that audience and focus is certainly still a big part of this edition, the purview is greater.

Since the early 1990s, perhaps it can be said that intercultural communication (formerly implying the international) has claimed domestic multiculturalism. Progress toward uniting international and multicultural learning—called for by Noronha (1992, 59); Cornwell and Stoddard (1999); Olson, Evans, and Shoenberg (2007); and others—has advanced. Both international and domestic community-based learning and service learning are more institutionalized than ever before, and some colleges and universities feel it is an increasingly important mission to serve local communities and imbue in their students an ethos for service. People in and outside the academy are inclined
to “think globally, act locally,” the other meaning of the portmanteau, “global” (Jenkins-Scott 2013).

**Internationalization at Home**

Community-based learning undergirds the “internationalization at home” (iH) movement, which took off in the late 1990s in Europe. As a site of learning across cultures, iH serves as a way to provide international experience to the vast majority of students who are constrained from traveling abroad, and it offers a way to provide service to burgeoning immigrant communities such as those in Malmö, Sweden, from which the movement spread (Wächter 2003, pp. 5–6). U.S. models of multicultural education helped form the European iH pedagogy.

While service learning and community-based learning in the United States are not new concepts, and iH had some early U.S. proponents (e.g., Mestenhauser 2003), interest in iH is increasingly entering into discussions in the field. Concern over the carbon footprint of student mobility has amplified the spotlight on iH as well. A key structural element of internationalization at home, however, is building the institutional leadership and resources that are needed to see intercultural agendas come to fruition on campus and in the local community (Hudzik 2011, 9). In response, there is growing movement toward establishing a relevant NAFSA member interest group on iH to help address and further explore those issues of institutional support.

**Learning Across Cultures in Today’s World**

The sites and modes of learning across cultures are many and varied, in local communities and abroad, and under the aegis of credit-bearing coursework and cocurriculum as well as unconnected with the academy. Our vocabulary and foci evolve with the times, as do our challenges. For example, the chapters comprising this volume were prepared during the 2016 U.S. presidential election and revised during the first few months of the new administration. The campaign and electoral victory of Donald Trump has reinvigorated the primacy of phenotypic race—as well as national origin, religion, sexuality, and educational attainment—as a marker of diversity. Moreover, factions
within the U.S. white Christian dominant culture feel besieged by the focus
on, or ascendency of, others unlike them. In the days following the Trump
electoral victory, overtly racist, xenophobic, and homophobic incidents took
place on campuses throughout the United States. “Time to... go arrest and
torture those deviant university leaders spouting off that diversity garbage,”
said one flyer distributed in men’s restrooms on a public university campus in
Texas that aimed at challenging diversity, multiculturalism, civility, and more
(Dickerson and Saul 2016).

The politics of race, as scientifically debunked as race is, has conjoined with
a bold resurgence of anti-science and anti-intellectual sentiment that has been
expressed in climate change denial and the appointment of numerous individ-
uals to the cabinet of the U.S. government who are hostile to and ignorant of
environmental protection, human welfare, education, and other critical issues.
Indeed, some people purport that anti-intellectualism, rather than bigotry or
illusory economic and political promises, explains the Trump electoral victory
(Krugman 2017). This intellectual mistrust, along with waves of xenophobia,
also figure into the narrow victory of the 2016 Brexit referendum in the
United Kingdom and the ascendency of numerous far-right, anti-immigrant,
and isolationist movements throughout Europe.

The reemergence of a divisive politics of race, xenophobia, and anti-intel-
lectualism has set a new bar and new boundaries for learning across cultures.
But is it new? By definition, if it is a “reemergence,” it is not new. We have
seen the rise and fall of different iterations of the same crusade numerous
times in the past century alone, in nearly every corner of the world. However,
we have witnessed histories that show that such movements can fail to
understand the importance of our work and the field at large.

Learning across cultures helps us to combat such intolerance by connecting
and embracing students, faculty, staff, and community members on campus,
at home, abroad, and across the tracks. It typically engages high-impact exper-
iential pedagogies, taking learning out of the classroom and across cultural
bounds, whether local or distant. With empathy and wonder, it recognizes all
people.
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