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Abstract

This paper considers aspects of higher education and globalization within the context of danger. Should colleges and universities continue to offer overseas travel-study programs in the age of international terrorism? At the post-secondary level, overseas educational programs have provided singular learning experiences for students, as well as considerable financial return to their home institutions. But, are such endeavors now questionable, because of danger and potential legal liabilities? In this paper, works in print and historical evidence are reviewed, relevant to globalization and danger in higher education. The University of Guam’s field program in Bali, Indonesia is examined as a case study. University of Guam students’ voices are heard, as they share recent overseas travel-study experiences. The paper concludes that, within the context of globalization and danger, academic scholars must now empower their university students with greater caution and awareness, while continuing to offer them innovative opportunities to engage the wider world that beckons them from afar.
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In this paper, we examine a particular challenge within the context of global education, that of post-secondary overseas travel-study programs and danger. Should universities and colleges around the world continue to offer overseas travel-study programs for their students in the Age of International Terrorism?

Integral to this discussion is the phenomenon of globalization. What is meant by the term globalization? Chiang et al. (2004: vi; 2003:1) define globalization as “…supra-national ideas and processes that cross national borders with impunity.” There are many other definitions of globalization, as well, that merit careful consideration. The paper presentations at the Globalization Conference held at the University of Trondheim, Norway, August 4-6, 2005, are relevant. The contributions of the Globalization Research Center at the University of Hawaii-Manoa, and their Globalization Research Network, are of great value. The journal Globalizations of the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, in the United Kingdom, explains the title of the journal as follows: “Moving to the plural Globalizations signifies a serious skepticism of the idea that there can ever be a single theory or interpretation of globalization. Globalizations encompasses global processes as well as global problems, and the nature and means of global solutions.”

To return to Chiang et al.’s definition of globalization cited above, the supranational ideas and processes that cross national borders with impunity serve to define the world as a smaller place than ever before. We can now more readily than ever encounter and engage the world’s people, near and far. But, what if they don’t like us, or think they don’t like us? In the context of this paper, travel-study means to spend focused time away from home, learning firsthand about “the other,” and also about oneself in the process. Danger refers to the unknown, the uncertain, and the inherent risks thereof, especially with regard to safety of life and limb. Many works in print (e.g., Eriksen, 2003; Featherstone, ed., 1991; Friedman, 1991; Lewellen, 2002; Pieterse, 1998; Schech and Haggis, 2000; Yamashita and Eades, eds., 2002) consider globalization and its impact on the world’s people. Lewellen (2002) divides the globalization process into the sub-processes of migration, transnationalism, diaspora, refugees, tribal cultures, and peasants, as singularly relevant to the anthropology of globalization. But, to what extent do these writers discuss the phenomenon of danger? In a search of the Index within each of these works, direct reference to danger is not apparent.

Diversity and differences between and among the world’s people are very real and very apparent, perhaps now more than ever before. Director Subha Barry within the global conglomerate Merrill Lynch (Gannett News Service 2004) discussed globalization and diversity at a three-day business summit at the United Nations Headquarters in New York. He stated: “We are recruiting…from the U.S., Europe…China…India… Having the best talent [from around the world] differentiates ourselves from other competitors.” But, distinguished senior anthropologist Dr. Clifford Geertz (2000:73) cautions: “…there is…the rise in awareness that universal consensus—trans-national, trans-cultural, even trans-class -- on normative matters is not in the offing. Everyone—Sikhs, Socialists, Positivists,
the Irish -- is not going to come around to a common opinion concerning what is decent and what is not, what is just and what is not, what is beautiful and what is not, what is reasonable and what is not; not soon, perhaps not ever.”

Overseas travel-study programs include both short-term and long-term academic endeavors away from the home institution of the students and, at times, of the faculty. The nature of overseas travel-study programs in the United States is variable from institution to institution. Most typically, junior-year-abroad programs are popular and well established at many of the American universities. Some, but not all, universities sponsor overseas travel-study programs in the form of field workshops and field schools in such academic disciplines as cultural anthropology, archaeology, and primate studies. Both of the present authors have directed or participated in overseas travel-study programs through their alma maters, University of Oregon and University of California at Berkeley, respectively, and their present institution of affiliation, the University of Guam, during the past three and one half decades. One of the present co-authors (R.S.) has directed anthropology field endeavors in Bali, Indonesia, during the period 1999 to 2007, involving university students from ten countries and academic faculty from six nations. There was an abrupt interruption of the Bali field endeavor in 2006. This interruption in 2006 was primarily caused by the prevailing climate of fear resulting from the second terrorist bombings in Bali in 2005.

Overseas travel-study programs are not new. The Greek scholar Herodotus traveled to Asia Minor in the 5th Century B.C. Marco Polo, a Venetian, left Italy in the 13th Century A.D. to travel eastward, to China, where he served in the Court of the renowned Kublai Khan (Bentley and Ziegler 2000). Did Columbus really discover America? It is possible that Chinese sailing junks reached America and elsewhere around the world as early as 1421 A.D. (Menzies 2003). In the Pacific, Captain James Cook’s exploration in the 18th century and the voyage of the Beagle with Charles Darwin on board in the 19th century are just two examples of many European explorations. Pioneers of modern overseas travel-study programs in the 20th century include those led by senior Japanese scholar Dr. Kinji Imanishi of Kyoto University in 1941, who traveled with his students to Micronesia for anthropological and ecological studies. His students included Tadao Umesao and Jiro Kawakita, both of whom later became leading scholars in Japanese anthropology and geography, respectively. Elsewhere in Asia and Europe, Professor Dorothy Garrod, the first female Disney Chair of Archaeology at Cambridge University in Great Britain, conducted overseas archaeological field research in Gibraltar, Anatolia, Bulgaria, Palestine, Southern Kurdistan and France, beginning in the 1930s. In 1938, Bruce Howe was a “green-horn graduate student” at Harvard University when he joined Professor Garrod’s five-month expedition to Anatolia and Bulgaria to document Paleolithic sites. Howe later worked with Dr. Robert J. Braidwood in Iraqi Kurdistan (http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/~pjs1011/Pams.html). Within American anthropology, the phenomenon of field schools or field studies is classic.

Over the years, many countries have successfully offered overseas travel-study opportunities for post-secondary students. In the United States, some of the well known programs include Fulbright Fellowships, Rhodes Scholarships, Woodrow Wilson Fellowships, Rockefeller Fellowships, the Student Project for Amity Among Nations (SPAN), National Student Exchange (NSE), and the like. Details about each of these programs can readily be found on the internet. Other comprehensive educational programs in the United States that welcome university students include EARTHWATCH (Stephenson and Kurashina, eds., 1989). University-level overseas study programs, in addition to providing students with singular learning opportunities, have achieved great prestige for the hosting institutions (e.g., websites of Michigan State University, University of Pennsylvania, and many others). In addition, it is likely that the considerable financial return to the host institutions, as an outcome of overseas travel-study programs, must also be considered to provide appeal on the institutional side.

In the age of globalization, overseas travel-study programs have become much broader in scope and geographic coverage. The number of students who choose to take part in overseas travel-study programs can be substantial. Foreign student exchange programs, internship programs, research expeditions, and various field schools at overseas venues fall under the general rubric of overseas travel-study programs. According to the online student newspaper of Indiana University (May 27, 2007), approximately 80 overseas programs are offered by Indiana University (idsnews.com). Annually, some 1600 out of 38,000 students enrolled at Indiana University choose to go abroad to study. To cite another example, the American Councils for International Education administers a number of programs that also include language internship programs, and undergraduate and graduate fellowships on behalf of their funding agencies (www.americancouncils.org).

Are University-level travel-study programs abroad now open to serious scrutiny? Is a major issue the potential legal liability for the hosting institution(s) if the unthinkable happens? Is a related issue the possible personal legal liability for faculty who teach such courses and travel with their students to overseas destinations? In the age of global education, these are new questions and challenges within higher education.

Our experiences with university-level overseas travel-study endeavors were at the doctoral (Ph.D.) level, and involved each of us traveling alone or in groups from our host institution to the overseas destination. R.S. set out from the University of Oregon to spend 18 months studying perception of environment on the island of Atiu, in the
southern Cook Islands, Polynesia, funded by the National Institute of Health in the USA, from January 1973 through July 1974. R.S. encountered seasickness (while traveling by ship between Rarotonga, the capital island, and Atiu), motor-cycle burns (falling off of her motorcycle), upset stomach problems (from getting used to eating new and different foods), and anxiety (about gathering sufficient data to write her doctoral dissertation). But there was never any reason to worry about the safety of her life, in terms of political or terrorism-related matters. H.K. departed from the University of California, Berkeley, to participate in the Tabun Archaeological Field School in Israel financed by the Smithsonian Institution and the National Science Foundation in the Summers of 1971 and 1972. H.K. observed the ongoing political development of Israel during his field stays in that country. H.K. also participated in field training in Malawi in 1972. He was a member of the University of California Archaeological Expedition to the Afar Region of Ethiopia for several field seasons in the 1970s and 1980s under the direction of the late Professor J. Desmond Clark. During the team’s field stay in Ethiopia in 1974, a coup led by an Ethiopian military officer brought down the government of then-Emperor Haile Sellassie. Fortunately, no harm was done to graduate students who were members of that University of California field team.

Within the present institution of the authors’ academic affiliation, the University of Guam, field schools in anthropology have been offered over the years. Faculty and students traveled to Ulithi atoll in the Federated States of Micronesia in 1992 to study contemporary island lifeways and coping strategies. In 1994, UOG faculty and students undertook a field study in ethnoprimitatology on the island of Ngeaur (Angaur) in the Republic of Palau (e.g., Wheatley 1999, Wheatley et al. 1998, Wheatley et al. 2000). Challenges for members of these field teams on islands in the western Pacific region included adjustments to local foods and local drinking water (which presented as stomach problems), hot tropical days without much shade, many mosquitoes, and sometimes unexpectedly complex human dynamics as may occur within small-scale societies. There was no apparent danger.

Semantics of the Word “Danger”

What does “danger” mean? In this paper, aspects of danger within the context of higher education and globalization are considered. “Danger” can be defined, simply, as the general term for “liability to injury, damage, loss or pain.” A related word, “hazard” implies “a foreseeable but uncontrollable possibility of danger and stresses the element of chance.” Another related word, “risk” implies “the voluntary taking of a dangerous chance.” “Vulnerability” is a state open to danger, hazard and other harmful forces.

Focusing upon the concept of “danger,” the present authors recognize the increasing semantic breadth and depth of the word, especially after the catastrophic September 9-11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the USA. The present authors have come to understand that danger can mean: a) real intrinsic danger, b) perceived danger that can vary from individual to individual, c) media-reported or media-hyped danger, d) potential danger that may be greatly influenced by chance, e) imminent danger wherein the time element is a significant factor; the term “threat” is usually meant to represent an imminent danger, and f) qualitatively coded danger.

After the terrorist attacks known as “9-11” in the USA in 2001, global terrorism has become the major concern affecting every segment of human society, including academic institutions of higher learning. Terrorism attacks have become much more frequent, and it seems, almost daily occurrences, as people watch news reports on television, and read world news in newspapers and on the internet. The circumstance that has significantly affected the University of Guam’s academic endeavor in Indonesia has been the two separate terrorist bombings that took place in Bali, Indonesia, on 10-12-2002 and 10-01-2005. Although University of Guam personnel were not present in Bali at the time of the bombings, the UOG 2006 Bali field endeavor was suspended by directives originating at the highest levels of administration on campus. The 2002 Bali bombing resulted in the death of 202 people, including 164 foreign nationals, 38 Indonesian citizens, and injuries affecting 209 people. The 2005 Bali bombing resulted in at least 20 deaths and 129 injuries, with a considerable number of innocent Indonesian victims among them (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2005_Bali_bombings; news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/2778923.stm).

Danger can be qualitatively coded. For example, the code established by the United States Homeland Security appears as a color-coded terrorism threat advisory scale. The advisory scale has been precisely constructed (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homeland_Security_Advisory_System). The scale is comprised of five color-coded threat levels that are intended to reflect or indicate the probability of a terrorist attack and its potential gravity, as follows:

- **Severe (red): severe risk**
- **High (orange): high risk**
- **Elevated (Yellow): significant risk**
- **Guarded (blue): general risk**
- **Low (green): low risk**
A project known as the Big Bang Project, under the auspices of the United States Department of Defense, makes an alarming prediction that global terrorism with the use of nuclear bombs might occur within the next five to ten years. It prophesizes the unthinkable in terms of the magnitude of danger. The survival or destruction of the globe is brought into attention (Dowie 2005). Though terrorism represents the most problematic and worrisome cause of danger, other major causes of danger on the global scale now include disease epidemics that can cause illness or even death in massive numbers, e.g. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS). Unexpected natural disasters such as earthquakes, tidal waves (tsunamis), and typhoons/cyclones seem perhaps more menacing to the health and safety of university field researchers than ever before.

Examples of Danger Experienced by University Students

A noteworthy example of danger experienced by university students in their overseas study program was the kidnapping of three Stanford University students along with a Dutch research assistant that took place at Gombe in Zaire (Congo) in 1975. The Stanford students were studying chimpanzees in their natural habitat with famed Primatologist Dr. Jane Goodall at the time. Recalling the incident some twenty years later, one of the kidnapped Stanford University students shared in an article written by Brian C. Aronstam (1998) in Stanford Magazine, “Personal security was never an issue [before the kidnapping occurred]... The sorts of things you worried about were more the mamba snakes, the copperheads, the occasional leopard.” The magazine article mentioned that the students were not warned of any risks to their safety, despite the fact that there was ongoing guerrilla activity (political) in eastern Zaire, some 34 miles away across Lake Tanganyika. The Stanford students and the Dutch research assistant were eventually freed, after negotiations and after the families of the students paid a ransom of U.S. $460,000 to the terrorist guerrillas.

In 1999, a University of Southern California Research Assistant in Anthropology from Canada and 14 eco-tourists who were tracking mountain gorillas in Uganda were taken hostage by terrorist guerrillas. In the course of the ordeal, eight of the eco-tourists were killed by their captors.

One of the present co-authors (H.K.) is aware of another incident in the late 1970s, when an archaeological field school team including a professor and students from a university in the USA (all will remain unidentified) was attacked by a group of bandits in East Africa. The leader of the archaeological team sustained serious injuries and the students were also subjected to harm. The nature of the harm was both physical and psychological.

Other dangers experienced by university students may not be directly linked to terrorism. The co-authors are mindful of a few other unfortunate incidents. An American student died from dehydration outside his archaeological camp after getting lost in the bush in East Africa. A graduate student from the Netherlands died after becoming severely dehydrated while fasting with the people in his study area in Indonesia. A young woman who was a Fulbright Scholar from the USA was killed unexpectedly by a mob in South Africa, apparently for being at the proverbial wrong place at the wrong time. Some other works in print can be found that address danger in the context of scholarly inquiry (e.g., Kovats-Bernat 2003).

A U.S. Congressional Hearing was held on Oct. 4, 2000, to address the topic of Safety in Study Abroad Programs. The Committee conducting the Hearing was the Congressional Committee on Education and the Workforce. The Subcommittee involved was the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. The 173 page Report that is an outcome of this U.S. Congressional Hearing is detailed and can be accessed online: http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs21/content_storage01/0000000b/80/00/db/08.pdf. In the Report, mention is made of traumatic events in Costa Rica, India, and Guatemala involving students registered in Study Abroad Programs offered by universities within the USA. In brief, the Hearing concluded that more than 100,000 Americans study abroad annually, and the number is increasing by 10% each year. The Report indicates that Study Abroad Programs in the USA lack overarching safety standards. Above all, according to the Report, students enrolled in such Programs need to be safe.

University of Guam’s Field Program in Bali, Indonesia: A Case Study

Beginning in Summer 1999, the University of Guam became a partner institution in the Balinese Macaque Project in Indonesia. The Project situated an international research team of faculty and students in Wanara Wana Monkey Forest in the town of Ubud, in the highlands of south-central Bali. The goal was to study the three constituent groups that consistently occupy Monkey Forest: the Macaca fascicularis monkeys that reside there, the local residents of the village of Padangtegal who regularly bring offerings to the temples in Monkey Forest, and the tourists who come to view all of the above. The research inquiry concerned sustainability, i.e., to what extent does Monkey Forest meet the needs of each of the constituent groups? If the situation has achieved steady state, is the
current situation sustainable? A number of works in print describe the macaques of Wanara Wana Monkey Forest in Padangtegal and the Balinese Macaque Project (Campbell 2006; Chiang et al., 2004; Iverson et al., 2000; Loudon et al. 2006; Stephenson et al., 2002; Wheatley 1999; and others).

During the five years of the Balinese Macaque Project, 1989-2002, Indonesia was consistently on the Warning List of the U.S. State Department. Americans were advised about instability in the region, and cautioned regarding travel to Indonesia. Nevertheless, the matter was viewed with some measure of calm at that time. Prospective faculty and student team members from the USA, other overseas countries (e.g., Mexico, Germany, Japan), and Guam were advised about the U.S. State Department Warning. To the best of the present co-authors’ knowledge, no prospective participant declined to join the Balinese Macaque Project because of his or her concern about danger.

Everything changed in October 2002, with the first terrorist bombing that occurred in Bali. The international component of the Balinese Macaque Project was put on hold. Indonesian academic colleagues at the Primate Center at Udayana University in Denpasar, Bali continued to monitor the well-being of the macaques in Monkey Forest, as they still do today.

The present authors hold in high esteem our international academic collaboration with Indonesian colleagues, and our cultural experiences shared with the Family of the Mawar at our homestay in Ubud. Considerable thought was given to initiating a University of Guam directed field project in Bali. In Spring 2004, an academic course entitled the Bali Field Workshop was taught at the University of Guam. Ten students and six international faculty members traveled to Ubud in Bali for one week, to engage the human community of Ubud (cf. Siongco et al. 2003). The endeavor was so successful that the project was undertaken the following year, again for one week, in Spring Semester 2005, this time utilizing the course title of Community Development. Once again, the project was inspiring and enlightening for all involved (Olivarez and Moore-Lin 2005).

Then, a most unexpected event occurred -- the second international terrorist bombing in Bali, in October 2005. This second bombing event was received with great alarm in many locales, including the University of Guam. The Administration of the University of Guam was concerned about safety if the University of Guam continued to send students and faculty to Bali, and about potential legal liability for the University of Guam in the event of another terrorist incident. There was a vivid sense of real danger. The Community Development course was not taught at UOG in Spring 2006. No overseas travel-study program to Bali was offered on campus. But UOG continued the commitment to studying Bali in an innovative way by inviting Bali filmmaker Jane Walters to Guam, to screen on campus her award-winning film, *Bali: Hope in Paradise*. The film concerns the impact on the Balinese people themselves of the first bombing in Bali in 2002 (Hemlani 2006).

In Fall Semester 2006, the University of Guam reviewed the matter of overseas travel-study to Bali with the University of Guam’s Legal Counsel. After conducting extensive research, it was determined that other universities in the United States were continuing to offer their overseas travel-study programs (e.g., Jacobson 2004, Jaschik 2004, *Study Abroad at UConn* 2006, Wheeler 2004, and others). In Spring Semester 2007, the Community Development course was taught again at the University of Guam, including the Bali field study portion of the course. Outcomes of the ten years of the University of Guam’s Field Studies in Bali 1999-2009 appear in print as *Manmakmata I Hale’-ta, Terbanggunnya Sambungan, Awakening Connections* (Johnson, ed., 2009).

University of Guam Students: “The World is Our Campus!”

In an upper division course that R.S. taught in Spring Semester 2006 at the University of Guam, entitled Globalization and Human Dynamics, four students were encouraged to write academic papers about their experiences during recent overseas academic endeavors, with particular reference to danger. Shaun Jackson (2006) wrote about travels in South America, his residence on Guam as an international student from the USA, and his holiday in the Philippines. Telena Nelson (2006) shared her experiences of being in Europe on a religious pilgrimage. Julius Cesar S. Cena (2006) wrote about *balikbayan* in the Philippines. Nadine Kaschak (2006), who holds a B.A. Degree in Anthropology from the University of Guam, described her time spent as a graduate student in an M.A. Degree Program in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) embedded within a TASP (Teach and Study Program) at Tel-Aviv University in Israel. The voices of these four University of Guam students provide clear evidence of the profound learning and life-changing experiences gained in the course of overseas travel-study programs, even in the presence of danger. Summaries from the students’ writings are offered here with their expressed approval.

Shaun Jackson came to the University of Guam from the USA as a National Student Exchange (NSE) student in Fall 2005. His only other overseas travel had been to Peru, for two weeks in Summer 2004. About Peru, he wrote, “Only two incidents happened in Peru that could be considered dangerous. The first was during a [taxi] cab ride from the Lima International Airport to a temporary hostel. The cab driver tried to charge us a higher rate than
agreed upon and at the time we were along the very well known, dangerous coast. The threats of abandoning us along the beach was the leverage he was using to get more money. We remained calm and went with it until we got to our destination, then paid him the original amount. The other incident occurred during a walk back from a pub where a drunken Peruvian man tried to pick a fight with one of my friends. This was also treated with careful strategies and the danger passed. The thing is to remain calm and extremely observant…” About coming to the University of Guam, Shaun wrote: “…one could say that an island where there is a large population of young men trained to kill and able to drink alcohol at age 18 would be [sic] quite a dangerous place…” Thankfully, Shaun did not experience what he considered to be dangerous events during the one year he spent in residence on Guam.

Telena Nelson’s planned departure for Europe in Summer 2005 was less than one month away when the subway bombings occurred in London on July 7. Over thirty people died and over 700 people were injured (www.news.bbc.co.uk). Initially Telena’s father forbade her to go: “…he was furious, he said stop being unrealistic, this is your life we are talking about.” However, I stuck by my decision and he calmed down, saying, “If this is what you want to do and I can’t stop you, then, promise me that you will be safe and observant of everything around you.” I thought, “He’s making it sound like I’m going to war.” Telena went with her church community to Europe for the twentieth World Youth Day, held in Köln, Germany. Young people came from all over the world to join Pope Benedict XVI in the celebration of the Eucharist, with some one million people present (www.en.wikipedia.org). Telena wrote: “…I was touched by the Holy Spirit in ways that I never felt before … [If I had backed out of the trip due to the London bombings], I … would have been hopelessly confused and unsatisfied. In the near future I hope to travel more to different areas of the world and experience other cultures. I realize that ignorance only stunts my growth and the embracing of cultures through travel will definitely allow me to be less apathetic to others and situations existing in my everyday life.”

Julius Cesar Cena of Guam returned to his place of birth, the Philippines, for a visit with his mother in early 2004. He had been away from the Philippines for ten years: “…This ‘homecoming’ was not merely a vacation. It was also an anthropological experience, contributing not just to my academic growth, but to my personal growth, as well.” Diasporic Filipinos are known as balikbayan, i.e., Filipino immigrants of any generation [sic] going back home for a visit. Balikbayan, Julius explained, symbolizes “…the reunion with our homeland, our people, our culture, and our identity. Although its conventional notion relies on the idea of immigrants bringing home dollars, canned goods, brand name clothing, a foreigner visiting another country whose language is different, balikbayan is a refreshing look in the mirror after you have not done so in a while. It is also a concept that captures the heart, seeing things around you with a different perspective.” Julius indicated that balikbayan are no longer seen within the rigid conception of what a Filipino identity is: “…However, our identities become ambiguous within the context of America or any foreign land. We are not quite Filipinos, and we are not quite Americans. Then, who are we? There is no direct or concrete answer to this question, but somehow, the answer seems to drift to us whenever we go back to our homeland. There are so many things to learn, so much more to gain, and claiming our identity, this drifting answer covering us like a blanket and giving us warmth, will always make me want to go back home. And threats of terrorism would not stop us.” Julius concluded, “If the Philippines is listed as one of the unsafe countries in terms of travel warnings [by the USA, and others], then what place in this contemporary world is safe to travel to? If one would argue that Guam faces slight danger compared to that of the Philippines, then I ask, “What place does safety have … [in the context of] slight danger?” Danger is danger, whether it is described as heavy or slight. More importantly, danger is everywhere. We could experience a terrorist attack here on Guam. We can die staying on Guam with the thought that Guam is a safer place, and therefore, we must not travel anywhere else…”

While residing in Israel for four months beginning in Summer 2005, Nadine Kaschak, who earned a B.A. Degree in Anthropology at the University of Guam in 2000, was ever mindful of the local political situation: “…that same situation is the one that drew me to studying and living in Israel, to learn about a region with so much culture and conflict.” Nadine was studying Hebrew in Tel-Aviv at an Ulpan (Hebrew Language School), in preparation for a two year M.A. Degree Program in TESOL at Tel-Aviv University. After describing a number of personally unsettling experiences that happened to her at close range, Nadine wrote: “In the end, I decided that the insecurity I felt, and the explosive nature of the political situations were too much for me to bear for two more years. I lost a considerable amount of money on my deposit for graduate school, and I also lost my relationship with a man that I thought I could spend the rest of my life with”… Nadine left Israel. But, she wrote: “I am thankful for my time there…I would still be studying at Tel-Aviv University for my Master’s in TESOL if I felt it was safe.” Nadine synthesized: “…The only way students will know is to experience it (sic). To make their own judgment. And isn’t that what education is? Isn’t that why we encourage university students to go overseas? To think for themselves, in a new environment, and realize that their home is not the only frame of reference for the world? … Only an individual student can determine in what environment his/her safety is threatened, by terrorism or otherwise. To
deny students the opportunity of overseas study based on insurance and liability is to deny a college student, an adult, the right to choose.”

In March 10, 2006, the time when the University of Guam’s Bali Field Project was supposed to have been taking place in Bali, Nadine Kaschak traveled from Guam to Bali independently as a tourist. As she boarded the flight to Bali, she and the other outbound passengers were handed a small slip of paper that read: *Passengers are advised that the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security has determined that Bandara Ngurah Rai International Airport does not maintain effective aviation security measures.* In spite of that unexpected jolt, Nadine did not cancel her trip. Nadine e-mailed from Bali: “The bombings have really hurt tourism here… it is sad to see Bali like this compared to the last time I was here four years ago. I would encourage anyone to come to Bali and help them [sic] pick up their industry. *The lack of tourists [here in Bali] is just one more way that the terrorists are winning…*”

The University of Guam’s students’ voices, as highlighted here, speak eloquently to the students’ convictions that they are entitled to explore their world. The students demonstrate inspired readiness and profound willingness to take inherent risks, and to be responsible for themselves, their decisions, and their actions, in the world that beckons them from afar.

The President of Hamline University in St. Paul, Minnesota, Dr. Linda N. Hanson, has set forth (2007:36) seven specific learning outcomes for Hamline University graduates, as follows:

- serve, collaborate, and lead in a community,
- solve problems in innovative, integrative, analytical, and ethical ways
- work and create understanding across cultural differences locally, nationally, and internationally
- use information and technology competently and responsibly
- communicate effectively in writing and in speaking
- apply the theories and methods of a field of expertise
- engage independently and reflectively in lifelong learning

All of these learning outcomes are relevant to the inquiry presented in this paper. The third outcome listed above seems especially relevant for university graduates, in the point of view of the writers of this paper.

**Summary and Conclusions**

University-level overseas travel-study programs are by no means new ventures. From the Crusades of the Middle Ages, to the European “Grand Tours,” people, especially students, have traveled on academic quests to far-away places, seeking others and perhaps also trying to find themselves. But, somehow, such ventures [may] appear in a different light in contemporary times, owing to the possible presence of danger in new and unprecedented ways. Danger at a time while one is traveling overseas now appears to be so random, so target-less, so myopic, and thus, so entirely confident in and of itself. Are people more at risk in groups? Is it easier—and safer-- for the one-by-one student travelers to hide, to disappear into the multitudes of people around them, to find safety in anonymity?

It appears clear in the course of this research that many, if not most, universities in the United States and around the world are continuing to offer their overseas travel-study programs to students for academic credits. And university students are continuing to enroll in these programs.

Danger, in the context of this paper, appears to lie almost anywhere, whether foreign or domestic; Europe or Middle East; Asia or Americas; Africa or Oceania; in other words, on a global scale. The co-authors of this paper suggest that international terrorism is perceived to be the greatest cause of danger for university students at this time. International terrorism appears to overshadow other causes of danger that are epidemiological, medical, accidental, climatic, and the like.

Safety risks associated with overseas travel-study programs that were of minimal concern three and one half decades ago have now become nearly perpetual at both the individual and institutional levels. Awareness of the need to insure the safety of all personnel – students, faculty, and others involved in overseas travel-study programs – has increased as a studied reaction to global terrorism in recent years. Calculating the safety risks for students as well as faculty requires a considerable extent of research in order to find accurate information. Overseas travel advisories are issued by the U.S. State Department for American citizens and the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs for Japanese subjects, to name just two among many other official entities. Advisories that are available on the internet should not be ignored or overlooked, and the same should be made available to students who seek to participate in overseas travel-study programs.
Societies around the world, or maybe especially in the Western world, have become increasingly litigious. Therefore, liabilities associated with overseas study programs must be carefully examined with institutional legal counsel, insurance companies, and administrators of academic institutions. Waiver forms such as the six-page waiver form developed by the University of Guam’s legal counsel specifically for UOG’s field study endeavor in Bali serve to outline the parameters of risks and responsibilities.

Risk and danger/disaster prevention as well as management plans should be responsibly developed by academic institutions that incorporate overseas travel-study programs. To be sure, within the context of globalization and danger, academic scholars must now empower their university students with greater caution and more vivid awareness than ever before.

The co-authors of this paper conclude that academic scholars must continue to encourage their students to view the world as their learning environment. Academic scholars must continue to provide innovative opportunities for their students to engage the wider world that beckons the students from afar.

Note: An early draft of this paper was presented at the 21st Pacific Science Congress Meetings held in Okinawa, Japan, June 12-16, 2007. An earlier version of this paper appears elsewhere in print (Stephenson and Kurashina, 2009).

References


Even organized international terrorism bred by Islamic fanaticism may be viewed as an oppositional reaction—resulting in deglobalization—to the pervasiveness of Western capitalism and secularism associated with globalization. Influences of globalization are multi-dimensional, having large social, economic, and political implications. A massive spread of education and of Western-oriented norms of learning at all levels in the twentieth century and the consequences of widely available schooling are a large part of the globalization process. This study is an attempt to examine globalization from an evolitional point of view. Furthermore, it evaluates whether or not terrorism is part of globalization. The interrelation between terrorism and globalization is subject to controversies. On one hand, some views assert that terrorism is spreading not because of globalization but because some people are excluded from globalization. Globalization and globalism are different. In particular, globalization points to aspirations for. Anti-globalists criticize the power of international institutions, particularly the World Trade Organization, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The critics of globalization further argue that these international institutions and organizations. In Globalization in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance Paul Q. Hirst and Grahame Thompson suggest that nationally and internationally market economies can be controlled in ways that promote social goals[3]. John Micklethwait and Adrian Wooldridge go even further in A Future Perfect: The Essentials of Globalization. In The Future in the Balance: Chapters on Globalization and Resistance Third World activist and scholar Walden F. Bello provides support for developing nations. In the conclusion to his edited collection Egalitarian Politics in the Age of Globalization, Craig N. 'Global Studies in the Soviet Union' by Viktor A. Los[21] and 'Global Studies in the West' by Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis, USA. *Address all correspondence to: DOI: 10.5772/17972. How did our world become so global? In a book titled, The World is Flat, Thomas Friedman describes ten forces in the world that flattened the world and made it global. Those ten flatteners of the world include: 11/9/89 -The New Age of Creativity: When the Walls Came Down and the Windows Went Up. 8/9/95 The New Age of Connectivity: When the Web Went Around and Netscape Went Public. Work Flow Software. Uploading: Harnessing the Power of Communities.