

1. Introduction (Lili)

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone depending on where you are. Thank you for coming to our webinar, in which we'll introduce the idea of *tianxia*, all under heaven, originally a Chinese concept, and discuss a *tianxia* heuristic for rethinking global higher education. *Tianxia* includes all of higher education and all of human knowledge. Unlike a nation, or an Empire, *tianxia* has no outer boundary, no self/other dualism.

This may make *tianxia* especially relevant at a time when globalisation and geo-politics has brought us closer than ever, so that our worldwide similarities and our differences are now obvious to us. Globalisation is not everything, but it has changed everything, including higher education. The last thirty years have seen great growth of cross-border activities in higher education. A networked global science system has emerged. International student mobility has expanded. There is continuous expansion in university partnerships and consortia, branch campuses, global hubs in higher education, and online delivery such as MOOCs. Higher education institutions and scientists everywhere are embedded in nation-states, while also being active in global relations and at the level of the world as a whole.

However, the term 'international', meaning inter-national, between nations, does not capture this. How then can we conceive the world as a whole, as a positive environment for all within it? How can we perceive global or world-wide higher education in a less pejorative, less limiting, more inclusive and more equitable manner than is suggested by the practices of global market, global ranking, White Supremacy, or Anglo-American knowledge hierarchy? What *is* the actual world, and what is the *possible* world? It is a compelling problem.

Today, we will argue that the *tianxia* idea provides a possible approach to that.

2. Open ontology, to connect to globalisation (Simon)

We now briefly indicate our philosophical stance. The key is open ontology. First, we argue that natural and social reality exists independently of our perceptions. But our interpretations, and social practices, are among the elements that constitute the real. Reality is not fixed but continually changing, emergent, it is not being it is becoming. There are many possibilities, and the possible is part of the real. Because our world is changing, becoming more globalised as Lili said, we need global governance to come onto the agenda. But

our perceptions are blocked, our interpretations, our old habits and ways of seeing, are preventing this.

Second, we position ourselves between the particularity of the universal, and the universality of the particular. We are wary of universalistic claims to know totality, and also wary of the kind of universal/particular dualism in which some particular values are elevated to the level of ‘universal’, while other particulars are seen as *just* particular, even ‘barbarian’. In relation to Qian’s three kinds of universalism the third offers a way forward. This is ‘the universality that acknowledges and respects the other’ – mutual recognition, actively seeking dialogue and consensus. The Chinese concept of *he er butong* (unity of diversity; harmony with diversity) speaks to the reconciliation of between different positionalities. We acknowledge the geo-cultural particularity, the Chineseness of the *tianxia* idea. We also see the potential of *tianxia* to move beyond the Chinese sphere, addressing universal questions about the world.

3. Tianxia as an evolving and living concept

- **Tianxia as concept, and different strands and debates (Lili)**

Ancient China was the source of two key ideas about the spatial governance of human societies. The older idea, the focus of today, was that of *tianxia*, thinking on the basis of the world as a whole, and the governance of the world on the basis of consensual values. This was part of the Western Zhou dynasty (1047-771 BCE) and the mode of statecraft in China until the Qin dynasty (221-206 BCE). The younger idea was the centrally-ordered nation state. The Qin dynasty state was the first nation state of a recognisably modern kind. In China, it replaced the politics of the world with the politics of the nation. However, despite the emergence of the Qin nation-state, the *tianxia* idea has continued as a strand in Chinese thinking and writings, especially in international relations. Thinking through the nation and thinking through the world co-exist in China. At times they are brought into an explicit relationship.

Tianxia is a specific ontological approach to the world and all relations within the world. Its Chinese characters are 天 (literal meanings as sky, heaven, nature, God) and 下 (literal meanings as under, below, down). In Chinese tradition, *tian* can both refer to the material and natural ‘heaven’, from Chinese people’s observation of ‘sky’, or a supernatural ‘heaven’ associated with notions of worship. Combined, the phrase *tianxia* means ‘all under heaven’.

Tianxia is an evolving and living concept. It is open to multiple uses and interpretations. Stemming from the idea *tian* (heaven), *tianxia* first emerged as **an ecological imagining of all human beings and creatures on earth**. It was an early construction of the world imagination, based on the observations, experiences and imaginations of Chinese people at the time. In this imagination, China, or the Central Plain in Northern China, was the centre of *tianxia*. The concept of *tianxia* then developed from this geographical and spatial imagination, becoming a **cultural constitution and understanding of the world order**.

Some Chinese thinkers viewed the world as transcending ethnicity and geographical location, reflecting **a civilisational imagination of the world**. They highlighted the commonness of human beings and downplayed the emphasis of China as the centre of *tianxia*. Ideas like ‘one *tianxia* (*yitianxia*)’ and ‘all under heaven are one family’ (*tianxia yijia*) were stressed. In contrast, some other thinkers focused on establishing a rigid and explicit hierarchical structure among groups of people inhabiting the *tianxia* space. They centred around **a political structuring** of *tianxia* rather than *tianxia* as a civilisational sphere, highlighting a hierarchical order between *xia* (夏, broadly referring to Chinese Han ethnicity) and *yi* (夷, broadly referring to non-Han ethnicity).

As this suggests, the meanings of *tianxia* are **multi-layered**. For example, Yang and Chen reveal that *tianxia* has at least eleven meanings in pre-Qin era: Zhou Dynasty’s territory, political and social order, the regime, the supreme power, time and space, all human beings, people’s welfare and fortune, routine business, all creatures and things, the territory where people of *Hua* (华) and *Xia* (夏) lived, and political situations. In an attempt to summarise the multiple meanings of *tianxia*, Zhao finds that the classic concept of *tianxia* primarily has three meanings or dimensions, geographical, psychological, and moral/political. Gan points to three facets of the classic idea of *tianxia*: (1) geographically speaking, *tianxia* means all areas under heaven, or within the four seas; (2) *tianxia* refers to order of governance; (3) *tianxia* points to the recognition of the values underlying the order.

Some scholars distinguish between *tianxia* as **a normative appeal** and *tianxia in realpolitik*. Wang argues that the *tianxia* idea is simultaneously embodied ‘as a way of ‘knowing’ [the world] and as a set of ‘normative’ propositions [in dealing with institutions in the world]. Wang’s arguments are echoed by Xu who sees classic *tianxia* as having two closely related meanings. One refers to the universal order, containing a set of cosmic values. The other is associated with governance and order in realpolitik in an imagined space,

following universal order and with the objective of reaching the Great Harmony. It remains unclear to what extent these principles were implemented in realpolitik.

It has also been argued that in Imperial China, the practices of *tianxia* led to a hierarchical system of world order, and the contemporary application of the *tianxia* idea may result in a new global empire or hegemon that replaces the existing one. In the classic *tianxia* idea, particularly when it is applied with geographical references, certain civilisations and regimes are placed as ‘centres’, while others are ‘affiliated’ or ‘peripheral’. Despite the emphasis on all under heaven being one family, there was an assumption of unequal relationships between different groups of people in *tianxia*, with the Han civilisation being in the centre. Xin will explore these ideas further in a minute.

- **Tianxia as virtues (Lili)**

At the core of *tianxia* are **Virtues**. Confucius states that ‘Governance based on virtue is like the North Star taking its place in the sky, while all the other stars revolve around it.’¹ in *Zuo’s Commentary on The Spring and Autumn Annals*, Guan Zhong said to the Marquis of Qi, ‘I have heard it said: Win over the disaffected with respect and embrace distant peoples with virtue. With virtue and respect unchanging, there is no one that will not be embraced.’²

De, meaning virtue, is an essential notion in the Chinese thinking about governance. It also reflects the Chinese approaches to expanding the impact within and beyond its borders. For example, an important reason for the Zhou Dynasty’s success in overturning the Shang Dynasty (1600-1046 BCE), and its long continuation after that, was its regime grounded in virtue. In Li’s words, ‘the Duke of Zhou found the bond [to connect all people under heaven], *de*. The universality of *de* made it transcend and tolerate local diversity, and became a centripetal force that connected all together.’ Following the idea of virtue, the Zhou people protected and respected the Shang people’s properties, original lifestyles, and religions. The only requirement made of the Shang was that they accept the Zhou regime.

The original Zhou kingdom included only 50,000-70,000 people. The Yin-Shang political centre in the Central Plain had a million or more. But Zhou had the moral authority to ‘use the small to govern the great’. It developed an institutional order that ‘did not rely solely on military threat for governance’.

¹ “为政以德，譬如北辰居其所，而众星共之。”（《论语·为政》）

² “管仲言于齐侯曰：臣闻之，招携以礼，怀远以德，德礼不易，无人不怀。”（《左传·僖公七年》）

This was based on a consensus about **shared values, rituals and benefits**. The values encompass **inclusion, respect for diversity, mutuality and respect for others, and governance based on the consent of people**. These values were practised to varying degrees even in relations with neighbouring kingdoms. However, virtue alone was not enough. Meeting shared interests and maintaining the security and stability of the regime were also important conditions of Zhou governance. ‘Purely moral exemplars have a difficult time exercising influence unless they are at the same time exemplars of success’ (p. 74). The Zhou dynasty began to falter when it no longer had surplus land to distribute in exchange for virtuous conduct (pp. 107-108).

- ***Tianxia* and modern nationalism, China, and the world (Xin, 6 mins)**

Thank you Lili and Simon. Following up with the discussions, another important strand of interpretation about *tianxia* is entangled with modern nationalism, China, and the world.

Firstly, there have been conflicting views about the relationship between *tianxia* and nationalism. When the idea of nationalism and modern nation-states was first introduced to China in the 19th century, some intellectuals began to see the *tianxia* idea as related to Chinese imperial imagination of world relations and as causing China’s weakness (Liang 2015, p. 114).

In contrast, Sun Yat-sen saw nationalism and *tianxia* as not in conflict. As he explained: ‘If we are going to bring peace and harmony to *tianxia* in future, we first need to restore nationalism and the status of our nation, to use our inherent morality centring around peace as a foundation to bring the Great Harmony to the world. ... This is the true spirit of our nationalism’ (Sun 1906/2011, p. 67).

Contemporary work on *tianxia* sits between two sets of notions: China-centred notions and world-centred notions. The former discusses *tianxia* where China plays a significant role, while the latter imagines the world as a whole that do not presume one centre or China being the centre.

Firstly, about China-centred notions. Zhao Tingyang’s works on *tianxia*, which have been highly influential in the contemporary discussions, see the reinterpretation of the *tianxia* idea as part of the movement of ‘rethinking China (*chongsi zhongguo*)’. The movement inspires China to re-build its own values, methodologies and frameworks, and rethink about itself and the world. To some, *tianxia* is a way for China to establish its own discourses and soft power

(W. Ding 2018; F. Sun and Chen 2016), such as in relation to the Belt and Road Initiative.

Nonetheless, scholars like Ge Zhaoguang (2015) suggested that since China-centredness and the centre-periphery distinction were intrinsic to *tianxia* in Imperial China, there is a danger of China ‘claiming the *tianxia* idea, which is a true nationalism, as a new cosmopolitanism’ (p. 54). Callahan also sees *tianxia* not as a regime of culture and authority, but a projection of a global hegemon (Callahan 2008; Callahan and Barabantseva 2011). Callahan (2008) also expresses concerns about China’s pressure on other smaller countries and the potential danger of forming a new centre-periphery system.

In turn, the critiques of China-centred *tianxia* have inspired attempts by scholars to reinterpret a world-centred *tianxia* (see e.g. Xu 2015, 2017; Liu 2015).

For instance, Liu Qing (2015) suggested to ‘reject the illusion of returning to the past “Chinese Empire”, and strive to save the ideals of the world from the disillusionment of China-centrism – while ... inherit and reinterpret certain ideas embodied in the idea of *tianxia*’ (Liu 2015, p. 9).

Liu (2015) argues that in the reinterpretation of *tianxia*, it is possible for win-win cooperation, mutual exchanges, and a sense of universalism derived from continuous dialogues between cultures (pp. 11-12). The *tianxia* idea appeals to *he er butong*, unity grounded in harmonious cosmopolitanism (Duara 2017; Beck 2016; Sun 1906/2011). It is believed that universality can be achieved through mutual respect and dialogue. Here, universality and particularity co-exist under *tianxia*.

Common to all discussions about *tianxia* highlights the commonness shared by humanity and human beings’ belongingness to the community (Gan 2019). It also challenges often Western dualistic worldview, which focuses on transforming, assimilating or eliminating ‘the other’ in order to mitigate the tensions between ‘I’ and ‘others’ (Qiang, 2010, p. 223).

An important perspective about *tianxia*, based on Zhao Tingyang, is ‘thinking through the world’. A contrasting notion is ‘thinking of the world’, in which the world is understood as an object, rather than a subject in its own right (Zhao 2011, p. 3; also Zhao 2003, 2018, 2019). When thinking through the world, the world becomes a single entity with sub-collective agents (Zhao 2019). The national identity of the individual is secondary to being a member of *tianxia*. To think through the world break through the national containers, paves the way for discussing global/world citizenship, and consolidate human beings’

responsibility to both serve the world and prioritise the good of the world, rather than other interests.

4. *Tianxia* in higher education studies, a heuristic (Xin)

So, what is the relationship between *tianxia* and higher education?

Although there have been vibrant discussions about globalisation in higher education scholarships, and although *tianxia* offers a distinctive and culturally significant lens to these discussions, there has been only a small number of relevant studies so far about *tianxia* and higher education. Some focused on *tianxia* and Chinese higher education, others with global scope.

For instance, Rui Yang (2015, 2016) examines paradoxes within the Chinese epistemology of *tianxia*. Yang suggests that the *tianxia* concept is a heuristic key to unlocking the paradoxical internationalisation of Chinese higher education, a perspective that has influenced our paper. Our colleague here today, Lili Yang and Lin Tian (2022) review a range of scholarships on *tianxia* in the Chinese and English languages and discuss its relation to higher education. In comparing Anglo-American and Chinese approaches to the ‘public’ dimension of activity in higher education, Lili Yang (2022) also suggests *tianxia weigong* (‘All under heaven belongs to all and is for all’) as an alternative to the ‘Western’ notion of global public or global common good.

Tianxia as a heuristic for understanding higher education

So, how to move forward the *tianxia* discussion in global higher education?

We argue that *tianxia* idea offers a way to escape the national container in higher education. There are multiple scales in higher education and science at the intersections between materiality, imagination and interpretation, and social practices (Marginson, 2011, 2021, 2022). Such as the ‘glonacal’ heuristic proposed by Marginson and Rhoades (2002). Despite the understanding of multiple scales, as Shahjahan and Kezar (2013) argue, perception and empirical research are often trapped ‘within the national container’ and framed by ‘methodological nationalism’ (Wimmer & Schiller, 2002, p. 301).

Tianxia is distinct from the ‘global’ scale. While ‘global’ refers solely to phenomena and activities that constituent worldwide relations, *tianxia* includes all of the different scales at the same time, as in the glonacal idea.

Higher education in *tianxia* includes all of global systems and activities. It also entails values and relationships. *Tianxia* is both a goal to be achieved, and something that is real. Its reality combines the actual and the possible. It both reflects and shapes behaviours. To sum up, *tianxia* functions as a description of existing social relations, a mode of interpreting social relations, an ideal form of social relations, and a call to practice that ideal.

Therefore, we propose *tianxia* as a heuristic or lens for understanding, interpreting and shaping the materiality, discourses and dynamics of global higher education and research. Arguably, due to the self-regulated nature of higher education and research, a *tianxia* order is more readily practised in higher education than in political and economic orders.

There are seven elements in the *tianxia* heuristic.

First and most importantly - ‘thinking through the world’. It imagines the higher education and knowledge world as a single networked and interdependent collective subject within a space without borders. *Tianxia* higher education and knowledge move to internalise all institutions and all knowledge. In *tianxia*, there is neither externality nor binaries.

Second, then, the *tianxia* higher education heuristic highlights connectivity, and the collaborative ‘*tianxia* as one family’ (*tianxia yijia*) and the need to ‘establish a world government and a world system of institutions that endorse the pursuit of this ideal’ (Zhao 2011, p. 28).

Third, *he er butong*, which entails both universality and diversity. It suggests both inclusive cosmopolitan populations of students and faculty and staff, and a radical opening up to include all human knowledge and all varieties of institutions.

Fourth, as in classical *tianxia*, the *tianxia* higher education heuristic is shaped by tensions between equality and hierarchy. Although hierarchies exist in a *tianxia* higher education world, they are not necessarily structurally closed. Material hierarchies should be separated from the hierarchies of values. Vital questions to ask are: *who* to decide *which* value order to follow, and *how* to leave the hierarchies open for changes to equality, equity and justice.

Fifth, the active consent of the participants in higher education. This is achievable as higher education space is a people intensive social sector that rely on sociability, groups, conversation and communication.

Sixth, the inclusion of nature, ecological thinking and sustainability frameworks. This follows not only from classical *tianxia*’s preoccupation with nature, but the understanding of the world as a collective subject, and

discussions about the role of higher education in promoting and facilitating ecologically sustainable futures (e.g. McCowan 2020).

Finally, the role of ritual, which play a key role in fostering affective commitment and a sense of belonging. Examples of rituals include academic degrees, credentials, ceremonies, and peer review in research.

5. Tianxia principles as a basis for global governance (self-regulation) in higher education (Simon)

We have said a tianxia heuristic involves several elements. Thinking through the world, and ecology and sustainability. Relationality and connectivity; which means, more specifically, willing participation and active consent, *he er butong* or unity in diversity, and rituals enabling the affect and practice of belonging. It also has both horizontal and vertical dimensions, and self-evidently operates to the benefit of all. What could it mean to create a mode of global governance in higher education, enabling voluntary collaboration across the world grounded in virtuous practices, in a world where there is *no outer boundary*? A world in which difference and diversity are how we learn, and there is no ‘abyss’ between self and other, no exclusion of elements outside the boundary. We suggest eight such practices:

1. Respect for knowledge and inquiry as profoundly important ends in themselves, and the source of potential applications and uses for social and global betterment.
2. The free worldwide flow of academic information in a common networked system.
3. Academic freedom to learn, to inquire and to teach, free from constraint and with adequate resource support and scope to exercise intellectual agency.
4. Freedom of higher education and research institutions to manage their affairs free of coercion.
5. Respect for persons in higher education at all positions and from all cultures and languages as potential contributors to common knowledge.
6. Inclusion of all bona fide scholarship and science as part of an accessible global repository of knowledge, including the extension of translation functions so that all available knowledge is recognised in the global pool.
7. Open sharing of papers and data unless there is a compelling and agreed case for non-transparency.

8. Routine support for the continuous exchange of academics and students across the world.

These virtues already attract and hold people in higher education, though they are not consistently practised in global relations. The core values of a *tianxia* order include academic freedom, truth seeking and truth telling, and the norms of academic conduct. Core practices like academic freedom differ in the nuance from country to country. In Anglo-American settings the primary emphasis is on negative freedom, freedom from external constraint or coercion. In China academic freedom is primarily understood in positive terms, freedom to do, in conjunction with high status public responsibilities (Hayhoe 2011). There are also important commonalities. In both cases faculty and students value autonomy in teaching and research. no one wants be told what to think, or to programme others as unthinking.

These can be shared values of a *tianxia* order in higher education and knowledge. Zhao's point about exemplars of success must also apply. What pragmatic factors would hold in place a *tianxia* order? There is a shared interest in the mutual status that is formed through collaborative international activities – in which each party augments the status of the other - and there are positive-sum benefits in information exchange, international education and especially, combined knowledge building. Science and scholarship are inherently relational, with a natural *tianxia* form. This is why cross-border science is expanding rapidly. It is true that at present in global higher education, this natural *tianxia* form is overdetermined by inequitable power. Status and knowledge are partly closed, partly privatised and highly stratified, structured by nation-states and calibrated by neo-liberal competition and rankings. In contrast, in a *tianxia* order they are shared and accumulate. A world-wide *tianxia* order in higher education, grounded in mutual respect and learning through diversity, can realise much greater total benefits, with these benefits accessed on an inclusive basis.

Thinking through tianxia: A new/old heuristic for worldwide higher education, 3 March 2022



00:39:07 David Mills: Do send in your questions please in response to this fascinating presentation.

00:40:07 Dr. Pallavi Kushwaha: Hello, everyone. Good presentation.

00:46:39 Jun Li: Wonderful presentation. Thanks to passionate speakers. Though the concept of Tianxia stresses universality, parallel concepts like mode of differentiation value hierarchy in social relations or guanxi. That is, when conflicts emerge, Chinese tend to take care of those who have closer guanxi with them. Then, how can we resolve such conflicts? How can tianxia yijia be realized?

00:47:06 Victorița Trif: Congratulations!

00:48:53 David Mills: Please share your thoughts and comments, as well as questions. All welcome

00:51:01 YUSUF OLDAC: How is the Tianxia imagery different from the “Western” take on the imagery of the “global”? Would you highlight key differences if we have a comparative look?

00:51:33 yaqiao liu: thank you so much for your fruitful information. I would like to ask the possibilities of using Tianxia as a theoretical framework in empirical studies about internationalization. In my sense, ‘Tianxia’ could be a potential theoretical framework to analyse the limitations of western theories when researching empirical studies about internationalization of HE in China. Do you have any suggestions in developing ‘Tianxia’ in empirical studies? Thank you so much.

00:51:35 McQueen Sum: Thank you for the wonderful presentation! I have a quick question about minzu universities in China.

00:51:58 YUSUF OLDAC: Of course, maybe there is not a coherent “western” imagery of global. Just wanted to get your opinions

00:54:59 Jun Li: Thank you for your responses. Dr. Lily Yang, welcome you to HKU. Looking forward to seeing you in person at our faculty.

00:55:26 Elisa Brewis: Can you mention some examples of research/teaching in practice that embody the 8 core values you propose? (apart from your own research project of course :-)

Thank you for showing the relevance of tianxia as an analytical lens and the in-depth presentation

00:56:02 Dr. Pallavi Kushwaha: Thank you David Mills sir for asking but I am clear so far but it still take some time to understand the concept application of Tianxia. It is something new which I came across and would like to detail about it.

00:58:46 Songyang Cheng: Fabulous presentation! Higher education can also be considered as a common good. I just wonder whether there some connections between common good and Tianxia under higher education aspect, Thanks!

01:00:23 Soyoung Lee: Thank you so much for your presentation - I'm not sure if I can articulate my question well, but I think I need some help to fully understand how 'hierarchy' and 'diversity/inclusivity' can coexist... because hierarchy presumes one-ness in my head? .. and the idea of changeability of the hierarchy and Tanxia as non-static concept... how the mobility of agents within Tanxia affect the change? Isn't it just reorder of hierarchy within the same structure - which in some ways is static structure?

01:02:00 YUSUF OLDAC: Thank you!

01:04:19 Dr. Bhaskar C.: A quite new concept. Thanks for presentation.

01:05:06 Sharon Ultsch: can you elaborate more on the idea of the relationship between the idea of higher education for the public good, which is often used in reaction to neoliberal ideology permeating higher education and comparison to tianxia- I am not sure my speaker will work so might only have it in writing

01:06:34 Bernard Lee: Thanks a lot for the presentation, Lili, Simon and Xin! Great work!

01:07:06 JIE DING: Thank you for the inspiring presentation. Tianxia offers a great concept in solving worldwide tensions philosophically. However, as you mentioned about the governance in tianxia system, do you think it needs the compulsory rules or ethic codes in this system? Who would be responsible for making the rules or codes? If the whole world is connected as an entity, will the higher education still have competition like world rankings?

01:07:15 Lori Lee Wallace: What an incredible presentation! I'm grateful to be in this webinar today. I do not have a question, but I do have a comment. You spoke of tianxia happening in the sciences. In looking at the 8 core values that you listed, it seems that the arts could work just as seamlessly.

01:09:43 Elisa Brewis: Great question Lori Lee! I was also just reflecting on the fact that innovation/radical transformation in society often comes from the arts/literature, while universities are often institutions that preserve conservative values/maintain power status quo

01:09:45 Sharon Ultsch: What was the process for synthesizing/ selecting the 8 core values of your manifesto

01:10:01 CGHE Webinars: Thank you for joining us today. A recording of this session will be on the CGHE site tomorrow morning: <https://www.researchcghe.org/events/cghe-seminar/thinking-through-tianxia-a-new-old-heuristic-for-worldwide-higher-education/>

01:10:13 Victorița Trif: Thank you!

01:10:45 CGHE Webinars: Our next webinar, 'From newspaper supplement to data company: Tracking rhetorical change in the Times Higher Education's rankings coverage', will be on Tuesday. You can register here: <https://www.researchcghe.org/events/cghe-seminar/from-newspaper-supplement-to-data-company-tracking-rhetorical-change-in-the-times-higher-educations-rankings-coverage/>

01:11:29 yaqiao liu: thank you so much for the answering. I am not sure if I articulate my question well. The connotation of Tianxia has similarities with Global citizenship (derived from Western contexts). But we can see many empirical studies about global citizenship, such as in faculty member level, students' perspectives, curriculum, etc. The same I have question about embedding Tianxia in education, policy...

01:11:44 CGHE Webinars: Registrations are also open for the CGHE Annual Conference on 24-25 May 2022. More details here: <https://www.cgheconference2022.com/>

01:11:51 Sharon Ultsch: no speaker

01:12:39 David Mills: OH sorry. Just spotted this Sharon. I will reprise it.

01:13:22 Sharon Ultsch: sorry I am here but no speaker.

01:17:14 Lori Lee Wallace: Fantastic!

01:17:25 McQueen Sum: Thank you so much, Lili, Xin, and Simon!

01:17:50 JIE DING: Thank you for great responses!

01:18:33 yaqiao liu: thank you so much !

01:18:41 Shuting Tan: Thank you Simon, Xin and Lili for the insightful presentation

01:22:50 Sharon Ultsch: Thank you all .

01:22:53 Lori Lee Wallace: An incredible discussion. Thank you for your research, Dr. Yang, Dr. Marginson, and Dr. Xu! Thank you for hosting, Dr. Mills!

01:23:32 Luyang Jin: Thank you!