

Introduction: Education in the Era of Globalizing Capitalism

Ilan Gur-Ze'ev and Klas Roth

The new, dramatic imposition, so it seems, is no longer stoppable. It is an embarrassing growth that shatters, deconstructs and transforms modern and pre-modern dimensions and levels of our lives; challenging dreams, concepts, practices and the fruits of the Enlightenment and humanist education, in all its forms and dimensions. As such it should be a starting point for a worthy effort to clarify and deepen our understanding of and responsibility for education in the era of globalization – not to retreat to sentimental, naive or nihilist alternatives. Or, in the words of Bauman: “Retreat from the globalization of the human dependency, from the global reach of human technology and economic activities are, in all probability, no longer on the cards. Answers like ‘stand the wagons in a circle’ or ‘back to the tribal (national, communal) tents’ won’t do. The question is not how to reverse the river of history, but how to fight the pollution of its waters by human misery and how to channel its flow towards a more equitable distribution of the benefits it carries ... An effective response to globalization can only be global.”¹

For better or for worse, modern history, or our lives as we were educated to articulate them, to reflect on them, to challenge or edify them – cannot necessarily continue linearly in the light of binary logic, social security and dialogically-reached consensus and collective action, regulated and edified in a liberal democracy; our lives cannot continue unchanged either in their present forms or in their current directions, as if nothing had happened in the last generation.

Some would claim that modern life and its prospects have no future at all, in the face of post-Fordist production, distribution, representation and consumption² within the framework of globalizing capitalism. They see globalization as a menace we should prepare ourselves to challenge; some would say to struggle against at all costs, since it can terrorize what is dear to us, even the very existence of the earth.³

There are also people who would argue that globalizing capitalism or, in other words, the Americanization of the planet,⁴ is the genuine world terror⁵ and is responsible for the reaction

¹ Bauman 2003, p. 19.

² Amin 2000, pp. 1–40.

³ Amin 2004, pp. 438–448.

⁴ Sen 2002, pp. 1–14.

⁵ West 1993, p. 394.

from in particular Islam and the fundamentalists⁶; and that it is not, in fact, the fanatic killers of Al-Qaida, Hamas, Hisbulla or the Islamic Jihad.⁷ And so, as Peter McLaren teaches us, it is the mission of post-colonialist education as part of the world's progressive forces to address the colonialist nature of globalizing capitalism in theory as well as in revolutionary practice.⁸ Others, such as Salman Rushdie, will disagree and insist that "Yes, this is about Islam".⁹ Still others, among them moderate social democrats, committed democrats¹⁰ and wise critical thinkers tell us that globalization opens for us new ways for mutual responsibility and leads us toward potential new forms of solidarity.¹¹ Less critical thinkers celebrate the disputable fact that globalization makes "us" richer¹² and could be restrained and re-educated,¹³ even ethically,¹⁴ and argue that it opens the gates for economically-rationalized pro-transparency and anti-dictatorial attitudes, for local autonomy and individual creativity, resistance to closure and for a new, edified, global human existence that will be richer, more democratic and moral; and that it will realize the vision of self-rule in oneself as an autonomous, creative, nomad and free human being.¹⁵ According to this vision, globalization offers us new horizons for rewording, uncensored creativity,¹⁶ liberation from territoriality and its ethnocentricity while transcending the limits, hierarchies, oppressive values, ideals and practices of modernity and anti-modernization alike.

Either way, we cannot avoid addressing the new existential, philosophical, economic, cultural and political conditions, as educators, as theorists of education, as objects of subjectification and as – directly and indirectly – subjects of dynamic disciplining symbolic bombardment. The changes and transformations inflicted/opened by globalization might be justifiably called "revolution", "transformation of human conditions" or "a new era".

So, how should we understand the new actuality and what should we do? Is this the first step on the way toward the world of the cyborg: a civilization beyond the dichotomies between nature and culture, humans, nature and machines, reality and fantasy, the moment and eternity? Or is it a gateway for the new, most advanced, self-inflicted barbarization of

⁶ Gray 1998, p. 7.

⁷ See also Giovanna Borradori 2003 and Michael A. Peters 2005 for elaborated discussions on the issue of terrorism in an age of globalization.

⁸ McLaren 1997.

⁹ Rushdie 2004, pp. 357–358.

¹⁰ Sacks 2004, pp. 210–231. See also: Giddens 2002, p. XXIX.

¹¹ Bauman 2003, pp. 16–17.

¹² Micklethwait and Wooldridge 2003, pp. 332.

¹³ Behrman 2002, p. 109.

¹⁴ Kuenig 1998, p. 92.

¹⁵ Novak 2002, p. 260.

¹⁶ Dunning 2002, p. 24.

humanity? Is it the beginning of a culture-clash that will bring the end of liberal democracies and eventually human life on this planet? Or is it a new beginning, a dangerous inauguration of a human rebirth, even if only for the few selected ones – an open possibility that is so complex and anarchist that we cannot yet foresee its future fortunes while we must already now position and educate ourselves for addressing its risks, possibilities and ambivalences? And if so, should we offer new ways of understanding and practising education that will prepare individuals to live in a godless, multi-oriented, kaleidoscopic, risky, free, creative, ecstatic world? Or, maybe we, as humanist educators, should react like the Roman soldier excavated in Pompeii who faced the magma of the Vesuvius by remaining at his post. Should we recycle archaic and outmoded humanist ambitions, values, ideals, and concepts in order to hold on to what is still left to us: heroic tragedy?

Nothing prepared us for a worthy addressing of this historical shift, certainly not modern humanist education. Humanist education, as well as its various current critiques, rivals and alternatives (such as critical pedagogy, ecological education, postcolonial education and radical feminist education) are not only disoriented. It is exhausted. Beside the alternative of Jihad, all other alternatives are too weak to enforce a coherent exclusive, stable, enduring set of master signifiers and strong endeavour. They compete with each other and with infinite other quests, fashions and developments, too weak to change the world according to an exclusive vision as an alternative to the humanist education that has become obsolete. Even more: they became part and parcel of the open-rich-contingent-conflicting-totality of global cultural products that function in line with the rules imposed by the globalization that they are committed to destroy or overcome!¹⁷ As an example, today's world political leader of anti-colonialism and anti-globalization, the Venezuelan president Hugo Chaves, who only recently opened in Caracas the Peter McLaren Institute for revolutionary pedagogies against globalization and colonialism, is at the same time a major player in the global oil trade, while knowing all too well that the rich in the West will not suffer very much from another rise in their gasoline for their cars while the billions in Third World countries will be pushed closer to starvation. At the same time, as a consistent anti-Western, anti-racist and anti-“whiteness” revolutionary, he presents his post-colonialism and violent rhetoric along with his closest ally and personal friend, Ahmadinejad, the Iranian fundamentalist president. He shares Ahmadinejad's explicit anti-Semitism and anti-colonialism, while devotedly working politically and economically in the global market according to the principle of the

¹⁷ Gur-Ze'ev, *From Critical Theory to Diasporic Philosophy*, Sense Publishers (forthcoming).

maximization of profits, undistinguishably from Nike, McDonald's and the other representatives of Western colonialism. A central difference between international corporations such as Microsoft and the explicit “anti-colonialist and anti-globalization” forces such as revolutionary Venezuela, fundamentalist Iran, Syria and Hezbollah is that these revolutionary forces are not subject to any systematic evaluation and regulation by any democratic institution or procedure and are practising or supporting direct and explicit violence against innocent citizens around the world under the flag of anti-globalization and anti-colonialism.

What is significant, however, is that the critical pedagogy of McLaren and even Ahmadinejad’s critique of the West has a point. It is erroneous to dismiss this critique as the irrelevant, vulgar rhetoric of the lunatic representatives of “the axis of evil”. The big challenges, however, is to not side with any of the good guys and challenge all forms of globalization, colonialism, post-colonialist-dogmatic-violent critique of globalization and colonialism. The challenge is to approach a critique of their intimate collaboration, similarities and differences and elaborate on the difference that makes a difference; towards new ways of understanding education in the era of globalization that will not only challenge these various manifestations of the essence of colonialism itself, but will further invite and cultivate alternative, flourishing, moral, life-loving, creative, solidarian modes of existence within the present system against its own logic and imperatives.

All the rival critiques of modern humanist education are trying to react to globalization, but they are all united in their impotency: impotency to offer a coherent educational alternative that will present understanding-explanation-prognosis-for-change and actual bettering of the world. The world of Jihad¹⁸ is seemingly and currently the only educational agenda offering a vivid emotional, spiritual, ethical, aesthetic, political and educational alternative worth approaching and addressing, but we will not go into this issue in this collection. Instead, we will go into Globalization itself as a creative break with modernity and its educational utopias; we will critically present various critiques of, inter alia, globalizing capitalism, and offer a reflection on their presumptions and limitations and the new possibilities they offer us.

The apparent weakness of some of the present critiques and educational alternatives to globalization and its fruits is partially due to the fact that the human condition is turning into something totally foreign, young and strange to us. We do not know yet what it will give birth

¹⁸ Barber 1996.

to, yet it is already creating new human preconditions, pressing challenges in actual powerful circumstances, and vivid, creative new ideals and telos that we do not have the tools to decipher and the mechanisms to stop, transform or edify. This newborn shift is not yet here in its full richness, yet the world as we modernists knew it is rapidly dissolving, is being deconstructed, ridiculed or transformed in front of our eyes. Maybe we should not expect a clear and distinctive birth of a new historical moment like the change from eating raw food into eating cooked food or from nomadism into agricultural and urban life. This is more in the nature of a new system that changes from linear-binary-hierarchical structures and dynamics into a rich, centerless, ecstatic, hybrid organization of reality, best symbolized by cyberspace and the logic of connectionism. This is one of the main reasons that the new threats, limits and possibilities embrace not only the various trends in humanist education but also its various post-modern and modern alternatives. In the meantime, educational theory and practice, formal and especially informal, in New York, Tokyo, London, Tel Aviv, Caracas, Sydney, Stockholm and Cairo, are already facing dramatic restructuring, changes and new possibilities that call for worthy educational attention.

Globalization is already manifested in many levels and dimensions of public and individual life. It already threatens existing preconditions, values, conceptual apparatus, habits and normalized expectations. It confronts the structures that made liberal democracy, humanist education and the welfare state possible. It confronts and deconstructs effectively any kind of relative economic independence and stability as well as ecological equilibrium and security in the self-justification of true knowledge, the autonomy of the subject and dialogical, democratic, intersubjectivity that the Enlightenment taught us to appreciate and struggle for. It deconstructs the preconditions for longing and struggling for non-violent consensus and true understanding; it deconstructs peace and worthy civic life in the nation state that accepts and enhances modernization, liberal and deliberative democracy, civic society and so much more. All that is gone now and at present we are caught between that which has become obsolete and that which has not yet arrived.

Central modern concepts, ideals and master signifiers are being swiftly transformed and deconstructed, or are becoming irrelevant, reflecting the advancement of new technologies, economic developments, cultural shifts/clashes, migration, ecological threats and the very fundamental dynamics of the “risk society”.¹⁹ This concerns concepts such as ‘love’,

¹⁹ Beck 1992.

‘subject’, ‘freedom’, ‘dialogue’ or ‘deliberation’, ‘understanding’, ‘truth’, ‘interpretation’, ‘legitimation’, ‘justice’, ‘security’, ‘danger’, ‘responsibility’ and ‘creativity’.

For example, young people today enter a reality where it is no longer rational for them to expect that they can rely on or hope for a consensual understanding of any of these concepts; nor is it possible for them to maintain confidence in an undisputable meta-theory that will justify “their” values, theory, ideals or hopes. At the same time, it is already common knowledge that people cannot rely on the future of their workplace, social security, ecological balance, or the outcomes of the next terror attack or of the global financial markets. The concepts of ‘security’, ‘confidence’ and ‘risk’ are being transformed existentially, philosophically and politically in such a way that “confidence” is no longer externally, logically or religiously founded, formal, fixed and stable, but is fundamentally rooted in the essence of the nomadic eternal-improviser²⁰ who creatively insists on transcending the given, the consensual, the self-evident and the unbridgeable, changing reality and himself or herself in an instant of the infinity of the moment. New ways of understanding and practising education might offer transcendence and a rearticulated autonomy within the totality of globalization. Within a globalized world and not in an imaginable utopia:

... openness, danger, and eros must have the last word. It is always put to the test in relation to the connection of human life to the moment, to history, and to eternity ... Politics, or the world of contingent power-relations and violent symbolic and direct dynamics, here becomes a very relevant factor, yet never has the upper hand. The Diasporic eternal-improviser, when true to himself or herself, is never a totally controlled citizen of the earthly city; he or she resists becoming-swallowed-by-the-system, the historical facts, or the social horizons. He or she crosses from the infinity of each moment to eternity, or from eternity to the historical sphere and to the infinity of the fleeting moment. Parallel to the asymmetry and the absence of hierarchy and determined order between the moment, history, and eternity is the absence of hierarchy and determinism between reality, and its hermeneutical depths. It parallels also the “cosmic music” of that which is symbolized by ‘reality’ and its representations, its courageous-edifying critique and its creative-transformative interpretations.²¹

Here, responsibility too is transformed – not abandoned – in face of the new horizons opened up by globalizing capitalism. In the face of structurally-rationally justified growing gaps between the haves and the marginalized, the transformation of old institutions such as the family and democracy²², the threats to the environment and the culture clash, humanist

²⁰ Gur-Ze'ev 2005.

²¹ Gur-Ze'ev, *Op. Cit.*, p. 32.

²² Gray 1998, pp. 1–7.

educators should ask themselves new questions and open themselves to the task of rearticulating the fundamental values, concepts and predictions of current formal education. More than ever effective education takes place less in the family, the community and the schooling system. The very concept and potentials of education are being transformed and this is being realized more than ever in chaotic, ambivalent, informal arenas like cyberspace, and commercial centres, in the face of MTV and in the rapidly changing marketplace governed by international conglomerates such as McDonalds or Microsoft. It is not only a challenge for citizenship education, democratic education or education for sustainability and responsibility.²³ It is also a far greater challenge for restructuring ethics. New ways of understanding and practising education today should relate to the effective, rapid deconstruction of what we know as ethics, canon, social, economic and ecological equilibrium and the already present presence of the future in the form of cyborgs, identity politics and the coalition between the McWorld, the world of Jihad and the post-colonialist alternatives which, on the remnants of the centralized sovereignty of the nation-state²⁴, are mistakably conceived as arch rivals. We assert that they are inseparable from the challenge of globalization and should be addressed as part of a coherent theoretical, political and educational re-articulation.

Today, we humanist educators in search of new ways of understanding and practising education have the responsibility to decipher and address what is actually happening around us. And what should we educators do when faced by these rapid, ecstatic, omnipotent changes while the new language for understanding and change is still beyond our comprehension? Yet the interdependence and mutual responsibility are present, and are pressing and urgent more than ever before. So, universalism does not fade away with the old foundations, hierarchies, security and telos. It is not necessarily correct, however, to recycle “critical education” in the face of globalization that confronts difference, hybridity, parallel and conflicting cultural legacies and moral yardsticks, and in the face of new technologies and economic de-territorializations that push away any centre, linearity, historical telos and non-violent consensus at a time when they are most needed. Ethical ambivalence, dynamic identity formations, and rapidly deformed-re-organized understandings, consensus and mutual action might lead us toward new ways of understanding and practising education. An understanding and practising of education that offer new, edified forms of togetherness, love, creativity and

²³ See Roth 2000 for a discussion on the transformation of education for democratic citizens, and Burbules and Roth for a discussion of changing notions of citizenship education in an age of transformation (forthcoming).

²⁴ Bauman 1998, p. 65.

responsibility while acknowledging ambivalence, multi-layered, Net-oriented realities, polyphonic dialogues and improvisation in a rich, dynamic, non-linear, speedy space-time relations are yet to come. Such education should address the existential and ethical need for responsibility and improvisation in the face of the various manifestations of globalization. As humans, as mothers and fathers, as friends, as free thinkers, as creators and as educators, we cannot content ourselves with maintaining our hopes and continuing what we have been doing up to now; not even “reforms” or merely adopting intellectual, educational or other fashions will do. The river of change and global risks of unprecedented magnitude, if nothing else, call for such a new education, and will not take “later on” as an answer! A far-reaching-sweeping change in educational theory and practice is needed; and there are very few who are willing and ready to rethink educational, political, philosophical and ethical traditions that have become so comfortable for them, in order to tackle the challenge we are facing globally today. This invitation, this first step toward the richness and the dangers of the unknown, is our endeavour in this collection.

Overview of the Book

The book opens with an interview of Nicholas Burbules by Klas Roth that sets the frame for the discussion and arguments to come. It continues with various theoretical and elaborated inquiries of critical issues in times of transition and ends with a discussion of the issue of hope: human beings endlessly strive to better the conditions for human development.. The authors show how various changes in the era of globalization influence discussions on education today, but also how altered conditions transform education and our thinking about it. In particular, they draw upon and sometimes move between different theoretical perspectives on education such as post-modern thinking, continental philosophy, analytical philosophy, critical theory, pragmatism, counter-education and post-structuralist thinking, but also on recent developments in political theory on deliberative democracy. They critically inquire into the notions of freedom, human rights and human-rights education, cosmopolitanism and hospitality, the development of various valuable capabilities in our modern complex world such as imaginative, ethical, critical and deliberative capacities, and a reasonable notion of subjectivity that takes the body into account. Issues of responsibility, democratic deliberation, multiculturalism and racism as well as sports education and globalizing capitalism are also raised and critically discussed. The book ends with a discussion on hope and education, a discussion also raised by Burbules in the interview. The

authors exemplify in different ways through their writing their own relation to and perspective on education, and particularly how their philosophical viewpoints reflect their way of understanding and discussing some of the more influential trends, perspectives and critical issues in education today. Several authors point to the value of reflection, critical inquiry, dialogue or deliberation for children and young people in education as well as for teachers, principals and educational policy-makers, as well as to the need for research on education in times when global transitions in social, political, religious, and economic terms affect us all and in different ways. It is our hope that the discussions in this book will give the reader impulses, insights and issues to deliberate and critically inquire into further; they are raised by some of the leading philosophers of education and editors of influential journals on philosophical questions and educational problems.

In the opening chapter – a dialogue on educational issues – *Klas Roth* interviews *Nicholas Burbules* about different trends within the philosophy of education, about the value of those trends for education in general and for teachers in particular, and about the barriers to philosophical reflection in schools. Professor Burbules also talks about the normalising function of education, issues of diversity and difference, globalisation and dialogue in times of transition and globalization, and especially about his own writing and thinking on these issues. In particular he puts forward his ideas on the tragic sense of education, which he says is probably the most important perspective for him in his work on education in times of transition and related issues.

Paul Standish takes up the Enlightenment notion of freedom and the challenges it faces in our global world. He puts forward an alternative, richer notion of freedom, particularly in relation to curricula. He draws on examples from the United Kingdom (UK) when he talks about the development of the idea of freedom in our modern world, the progressive movements in the UK and especially the idea of liberal education. At the end of his chapter he addresses the problems and difficulties of liberal education and in particular the idea of rational autonomy, which he argues is narrow, elitist and does not pay attention to a more full-fledged view of morality. He concludes by putting forward his alternative notion of freedom in terms of knowledge by direct acquaintance.

Pradeep A. Dhillon argues for human rights and human-rights education in terms of Kantian ethics. She argues against narrow political and legal views and points out that we cannot do without philosophical and metaphysical claims. She brings the significance of Immanuel Kant's universalism and cosmopolitanism to our attention, stressing that a Kantian notion made human rights and human-rights education globally significant. She argues that a

Kantian notion of human rights discourse and education can take into account critique from those who talk about the significance of cultural differences that enrich human-rights discourse and embrace human-rights education in the era of globalization.

Sharon Todd also discusses Kant's ideas, especially his notion of cosmopolitanism and hospitality. She particularly focuses on the ambiguities of cosmopolitanism, arguing that it defends universal moral standards on the one hand and recognises local systems of meaning on the other hand. She explores the effects of universal rights on the concrete case of the French law prohibiting religious symbols in schools. Todd argues that Kant's notion of hospitality requires attentiveness to the needs of others and, if coupled with Levinas' notion of the Other, leads to a commitment to valuing difference and a framework for considering the effects of rights upon those whose needs do not seem to be recognised. With such a framework she believes we could be more attentive to and learn from those whose needs are misrecognised due to universal rights.

Elizabeth E. Heilman explores ideas for global education or cosmopolitan education and argues that it has various intentions: imaginative, ethical and pragmatic ones. The first is a type of psychological education, the second is a kind of moral education and the third is a kind of technical education. She claims that these intentions of global or cosmopolitan education develop students' abilities to think differently, inspire emotional responses and a willingness to act responsibly towards the other, and promote an understanding as well as knowledge of global and environmental problems, political and economic systems and changing technologies. She concludes by arguing that the imaginative and ethical intentions are more fundamental than the technical ones.

Klas Roth discusses various notions of education for responsibility an epistemological one, an ethical one and a deliberative interpretation. He argues that the conditions for successful education in epistemological and ethical terms are problematic, and that we do not need to draw a sharp distinction between the epistemological and ethical dimensions of education for responsibility. He suggests that the distinction between knowledge and ethics is not a distinction in kind but a difference in degree. In his opinion, a deliberative notion shows, that we are both accountable to and responsible for each other when entering into a deliberative communicative relation with one another. Deliberation, he argues, gives those concerned the possibility to critically investigate, to come to understand and legitimate whatever concerns them, and to develop their communicative capacities in cognitive, ethical and critical terms.

Lars Lovlie also considers the notion of deliberation. He discusses the educational point of view as a pro-critical education for children and young people, and questions whether

education for deliberative democracy can consist of such an education. He distinguishes between a strict and moderate version of deliberation and argues that ethical phenomena – existential topoi – such as friendship, love, mourning and death bridge the gap between a strict and a moderate version. The strict version focuses basically on reason and the moderate one on virtues, while the existential topoi or topics do not submit to formal views of deliberation either on personal virtues or local values. Lovlie argues that existential phenomena are radical experiences that instead raise new questions and insights without being categorical or determined by the values within specific communities or personal interests.

Mark Halstead inquires critically into multicultural metaphors used in the various discourses on multiculturalism. He particularly focuses on those who aim at stimulating imaginative capacities and evoking emotions, and argues that it is not enough to stimulate children's and young people's imaginative capacities or evoke their emotional responses; children and young people need to develop their critical skills as well. Halstead shows how multicultural metaphors, whether they concern the insider/outsider, threat or menace or a mixture of different kinds, structure our thinking. He argues that learning about multiculturalism cannot do without metaphors of various kinds or be avoided, and that the only way to protect children and young people from being influenced negatively by multicultural metaphors is to develop their skills of critical thinking.

Walter Feinberg explores the relation between racism and capitalism, showing that racism is not only an attitude but is also built on power relations and supported by institutions and practices of various kinds. It is particularly important to acknowledge this in a global economy and with the mobility of labour across nation-states. He argues that narratives of class and mobility, as well as those of marginalisation and race, are structured differently, and that the educator's task is to disengage these narratives from each other and enquire into the different normative standpoint they entail. He shows how the effects of various different narratives work in communication, or rather miscommunication, between people and points out the importance of the teacher helping students to understand the dynamics and interplay of such narratives in communication in education.

Birgit Nordtug enquires into the notion of subjectivity and the relation between knowledge and subjectivity, a much-discussed topic today. She distinguishes between three post-structuralist notions: Giddens's reflexive approach, Bauman's moral approach and Kristeva's linguistic approach to subjectivity. Nordtug argues that Giddens's notion of reflexive modernity provides concepts and perspectives that constitute the notion of subjectivity within the frameworks produced by the experts, and functions as a resource for reflexivity. She

points out that Bauman views subjectivity differently. He claims, according to her, that real subjectivity is free from knowledge and is instead experienced through taking responsibility for the responsibility for the Other. Nordtug is critical of both of these views and argues for a notion of subjectivity that is more closely affiliated with Kristeva's linguistic approach, which takes knowledge construction and especially the symbolic and semiotic dimension into account. She claims that such a notion of subjectivity is valuable for an understanding and critical analysis of knowledge production in educational practices.

Ilan Gur-Zeév explores the historical roots of sports education and its changes throughout time... He begins in Ancient Greece and continues through the Middle Ages and Modernity, ending up in our time, a time of globalizing capitalism. He traces its religious, ideological and philosophical roots and develops a philosophy of sports counter-education. He argues that such an education challenges the instrumentalization and reification of sports and sports education today and in particular the hegemonic sports industry. He also argues that sports counter-education offers a dialectic view which transcends the impact of global capitalism on sports and opens up the critical potential of sports education as well as its humanistic roots, the impetus of Love of Life.

Richard Kahn enquires critically into the concept of paideia and explores in particular its changes throughout time. He begins in Ancient Greece and traces its changes from the Athenian paideia and its Hellenistic transformation to the period from Alexander through the Roman Empire, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the Enlightenment to our modern globalized world. He argues that the educational and political notion of paideia,, with its focus on class distinctions, domination and oppression by elites over the people, has outlived its transformations from its birth to our time. He finally raises the question of an ecological paideia as a possibility for future education, functioning as an inclusive radical democratic concept and a critical education for democratic life.

Olli-Pekka Moisto and *Juha Suoranta* explore the notion of hope in relation to education and argue that we need to change ourselves if we want to change the world. They enquire into different notions of hope and argue that an individual's lonely act in silence and isolation can have social effects. They argue that it is especially important that education should encompass a comprehensive notion of hope in our modern world that does not lead to or include despair, pessimism, cynicism or passive waiting, but a critical, dynamic hope. They particularly draw on Erich Fromm's discussion on hope when they put forward their dynamic notion of hope, which includes faith and fortitude and the realization of autonomous activity in interaction with the environment and other people. They conclude by suggesting principles for teaching

and planning the curricula, which, in their opinion, can be seen as cornerstones of hopeful education in the era of globalization.

References

- Amin, Ash 2000: Post-Fordism: models, fantasies and phantoms of transition, in: Ash Amin (ed.), *Post-Fordism – A Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 1–40.
- Amin, Ash 2004: A better world is possible – International forum on globalization, in Frank J. Lechner and John Boli (ed.), *The Globalization Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 438– 448.
- Barber, Benjamin 1996: *Jihad vs. McWorld*, New York: Ballantine Books.
- Bauman, Zygmunt 1998: *Postmodernity and its Discontents*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Bauman, Zygmunt 2003: *Society Under Siege*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Beck, Ulrich 1992: *Risk Society – Towards a New Modernity*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Behrman, Jack N. 2002: Transformation of society – implications for globalization, in: John Dunning (ed.), *Making Globalization Good – The Moral Challenges of Global Capitalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borradori, Giovanna 2003: *Philosophy in a Time of Terror. Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Burbules, Nicholas and Roth, Klas *Changing Notions of Citizenship Education in Contemporary Nation-states*, Sense Publishers (forthcoming)
- Dunning, John H. 2002: The moral imperatives of global capitalism – an overview, in: John Dunning (ed.), *Making Globalization Good – The Moral Challenges of Global Capitalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giddens, Anthony 2002: *Runaway World – How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*, Surrey: Profile Books.
- Gray, John 1998: *False Down – The Delusions of Global Capitalism*, The New Press.
- Gray, John 1998: From the great transformation to the global free market, in: John Gray, *False Down – The Delusions of Global Capitalism*, The New Press.
- Gur-Ze'ev, Ilan 2005: Toward a New Critical Language in Education, in: Ilan Gur-Ze'ev (ed.), *Critical Theory and Critical Pedagogy Today – Toward a New Critical Language in Education*, Haifa: Haifa University, Faculty of Education, pp. 7–35.
- Gur-Ze'ev, Ilan *From Critical Theory to Diasporic Philosophy*, Sense Publishers (forthcoming).
- Kuening, Hans 1998: *A global ethic for Global Politics and Economics*, Oxford: Oxford university Press.
- McLaren, Peter 1997: *Revolutionary Multiculturalism – Pedagogies of Dissent for the New Millenium*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview.

- Micklethwait, John and Wooldridge, Adrian (2003) *A Future Perfect – The Essentials of Globalization*, Random House.
- Novak, Michael 2002: A universal culture of human rights and freedom's habit – caritapolis, in: John Dunning (ed.), *Making Globalization Good – The Moral Challenges of Global Capitalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peters, Michael A. 2005: Introduction. Education in the Age of Terrorism, in Michael A. Peters (ed.) *Education, Globalization, and the State in the Age of Terrorism*, London: Paradigm Publishers, pp. 1–30.
- Roth, Klas 2000: *Democracy, Education and Citizenship. Toward a Theory on the Education of Deliberative Democratic Citizens*. Stockholm: Stockholm Institute of Education Press.
- Rushdie, Salman 2004: Yes, this is about Islam, in: Frank J. Lechner and John Boli, *The Globalization Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 357–358.
- Sacks, Jonathan 2004: Global covenant: a Jewish perspective on globalization, in: John H. Dunning (ed.), *Making Globalization Good – The Moral Challenges of Global Capitalism*, Oxford: university of Oxford Press, pp. 210–231.
- Sen, Amartya 2002: How to judge globalization, *The American Prospect*, 13: 1, pp. 1–14.
- West, Cornel 1993: Entanglements and complicities, in: Joseph Natoli and Lind Hutcheon (eds.), *A Postmodern Reader*, New York: State University of New York Press.