

Writing in a Deterritorialized Landscape

Translating globalism into composition pedagogy

SHU-YIN SHARON YAM

Although the cultural phenomena of globalization have dominated the field of English studies for an extensive period, very few scholars have begun to discuss a praxis in the writing classroom that considers diaspora, deterritorialization, and the ethics of cosmopolitanism in conjunction with new forms of solidarities amidst an irregular global landscape. My goal is to begin the search for a pedagogy that will allow students to engage in effective and various forms of communication in a globalized world both within and beyond the academic discourse community. In addition, I will stress the ethical dimension of interaction and communication under globalization. In this paper, I thus explain how Arjun Appadurai's global cultural flows model helps construct a pedagogy that connects the writing classroom to the reconfiguration of communications and identity under globalization. This pedagogy motivates educators to reevaluate the valence of popular discourse on multiculturalism under globalization, determining whether we now need a different theoretical underpinning for our teaching to remain relevant and ethical in a global context. I emphasize the ethical dimension of this pedagogy because communications with what we perceive as the Other are often volatile and even violent. Thus, I argue that a pedagogy of globalism should help students develop a sense of deterritorialized solidarity beyond national, geographical, and cultural boundaries. Given that the ethical blueprint of this pedagogy is primarily informed by cosmopolitanism, I offer pedagogical approaches that challenge the boundary of the university and enable students to experiment with different forms of communication in a deterritorialized context. For the university writing class to remain relevant and constructive, a global turn is necessary.

The field of composition studies takes on a global perspective when its pedagogy is situated in a postcolonial context with considerations of the transnational linkage between former colonies and colonizing states. Adopting concepts from post-structuralist postcolonialism in *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*, Suresh Canagarajah discusses the potential of liberation in composition pedagogy. Using Derek Walcott as an example, Canagarajah elaborates on what he refers to as the "resistance perspective" of language, which recognized that

The creative tension between the languages can also bring forth new discourses...The fact that such productive interactions are possible demonstrates that our consciousness is able to accommodate more than one language or culture, just as our languages can accommodate alien grammars and discourses. (1-2)

As Canagarajah characterizes it, the resistance perspective offers to liberate writers from the periphery as they appropriate and reinvent the language and discourse of their colonizers in the center. However, as Aihwa Ong reminds us, the framework of the center-periphery model is no longer sufficient in explaining “the links between transnational migration and political struggles” because it focuses narrowly on the exploitative relationship between the Global North and the Global South, the oppressor and the oppressed (9). She argues that under globalization, concepts and institutions continually acquire new meanings in a local context. Therefore, the binary, polarizing opposition should be reworked into a network where people receive the multidirectional cultural influences for which a center-periphery model does not account. For pedagogy to help students conceptualize a globalized world beyond the classroom, we first need to rework our perception from binary oppositions to a more fluid global landscape.

Although rarely discussed in the field of composition pedagogy, Edward Said’s work presents us with insights into a pedagogy of globalism, as it provides an argument about writing from an exilic and deterritorialized perspective. Said’s limitation, however, is similar to Canagarajah’s: both of them rely heavily on the center-periphery model that I argue is inadequate under the new global cultural economy. As a result, I will be using Said’s work only as a springboard to begin conceptualizing a more global composition pedagogy. This pedagogy can help students grasp what writing means from a perspective that deemphasizes a rigid sense of attachment to a single identity or position—a perspective necessary under globalization.

In *Culture and Imperialism*, his so-called “exile’s book” (xxx), Said confirms that his positionality as an exile stems from his personal experience. “Ever since I can remember,” he writes,

I have felt that I belonged to both worlds, without being completely of either one or the other. During my lifetime, however, the parts of the Arab world I was most attached to either have changed utterly by civil upheavals and war, or *have simply ceased to exist*. And for long periods of time I have been an outsider in the United States, particularly when it went to war against, and was deeply opposed to the (far from perfect) cultures and societies of the Arab world. (xxx, emphasis added)

Said’s position is akin to that of a diasporic subject whose imaginary homeland no longer exists. Here, the notions of exile and diaspora are blurred because exile in its original sense entails the existence of a homeland and the possibility of return. In other words, although Said claims that his work is that of an exile, it can also be interpreted as one written from a more broadly diasporic position. Yet Said implies that his exilic position has benefited his writing, explaining that “belonging as it were, to both sides of the imperial divide enables you to understand them more easily...Perhaps all this has stimulated the kinds of interests and interpretations ventured here, but these circumstances certainly made it possible for me to feel as if I belonged to more than one history and more than one group” (xxx-xxx). In other words, Said suggests that his deviance from the traditional sense of attachment and loyalty to a singular culture has motivated his conception of “contrapuntal reading,” and argues that “In reading a text, one must open it out both to what went

into it and to what its author excluded. Each cultural work is a vision of a moment, and we must juxtapose that vision with the various revisions it later provoked" (78-79). Thus, to read contrapuntally is to discover opposing voices and the dialogic nature of the work while challenging the stability of the colonial power. Said positions himself as belonging to both the core and the periphery, and such positionality gives him a higher degree of sensitivity to Western literature's multiple voices, particularly those that are implicit.

Translating Said's way of thinking and perception into composition pedagogy would entail guiding students to search for the suppressed voices within the sanctioned dominant discourse by introducing them to the theoretical underpinnings of contrapuntal reading. This form of pedagogy can be used to help students develop awareness of the dialogic nature of writing; by looking at the history of production of the dominant discourse, students will begin to analyze why certain voices are omitted. Here, it is useful to bring in James Gee's concept of "Discourse" because the distinction he makes between primary and secondary Discourses helps conceptualize what a contrapuntally informed pedagogy informed would look like. Gee defines a Discourse in the following way:

A Discourse is a socially accepted association among ways of using language and other symbolic expressions, of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing, and acting, as well as using various tools, technologies, or props that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or "social network," to signal (that one is playing) a socially meaningful "role," or to signal that one is filling a social niche in a distinctively recognizable fashion. (161)

According to this framework, Discourses are ideological and resistant to criticism because they can be scrutinized only by members outside of that particular discourse community. What Gee calls primary Discourses, then, refers to "those to which people are apprenticed early in life during their primary socialization as members of particular families within their sociocultural settings. Primary Discourses constitute our first social identity, and something of a base within which we acquire or resist later Discourses" (168). As we engage in different social settings outside of our first socialization, we begin to acquire the secondary Discourses we need to function in certain communities, particularly those that are sanctioned and privileged by an authority. Gee argues, "Good classroom instruction can and should lead to meta-knowledge, to seeing how the Discourses you have already got (not just the languages) relate to those you are attempting to acquire, and how the ones you are trying to acquire relate to self and society" (172). I argue that integrating Said's contrapuntal reading into composition pedagogy will help us achieve this goal, particularly when instructors attempt to initiate new students into the academic discourse community.

While acknowledging that academic discourse is embedded within the power grid diffused throughout the institution, we can begin by teaching students rhetorical strategies appropriate to reading journal articles, followed by assignments encouraging them to imitate what they are reading. By asking students to reflect critically on the difficulty they encounter when adopting academic discourse and uncover the reasons behind it, we draw their attention to the exclusion of certain voices and ideological positionality in the academe. No one would dispute that students' primary discourses are intimately tied to their cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, or that most discourses used by racial minorities and among people of a lower socioeconomic status are largely excluded from the academic discourse. Therefore, students will begin to perceive the power imbalance embedded in socially constructed academic discourse when they are asked to examine whose voices have been erased and why. A pedagogy influenced by Said's work will encourage students to create meta-knowledge and exercise cognition not only of the dominant secondary discourse, but also of their primary discourses so that they will be able to understand what is erased when they adopt one that is secondary. To achieve this understanding, the composition

classroom has to be a safe space within the academe that allows students to use their primary discourses assumed to differ from the one sanctioned by the institution, and doing so without adverse consequences. Contrapuntal reading in conjunction with an emphasis on the variety of discourses will also help students realize the multiple positions and identities they occupy, a positionality that coincides with a deterritorialized conception of culture and identification.

The limitation with Said's work in relation to the pedagogy of globalism is that it does not move far from the center-periphery model. While Said attempts to create an in-between space that facilitates cultural understanding and resistance, he is unable to conceptualize a fluid global landscape where cultures and ideas flow multidirectionally. Before moving beyond Said to consider how composition pedagogy can accommodate globalism, I will elaborate on Appadurai's conception of a new form of global culture transaction that accounts for key forces of cultural influence under globalization: diaspora, mass migration, and the fluid movements of capital and information. Appadurai argues that "The new global cultural economy has to be seen as a complex, overlapping, disjunctive order that cannot any longer be understood in terms of existing center-periphery models (even those that might account for multiple centers and peripheries)" (32). Instead, he proposes five terms that he argues can account for the complexity and fluidity of the new global cultural flows: "(a) ethnoscapas, (b) mediascapas, (c) technoscapas, (d) finanscapas, (e) ideoscapas" (33). Appadurai characterizes such irregular landscapes as "deeply perspectival constructs, inflected by the historical, linguistic, and political situatedness of different sorts of actors...these landscapes are eventually navigated by agents who both experience and constitute larger formations, in part from their own sense of what these landscapes offer" (33). In other words, agents both construct and live within landscapes that wholly constitute their experiences and identities. In this sense, various groups are given the agency to maneuver the world they live in. Revising Benedict Anderson's notion of the imagined community, Appadurai argues that these global cultural landscapes and flows will create "imagined worlds...constituted by the historically situated imaginations of persons and groups spread around the globe" (33). Because the effects of globalization and the development of information technology are so far-reaching, almost no one is exempt from disorienting, deterritorialized experiences. Thus I am motivated to propose a pedagogy that will help students and instructors navigate these highly irregular cultural landscapes, while also communicating and interacting with each other ethically amidst an overwhelming wave of information and new positionality where the sense of attachment and loyalty is no longer singular.

Here, Appadurai's conception of postnation can help us conceive new forms of ethics and discourse under globalization while simultaneously challenging the conception of multiculturalism common to the university. Appadurai argues that postnation is formed through implosion: global events and large-scale interactions are transmitted to local communities through the ethnoscape, mediascape and technoscape, while global cultural and informational cascades interact with local feelings and trigger internal conflicts within these communities. One germane example is seen in the recent Arab Spring Revolutions that spread from one nation-state to the entire surrounding region. Thus Appadurai points out that "The violence that surrounds identity politics around the world today reflects the anxieties attendant on the search for nonterritorial principles of solidarity" (165). In other words, what constitutes such solidarity is not a rigid sense of belonging towards a specific group defined by language, race, nationality—or what Appadurai calls "natural facts"—but is a cultural product of deterritorialized imagination, in the sense that such a construction is facilitated by mass movements of people through immigration, diaspora, or exile, and by the force of electronic mediation. Since the language of traditional nationalism cannot account for this new sense of solidarity, Appadurai argues that the postnational movements often escalate into a violent discourse of counternationalism. He points out that "This vicious circle can only be escaped when a language is found to capture complex, nonterritorial, postnational forms of allegiance" (166). What this means to the composition classroom is that we can no longer be satisfied with teaching

students a superficial form of multiculturalism discourse that emphasizes tolerance of differences; instead, our pedagogy should be informed by the network of human movements that constitutes a significant part of globalization. The implication for writing, then, is that we can no longer address our audience as if it has only one uniform identity. In fact, we increasingly find ourselves writing from multiple positions at once because of the complexity of our identifications and senses of belonging. In this case, effective composition pedagogy should help our students conceptualize and practice means of communication and engagement that take into consideration the fluidity and irregularity of identities in a global cultural network. I will argue that, for this pedagogy to develop, we need to create a learning space that allows students to experience transnationality in relation to locality and neighborhoods.

The concept of transnation decentralizes nation-state, while valuing people's "special ideological link to a putative place of origin" even though it is "a thoroughly diasporic collectivity" (Appadurai 172). Nation-states thereby become a hub for nonterritorial transnations that connect to the plethora of global diasporas. I see the concept of transnation as significant to pedagogy as it suggests that an education curriculum that emphasizes a mosaic imagery of multiculturalism within a uniform national identity is no longer adequate in helping our students navigate the current cultural landscape. In fact, as Sheldon Pollock, Homi Bhabha, Carol Breckenridge, and Dipesh Chakrabarty point out, the current form of cultural pluralism "recognizes difference so long as the general category of the people is still fundamentally understood within a national frame" (582). In other words, for the pedagogy of globalism to accommodate diasporic diversity, we will need to reconceptualize cultural pluralism that transcends national boundaries. I am also discrediting the form of multiculturalism that over-emphasizes racial and cultural differences informed by essentialism. I find it helpful to conceptualize the meaning of "a society constructed around diasporic diversity" (Appadurai 173) by turning briefly to Stuart Hall's conception of a constructive form of multiculturalism:

If each individual is ascribed to one of those ethnic segments, the term *multicultural* simply describes the many segments, whereas adjectivally *multicultural* describes a society that has been messed up or mongrelized by the variety of people who probably do tend to locate themselves more in one group than in another but who are not so formally fixed into groups. (qtd. in Drew 227)

What Hall and Appadurai are promoting is a cultural arrangement that recognizes multiple identifications that are not strictly categorized through essentialism or nationalism.

This idea challenges the connotation of classical rhetoric as a capacity for people to become citizens and engage in civic discourse because, as Jessica Enoch notes, "recent pedagogical history indicates that these terms [civic and citizenship] often refer to national investments" (172). In other words, rhetorical education under globalization must rethink what the public sphere entails and what it means for students to participate in public discourses. This new form of global public discourse can be seen as a product of intertwined and deterritorialized discourses that carry local values and interests; under this conception, nation-states and national belonging are decentered. Also, with the increased prominence of cyberspace and digital writing, the demarcation between private and public discourse begins to collapse: personal journal writing becomes public through blogging and letters are exposed to public eye by email. Rhetoric in the global arena of digital space cannot be seen as merely a discourse for public engagement because it has increasingly become a hybrid of both public and private exchanges. At the same time, we cannot neglect the locality and situatedness of discourses amidst the global cultural network because they form a facet of the global public discourse. Appadurai cogently links the concept of locality with neighborhood: "I use the term neighborhood to refer to the actually existing social forms in which locality, as a

dimension or value, is variably realized. Neighborhoods, in this usage, are situated communities characterized by their actuality, whether spatial or virtual, and their potential for social reproduction” (179). He further argues that neighborhoods are highly contextual, and they are produced by either opposing or aligning themselves with other neighborhoods. Although the constitution of neighborhoods can potentially lead to a loss or lack of global perspective, we cannot do away with them since they provide us the cultural contexts that make certain actions and discourses meaningful. However, if the transnations within a nation-state are to function simply as distinct neighborhoods, we would simply trace our steps back to the essentializing form of multiculturalism I have previously refuted. What we hope to see is a space where diasporic diversity is respected, as we see the establishment of relationships between neighborhoods not so much as a colonizing effort, but as a means to establish a common ground— a prerequisite for forms of deterritorialized solidarity. We may begin to conceptualize this space as what Giorgio Agamben calls the “coming community” where “humans co-belong without any prior or representable conditions of belonging” (85). Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri refer to this configuration as “life in common.” They state, “The multitude is neither an identity, nor uniform (like the masses), the internal differences of the multitude must discover the common that allows them to communicate and act together. The common we share, is in fact, not so much discovered as produced” (228). The implication of the common for composition pedagogy is both a pragmatic and an ethical one: for us to teach students how to communicate in a deterritorialized space with people across neighborhoods, we will need to help produce a common context for mutual understanding. The production of a common ground does not ensure consensus, but it provides the possibility to eliminate hostility and indifference towards members of other cultural neighborhoods.

The opportunity to produce a common ground is constantly present under globalization because every time we communicate in the deterritorialized space we are attempting to establish mutual understanding. As Kwame Anthony Appiah argues,

So I’m using the word “conversation” [across boundaries of identity] not only for literal talk but also as a metaphor for engagement with the experience and the ideas of others. And I stress the role of the imagination here because the encounters, properly conducted, are valuable in themselves. Conversation doesn’t have to lead to consensus about anything, especially not values; it’s enough that it helps people get used to one another. (85)

In the classroom, the role of conversation can be seen as a point of engagement for students to understand the existence of diasporic diversity and the multiplicity of identities within a nation-state without having to reach an agreement on what to think and how to feel about certain local values in specific transnations.

However, even though “getting used to each other” may eliminate hostility between and within neighborhoods when their boundaries are challenged under deterritorialization, it will not reveal what Kamela Visweswaran calls “cultures of the common” because it does not encourage active discovery and production of deterritorialized solidarities (14). To achieve this goal, we will need to first refute anti-foundationalism because it presupposes that nothing is universal and prevents us from establishing the common. While Visweswaran points to shared lived experiences across neighborhoods as the foundation of deterritorialized alliances, Appiah emphasizes the existence of universal values. He points out that although many values are local, there are certain universal values that are based on “many of the traits we humans share,” including some cultural practices and moral concepts (96). He then argues that we will not be able to understand one another at all if we do not have a shared human nature. Based on the assumption that there *are*

universal values, Appiah proposes that we can see cosmopolitanism as the ethical framework in a globalized world: “[Cosmopolitanism] begins with the simple idea that in the human community, as in national communities, we need to develop habits of coexistence: conversation in its older meaning, of living together, association” (xix). Since there are many versions of cosmopolitanism and not all of them are relevant to the pursuit of an ethical blueprint for the pedagogy of globalism, I draw on what David Hansen coins as “cosmopolitanism from the ground up.” “Rooted in everyday life” such cosmopolitanism

spotlights the familiar fact that human beings can create not just ways to tolerate differences between them but also ways to learn from one another, however modest the resulting changes in their outlooks may be. It is a cosmopolitanism that does not take sides dogmatically and yet that does not stand apart from conflict, misunderstanding, and challenge. (4)

Hansen’s model posits a modest view of the possibility of creating solidarities based on mutual understanding. In fact, this view may be what we need in the classroom, a simple yet theoretically refined concept that provides an ethical framework for the pedagogy of globalism. The ethical underpinning of the pedagogy of globalism stems neither from cultural relativism nor multiculturalism within a national framework; rather, it emphasizes commonality and the possibility of creating deterritorialized solidarities. At the same time, it acknowledges the local nature of certain values and does not seek complete agreement.

Although we may now have a general framework of the global cultural flow and an ethical framework of engagement under globalization, we have yet to explore their implications for pedagogical approaches. Appadurai’s characterization of globalization celebrates the diasporic diversity and the fluidity of cultural transmission due to the deterritorialized movement of people, capital, ideas, and technology. Whether they are aware of this phenomenon or not, students constantly experience such irregularity of the global cultural landscapes around them as they encounter familiar but potentially othering cultural artifacts. Even the students who have never been displaced from their primary cultural and national identifications experience a new sense of displacement and disorientation because of factors such as their extensive use of the internet and the increased number of immigrants they encounter. Thus it is crucial for students to develop the skills needed to navigate the fluid global cultural landscape and to exercise their agency by effectively and ethically communicating their ideas in such arrangements. A composition class based on the pedagogy of globalism will first draw largely from students’ engagement with the Internet as a global instrument for the dissemination of information and ideas beyond national and cultural boundaries. Then the class will gradually move into the other force that constitutes the irregularity and fluidity of the current deterritorialized cultural landscape—mass human migration. To this end, the classroom can no longer be a closed space where students interact with each other and the instructor as if they all belong to the same and only discourse community. What I propose here is to make the composition classroom an open space where students interact with those who are not members of their familiar cultural neighborhoods.

Since the primary Discourses, borrowing from Gee, of many students involve the Internet and other forms of information technology, students may not always be aware of the force of electronic mediation in deterritorializing different cultural values and practices, which in turn affects self-identification. The development of cyberspace and electronic technologies has created a heightened sense of time-space compression, which Doreen Massey refers to as “movement and communication across space, to the geographical stretching-out of social relations, and to our experience of all this” (147). In other words, web-users experience the seeming shrinkage of space and the expansion of time. They then encounter others who dwell in materially different spaces

whenever they simultaneously gather and interact in the digital space. Consequently, the genre of writing should move beyond traditional academic essays to forms of writing on the Internet that address audiences who belong to different imagined worlds. These forms can include activities such as responding to culturally unfamiliar YouTube videos or writing a Wikipedia article while observing the guidelines for doing so. Before we ask students to complete these assignments, we should introduce them to the concept of rhetorical situations, particularly the importance of writing to a specific context and audience. Through such assignments, students may rethink what it means to engage in rhetorical production and exchange in a global public sphere that does not necessarily allow writers to conceptualize the positionality of their audiences. However, certain rhetorical conventions remain in the deterritorialized digital space. For example, inappropriate responses on a YouTube video can be flagged by other users and be permanently removed, and Wikipedia articles not backed by verifiable references can be edited by others. In this sense, to be able to communicate in this globally shared space, an understanding of the implicit rules and established conventions of writing becomes extremely important. These assignments not only help students conceptualize what appropriate means of communication are in a deterritorialized space, but also help them develop a more acute sense of awareness about the differing conventions in specific contexts. Such an awareness is a transferable skill that can be employed in different social as well as academic settings.

After introducing students to the intersection between rhetorical knowledge and a deterritorialized digital space, the class can move beyond the university into areas where the notions of transnation and ethnoscape are physically manifest, for example, in areas where most immigrants reside. This activity pushes beyond the imaginary encounter with unfamiliar ideas and concepts that Appiah proposes in his discussion of conversation. Students who visit these neighborhoods and shadow the daily lives of community members in small groups will physically inhabit an unfamiliar local space with values and practices different from their own. The act of shadowing a neighborhood member differs from service learning in the sense that shadowing ensures a balanced power relation between the two parties because students assume the position of learners without a sense of condescension. Volunteerism, on the other hand, can become merely “an exercise in observing otherness and at worst a missionary expedition” (Forbes et al. 158). Students experience how members of the neighborhood navigate the landscapes of their habitus and how the geography of the area in turn influences their interactions and ways of living. This method encourages them to write from within the community rather than about it. As Aaron Schutz and Anne Ruggles Gere suggest, writing *with* the neighborhood members without writing *for* them promotes a sense of engagement and solidarity among people who collaborate “as relative equals in a common project of social change” (146).

Doing so is ethically significant because, as Lynn Worsham argues, “the discourse of emotion is our primary education (primary in the sense of both earliest and foundational)...work of decolonization must occur at the affective level, not only to reconstitute the emotional life of the individual but also and more importantly, to restructure the feeling or mood that characterizes an age” (216). The composition classroom can become the intellectually and physically uncomfortable space Worsham describes—one where students experience the affects of displacement, such as fear, alienation, acceptance, or even liberation. This experience will initially help them develop a mutual understanding with those who have felt a more severe degree of displacement, and may facilitate the formation of what Leela Gandhi calls “affective communities” (8): a new form of alliance and solidarity made possible by transcending cultural, geographical, and national boundaries. Such a focus on deterritorialized solidarities also prompts students to think not in terms of differences but in the commonalities they share with members of other neighborhoods. The role of the instructor in this pedagogy is to help students mediate their affective responses by guiding them through the thinking and writing process while they try to communicate to others the emotions evoked in attempting to understand discourses that are not accommodated by

institutionally accepted logic and meaning. When students inhabit the space where “outlaw discourses” are used (Ono and Sloop 5), they can embark on the first step of social change as they begin to think about how the logic of dominant discourses can be transcended to encompass outlying cultural logics and social experiences.

Wendy Hesford succinctly points out the motivation behind the pedagogy of globalism:

Turning toward the global means supporting scholarly and pedagogical work that challenges the dialectic of recognition (namely the binary frames of subject/object, self/other, and Western/non-Western) and disciplinary homeland nostalgia that have long dominated the field. The project also involves recognizing historical and cultural intertextuality. (797)

And, while my main focus with the pedagogy of globalism is its function in preparing students to communicate and interact effectively and ethically in a globalized world beyond the university, I argue that such pedagogy is also immensely helpful in developing the skills students need to succeed. Indeed, in “Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing,” certain habits of mind stated by the Council of Writing Program Administrators can be cultivated by the pedagogy of globalism:

Curiosity—the desire to know more about the world; Openness—the willingness to consider new ways of being and thinking in the world; Engagement—a sense of investment and involvement in learning; flexibility—the ability to adapt to situations, expectations, or demands; and metacognition—the ability to reflect on one’s own thinking as well as on the individual and cultural processes used to structure knowledge.

The pedagogy of globalism also helps students develop the rhetorical awareness, knowledge of specific conventions, and ability to communicate digitally that the Council of Writing Program Administrators endorses as central to student success. The congruence of the pedagogy of globalism and the “Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing” suggests that success is now intimately tied to the ability to communicate and coexist ethically with others within the mesh of the global cultural landscape. The question that remains for us is how this vision can be implemented in classrooms beyond the first-year level to ensure students’ abilities to act as ethical agents in a globalized world.

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Works Cited

- Agamben, Giorgio. *The Coming Community*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993. Print.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton, 2006. Print.

- Canagarajah, Suresh A. *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. New York: Oxford UP, 1999. Print.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators, National Council of Teachers of English, and National Writing Project. "Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing." 2011. *Council of Writing Program Administrators*. Web. 10 Apr. 2011.
- Drew, Julie. "Cultural Composition: Stuart Hall on Ethnicity and the Discursive Turn." *Race, Rhetoric, and the Postcolonial*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1999. 205-39. Print.
- Enoch, Jessica. "Composing a Rhetorical Education for the Twenty-first Century: Taking IT Global as Pedagogical Heuristic." *Rhetoric Review* 29.2 (2009): 165-85. Print.
- Forbes, Kathryn, et al. "Punishing Pedagogy: The Failings of Forced Volunteerism." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 27.3 (1999): 158-68. Print.
- Gee, James Paul. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. New York: Routledge, 1996. Print.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-de-si cle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2006. Print.
- Hansen, David. "Cosmopolitanism and Education: A View from the Ground." *Teacher College Record* 112.1 (2010): 1-30. Print.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin, 2004. Print.
- Hesford, Wendy S. "Global Turns and Cautious in Rhetoric and Composition Studies." *Modern Language Association of America* 121.3 (2006): 787-801. Print.
- Massey, Doreen. *Space, Place and Gender*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1994. Print.
- Ong, Aihwa. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham: Duke UP, 1999. Print.
- Ono, Kent and John Sloop. *Shifting Borders: Rhetoric, Immigration, and California's Proposition 187*. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 2002. Print.
- Pollock, Sheldon, Homi Bhabha, Carol Breckenridge, and Dipesh Chakrabarty. "Cosmopolitanisms." *Public Culture* 12.3 (2000): 577-89. Print.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage Books, 1994. Print.
- Schutz, Aaron, and Anne Ruggles Gere. "Service Learning and English Studies: Rethinking 'Public' Service." *College English* 60.2 (1998): 129-49. Print.

Visweswaran, Kamela. *Un/Common Cultures: Racism and the Rearticulation of Cultural Difference*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2010. Print.

Werbner, Pnina. "Global Pathways: Working Class Cosmopolitans and the Creation of Transnational Ethnic Worlds." *Social Anthropology* 7.1 (1999): 17-35. Print.

Worsham, Lynn. "Going Postal: Pedagogic Violence and the Schooling of Emotion." *JAC: A Journal of Composition Theory* 18.2 (1998): 213-245. Print.