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WE HAVE ALWAYS LIVED IN A COMPLEX WORLD, BUT FEW DENY THAT today we live in a noticeably more interrelated world than we did even a de- cade ago. Multitudes of global linkages meet to form collections of meaning and materiality that affect our lives: in the things we make and use, the ways we think and feel, how and why we do what we do. They appear in our so- ciopolitical structures, economic systems, forms of governance, and foreign policies. We are conscious of many of these connections, oblivious to others. We know our shirts are made in Honduras and our iPads in China, and we know that we can now buy German chocolate, not long ago considered a rare treat, at every big-box store in the United States. On the other hand, we do not immediately see how personal feelings reflect transnational inequalities, how hippies and the U.S. countercultural movements of the sixties were part of the Cold War, or how southwestern Illinois and Punjab, India, are genea- logically linked through activists and genetically modified seeds. Whether invisible or obvious, these connections transcend geographic, sociopolitical,
and disciplinary territories, and they seamlessly slip into the everyday and the personal. The approach to global studies presented in this volume provides an empirical framework to discern how transnational interconnections like these are anchored in practices, peoples, perceptions, and policies. The volume offers an approach that allows global scholars, from all disciplines and with varied interests, to investigate how our diverse lives and locales are defined by and give meaning to global processes.

Global studies has not always provided avenues into the personal, plural, and partial, nor has it necessarily transcended geographies and disciplines. Global studies emerged in the 1980s, when intellectuals, professionals, and practitioners first took note of the rapidly increasing transnational flows of people, ideas, and products, and the social, political, economic, and cultural consequences of these trends. Economics and political science dominated this emerging field, bolstering the initial interpretations of globalization as either a faceless, singular, and neoliberal force bearing down on states and societies or, contrarily, as nothing new. By the 1990s, when undergraduate degree programs, research organizations, and academic journals began to sustain this intellectual inquiry, analytic lenses saw beyond the categorization of globalization as either an omnipresent influence or the status quo. Sociologists, geographers, and anthropologists expanded the conversation around globalization from economics and politics to include space and the social. Networks and assemblages replaced anchored geographies, and scholars began to look equally at connections and at what was being connected. Soon graduate degree programs, international conferences, and advanced scholarship were being pursued under the umbrella of global studies.

Today, interest in globalization has spread throughout the academy and entered popular awareness. Yet global studies lacks a framework of understanding and a set of empirical methods that students and researchers can apply across and within the disciplines. Global studies retains several disciplinary mindsets, and many scholars still define their global research narrowly or through binaries. While scholars may argue against simple dichotomies, or align themselves on one side, binaries such as universal/particular, global/local, and micro/macro still inform how we understand global trends. And while the field is increasingly multidisciplinary, it is far from interdisciplin-
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ary. Countless scholars focus in on singular frames of reference: culture, society, law, communication, economy, and politics retain their disciplinary significance; the humanities, though with increasing contributions from history, literary studies, and media studies, are regularly absent.

The contributors to this volume build upon previous global scholarship, but in and of themselves none of the earlier approaches meets their analytic and methodological needs. While the contributors do not advocate a one-size-fits-all approach to global studies, they do recognize the need for a more rigorous global framework. Drawing on empirical knowledge to define their analytics and scholarly practices, they provide a grounded approach to global studies.

The objects of empirical inquiry, however, vary dramatically across disciplines and subject matter, from international environmental standards, financial markets, and immigration policies to the performance of aesthetics, identities, and emotions, for example. Empirical research can involve quantitative data sets and regression analysis, or it can originate in oral histories and ethnography. What the scholars contributing to this volume share is a willingness to step back in their analyses and consider the assumptions about the global implicit in disciplinary approaches and received wisdom. Each chapter is framed around an entry point or key term, with discussion of the contributor’s analytical framework and empirical research. The terms and concepts that are highlighted were not chosen because of their importance in a given field or in the work of other scholars. Rather, the entry points have emerged in the course of each contributor’s engagement with existing approaches to global studies, a particular research question, and ideas generated through collaboration with others in the group. They allow researchers to alter their analytics and avoid involuntarily foregrounding stubborn epistemologies and dichotomies in their scholarship. They are as much new lenses on the global as they are keywords for analysis and scholarly debate. The entry points—ranging from Affect, Rules, and Rights to Materiality, Seascape, and the Particular—offer a conceptual toolkit for global research in the twenty-first century, while the essays provide examples and insight into conducting research on a wide range of themes, from global financial gold markets and transnational labor migration to public art in China and the global significance of 1968.
Many of the contributors were originally trained as disciplinary and regional specialists. Going global meant that they had to challenge epistemological assumptions and stray at times from home disciplines and geographies. They did not modify their objects of inquiry, but asked different sets of questions about them. In the end, the focus on global phenomena did not detract from disciplinary approaches or regional studies, but rather gave greater meaning to their respective objects, disciplines, and areas of inquiry, and produced deeper understandings of lived identities, communities, cultures, histories, and intimacies.

As global scholars, the contributors to this volume demand wider frames of reference, multi-scalar optics, and interdisciplinary skills in order to be aware of and continuously adjust their vantage points. Even so, understanding of the multifaceted world in which we live remains partial. As a result, there is more than one global. Just as general theories of singular society are no longer suitable for the social sciences, it is similarly unfitting to assume one way of framing global studies. Rather, this collection of essays and the scholarship of their authors represent various entry points for exploring a plurality of globals that emerge and come to rest in different guises, locales, and performances. The contributors thus rupture many of the analytic and methodological cartographies that provide global certainty, and they diligently avoid an “impact model” of globalization (Hart 2002). As such, neoliberalism and capitalism are not the only drivers of globalization, nor are they normative, singular, and invincible (Ong 2007). Agency, causality, sovereignty, and power do not inevitably radiate from singular geographies or entities, even though they may cluster in particular locales, actors, and materials.

Traditional renderings of globalization tend to emphasize acceleration, rapid change, movement, and an annihilation of temporal and spatial barriers, but there are also continuities and historical structures that are in interplay with our ongoing practices and perceptions. Not everything shifts at the same rapid twenty-first-century speed. Saskia Sassen (2006) demonstrates this in her scholarship. She reveals how territory, authority, and rights merge into a conceptual framework that shifts, tips, and reorganizes through time while simultaneously maintaining its integrity as loosely assembled modular structures. By allowing for change alongside continuity, grounded global
studies illustrates how transformation occurs fluidly, reliably, and at times not much at all.

This book takes a fresh look not only at global scholarship but also at what steered the authors to become global scholars. Exposing the histories, ideologies, approaches, and responsibilities that have guided them to the entry points from which they now do global scholarship, they lay bare their subjects of inquiry. They reveal the processes that led them to the global through numerous frames of reference and disciplinary points of departure. They ask essential questions and transcend the many dualisms that are regularly employed in academia and beyond to describe what is and is not global. They walk the readers through the wide-ranging methodological, ethical, and theoretical questions that bring them to far-reaching globals, anchored not only in standards, markets, media, technologies, and nations, but in identities, activisms, rights, and emotions.

If interdisciplinarity is a heightened form of disciplinarity, as Louis Menand suggests (2010), then we indeed are carving a new intellectual space for this emerging discipline. To date, global studies does not have a master concept around which theory and method can take shape, like sociology has in society, or political science has in politics. Some have suggested that globalization is the core concept (Wank 2008), but there is no consensus on this point. Other global researchers might propose relations or interconnections as a primary concept, and the authors in this volume clearly recognize the relational constructions of their global areas of inquiry. But when global studies focuses only on the connections, the specific locations and phenomena where those intersections are lodged and practiced are eclipsed, and we risk slipping back into the same dichotomies—between global and local, the general and particular, the micro and macro—that we have been working to move beyond. As Rockefeller (2011) has noted, global scholarship has too often focused on flows without a critical consideration of what is flowing. Grounded global studies must not shy away from the inequalities, anomalies, and differences that are intrinsic to global circulation.

At the core of this emerging discipline is a commitment to empirical research and a search for previously unrecognized arrangements, patterns, and productive connections and disconnections. The entry points identified in the present collection allow global scholars to scrutinize the broader relationships and particularities that intersect and emerge into visibility. They
also help scholars acknowledge the power and penetration of established dichotomies or nodes of authority, while simultaneously dissecting them and exploring their mutual constitution. Rather than propose one shared formulaic framework for global research, we encourage scholars to develop their own entry points, work through series of provocations, and create their own framings for the global however and wherever it is made manifest. This is our intellectual space for grounded global studies.

GLOBAL METHODOLOGIES

Our use of entry points works toward correcting various misconceptions, including the impression that global studies is not sufficiently moored in the real lives and social meanings of people and practices. Though we recognize that the global is neither all-encompassing nor linear, meaning that it has its limits, both physical and metaphoric, we are also aware that the global is found in intimate practices, personalities, and performances. The global is not only anchored in the broader regulatory frameworks, standards, and rules that structure our lives, but it is also embodied in essential aspects of our being that may seem to have nothing to do with globalization.

Like electronic web portals, entry points consolidate diverse and far-reaching ideas, people, and resources. Like entries to a citadel, they allow scholars and readers to explore halls, chambers, and secret passageways that together give structure to objects of inquiry. Similar to disciplinary frameworks, entry points give us analytic lenses through which we may pursue our research. Entry points are fallback points, creating some didactic limits and guiding structures for scholarship of global manifestations. They help us avoid branding the global or imagining the local as the origin of meaning and intellect. They define units of analysis and determine our empirical paths, intellectual processes that are key challenges for research in the twenty-first century (Beck and Grande 2010, 412). Our entry points direct our gazes and guide us into the global. They slice reality differently, opening up new modes of understanding.

While global studies has no single master concept, there is an intellectual space in which basic epistemological concerns and critical ontological questions can be raised. Part of defining a disciplinary space for global studies is agreeing on key characteristics that define globals. The globals in this volume
are negotiated; they are processes that are created and reified relationally within hinterlands, cities, identities, economies, things, policies, and the personal. They are shaped and signified from within junctures, some of which, in fact, may not appear global at all. Globals can be partial; they need not be mega-processes but can be encountered as incomplete arrangements or even fragments. The contributors see globals as practice: they are ideologies, technologies, and habits that are structured and made legible through everyday lives. Globals are symbolic and embodied with authority and agency, always fashioned and explored within regimes of value and hierarchies of power across multiple scales.

Grounded global studies relies on the deep knowledge emerging from area specialization and the disciplines. This means that there are many potential frames of reference and patterns to discern. The essays in this volume posit no specific vantage point as an a priori starting point. The nation-state is not the primary frame of reference, but one of many used to pursue various global manifestations. There cannot be only one unit of analysis when investigating the connections between different scales (Amelina et al. 2012, 5). Because scholars of the global must define their own entry points and methodological approaches, global studies avoids methodological nationalism’s “bounded, static thinking while not disregarding the processes that actually construct emplacement, territorialization and the construction of ethnic, national, and diasporic identities” (ibid., 7). This approach challenges geographies while recognizing that territories and materiality do in fact still matter (Kaplan 2012).

The contributors to this volume move beyond comparative approaches to empirically probe the complex interplay among locales, practices, policies, and people (Shaw 2003). They use comparison relationally and avoid quantifying or measuring isolated cases against universal benchmarks. Relational comparisons (Hart 2002) emphasize how entities are formed in relation to one another as well as vis-à-vis broader contexts (ibid., 13–14). This shifts the focus from isolated units of inquiry to the transactions and relations in which they are constituted (Emirbayer 1997).

It may be an emphasis on the connections as well as on what is being connected that encourages many of these authors to embrace ethnographic methods, regardless of their own disciplinary backgrounds. One of the most pressing issues in global studies is the importance of situating understand-
ings of the global in everyday life, in order to investigate how regulations and ideologies get lodged in people’s experience. Using ethnography allows many of the authors to enter the points where globals become embodied, discussed, strategized, and performed. As a collective, however, we pursue a form of methodological cosmopolitanism (Beck and Sznaider 2006) that demands a plural rather than a singular approach to society and social phenomena.

**ENTRY POINTS**

Deborah Cohen and Lessie Jo Frazier use the concept of Scale as their entry point, which allows them to historicize the moment in which the world first begins to think globally. How and when did an explicit global scale emerge? Their topic is truly a global moment, the confluence of events and ideas in the late 1960s that resonated in social movements across the world, epitomized in popular imagination by the year 1968. They ask how and when Paris became connected to Chicago, Prague, Rio, Mexico City, and U.S. college campuses. As the authors pursue these questions, they provide new perspectives on the Cold War, shifting focus from competition over military prowess to a reordering of relationships of race and sexuality as well as foreign aid and geopolitics. They explore the histories that give birth to transnational ways of thinking as well as smaller optics, ultimately recognizing the role of the radical remixing of ideas and bodies in the 1960s that now allows us to seamlessly think and act through global scales.

Similarly, Prakash Kumar explores the global history of genetically modified (GM) seeds in India and the genealogy of the activism that has resisted them. These histories and genealogies are not linear or exclusive; Kumar tracks them across Euro-American, Indian, and international spaces and temporalities. In his approach, anti-GM activists become archives brimming with transnational ideologies, policies, histories, and political economies. Some activists, like Vandana Shiva, are able to discern their own global connectivities and are able to reorganize networks and genealogies, and move social and political action forward. The responsibility of a global scholar is to excavate these connections to expose the crisscrossing trajectories as well as the locales where advocacy may in fact be global mimicry.

Cohen and Frazier’s and Kumar’s analyses represent what Rachel Harvey calls the global particular, when research at a global scale eclipses the hetero-
geneity from which the global emerges. Harvey uses a grounded discussion of global financial gold markets to consider the unceasing tension between the global and the particular. She defines this friction as playing out through three analytic vantage points that define the slippage between the general and the particular and represent the relational framings often used in the field of global studies. Her shifting vantage points span the global in the particular (when the global defines the local), the particular in the global (when the local defines the global), and the global particular (when the global becomes the smallest object of inquiry and thus masks the specificity from which it emerges). All of these relationships represent a conceptual rubric that epitomizes the interplay between what are typically seen as dichotomies between local and global, the particular and the general, and the relative and universal. Harvey uses her qualitatively different moments of interconnectivity to break through the binaries that are entrenched in but yet do not adequately represent approaches in global studies. She applies her rubric to global foreign exchange, which she enters through the Particular, from its anchoring in a creative social movement in northeastern Nevada, the Jarbridge Shovel Brigade, to rituals surrounding the “Gold Fixing Room” in London where gold bars are priced for the world market.

As Harvey explains, global scholars must seek what is left out (of dichotomies, for example) and what gets caught between scales. In so doing, they will come face-to-face with a multiplicity of paradoxes, inequalities, and contradictions. These ruptures, frictions, or disjunctures 7 mirror what Faranak Miraftab uses as her entry point, Displacement. For Miraftab, displacement is as much about physical movement and distant homes as it is about neglect and inequality as practiced through international trade policies. Displacement and dispossession spring forth in a rural rust-belt town in Illinois, where multiplicities of global ruptures emerge, and where connections to faraway spaces and times define the labor force of a meat-packing plant where over eighteen thousand hogs are slaughtered each day. This is backbreaking and dangerous work that depends on immigrant labor, and Miraftab reveals how capitalist accumulation relies on harnessing the physical, social, political, and economic displacement that stretches across nations, polities, and families. The author also recognizes that her entry through displacement does not stop at the analytical. To displace the vulnerability and risk associated with conducting research within hegemonic power structures, she uses
multi-sited methods. Her own shifting allows her to make sense of the lives and geopolitics colliding in and connecting Togo, Mexico, and a rural town in the United States.

Conflicts are integral parts of the global assemblages. These assemblages are generative and generated, or ruly and unruly, as Tim Bartley suggests. They are governing and ignored, influential and manipulated. They are composed of capital, people, things, symbols, power, and legalities that are in constant negotiation yet quite stable and unwavering. Zsusza Gille, in her research on Hungarian food politics, emphasizes Materiality in her assemblage of humans and non-humans. Things like fungus, peppers, and foie gras are players as much as European Union trade policy and the world’s largest processor of waterfowl. In her case, just as a meat-packing plant in Illinois is harnessing global disjunctures, all players, whether Hungarian peppers, a for-profit corporation, or a political entity, can manipulate materiality. This is a process of materializing politics, where power is not shared equally across assemblages but is clustered at certain points and within particular bodies that are able to guide and take advantage of socio-material assemblages. Hungary, according to Gille, did not just join the European Union, but rather entered into a new socio-material ordering of humans and non-humans.

Michael Mascarenhas explores the global through Sovereignty, as he argues that NGOs represent new contingent forms of biopolitical control and autonomy. He demonstrates that NGOs strategically harness financial and symbolic capital, authority, and actors as they develop twenty-first-century practices of humanitarianism. In so doing, sovereignty is a deterritorialized and global assemblage of knowledge, money, and crisis intervention. Mascarenhas guides his readers to the technologies, donors, and politics that help NGOs craft and direct knowledge and concern about water sanitation and certain people around the world. This transnational assemblage comprises relationships between governments, citizens, NGOs, technologies, and donors, and in turn paves the way for humanitarian intervention that either succeeds or fails. That NGOs are acting more like governments than advocates for social change often leads to developmental flops, when transnational corporations and donors’ demands take precedence over community interests. Akin to what Zsuzsa Gille argues, here power is not only contingent or emergent but formally embedded in materialities. As such, technologies
are only effective if they are part of specific assemblages that are arranged for their efficiency and function.

Alex Perullo finds that effective development in East Africa requires not just technologies but storytellers who must delicately balance and communicate the tension between relativism and universalism. By entering the global through Rights, Perullo demonstrates that the strategic practice of a discourse of human rights demands insight into the inherent tension between basic human rights—clearly, one of the most “universal” foundations for human lives—and how rights are interpreted, articulated, and manipulated within collections of people, governments, cultures, neoliberal markets, and non-profit organizations. To traverse these collections of interconnectedness, individuals and organizations must utilize a lexicon of rights that allows them to communicate fluidly and globally, across institutions and governments. NGOs in East Africa are particularly skilled at using the rhetoric of rights to shift across scales of practice and power. Perullo also reminds us, as do many of the other contributors, that development is big business and is a practice and discourse where global connections are lodged, manipulated, and reified.

Managing an unruly phenomenon like globalization is not easy, especially as multiplicities of legalities, standards, and operations are layered and overlapping in our lives, goods, and modes of production. Exemplified by the NGOs discussed by Mascarenhas and Perullo, new rule-making projects are popping up across the various landscapes in attempts to broadly regulate environmental standards, human rights, labor conditions, and product quality and safety. Yet, as Tim Bartley demonstrates, rules are made to be broken. Globalization thus becomes a puzzle of rules that must be pursued and played to effectively practice and understand transnational governance through labor and environmental standards. Using Rules as an entry point, Bartley suggests that neoliberalism is the basis for this puzzle, since it represents a global marketplace as well as multiple spaces of knowledge and practice. This tension opens up opportunities for alternative rules and forms of governance. However, it also means that rules and unruliness are cut from the same cloth, such that environmental standards for forest management lead to swaths of illegal logging, and anti-sweatshop campaigns shift apparel production to countries with dreadful safety standards and feeble labor
rights. This puzzling hypocrisy of tightening rules and resourceful dodging, made manifest when garment factories in Bangladesh crumble and burn, is bolstered by neoliberalism. Yet, neoliberalism is not a monolithic phenomenon. The puzzle of rules allows neoliberalism’s rules and regulations not only to promulgate a global market but also to generate alternative values and orders of worth.

In a similar vein, Manuela Ciotti sees the global art market as becoming the new museum. As she carefully analyzes global exchange of modern and contemporary art from India through *Form*, she describes art institutions as global forms of aesthetic sovereignty. The institutions she examines—art fairs, galleries, auction houses, and biennales—are enterprises that are producing the new global museum, as they define exchange rates as well as aesthetics. They are global forms, both processes and outcomes of circulation, where colonial histories, market values, geopolitics, and artistic expression collide and coalesce in the construction of “Indianness,” and differences are captured for capital and consumption. In many ways, these institutional art forms adhere to marketplace ideals by negotiating art as intersecting politics, histories, values, identities, cultures, materialities, and commodities.

For Stephanie DeBoer, new media, film, and technologies are arranged into patterns that forge new platforms for pursuing and defining specific globalized locations. Entering the interface of new technologies and urban landscapes in Shanghai through the concept of *Locations*, DeBoer demonstrates how social media artists, curators, and filmmakers help reinvent Shanghai as a globalized and futuristic space. In so doing they build on, and at times mask, the multivariant scales and powers that are in play in this mediated urban space, and in China more broadly. Exhibits, installations, and festivals themselves become landscapes of interactions and unevenness, as differentiated complexities of the world get performed. They are battlefields where meanings of Chinese urbanism and globalization are vying for prominence and visibility, and where technologies are strategically used to navigate urban policy, aesthetics, state mandates, and global media and industry.

Urban spaces are not the only cartographies defined as global. The scrutiny and reinterpretation of physical and political geographies are at the core of global studies. For example, even though Anne Griffiths’s entry point is *Land*, she interprets land as multifaceted, metaphoric, narrative, and global. As such, she excavates the legal and cultural significance of land in Botswana,
and people’s relationships with it, as she fluidly switches back and forth between local, national, regional, and transnational scales. None of the scales she employs take precedence or have more authority; they are simply part of this collection of global articulations, which emerge in the life histories of two brothers. Their diverging life trajectories reveal how the navigation of legal pluralisms, global connections, and scales of meaning build individual and family access to resources and their diverse social and economic relationships with land.

For Sean Metzger, Seascapes are not only about histories of maritime trade and labor migration, but also about artistic inventions, new identities, and affective responses. Oceanic zones have long been spaces of global interconnectedness, but they also are heuristic metaphors for many of the goals of global scholarship. Metzger views Chineseness as performed on the island of Martinique through the optic of the seascape that frames various aesthetics, feelings, representations, and histories. He draws on cultural studies and textual and visual analysis to illustrate how spaces such as the Chinese Atlantic emerge from roots and routes, thus highlighting the relationships embedded in the flows and ripples that ultimately become localized performances of Chineseness. His privileging of sight reveals not only the visible but also the unseen that is often occluded from images, histories, and processes of identification.

Like Metzger, Katerina Teaiwa renders the global through roots and routes, and through the sea, but her roots go much deeper, not only into ancestral time but also physically into places where identities, beliefs, and practices are anchored. Teaiwa urges us to think about how geopolitical Frames of Oceania have shaped Pacific states and societies, and understandings of history and identity as well. The Pacific is often represented in maps of the world as a blank space between China and the United States. Reframed through the perspectives of Pacific islanders and Pacific studies scholars, Oceania becomes a sea of interlinked islands, and the ocean a highway that has connected them for millennia. Rootedness and mobility are equally important ontological frames, as ancestors, histories, authorities, and inequalities are lodged in physicalities and movements. Teaiwa demonstrates the importance of critically contextualizing not only phenomena and policies but also scholarly vantage points. She is mindful of the colonial legacies and international inequalities that structure or are challenged by practices and perceptions.
As one of her many lessons for global studies, she demonstrates how broader oceans co-produce the islands where globals are moored, performed, and studied.

Deirdre McKay approaches the global through ethnography and through a concern for Affect, as she shows that Filipino caregivers in the United Kingdom make sense of the global as they encounter it through formal institutions but also through emotions, imaginings, desires, and fears. Care—in the forms provided by Filipinos to their employers, and in the practice of concern and support for each other and for those at home—is re-envisioned by migrants through interactive technologies, remittances, and government welfare. Ultimately, globalization and perceptions of care define what it means to be a person in a world made up of givers and receivers of benevolence. McKay reminds us that globalization does not eclipse the cultural and the intimate, but is in fact performed and defined in acts of compassion, or the lack thereof.

Like McKay, all the contributors strive for a more nuanced understanding of the networks of people, things, practices, ideologies, and institutions. They slice up these realities differently, empirically revealing what is too often masked or ignored in global studies. The volume also raises important questions about ethics in global research, recognizing that global stories silence some voices and exclude others. From the observation that humanitarianism rests on interdependencies to the recognition that global and national interests compete on the battlefield of human rights, the contributors engage with questions about inequality as they bring to light the multiple perspectives that give meaning and substance to understanding the global. Ultimately, ethics has everything to do with global studies, from how it is taught, learned, and institutionally supported to where it is located and empirically investigated. A sense of belonging and responsibility to the world is inseparable from the intellectual space being carved out by global studies.

According to Doreen Massey (2004), responsibility derives from the same relations in which our complicated and boundless identities are created, and she urges us to think relationally about the world and our identities. When identities are conceived as concentric spheres that start with individuals and move outward through families, communities, ethnicities, states, and the world, care and responsibility are reduced to geographic units, often located in a house or in the bond between parent and child. Our most meaningful commitments are assumed to be toward those in our proximity, our family
and localized communities. But identities are neither concentric nor cartographic, and we must interrogate whether responsibility is truly anchored in geography. If identities are indeed developed and reified through connections extending far beyond our immediate spaces of intimacy, spilling over borders and beyond skins, then it is a simple step to confront emotional and ethical relationships to faraway geographies and communities. It becomes easier to care about the world. If our identities are boundless, our responsibilities are as well.

Grounded global studies offers a critical and ethical broadening of academic pursuits that is not only beneficial but essential for the interconnected world in which we live. It examines assumptions and challenges reasoning with a number of provocations and entry points. It does not displace disciplinary ideals or regional specificity but rather strengthens and deepens their significance. Global studies creates more competent and critical sociologists, anthropologists, political scientists, historians, urban scholars, scientists, area specialists, and educators. It makes us more capable of fully understanding objects of inquiry and confidently answering research questions. We become more ethical scholars, with abilities, ideas, commitments, and research that transcend academic disciplines, frames of reference, and the globe itself. The contributors to this collection map out their intellectual and empirical paths in ways that serve as examples of global scholarship for researchers of all ages. The case studies examine specific expressions and manifestations of the global, offering various routes and apertures for discerning formations of meaning. We hope that students and global scholars alike will draw liberally upon these essays, adapting these framings to ask insightful questions and discover other entry points, intersections, and vantage points for exploring the global.

**Notes**

1. Scholars whose work seems particularly relevant to many of the authors include Arjun Appadurai, Stephen Collier, Gillian Hart, David Harvey, Epeli Hau’ofa, Henri Lefebvre, Do- reen Massey, Aihwa Ong, Saskia Sassen, Neil Smith, and Anna Tsing. Discussions of specific works and literatures are included in each chapter.

2. See Beck and Grande (2010, 411) for their discussion of cosmopolitan methods and theories of society.

3. I thank Michael Curtin for suggesting that global studies starts with a set of provocations.

5. Thank you to Framing the Global fellow Zsuzsa Gille for suggesting that entry points are a mechanism for slicing up reality differently and ratcheting down the level of abstraction.

6. See Amelina et al. (2012), Beck and Sznaider (2006), Beck and Grande (2010), and Shaw (2003) for discussions on methodological nationalism and means to overcome these deeply entrenched approaches to scholarship.


8. For more on assemblages, see Deleuze and Guattari (1987), Latour (2005), Ong and Collier (2005), and Sassen (2006).

9. See also Hardt and Negri (2000, 37).

10. This type of thinking also reifies an anchoring of authenticity and genuineness in the local, in binary opposition to the global, which is imagined as more abstract and instrumental than profound.

11. In her argument, Massey borrows from scholarship that finds entry points with the philosophy of Spinoza.

12. Because global studies enhances disciplinary thinking, please note that authors in this volume use their preferred disciplinary referencing and citation styles. The reader may thus notice different styles across chapters.
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