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Transnational Scholarship: Building Linkages between the U.S. Africanist Community and Africa

Paul Tiyambe Zeleza

Relations between the U.S. Africanist community and Africa are marked by complex connections, contestation, and challenges engendered by the intellectual, institutional, and ideological diversity of scholarly cultures, capacities, and commitments both in the United States and on the African continent. As we enter the new century, the scholarly enterprise on both sides of the Atlantic faces many perils and possibilities, both old and new, requiring innovative forms of engagement. Historically, as I have argued elsewhere, the patterns of academic exchange between the United States and Africa have been unbalanced. They are patterns that contemporary processes of globalization have helped reinforce and recast.

To restructure and strengthen linkages between the U.S. Africanist community and African institutions and scholars on the continent, it is important to understand the changes that are taking place in both regions. Besides the continuing problems of funding, area studies programs in the United States face disciplinary, demographic, and delivery pressures: disciplinary because of opposition in certain disciplines and competition from various interdisciplinary fields, demographic because of the changing composition of faculties and classrooms, and delivery because of the technologies and utilities of instruction and research. Institutions of higher education and research in Africa have also become more complex during the past two decades. Alongside the increasingly underfunded public universities, the number of private universities and independent research centers, associations, and networks has grown, altering the processes of knowledge creation and consumption, the patterns of institutional governance and access, and the possibilities of academic exchanges.

This short essay seeks to explore the linkages that have been built and could be built between the U.S. Africanist community and Africa in this era of so-called globalization. At a basic level, globalization of higher education refers to the internationalization of university personnel and programs in terms of teaching, research, and public service, the ubiquitous triple mandate by which universities swear in their mission statements.

Africa's international academic relations or exchanges flow among the African countries themselves and between these countries and those on other continents, including the United States. These flows take several forms, such as the physical mobility of academic staff and students, the networking of research and libraries, and the collaboration on curricula development, programs, seminars, and conferences. The essay is divided into three parts. The first briefly examines the traditional unequal academic exchanges between Africa and the United States. The second analyzes the patterns of linkages developed more recently. The third explores the implications of African intellectual migrations—the "brain drain"—to the United States on building more productive linkages across the Atlantic.

Old Patterns of Exchange

Academic exchanges between the United States and Africa involve student and faculty exchange programs, short-term training programs, and technical assistance for specific projects. For the African studies community in the United States, it is the student and faculty exchange programs that are most crucial. Clear imbalances exist in the flow of students and faculty between the United States and Africa. The imbalances in student flow are evident not only in the numbers of students involved, but also in the students’ levels, lengths, and fields of study and in social composition. Academic mobility between Africa and the United States lags far behind that among other regions. In 1999–2000, only two African countries were among the top 30 countries sending students to the United States, led by Kenya with 5,684 students (ranking 20th) and Nigeria with 3,602 (28th). Ghana, with 2,127 students, came in at number 45; Egypt, with 1,964, at 49; South Africa, with 1,962, at 50; Morocco, with 1,607, at 58; Ethiopia, with 1,285, at 63; Zimbabwe, with 1,184, at 65; Tanzania, with 1,091, at 67; and Botswana, with 1,053, at 70. Taiwan, fifth on the list, sent nearly one-and-a-half times more students to the United States than the above 10 African countries combined. All together, Asian countries, led by China, accounted for seven of the 10 leading senders, or 54.4 percent of the total, fol-
followed by Europe with 15.2 percent, Latin America with 12.1 percent, the Middle East with 6.8 percent, Africa with 5.9 percent, North America with 4.7 percent, and Oceania with 0.9 percent.3

Even more dismal are the statistics for American students going to Africa. By the mid-1990s, there were 107 programs, most of them created after 1990, sponsored by 68 institutions and consortia in 23 African countries.4 More than half the programs were for a single semester or summer session. 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 30 destinations: 891 American students went to South Africa, and 627 went to Ghana.

As for the levels of study, 90 percent of the American students abroad were undergraduate, mostly juniors and seniors, and 9 percent were graduate students. Of foreign students, only 46 percent were undergraduates, and 42 percent were graduate students. The rest were nondegree students. Also, foreign students stayed far longer in the United States than did American students in other countries. The former often spent years pursuing their degree programs, whereas Americans studying abroad, despite their rising numbers, stayed for shorter periods, mostly for a semester or less. In 1998–1999, 38 percent spent one semester, another 34 percent spent a summer, and fewer than 10 percent a whole academic year.5

The imbalances can also be seen in the fields of study. Foreign students largely came to the United States for the sciences and professions. In contrast, Americans went abroad for the social sciences and humanities. The top fields of study for foreign students at U.S. institutions in 1999–2000 were business (20 percent), engineering (15 percent), mathematics and computer science (11 percent), social sciences (8 percent), and physical and life sciences (8 percent). For their part, American students concentrated on the social sciences and humanities (35 percent), business (18 percent), foreign languages (8 percent), fine or applied arts (8 percent), physical sciences (7 percent), education (4 percent), health sciences (4 percent), engineering (3 percent), mathematics and computer science (2 percent), and agriculture (1 percent). The rest were in undeclared and other fields. Comparisons of the academic levels of the foreign and American students also show imbalances. The low percentage for foreign languages suggests that few American students knew the languages of the countries they visited, other than English, with less than 10 percent learning foreign languages.

In terms of gender and racial composition, several discrepancies are noticeable. Among foreign students, 58 percent were men and 42 percent were women, whereas among the Americans, women predominated with 65 percent, compared with 35 percent for men. Less comparable but quite meaningful in the American context is the racial distribution. White students made up 85 percent of the study-abroad students; Hispanics, 5 percent; Asian Americans, 4 percent; African Americans, 3 percent; American Indians, 1 percent; and multiracial, 1 percent. Thus, American students abroad were predominantly undergraduate White females who went for short periods to study the social sciences and humanities. By contrast, foreign students were largely male graduate students of color seeking to earn their degrees in the United States in the sciences and the professions.

The reasons for the imbalance 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. For their part, African universities are not always enamored of American students, whom they sometimes find poorly prepared academically and culturally and whom they view as exhibiting intolerable racial and class arrogance, suffering from the safari syndrome, and showing 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 programs to be effective and sustainable, genuine reciprocity is imperative.6

Clearly, more equitable student exchanges require that African studies programs in the United States expand their disciplinary and demographic reaches. Fields in the sciences and professions, which predominate in attracting African students to the United States, need better incorporation into African studies programs. Such incorporation would facilitate more meaningful interactions between African students in the United States and American students in African universities and provide them with both the broad humanistic and scientific literacies essential for a pedagogical and scholarly enterprise fueled by developmentalist ambitions. Promoting greater genuine reciprocity in student exchanges and incorporating more African American students into African study-abroad programs in Africa would help deepen study-abroad experiences for African and American students alike.

Similarly, Africa is not a major source or destination for faculty exchanges. In 2000–2001, African countries accounted for a relatively small percentage of academics visiting American universities: 3.0 percent, as compared with 37.7 percent for Asia and 42.3 percent for Europe. The African country with the most scholars visiting U.S. institutions was Egypt with 671 (ranked 22nd), followed by South Africa, with 327 (39th) and Nigeria with 176 (50th). These figures should be compared with those of China, first in the number of visiting scholars with 14,772.7 As with the African students, most of the visiting scholars were in the sciences and professions. Disincentives exist on both sides of the Atlantic.
that make faculty exchanges difficult. Funding is a central issue for African scholars wishing to go to American universities. Also, few African scholars are Americanists, and few work in reputable scientific institutions, confining them to underfunded African studies programs or second-rate American universities. To American academics immersed in the conceits of European- and American-centered cultures or the universality of science, the intellectual value of African scholarship is not self-evident. Even in the best of circumstances, strong institutional disincentives exist in faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure procedures that discourage American academics from participating in long-term, mutually beneficial relationships with their counterparts abroad. In the highly competitive, publish-or-perish madhouse of the American academy, tenure clocks are known to favor mass production, which often precludes prolonged collaborative research and copublishing with overseas colleagues.

This situation often means that it is academics from the less prestigious universities, those without tenure or those marginalized by or committed because of age, nationality, race, gender, or discipline, who may be more willing to engage in scholarly exchanges. The difficulties of establishing new linkages between African and American scholars cannot be underestimated. Incentive structures are required to encourage scholars who might wish to maintain active collaborations with institutions and colleagues in Africa. The foundations, national research institutes and councils, university consortia, and professional associations have a role to play in sensitizing universities to the benefits of international education and transforming the reward structures that penalize academic exchange and mobility. The inclusion of African scholars in some programs of the Social Science Research Council is a move in the right direction. Also critical is the appointment of Africans to senior positions in some of the key American foundations involved with African education and research, such as the Ford, Rockefeller, MacArthur, and Carnegie foundations. Some of these foundations and agencies require collaboration between American researchers and partners in Africa, Asia, and Latin America before they will fund a project, though United States–based specialists often set the research priorities and agendas. Encouraging more multinational thematic research involving American and African researchers is long overdue. In short, given their financial and professional muscle, the foundations and university associations could facilitate new linkage programs built around joint appointments and the funding of leaves of absence to work in African institutions, international collaborative research competitions, and innovative electronic systems of instruction.

As with students, scholars in the sciences and professional fields are often not part of the African-studies–sponsored faculty exchanges between African and American institutions. Scientists in American research universities do not think they have much to gain by going abroad to work with colleagues in laboratories that are less well equipped than their own. Moreover, African scientists are rarely invited by their American counterparts, if they are known at all. This kind of exchange is one more reason for African studies programs in the United States to expand their academic tents to include the sciences and professional fields rather than remain as special fiefdoms of the humanities and social sciences. Cultivating collaborations with scientists will require far more resources, including the revitalization of research laboratories and other infrastructures in African universities.

Emerging Patterns of Exchange

During the 1990s, new patterns of academic exchange and mobility between American and African universities began to emerge. Three can be identified: (1) the growth of what is called transnational education; (2) the globalization of American scholarly societies; and (3) the expansion of online education. Transnational education often involves the establishment of overseas university branches, not a new phenomenon, of course. But what is new is the scale. Establishing overseas university branches is facilitated by the growing privatization of higher education around the world. These branches are growing rapidly in Africa. For example, following legislation authorizing private higher education in Senegal in 1998, it was announced that Suffolk University in Boston would develop a branch campus in Dakar. A better-known example is that of the United States International University, recently renamed Alliant International University, which has six campuses in the United States and two overseas campuses, one in Nairobi, Kenya, and the other in Mexico City.

Also, more American scholarly associations are expanding their global reach by aggressively recruiting foreign members, including from Africa. To quote Beth McMurtrie, "From the Organization 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." McMurtrie attributes this broadening to three factors: (1) American academics are becoming global in their outlook; (2) the collapse of communism opened up communication with Eastern Europe and expanded research there and interest in international research generally; and (3) the powerful impact of the Internet.
International distance education using the Internet is expanding rapidly, enabling American universities to export curricula and instructional expertise, especially in the lucrative fields of science, engineering, and business. In a relatively short time, universities have developed thousands of online programs across the United States in which overseas students can enroll. Some are specifically targeted at international students. However, 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, though the collaborative curriculum development project among Tufts University, Makerere University, and the University of Dar es Salaam serves as a fascinating example. Launched in January 2001, the project seeks to connect international-relations students at the three campuses through a shared Web site using asynchronous learning networks. It aims to promote interactive dialogue among students and 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. The challenge for African studies programs, therefore, is to use the new information technologies to promote instructional flow in both directions, not to reinforce U.S. dominance in online education.

We have been trying to grapple with some of these challenges at the Center for African Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). For example, in terms of our extracurricular programming, we not only invite African participants to all our major annual conferences, but also organize some of the conferences jointly with African institutions. These conferences include the Business Workshop, now in its seventh year and organized jointly with UIUC’s Center for International Business Education Research and the College of Commerce, held on a specific topic or theme, to which we invite entrepreneurs, policymakers, and academics from both the United States and Africa; the Media Workshop, now in its second year and organized jointly with the UIUC’s College of Communications; and the age-old Annual Spring Symposium, organized jointly with a college at UIUC and the relevant African institutions and addressing a theme of topical significance. The 2000 symposium on “Technology and Development in Africa,” for example, was organized jointly with the UIUC’s College of Engineering, the African Academy of Sciences, and the Third World Academy of Sciences, whose executive director was the keynote speaker. The 2002 symposium on “African Universities in the 21st Century” was organized jointly with the UIUC’s College of Education, the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA), and the Association of African Universities. The latter symposium was held both in Champaign and Dakar, and the two sites—attended by 40 participants each—were connected through video. The CODESRIA Book Series and an American publisher, as part of an effort to encourage copublishing between Americans and Africans, will publish the selected proceedings jointly.

As for research, the center has encouraged multidisciplinary and multinational collaborative projects. One example is the project on “African Environment: Experience and Control,” funded by the MacArthur Foundation, which involved our faculty from agricultural economics, geography, history, and political sciences with colleagues in the social sciences and natural sciences in Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, and Mozambique. Another was a project on “Training the Next Generation of Africanists,” funded by the Ford Foundation, which facilitated student and faculty exchanges among UIUC and three African research networks: CODESRIA in Dakar; the Organization of Social Science Research in Eastern Africa in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; and the Center for Basic Research in Kampala, Uganda. Research seed grants required UIUC applicants to work with colleagues affiliated with the three institutions. As for instruction, in 2001–2002, UIUC implemented a project that brought 12 Kenyan students enrolled in doctoral programs at Kenyatta University for year-long coursework, after which they returned to Kenyatta to complete their studies. This program is intended to facilitate joint training and supervision of graduate students by Kenyatta and UIUC faculty and help stem the brain drain.

For both the conferences and the research projects, we deliberately reached out to nontraditional “area studies” colleges and disciplines on campus and to African institutions and scholars. We would like to expand these linkages to include collaborative instruction with African institutions using the new information technologies.

The Role of the Contemporary African Intellectual Diaspora

The subject of the brain drain has increasingly dominated debates about African academic exchanges and mobility. As noted in a recent special issue of African Issues, the subject of the brain drain raises difficult questions about Africa’s capacity building, development, transnationalism, and globalization. The growing presence of migrant African academics is reconstituting racialized divisions within the African studies community in the United States and recasting the perennial struggles for scholarly authority and accountability about the relevance and reliability, biases and boundaries, integrity and imperatives, ideological attachments and intellectual agendas of the Africanist enterprise. The bitter controversy surrounding Phillip Curtin’s 1995 diatribe against the “ghettoization of African history”—that African history standards were falling because universities employed too many Africans and Afri-
can Americans—is a testimony to the challenges that the contemporary African intellectual diaspora poses in the structure and reconstruction of academic relations across the Atlantic.\textsuperscript{12}

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. As Robyn Iredale notes, “The geographical circulation of intellectual elites and the resulting de- or multinationalization of knowledge is a phenomenon of the 20th century. ... A global labor market now exists in some occupations where a person’s skill is his/her greatest asset to be bought and sold.”\textsuperscript{13} Theoretical explanations for skilled migration range from the microlevel human-capital approach, which contends that individuals move to maximize gains from their investments in their educations and training, to the macrolevel structuralist, neo-Marxist perspective, which emphasizes the unequal development between core and periphery countries, the “structuration” approach, which 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, including the United States. 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. It should not be surprising, therefore, that African migrants in the United States are the most educated, compared with other migrant populations and native-born Americans. According to the 2000 census figures, 48.9 percent of African migrants in the 25-and-older age bracket had a bachelor’s degree or higher, compared with 44.9 percent of Asians, 32.9 percent of Europeans, 25.0 percent of South Americans, 5.5 percent of Central Americans, and 16.1 percent of native-born Americans. According to the 2000 census figures, 48.9 percent of African migrants in the 25-and-older age bracket had a bachelor’s degree or higher, compared with 44.9 percent of Asians, 32.9 percent of Europeans, 25.0 percent of South Americans, 5.5 percent of Central Americans, and 16.1 percent of native-born Americans in the same age bracket.\textsuperscript{14} The migration flows of the academics among the African migrants have been sustained by the intricate and intense educational networks that link universities in Africa with those in the United States, the recruitment drives and inducements of the United States. 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. It should not be surprising, therefore, that African migrants in the United States are the most educated, compared with other migrant populations and native-born Americans. According to the 2000 census figures, 48.9 percent of African migrants in the 25-and-older age bracket had a bachelor’s degree or higher, compared with 44.9 percent of Asians, 32.9 percent of Europeans, 25.0 percent of South Americans, 5.5 percent of Central Americans, and 16.1 percent of native-born Americans in the same age bracket.\textsuperscript{14} The migration flows of the academics among the African migrants have been sustained by the intricate and intense educational networks that link universities in Africa with those in the United States, the recruitment drives and inducements of various institutions and organizations, 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.”\textsuperscript{15}

African academic migration to the North is an outgrowth of complex movements of African intellectuals on the continent itself within and between countries. African intellectuals are members of complex networks linking universities and independent research centers in Africa to those in the North through training, publications, and research funding. Ali Mazrui’s suggestion, made in the late 1970s, that African universities functioned as branches of multinational corporations remains apt despite strenuous efforts at indigenization.\textsuperscript{16} This situation, of course, is not peculiar to Africa; contemporary processes of globalization have accelerated the trends toward intellectual transnationalization. Academics, through the very nature of their work and institutional affiliations, belong to globalizing and potentially globalized networks. African grant academics in the North constitute a community that offers African scholarship a unique entry and insertion into global research networks and engagements with historic African diaspora and African studies communities. They constitute an essential bridge in academic exchanges between Africa and the United States.

It stands to reason that the contemporary African academic diaspora is not homogeneous. It is divided in terms of preoccupations and prospects as much as by discipline and ideology. Abdoulaye Gueye, for example, has shown that in France, African migrants who hold doctorates in the social sciences and humanities do not prosper as well as those in the natural sciences.\textsuperscript{17} A study on rates of return of African doctoral students trained in North America between 1986 and 1996 reveal disciplinary differences. The highest rates of return to Africa were recorded for the life sciences (70 percent), followed by the social sciences (65 percent), education (62 percent), the physical sciences (56 percent), the humanities (54 percent), professional services (54 percent), and engineering (45 percent). The relatively low return rate for engineering, the physical sciences, and professional services might be attributed to high demand in North America, and for the humanities, it might be attributed to the low demand in Africa. The converse may help explain the high return rates for the life sciences, social sciences, and education, namely, “a relatively low demand in North America and a relatively high demand in the region [Africa] ... [T]hose fields with high return rates in our survey do loosely correlate with those fields prioritized by funding programs. Moreover, these programs frequently select for advanced training those Africans working on projects they are funding, and often hold open their jobs (or better ones) until their return.”\textsuperscript{18} As for ideological orientations, as F. Njubi Nesbitt suggests, the “double consciousness” of African academic migrants in the North produces three “types” of migrant intellectuals: the comprador intelligentsia, the postcolonial critic, and the progressive exile.\textsuperscript{19} One does not have to agree with this schema to recognize the ideological pluralism among migrant African academics.
African migrant academics are central to any process of improving academic discourse and exchange among the United States, other countries in the North, and Africa. To do so would mean that universities must carefully construct partnerships that embrace all key constituencies and components of the academic enterprise: on the one hand, students, faculty, and administrators, and on the other, teaching, research, and publishing. Building new international partnerships, mediated by Africa’s own diaspora, both the historic and the contemporary, will go a long way toward improving and strengthening the patterns of academic exchange and turning the brain drain into not just a potential “brain gain” but “brain mobility.” They should be in the forefront of establishing or strengthening the structures that facilitate the mobility alluded to earlier: joint appointments, online education, and supervision of graduate students; collaborative research; and copublishing. The establishment of academic journals by African migrant academics in the United States, including online journals, demonstrates the possibilities of promoting new modes of African scholarly production and communication between Africa and the United States and of overcoming the debilitating “document drain,” as Peter Limb calls it. The African academic diaspora can also assist in provincializing American scholarship and universalizing African scholarship and in curbing the self-referential solitude of scholarly discourses on both sides of the Atlantic.

Conclusion

There can be little doubt that the African studies community in the United States needs to strengthen and restructure its linkages with African institutions and scholars. Many Africanists maintain personal linkages with colleagues in African countries. Similarly, African studies programs in various universities seek to promote linkages with counterparts across the continent. The African Studies Association (ASA) has a role to play in coordinating some of these efforts. As the premier Africanist scholarly association in the nation, it has a responsibility to promote critical and informed public debate among U.S. policymakers, business leaders, the nongovernmental organization community, and the popular media and discussion about African issues and relations between Africa and the United States.

In building more effective linkages with Africa, it is necessary to expand the field of African studies to incorporate previously ignored or marginalized disciplines and groups. In disciplinary terms, African studies programs and the ASA would benefit from an active policy of incorporating scholars who carry out research in North Africa, as well as those who are in the natural sciences and professional fields. Outside the national and regional organizations, many of the key research centers, networks, and associations in Africa tend to be continental, such as CODESRIA, and to be in the natural sciences and professions. An expanded concept of African studies in the United States would help build more meaningful and mutually beneficial relations with African institutions and scholars. In the same vein, it would be useful for ASA to work more closely with other Africa-related associations that cater to specific disciplines or to African diaspora concerns and communities. The brokerage role of the contemporary African intellectual diaspora in these endeavors cannot be overemphasized.

Notes

1. More fundamentally, it refers to a process of capitalist globalization and an intellectual project of neoliberalism. For higher education, globalization entails what I call the six Cs: corporatization of management, or the adoption of business models for the organization and administration of higher-education institutions; collectivization of access, or growing massification of higher education; commercialization of learning, or the rapid expansion of private universities; commodification of knowledge, or increasing production, sponsorship, and dissemination of research by commercial enterprises and for-profit institutions; computerization of education, or the incorporation of information and communication technology into the knowledge activities of teaching, research, and publication; and connectivity of institutions, or more emphasis on institutional cooperation and coordination within and across countries. See Paul Tiyambwe Zeleza, Rethinking Africa’s Globalization, vol. 1, The Intellectual Challenges (Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, 2002).

2. In 1999–2000, there were 516,438 foreign students in the United States compared with 129,770 American students abroad. Although the majority of foreign students came from Asia (54.4 percent), most of the American students went to Europe (62.7 percent). By contrast, Europeans accounted for only 15.2 percent of foreign students in the United States, and only 6 percent of U.S. students went to Asia. See Chronicle of Higher Education, Almanac 2001–2002 48, no. 1 (August 31, 2001).


6. For a more detailed discussion of the problems and possibilities of student exchanges between the United States and Africa, see the special issue on “Study Abroad in Af-


8. Beth McMurtrie, “America’s Scholarly Societies Raise Their Flags Abroad,” *Chronicle of Higher Education* (January 28, 2000): A53. There is always the danger that American societies, typically larger and more prosperous than their foreign counterparts, may be intrusive and undermine foreign societies. To avoid this, some American groups have created membership agreements with those organizations. Under the agreements, membership in a scholar’s home organization earns him or her special privileges, such as a discounted rate on membership in the American society.


