

# ISSUES IN GLOBAL EDUCATION

Issue No. 168

*The American Forum for Global Education*

2001-2002

*In this edition of Issues in Global Education, we attempt to do two things. First, to present some of the latest thinking as to the directions global education should take, and, second, to explore some of the ways in which those directions might take shape in new guidelines to assist schools in incorporating global education in their classrooms. The point is to stimulate discussion, not to urge blind acceptance, for included in this issue is at least one articulate disclaimer representative of other similarly negative voices.*

*With this edition, the Editor hopes to stir some thought about the Guidelines for Global and International Studies Education published by The American Forum for Global Education in 1995. The American Forum would like to initiate a full dialogue to help change or improve those guidelines to meet the challenges of the changing nature of society. The Forum believes that these guidelines should be flexible and adaptable for educator's use in developing school and college programs. We invite all who read this issue, and all who are interested in furthering global education, to send their visions, viewpoints, arguments, positions, and critiques to Issues' Editor. See the masthead for contact information. The Guidelines may be found at [www.globaled.org/guidelines/html](http://www.globaled.org/guidelines/html) or contact The Forum for paper copy.*

"What would universal society be like which would have no particular country, which would be neither French, nor English, nor German, nor Spanish, nor Portuguese, nor Italian, nor Russian, nor Tartar, nor Persian, nor Indian, nor Chinese, nor American, or rather which would be all of these societies at the same time? What would be the consequence for its customs, its sciences, its arts, its poetry? How would people express emotions that are felt at the same time, but in different ways by different nations in different climates? How would the language incorporate this confusion of needs and images? And what would that language be? Would the fusion of societies result in a universal idiom, or would there be a dialect of transactions serving daily usage, while each nation spoke its own language, or would different languages rather be understood by everyone? Under what similar rule, under what single law would this society exist? How is one to find a place in a world which is made larger by the power of ubiquitousness; and made smaller by the little proportions of a globe which is everywhere polluted? All that will be left will be to demand that science find a way of changing planets." Francois-Rene de Chateaubriand, 1841

Quoted in Emma Rothschild, "Globalization and the Return of History (Who is Europe?)," in *Foreign Policy*, Summer, 1999

## GLOBAL EDUCATION REDIRECTION OR NEW DIRECTION?

The tragic events of September 11th added a new, and terrible, dimension to the notion of globalization, especially as we view it in the United States. Many events, inventions, technological advances, communication revolutions, economic up- and downswings, political upheavals and overthrows, cross-cultural contacts and conflicts have occurred in our world since 1995—the year in which the last set of global education guidelines were issued by The American Forum for Global Education. At that time, and for several years prior, much of the nature of global education had remained relatively static in Cold War and immediate post-Cold War rhetoric. A recent issue of *Issues in Global Education* was dedicated to the early work of Lee Anderson, an

early advocate of global education. Lee, like many of us who grew up and worked in the global education field through the 70's, 80's and 90's, were indebted to the seminal work of such early gurus as Robert Hanvey, Chadwick Alger, James Becker and Kenneth Boulding. These men were among the first to encourage a "global perspective"—which for them was an attempt to stand in the shoes of others and view the world through the eyes of others. Some US states slowly began to infuse their social studies programs with international overtones, then added culture studies that went beyond Europe to include cultures from Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America. Finally, school systems modified their curricula to recognize the emerging global nature of the world.

# Challenges for the 21st Century

By Klaus Schwab

[The following is a general statement of what one person, involved in assessing the economic world, believes will be some necessary principles to govern future directions of globalization. *Ed.*]

The motto of the World Economic Forum and the guiding philosophy in my own life has always been “Entrepreneurship in the global public interest.”

Let me start with entrepreneurship, which is best defined as daring undertaking. Vision, risk-taking, courage, action—these are the dimensions of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship certainly means leadership, but it means more: namely, creative leadership. Whom do you consider as the true leaders in today’s world who can deal with the key problems associated with population and development? Who comes to your mind? Politicians? Entrepreneurs? My guess is that the names coming up are likely to be Bill Gates (Microsoft), Jack Welch (General Electric), Percy Barnevik (Investor AB), Ted Turner (CNN)—and not necessarily Bill Clinton, Tony Blair, Jacques Chirac, Boris Yeltsin or Gerhard Schroeder.

Entrepreneurs are eager to challenge rather than submit themselves to the orthodoxies of our age. They are shaping the future rather than promising it. They are movers and shakers and not firefighters. But let’s not blame the politicians. Politics has always been the art of the possible, entrepreneurship the art of the impossible. If an entrepreneur says impossible, he finds himself interrupted by someone who just did it!

The 21st century will be the age of globalization. The technological revolution of the microchip and the Internet have taught us that all types of “walls” have crumbled in a world that is becoming more virtual than material. The Web puts power in the hands of people in a way that the voting ballot could never do. The “netizen” replaces the citizen.

In a borderless world it is difficult for

politicians and national leaders to flourish, to lead. Since they have to be elected, their survival depends on their ability to rescue those who are left behind by the growing forces of change. Politicians are applauded by those who regret the passing of the good old world of relative stability, of well-traced borderlines between nation-states, between social classes, between hierarchical levels. By contrast, the borderless world is a paradise for entrepreneurs.

Joseph Schumpeter, a famous Harvard professor, coined the notion of creative destruction, the perpetual cycle of destroying the old and replacing it with the new, in his book *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. Entrepreneurs are constructive in a reconstructive world. Unlike politicians, they are not driven by voters, who resist change, but by customers and shareholders, who make sure that only those who provide superior value in a mega-competitive world will survive and prosper.

The clash in the world is not, as Professor Samuel Huntington, another well-known Harvard faculty member, says, a “clash of civilizations.” The biggest challenge for our world is the reconciliation of tradition and innovation within each civilization. And we are only at the beginning! Bill Gates’ new book, *Business@the Speed of Thought*, starts with the sentence, “Business is going to change more in the next 10 years than it has in the last 50.” Equally, we could say, “Life is going to change more in the next 10 years than it has in the last 50.”

The conflict between entrepreneurs and politicians is not only the expression of an antipolarity between a world without borders and one still built on the illusion of borders, particularly borders

to protect the present against the future. No, the conflict between entrepreneurs and politicians is a violent collision between the winners and the losers of change.

Globalization is an irreversible fact of life. But “time compression,” the accelerating role of change, outpaces the ability of societies, their political systems and their leaders to adjust to the new challenge brought about by globalization.

The sheer pace of change in technology, finance and workplaces has outstripped people’s ability to cope. The reaction is simply to opt out because things are happening too fast. There is repulsion at the widening discrepancy between the losers and winners of globalization. But the increasing inequality is often confused with poverty even though at the bottom they may feel the same. The reality of globalization is increased inequality but also decreased poverty.

But not only the poor or the losers resist globalization; people of middle age and up perceive that globalization undermines the stability of their life achievements. They feel that they have lost control and they want to have assurance that national politicians are doing something about their “securitization.”

Our whole interrelated system with its economic, political and social dimensions is under tremendous pressure. We would be deceiving ourselves if we assume that we can avoid the breakdown of the system by decoupling economics from politics and social issues. Secretary General Kofi Annan of the United Nations said [at the World Economic Forum’s Annual Meeting] in Davos this year (1999), “History teaches us that such an imbalance between the economic, social and political realms can never be sustained for very long.”

Thus, “Entrepreneurship in the global public interest” is the only way to move forward. In the process of constructive deconstruction, entrepreneurs have to embrace values that show a true commit-

ment to improving the state of the world for all people. The prototype of the entrepreneur of the 21st Century has to be the “social” entrepreneur, or there will be no entrepreneur any more, as we will all be annihilated by social destruction. Social entrepreneurship in the 20th Century meant primarily the provision of social safety nets and other material measures to limit the damage done to the victims of the industrial revolution. But today the social responsibility of the entrepreneur has to be adapted to new realities, the “soft” issues that characterize the ongoing revolution of globalization.

Responsible globality will require adherence to a set of fundamental values. First, we have to be aware that we are living in a global village where, in principle, everybody has the capacity to be our direct neighbor and to interact with us. The “death of distance,” as Francis Cairncross of *The Economist* puts it, means that we have to be concerned about the fundamental rights of each of those neighbors. The worldwide preservation and development of human rights is one core value of responsible globality.

Second, we are the trustees of future generations’ environmental sustainability of entrepreneurship, which is another indispensable value of responsible globality.

Third, the notion of work will completely change in the new world. As a result of the fast pace of change, employment will not come from without but from within each individual. Employment has to be self-generated by permanently updating one’s own capabilities. Employment becomes a function of employability. This creates a new social responsibility for any entrepreneur who provides employment. In the same way as he invests permanently in the maintenance of his physical infrastructure, he has to invest permanently in the maintenance of the employability of people. Laying off someone is not unsocial per se in a superflexible economy, but the same cannot be said of depriving people of continued employability. To stimulate

and provide lifelong education is another core value of globality.

In conclusion, business leaders have to become business politicians and embrace, support and enact a set of core values in human rights, environmental stewardship, population and education practices. Or in broader terms: “Entrepreneurship in the global public interest” means to foster social development, sustainable development and human development. In those areas, business leaders can make a real difference both individually and through partnerships with all sectors of society.

Entrepreneurship with no social, environmental and human responsibility can easily degenerate into brutality; social, environmental and human responsibility without entrepreneurship flies by as a sweet dream—like a great vision without the necessary creation and allocation of resources. But entrepreneurship in the global public interest can change the world. The response to the Industrial Revolution, which shaped the course of the 20th Century, was—after much bitter suffering—the welfare state. Now the sovereignty of states is put into question as well as the sustainability of traditional collective welfare programs.

Today, at the dawn of a new century,

and confronted with business that can just emigrate from national regulatory frameworks, new international regulatory systems and new standards are necessary to protect societies, individuals and the environment. This is a very difficult thing to do when there is a lack of will on the part of national governments to engage in the process of global rule setting—accelerating de facto the dismantling of national authority—and when institutions to enforce new global rules are still in the infant phase. In such a situation, enlightened companies have to take the lead to create progress in recivilizing capitalism by driving forward the values of a new global civic responsibility.

Globalization is a one-sided economic phenomenon. Responsible globality is different: It is economy plus society plus environmental sustainability plus human dignity. The fact that all major actors—such as the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and major corporations—are trying to adopt a comprehensive approach, the approach of responsible globality, shows that the effort to define a philosophy for the 21st century has just begun.

*Klaus Schwab is founder and President of the World Economic Forum in Geneva, Switzerland. Source: Freeman, Jack and Pranay Gupte, Editors, All of Us. 1999. New York: Earth Times Books.*

## Preparing for the 21st Century

### *Winners and Losers*

*By Paul Kennedy*

[The second piece, from a distinguished historian, has a similar tone although written in 1993. It also stresses the human dimension of the process of globalization. *Ed.*]

Everyone with an interest in international affairs must be aware that broad, global forces for change are bearing down upon humankind in both rich and poor societies alike. New technologies are challenging traditional assumptions about the way we make, trade, and even grow things. Automated workplaces in Japan

intimate the end of the “factory system” that first arose in Britain’s Industrial Revolution and spread around the world. Genetically engineered crops, cultivated in biotech laboratories, threaten to replace naturally grown sugar, vanilla, coconut oil, and other staple farm produce, and perhaps undermine field-based agriculture as we know it. An electronically driven, twenty-four-hour-a-day financial trading system has created a global market in, say, yen futures over which nobody really has control. The globalization of industry and services per-

mits multinationals to switch production from one country to another (where it is usually cheaper), benefitting the latter and hurting the former.

In addition to facing these technology-driven forces for change, human society is grappling with the effects of fast-growing demographic imbalances throughout the world. Whereas birthrates in richer societies plunge well below the rates that would replace their populations, poorer countries are experiencing a population explosion that may double or even treble their numbers over the next few decades. As these fast-swelling populations press upon the surrounding forests, grazing lands, and water supplies, they inflict dreadful damage upon local environments and may also be contributing to that process of global warming first created by the industrialization of the North a century

and a half ago. With overpopulation and resource depletion undermining the social order, and with a global telecommunications revolution bringing television programs like “Dallas” and “Brideshead Revisited” to viewers everywhere from Central America to the Balkans, a vast illegal migration is under way as millions of families from the developing world strive to enter Europe and North America.

Although very different in form, these various trends from global warming to twenty-four-hour-a-day trading are transnational in character, crossing borders over our planet, affecting local communities and distant societies at the same time, and reminding us that the earth, for all its divisions, is a single unit. Every country is challenged by these global forces for change, to a greater or lesser extent, and most are

beginning to sense the need to prepare themselves for the coming twenty-first century. Whether any society is at present “well prepared” for the future is an open question; but what is clear is that the regions of the globe most affected by the twin impacts of technology and demography lie in the developing world. Whether they succeed in harnessing the new technologies in an environmentally prudent fashion, and at the same time go through a demographic transition, will probably affect the prospects of global peace in the next century more than any other factor. What, then, are their chances?

*Paul Kennedy is J. Richardson Dilworth Professor of History and director of International Security Studies at Yale University.*

*Source: New York Review of Books, February 11, 1993, pp. 32-44. As reprinted in O'Meara, P., H. D. Mehlinger, M. Krain. (2000). Globalization and the Challenges of the New Century. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press. pp. 323-354. Permission Pending.*

## The Post-Cold War Era Implications for Educators

*By Maurice A. East*

[In this article from *Social Education*, a commentator and researcher on international affairs, suggests some other guidelines for the changing world. *Ed.*]

Compounding the problem of describing the current international system is the fact that, in many areas of the world, the post-Cold War era has brought about a decreasing interest in things international at the very time when life in the waning days of the twentieth century is internationalizing faster than ever before. There is a widespread sense that it is now time to devote much more attention to other issues, often very domestic and local. For countries to become more inwardly focused at a time when they are more affected by the outside world than ever would certainly influence the direction

taken by the international system. [The events of September 11th and since have changed the non-internationalist stance of the new administration. *Ed.*]

I suggest that the post-Cold War world has three main characteristics:

### **1. GREAT UNCERTAINTY.**

The Cold War provided a structure and predictability in international affairs that is no longer present.

### **2. EVEN GREATER COMPLEXITY.**

As the Cold War structure disintegrated, an interdependent world became more complicated. As the Cold War alliance system collapsed, questions arose of inclusion and exclusion, organizations and conditions sought new missions, new international actors emerged, and new conflicts and issues (often long dormant) appeared on the international agenda.

### **3. GREATER DIFFUSENESS OF POWER AND CONTROL.**

After the collapse of the Soviet Union the US has re-examined its international commitments. Other international centers of power and influence have grown and become more significant, e.g., the European Union and the Asia-Pacific. Regional issues are becoming much more important for many nations, replacing the pervasive East-West global issues of the previous era. Nations large and small are now faced with taking more responsibility for dealing with and managing issues and potential conflicts in their neighborhood.

*Maurice A. East is a Professor and former Dean at the Elliott School of International Affairs, George Washington University, Washington, DC*

*Source: Social Education, September, 1998, pp. 248-251.*

# Reevaluating Global Education

## *Opinions from the Field*

[The previous articles by Schwab, Kennedy and East are but several from many commentaries on the condition of the world today. Have those conditions changed what we need to consider in the way we educate future generations on the nature of globalization? Below are several viewpoints on what each of the authors asserts is a required new direction, or certainly, a major modification in how we have perceived global education up to now, and where it should be headed. Again, these excerpts serve as a starting point for discussion and consideration to the possible need for The American Forum to revise its 1995 *Guidelines*. In the following excerpts, the Editor has either attempted to summarize the main ideas, or to allow the authors to speak through extensive quotations. All parenthetical expressions are the Editor's; the use of elisions is an attempt to provide some connection without having to reproduce entire pages of material. Additionally, all internal sources used by the authors have been omitted for reasons of space and continuity. A fuller examination of each author's ideas, and resource material, can be found in the original citation. *Ed.*]

### COMMENTARY 1

Merry Merryfield's recent work concerning the nature of global education summarizes well the contrasting notions of global education as we have traditionally known it, with a new vision that demands that we carefully begin to "globalize" global education! The approach is brought home to all of us by the recent terrorist attacks on New York City and Washington, DC. Terrorists have become, in a continuation of what Merryfield and others have described with "imperial disdain": dark skinned, wearing burnouses or other regalia of the Arab world, and of Islamic faith. The image of Osama Bin Laden is the personification of the world's newest scourge. The immediate response to this scourge in our national media and political pronouncements is to vilify it. More thoughtful responses have fortunately begun to prevail: why have these people grown to so hate the US? What, in our culture, politics, economic success, etc., have we done "to them," or are we perceived to have

done, to create this animosity? Where lies the source of this feeling? If globalization is seen as just another version of imperialism (corporate colonialism), there is a need for self-examination not only by corporate leadership, but by world leadership as a whole in all fields of endeavor and relationships. Merryfield, based on her own research and that of others, posits three ideas that should form the basis of the "new vision" for global education:

#### **1. [A need] for analyzing how the educational legacy of imperialism shapes today's mainstream academic knowledge.**

The present day history and "educational legacy of imperialism (15th century on) shapes today's mainstream academic knowledge." Merryfield asserts that much of what is contained in textbooks and in the education of teachers is carried over from the histories and literature of imperialism/colonialism. "As exploration led to empire, the interpretation of these new worlds developed into a vast scholarship that provided new

explanations and a reordering of both past and present knowledge . . . Over five centuries, knowledge was generated in the in the name of imperialism's intellectual interests by scientists, naturalists, ethnographers, historians, geographer, journalists, painters and poets . . ." Merryfield quotes John Willinsky: "Like architects after an earthquake, many lettered Europeans saw a chance to rebuild a world." But today, attitudes and beliefs based on the earlier conceptions and preconceptions of colonial people, events and places are being seriously questioned. The increased awareness and reality of self-determination, freedom and independence has released the voices and the actions, and sometimes the demons, of long subjugated peoples. This new awareness must be understood by those who have colonialized, as well as those who have been colonized, physically and mentally.

#### **2. [A need for] understanding the world views of people under-represented in mainstream academic knowledge.**

"If global education is to be world-centered, it is critical that students learn from the knowledge and experiences of people who, because of their race, gender, class, culture, national origin, religious or political beliefs, are ignored, stereotyped or marginalized in mainstream academic knowledge. Unlike the global education of the 1970's, this process brings to the center of the curriculum the voices of people past and present who were silenced because they had little or no power to be heard." This, says Merryfield, calls for a "'double consciousness' (W. E. B. DuBois, 1967) . . . Unlike the perspective consciousness of global education (as propounded by Robert Hanvey) that teaches students to become aware that other people may

have view of the world profoundly different from their own, double consciousness is an act of survival in coping with the institutionalized violence and prevalent discrimination of racism . . . The realities that create a double consciousness are a global phenomenon. Understanding two world views develops when people are separated or discriminated against because of their race, language, religion, national origin, or other differences. The ability to see one's world both from the mainstream and from the margins is one of the shared characteristics of multicultural and global educators . . ." [In analyzing the experiences of excellent US and Canadian multicultural and global educators] Merryfield found that most [of these teachers] identified experiences that led to a consciousness of what it is like to be considered inferior, to be placed on the periphery of society, to be looked at as an outsider who does not and will never belong. For people of color in the study, these experiences hap-

pened early in life as part of growing up in white America [or Canada]. "Many of the white educators, however, did not develop this consciousness until they left North America and lived overseas. In order to make sense of these experiences, they looked critically at fundamental assumptions about reality, truth, power, and culture that they had before taken

for granted." Such self-evaluation, Merryfield notes, gave these teachers some different intellectual tools with which to look at the broader issues in the wider society—giving them, so to speak, a "double consciousness" that had not been present in their thinking or teaching. That kind of thinking can only be helped along with what Merryfield describes as "synthesizing differences through contrapuntal literature and histories" (Edward Said, 1978, 1993). What this essentially means is

blindly accepted as being "truth" as laid down by the Imperialists of the colonial eras. How many times does a study of the Islamic world, for example, get told by an Islamic historian or writer? Most of our texts are written by, and for, the imperial version of "accepted truth." Thus, we may well be interpreting events of today through the lens of one set of glasses, when at least two might help us better understand the premises upon which someone else's truth is viewed. Terrorist activity cannot be tol-

erated anywhere, but there is a need for globalists to reach for a greater understanding of perspectives from which people who may commit terrorist acts are operating. The contrapuntal approach would afford students the ability not only to see another's world view, but to bring understanding to their own personal view of the global condition.

A third aspect of this "understanding the world view of people under-represented in mainstream academic knowledge" is Ngugi wa Thiongo's theory of the notion of "decolonizing

the mind." Merryfield writes that "Decolonizing the mind . . . helps people become conscious of how oppressors force their world views into oppressed peoples' lives in such ways that in later generations people may never realize that their ideas and choices are affected by colonialist or neocolonialist perspectives. It is not only subjugated peoples who have a colo-



"Global Family" by Chongoisal Pawarat, Age 11, Thailand

#### *Paintbrush Diplomacy, Connecting the World Through Children's Art*

Since 1975 Paintbrush Diplomacy has promoted cross-cultural understanding through its international student art and writing exchange program. Its permanent collection includes over 2,000 paintings from over 100 countries and exemplifies the rich cultural diversity of the world's children. Paintbrush Diplomacy encourages awareness of international issues and supports children's causes through a variety of programs including educational exchanges, community exhibits and special events. To learn more about Paintbrush Diplomacy please visit us at [www.paintbrushdiplomacy.org](http://www.paintbrushdiplomacy.org) or contact us at (650)325-6611 or [pbdiplomacy@aol.com](mailto:pbdiplomacy@aol.com).

that students/people should be given the opportunity to study history or literature that has its authorship in people from the "Other." Those who are the subjects/victims of colonization or imperialistic actions and thinking, are now finding their voice. Their voice presents the viewpoint of the oppressed toward the same events or topics that have been

nized mind. When white students assume they are superior to others because of their race, they are exhibiting similar colonialist assumptions. The pedagogy of decolonizing the mind . . . [must focus] on examining where norms, assumptions and underlying beliefs came from and what effect they have on people's lives . . . If we move the center of [education] . . . to include the experiences, knowledge, and world views of people who are now ignored or under-represented, young Americans will have a broader, more complex understanding of global realities."

### 3. [A need for] sustained and reflective cross-cultural experiential learning.

[The] "interaction across identity, power, and experience is central to understanding how cross-cultural experiences create meaning in people's lives. It is especially critical to keep in mind when cross-cultural experiential learning places people in different positions of power than they normally experience. Think of the change in the context of power when an African American male student leaves his Africentric school near his home to work in a service learning project with the city's mostly white businessmen. Another type of change in power would be from the periphery to the center when a white female teacher returns to her middle-class suburban school after a year of teaching English within the Muslim culture of Northern Nigeria. The dynamic nature of reflection and discourse over time is very complex as people and their narratives of experience may change. When adults or even high school students look back upon their lives and identify those experiences they now see as significant in shaping their world views they may see meaning that differs from how they made sense of those events at the time when they were actually experiencing them. The retrospective meaning making quality of reflection upon one's lived expe-

riences means that the significance of cross-cultural experiences may change over time and contexts. Teachers need to reflect upon their own lived experiences with people who are different from themselves and analyze how they have developed their perspectives and knowledge of others before they begin such processes with their students." These experiences must, in Merryfield's view, incorporate not only the internalization and realization of a teacher's [and student's] own lived experiences, but also experiences found in literature and other venues. All of these encounters should be studied, and written about, and where possible, to be experienced either in other countries, other areas of their own world, or in shared manner with visiting "others" to the United States. "Teachers and students come to schools with lived experience that informs their understanding of identity, human differences, power, hybridity, cultural change, and other constructs of [education]. These lived experiences provide the foundation for specialized cross-cultural experiential learning in . . . classrooms, in the community, in service learning projects and experiences within and across different cultures. Few people forget the lessons learned when they experience first hand what it feels like when one's human differences are the basis for being welcomed into the center or pushed towards the periphery of society."

[The wealth of ideas and suggestions in the original article are too extensive to include here, and the Editor hopes that too great an injustice has not been done to the original. Again, we need to remember that this is stimulus material, not conclusive. *Ed.*]

*Merry M. Merryfield is a Professor of Social Studies and Global Education at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.*

*Source: Merryfield, Merry (2001) "Moving the Center of Global Education: From Imperial World Views that Divide the World to Double Consciousness, Contrapuntal Pedagogy, Hybridity, and Cross Cultural Competence," in Stanley, William (Ed.), Critical Issues in Social Studies Research, Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.*

## COMMENTARY 2

[In a continuation of his article in *Social Education*, Maurice A. East made some concrete suggestions for the direction of Global Education in the schools. *Ed.*]

Given this post-Cold War context, what are some of the changes in international relations that need to be reflected in the K-12 curriculum?

1. Studying Cooperation in Addition to Conflict. A key change in the post-Cold War study of international relations is a greater emphasis on understanding cooperation between nations. Despite the unfortunate tendency of the media and individuals alike to focus on conflict and the use of force, the overwhelming proportion of international activity is non-violent.

"Cooperation under anarchy," the title of an important book, is a concept that captures this change very well. As the Cold War waned, scholars became more interested in explaining cooperation and examining why there is not more violent conflict in international relations. The anarchic self-help nature of the international system has been accepted by scholars with very different orientations—realists and liberal institutionalists alike.

With this in mind, it may be useful to reconsider standard history curricula and texts to determine whether "cooperation under anarchy" is adequately represented there. Might not more emphasis be placed on the diplomacy, negotiation, and international institutions that make conflict less likely at the expense of some study of the details of prosecuting the major wars?

2. The Increased Importance of International Economic Issues. As noted

above, the increasing role played by economic issues in international affairs preceded the post-Cold War era. In fact, it is common to hear non-US scholars comment that it was only in the United States that international economics was not traditionally recognized as a core aspect of post-war foreign policy. One reason often cited for this is the economic dominance of the US at the end of World War II. However, the pace of international economic interdependence has quickened, and the ending of the Cold War means that ideological and security-based international issues have decreased in salience, while international economic issues have gained in importance. (In the academic world, one indicator of this is that the subfield of International Political Economy has been the most popular and fastest growing subfield in international studies.)

The deepening (and widening) of economic integration in Europe; the evolving international political economy of the Asia-Pacific; the transformation in literally all regions of formerly centralized economies; the completion of the GATT Uruguay round; and the formation of the World Trade Organization and the North American Free Trade Area are just a few of the issues that have dominated the post-Cold War period.

Given the secondary position of economics in the K-12 social studies curriculum and in the training and background of most social studies educators, it would be fair to assume that many of these international economic issues are not well covered in the current curriculum. These issues deserve somewhat more prominence, which may require some educators to retool their knowledge of economics

and international political economy.

3. International Organization as a Key Concern. The increased concern with how nations and other international actors organize themselves to cooperate in an anarchic, self-help system is a major concern of contemporary international relations scholarship. It is not coincidental that the most prominent academic journal of the post-Cold War period is *International Organization*—with no “s.” A large proportion of post-Cold War research focuses on the level, type, and degree of organization found in international relations. Earlier, there was more emphasis on various types of organizations (the UN, OAS), non-governmental organizations (such as Greenpeace or the International Red Cross), multinational corporations (e.g., IBM, Unilever), and alliances (NATO).

Now the focus is less on the institutions and entities and more on what are called international regimes, that is, the arrangements between and among the entities and their patterns of interaction. The use of this concept to describe current international relations has become increasingly important in the discussion of international organization in the post-Cold War period. The typical pattern of international behavior is neither unstructured anarchy nor UN behavior. The examination of the different patterns of international regimes is one approach to understanding the diversity of international activity ranging between these two polar opposites. Krasner notes: “It is the infusion of behavior with principles and norms that distinguishes regime-governed activity in the international system from more conventional activity, guided by narrow calculations of interest.”

Another concept that focuses on the organization of international affairs is multilateralism. The focus here is on nations and other international entities acting collectively. The idea of multilateral action has come to the forefront of the study of international relations in the post-Cold War era because of two events. One was Mikhail Gorbachev’s decision to shift the Soviet Union’s policy towards the UN in the mid-1980s. In a speech at Vladivostok, he emphasized the value of multilateral actions and the UN, especially in dealing with international problems. He highlighted and to some extent validated the idea that world problems could no longer be dealt with effectively by nations acting solely unilaterally. The other event was the Persian Gulf War, in which President Bush sought to conduct the operation as a multilateral undertaking with the attendant international legitimacy created by doing so.

The Clinton Administration began its first term by putting heavy emphasis on multilateralism as a key part of U.S. foreign policy (led by then UN Ambassador Albright). However, unfortunate developments in Somalia and then Haiti quickly revealed the limits of multilateralism, and a more balanced perspective emerged. But a key issue in the post-Cold War period is how and when to use multilateral and collective actions to manage international affairs. Peacekeeping operations, which have become so frequent and prominent in the post-Cold War period, raise all the delicate issues inherent in multilateralism, whether they are UN-sponsored, NATO-sponsored, or ad hoc arrangements by regional powers and organizations.

### Individual Rights and Democratic Values

A key feature of post-Cold War international relations is its increased concern with issues that affect individual rights and democratic freedom.

Many of the substantive issues of the post-Cold War period focus on international well-being at the individual level. Issues of migration and refugees are of increasing concern, in part because of the movements of large masses of people as a consequence of the ethnic-based violence and civil strife that has occurred as the Cold War suppression of regional conflicts dissipated. Human rights issues appear more prominent today, partly as a result of the increased attention being paid to them as Cold War issues subside. And advances in international media coverage bring human rights abuses and the consequences of ethnic strife and natural disasters into our homes and schools instantaneously. The transformation of former centralized economies toward more free market systems also is driven by efforts to increase the economic autonomy of the individual.

Most of these forces are operating to increase the ability of individuals to be involved in and influence international relations and foreign policy without the mediating influence of the nation-state. This is part of the reason James Rosenau, in a very influential book [*Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity*], refers to the “turbulence” in international relations today.

The increased interest in human rights has resulted in a scholarly reaction against traditional realist perspectives that assert that individual values play little role in the analysis of international

relations, since all actors are presumed to engage in the pursuit of power and national interests. As the Cold War waned, there were more and more instances of behavior that could not be explained from this perspective. Concerns for human rights and environmental policies cannot be explained using only realist assumptions. Researchers today are more frequently examining the sources of these concerns in terms of the ideas and values that drive them.

Another focus is on the relationship between democracy and foreign policy. Activities on behalf of human rights are strongly centered in democratic countries. There is good evidence that democratic states do not tend to wage war with other democratic states. The promotion of human rights and democratic values is a trend whose future success is difficult to estimate, but which current reviews of international relations cannot ignore.

### Changing Concepts of International Security

During the post-Cold War period, a number of successful international initiatives have reflected some new directions in international security:

- A major multilateral military operation was successfully undertaken to meet direct military aggression by Iraq against Kuwait in the Persian Gulf
- The Non-Proliferation Treaty was renewed indefinitely, and the non-proliferation regime was strengthened by strong international actions against Iraq and North Korea
- The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the norm underlying it were

accepted by virtually the entire international community

- Major efforts were successful in avoiding nuclear accidents or proliferation after the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

Much, however, remains to be done, foremost being the finalization of several nuclear reduction and limitation treaties between the US and Russia. The new shape of international security will be influenced by the outcome of initiatives to enlarge NATO and the success or failure of peace-keeping operations such as those in Bosnia. [This would, of course, now be modified to include greater emphasis on the security against terrorist acts. *Ed.*]

### Final Thoughts for Educators

What do these changes in the study of international relations mean for educators? Are there implications that can be noted for our school curriculum?

First, with the passing of the Cold War, the models and ideas that worked before may well need rethinking. There is certainly continuity with the past—the basic anarchic self-help international political system still exists. But its characteristics have changed. Traditional realist power political considerations have not disappeared, but they are unable to explain as much of international relations today. Now more than ever, one needs to utilize multiple perspectives in understanding post-Cold War international relations and foreign policy.

Second, the greater complexity of international issues today means that it

is more important than ever to analyze various sides of an issue. Most post-Cold War issues cannot be cast in the good/bad terms of the Cold War. This in turn can lead to more controversy in the classroom. Discussing NAFTA or US policy toward China will almost certainly touch on very sensitive political points of view. But a responsible discussion of these issues cannot avoid the inherent controversy.

Third, much of the study of post-Cold War international relations needs to focus on the changing role of the US in the world, which means a future-oriented perspective. This provides many issues that can be effectively dealt with in the classroom: Is the US a hegemonic or declining power? Should the US be more or less involved in world affairs? What level of military security is needed over the next decade?

Finally, thanks to continuing globalization, it is easier than ever before to assure that teaching about international relations today need not be narrowly focused on the US, nor does it have to reflect such a strong US perspective or bias. Thanks to today's technology, it is possible to get considerable "real-time" media coverage of many international events and activities (but by no means all!). TV news produced in other countries is readily available through many cable systems.

***"All this airy stuff about the global village simply doesn't engage with the fact that people don't live in that global village; they live in their language, they live in their culture."* - M. Lanatoeff**

(Viewing these programs can be an interesting experience even for those who cannot understand the language.) Radio news can also be heard on short-wave radios.

There are many more books and articles written in English by non-US scholars that often give a very different perspective and interpretation to international relations than the conventional wisdom of Americans. Similarly, more U. S. scholars are more productive than ever in writing about other countries' foreign policies. All of these contributions can enrich and broaden one's understanding of post-Cold War international relations.

Source: East, Maurice A., (1998) "The Post Cold-War Era," in *Social Education*, 62 (5), pp. 248- 251.

## COM M E N T A R Y 3

[In a comparative study of the practices of teachers of global education in three areas—Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States—Graham Pike discovered some interesting differences between and among these educators. In the case of the United States teachers, they were "more likely to characterize global education as learning about a constellation of discrete countries and cultures . . . rationales for global education are couched in terms of young Americans' insularity and lack of awareness about other countries.

American culture is used, often without exposition of its own complexity, as the yardstick by which other cultures' similarities and differences are compared. The future economic and political role of the United States in the global system provides a common motivation for involvement in global education." This, says Pike, is in contrast with the other nation's global education which is more likely "perceived to be in the interests of all people and the planet." In Canada and the UK, global education is directed more toward personal growth, rather than national development. There is also a great "moral responsibility" factor present in concern for those less fortunate, the poor of the world. Pike sees a major challenge in reorienting teachers—considered as the major influence on the practice of global education—to broader realities of global responsibility, breaking, as it were, from their more parochial self-and localized curriculum guided concerns. *Ed.]*

### The Challenge for Global Education

The framework offers some insight into the problem of meaning in global education. While a systems view would suggest that teacher thinking in any curriculum area is regularly informed by a confluence of cultural influences at all three levels, as well as by the impact of globalization, few other educational innovations require of practitioners a conscious understanding of all such influences on their lives. In other words, in responding to most innovations, teachers generally weigh personal and school-related factors; rarely do they have to actively consider national and global forces. I am suggesting, therefore, that difficulties in finding meaning in global education stem, in part, from the

problems of comprehending an educational innovation that cannot be sufficiently understood in the context of the cultural framework within which teachers normally operate.

To understand global education—especially more holistic models—requires more than “the removal of the national border” as a curriculum outcome; it demands crossing the “perceptual threshold” into an arena of contemplation that considers not only the needs of students, teachers, and schools but also the priorities of one’s own country, other peoples and species, and the exigencies of the planet. Such reflection inevitably draws upon a complex web of personal attitudes and beliefs, not just about education but touching upon broader issues relating to the needs and obligations of national and global citizenship.

This is “global education as a moral enterprise,” wherein teachers’ thinking about their practice invokes personal convictions concerning global ethics and education’s moral purpose. In so doing, practitioners are operating at the highest level of three levels of reflection, where moral and ethical criteria are incorporated into their thinking about practice. As [was] found in Norway, and confirm[ed] in England, teachers are unaccustomed to talking about their work at this level. Most of their reflection time is spent at the lowest level, that of pursuing the most proficient means to achieve predetermined ends.

Global education, then, demands that teacher reflection take place at unusually sophisticated levels. One of the most complex issues facing practitioners arises from the challenge posed by global education to the school’s tradi-

tional role in the shaping of national identity. As many writers have noted, the school curriculum has long been used as a vehicle for promoting national values. Through its analysis of global systems and the impact of globalization, global education challenges the wisdom of this goal of schooling in a world that is characterized by increasing interdependence and the decreasing power of nation-states. A full understanding of any particular country, it is frequently argued, requires comprehension of that country’s place in the global system and recognition of the impact of decisions made elsewhere. A person’s identity and citizenship is no longer framed within the boundaries of one nation but shaped by a plethora of influences that emanate from multiple points in the global system.

However, as my research reveals, global education itself is infused with distinctive national characteristics. In other words, educators’ interpretations of, and responses to, the forces of globalization are as subject to the influences of particular cultural belief systems and world views as anything else. In this sense, the global education movement does not signal a globalization of education; rather it reflects the development of more globally-oriented models of national education.

Herein, perhaps, lies a clue to the conceptual challenge facing global education practitioners in their search for meaning. On the one hand, the key concepts they present in classrooms question the primacy and validity of viewing the world in terms of separate nations. On the other hand, the cultural systems from which their “interactional conversations” draw cling to beliefs and assumptions that are predicated upon

world views in which nations and peoples are unconsciously regarded as distinct. According to [one writer,] M. Ignatieff, the paradox is not confined to global educators:

All this airy stuff about the global village simply doesn’t engage with the fact that people don’t live in that global village; they live in their language, they live in their culture.

Whatever the political and economic realities of the global system, it is particular nations and cultures that continue to provide people with their primary sense of belonging and, by extension, continue to exert a powerful influence on education systems. If the meaning of global education is to be understood at a profound level, the challenge is to find creative ways to assist practitioners in “the removal of national borders,” not just in their curriculums but also in their thinking.

*Graham Pike is Assistant Professor of Education and Director of International Education at the University of Prince Edward Island, Canada.*

*Source: Pike, Graham (2000), “Global Education and National Identity: In Pursuit of Meaning,” in Theory Into Practice, 39:2, Spring, pp. 64-73.*

---

## COMMENTARY 4

---

[It is important to note that there are significant anti-globalization advocates, and their opinions are worthy of note, if only to provide further information about what “new” or different directions global education might have to take in order to provide teachers and students with the “big picture.” These voices tend to be those who perceive globalization as an “economic imperialist” scheme that will continue to foster vast inequities between and among the peoples of the world.

Many are quite concerned with what they consider to be the absence of moral or ethical concerns among the globalization advocates—for the enormous poverty and devastating diseases impacting primarily on the undeveloped or less-developed areas of the world. Following is one such article by Victor Ferkiss. One section of which appears to have been prophetic of the events of September 11th. *Ed.*]

### **Globalization Myth, Reality, Problems**

The demonstration—unprecedented since the Vietnam war era—that convulsed normally laid-back Seattle late last fall had two results. It brought the work of the World Trade Organization to a halt, and it reintroduced the issue of globalization to the American political scene. Labor had unsuccessfully fought the Clinton administration over NAFTA. Now new allies in the environmental and human rights movements had appeared. Though all four major candidates for the presidency in 2000 are free traders—only the marginal Pat Buchanan carries the banner of economic nationalism—a major test will occur next year as the president of the AFL-CIO, John Sweeney, and Teamster head James Hoffa strive to scuttle the Clinton trade pact with China. They hope the common ties forged in Seattle will hold in that battle as well.

This despite apparent prosperity. America's economy is on a roll. Jobs are plentiful. The stock market keeps rising. Unlike situations in the past, the electorate currently seems unconcerned about economic matters. Some economists warn that what goes up must come down. Others increasingly argue that we have

***“The conventional wisdom holds that globalization is a new and unique condition, that it is irresistible and that it is overwhelmingly beneficial to humanity. But conventional wisdom is wrong on the first two counts, and it may well be wrong on the question of benefits as well.” - Victor Ferkiss***

entered a new era in which the old rules no longer apply. When asked why, they often refer to globalization—the joining of all people the planet over into a single interrelated system of economic and cultural ties, increasingly mediated by the computer and above all by the Internet.

The conventional wisdom holds that globalization is a new and unique condition, that it is irresistible and that it is overwhelmingly beneficial to humanity. But conventional wisdom is wrong on the first two counts, and it may well be wrong on the question of benefits as well.

Global political and economic interaction is not all that new. Ancient Rome controlled and economically integrated most of the western world, while China ruled the Far East. Beginning with the 15th century, Spain, Portugal, France, England and the Netherlands created worldwide empires in which goods, people and ideas flowed almost freely. Economic factors came first then, as they largely do today. Spices and sugar were the touchstones. In order to keep control of the small East Indian spice isle of Banda, the Dutch were happy to cede Manhattan to English rule. The French were just as willing to let the English keep Canada as long as France could hold on to the West Indian sugar island of Guadeloupe. Crops were diffused globally; the slave trade moved millions across oceans; indeed the Chinese

demand for silver largely financed the Spanish slave trade. Ideas moved globally as well—Christianity, capitalism and, eventually, even democracy.

Thus in 1850 Marx and Engels could in the Communist Manifesto hold—truthfully—that the bourgeoisie had taken over the whole world, dissolving all previous cultures and allegiances, and “in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single unconscionable freedom-Free Trade.”

The leading international financier Baron Rothschild said in 1875, “The world is a city,” as stock markets fell together across the globe. People moved freely. In 1900 the foreign-born constituted 14 percent of the American population, as opposed to only 8 percent today. Capital moved freely as well. Most of American growth was financed by Europeans, and defaulted loans were common. An International Monetary Fund report in 1997 noted that international capital movements as a proportion of economic output were still below the level of the 1880's. The economist Alan Taylor of Northwestern University recently said in regard to the global economy that “these days, it's just getting back to where it was 100 years ago.”

Even now globalization is far from complete, as unresolved disputes at the

recent WTO meeting attest. The United States and Europe war over genetically enhanced crops, and France refuses British beef. On the cultural plane, local cultures reassert themselves in opposition to American domination, and ethnic conflicts persist in the Balkans, the former Soviet Union, Kashmir, Africa and elsewhere. The world is still far from one.

What happened to the world between the earlier period of globalization and the current move back toward it? World War I tore the economy of the world apart, and the postwar moves toward economic self sufficiency—above all in Germany under Adolf

Hitler and the United States under Franklin D. Roosevelt—hastened the process of economic nationalism. Some have facetly blamed the Great Depression on the new high tariff regimes, but that is at best an oversimplification. The economic downturn had a momentum of its own. In any event and whatever the cause, the events of the interwar period proved that globalization is not only not really new, it is also far from irresistible.

But if globalization is neither new nor invincible, is it desirable? Many critics conclude that it is not. Most argue that essentially it represents a

rerun of the earlier colonialism and bourgeois world domination, with the United States as the overwhelming hegemony, the international market mediated by the Internet as its instrument, and the small upper class of Internet users in other nations as the contemporary equivalent of previous local elites who served the imperialists' bidding. For many nations, becoming part of the world economy has high initial costs, as local economies are torn apart due to fluctuations in international financial markets. Consider Indonesia as an example. Austerity, usually recommended by international agencies, can be highly destabilizing politically.

**A PBS Premiere December 31, 2001, New Year's Eve • 8:00-11:00 pm (all time zones)**

**THE CRUCIBLE OF THE MILLENNIUM**

a 3-hour PBS program to be aired nationwide this New Year's Eve, reflects many of the significant themes in world history. It explores the idea that people have met, traded goods and ideas, and exchanged and adapted cultures over the course of the last 500 years. This has had both positive and negative implications, and the study of the world as a series of encounters, between peoples, nations, cultures or regions helps to explain how these events created and will continue to form the world of today and tomorrow.



**The American Forum for Global Education has created an Educational Resource Guide for *The Crucible of the Millennium***

It analyzes the material from this video documentary and can help educators transform this exciting material into a high school or college course of study. The Guide focuses on the themes of trade, technology, change and continuity, and on changes in the functions of the state.

These materials consist of classroom strategies to further engage students in their studies of exploration, discovery, and globalization.

- Tapping Prior Knowledge • Vocabulary Strategies
- Writing Strategies • Review Strategies • Involvement Strategies

Also included in this package are resource readings (both secondary and original) that reflect the historical record of the early explorations, the early empires, and the interchanges between and among these early peoples. These documents can be used for instructional purposes, or for student research.

These materials can be obtained from the American Forum for Global Education. *The Crucible of the Millennium* is a three-hour video program in two separate VHS tapes with an accompanying educational guide.

Video 1: Through the Looking Glass .....	\$29.95
Video 2: Echoes and Resonances .....	\$29.95
Both tapes .....	\$50.00
Educational Resource Guide .....	\$45.00
Both Tapes and Educational Resource Guide .....	\$90.00



**ALL THESE MATERIALS ARE AVAILABLE FOR PURCHASE FROM THE AMERICAN FORUM  
VISIT OUR WEBSITE AT [www.globaled.org](http://www.globaled.org) OR CALL 1-800-813-5056**

*The Crucible of the Millennium* was made possible by funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Additional funding was provided by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations, and the Debs Foundation. It is a sponsored project of the New York Foundation for the Arts. *The Crucible of the Millennium* was created by Yanna Kroyt Brandt and Nat Brandt and produced by Kroyt Brandt Productions with Cheryl Hill as Supervising Producer. The companion Educational Resource Guide was developed by the American Forum for Global Education with funding from the US Department of Education, Title VI.

Closely related to this, globalization is the enemy of democracy, especially in weaker nations, as the electorate comes to realize that no matter whom they elect to power, their national leaders are impotent before the dictates of the international marketplace.

The free market is not only economically destabilizing; perhaps more important, it is socially destabilizing as well. Americans have seen some of this as old manufacturing industries have crumbled under competition from cheaper imported goods, and as a result whole cities have decayed. The fact that high employment in the service industries has masked some of the economic effect does not restore the social fabric often ripped asunder. What has happened to the United States is minor compared to the uprooting of farmers, migration to cities, changes in age and gender relations and, above all, the loss of community elsewhere. Some of these changes may be desirable in themselves, but the problem is not only with their speed but their often involuntary nature as the “creative destruction” of the free market spreads from the economy to the community and the family.

A primary negative consequence of globalization has been to increase economic inequality, both on a world scale and within nations. Last fall, an international meeting of Jesuits convened by the Woodstock Theological Center at Georgetown University to assess globalization noted that “the harms and benefits of globalization are not evenly distributed either among nations or within them.” The economist Lester Thurow of MIT is more blunt and has said that “almost everywhere we look we see rising inequalities among countries, among firms, among individuals . . . Returns to skills are up; returns to unskilled labor are down.” Public opinion surveys such as the Pew Report state that while the upper and middle classes in America are happy with globalization, the lower class is not—with good reason.

The inequalities they perceive domestically are even more blatant internationally. A United Nations development report last year stated that “globalization is compounding the gap between rich and poor nations and intensifying American domination of the world’s economic and cultural markets . . . In 1985 the average income per person in the richest country was 76 times that of the poorest; in 1997 it was 228 times

greater. Pope John Paul II has spoken of the “growing distance between rich and poor [and] unfair competition which puts the poor nations in a situation of ever-increasing inferiority.”

Critics of the stand taken by organized labor in Seattle have argued that it is simply selfish for highly paid workers to object to the attempts of workers in poor nations to better themselves and hold that trying to improve working conditions of the exploited is ill-advised; but this assumes that the workers in developing nations have a real choice as to how they work and have no desire to organize to fight the corporations, often based in the West, that profit from their labor. The fact that in most of these third world countries labor unions are brutally suppressed makes the position of the labor critics seem hypocritical.

Inequality aside, there are other evil results of globalization. Economic growth always menaces the environment, but now the pace of peril has increased. The Pope has also condemned “the destruction of the environment and natural resources.” In time, economic growth can make progress in environmental protection possible (though not of course inevitable), but the race between growth and protection will be a difficult one. Meanwhile, as one observer has noted, while economic growth may make cleaner air possible, if current trends continue, the residents of Mexico City will breathe bad air for at least another generation.

Plagues have never respected national boundaries—witness the Black Death. But globalization, with its attendant speed of travel, makes bioinvasion by bacteria and viruses much quicker and more like-

***“The increasing interconnectedness of the world also makes nations much more vulnerable to terrorism in all its variants, from the sabotaging of planes in the air to the poisoning of water supplies. The balance between the good effects of globalization and its evils is not easy to strike.” - Victor Ferkiss***

ly. So too with invasion by non-native plants, animals and birds. On introduction to new areas they have always caused problems—think of rabbits in Australia and tumbleweed and kudzu in America—but the ease of transportation brought about by globalization only speeds the process.

The increasing interconnectedness of the world also makes nations much more vulnerable to terrorism in all its variants, from the sabotaging of planes in the air to the poisoning of water supplies. The balance between the good effects of globalization and its evils is not easy to strike.

Most critics of globalization—and even some supporters—would hold that the greatest problem it has created is the loss of the ability of nations to control their own affairs in the midst of a global economy. Some commentators on the Seattle protests have cast them as reflex reactions rooted in a general disquiet about becoming the prey of changes imposed from outside. But such reflexes have merit. As journalist William Pfaff has put it, “The economy has been globalized but economic regulation has not. There is now a fundamental discrepancy between economic power and regulatory power. The latter has no international political foundation.”

What can be done? The economist Robert Kuttner has suggested that nations reclaim their sovereignty by limiting cross-border transactions or pool their sovereignty in an international regulatory mechanism. The international financier George Soros holds that “to stabilize and regulate a truly global economy, we need some global system of decision-making. In short, we need a

global society to support our global economy.” But the nations of the world have a long way to go in that direction. Even in Europe, relatively advanced in merging national economies into a larger European Union, the British especially are balking at a final surrender of their full independence.

Whatever the solution, the turmoil in Seattle has—at long last—put the issue of globalization on the table. Only

“When steam power will be perfected, when, together with telegraphy and railways, it will have made distances disappear, it will not only be commodities which travel, but also ideas, which will have wings. When fiscal and commercial barriers will have been abolished between different states, as they have already been between the provinces of the same state; when different countries, in daily relations, tend toward the unity of peoples, how will you be able to revive the old mode of separation? . . . The too great disproportion of conditions and fortune could be sustained as long as it hidden; but as soon as this disproportion has been generally noticed, the death blow has been dealt. [One threat to established political society] was the expansion of intelligence [as] instruction [became a condition of all classes]. [Another threat] was the multiplication and variety of machines: what will you do with the human race, unemployed? ”

Completion of statement by Chateaubriand, 1841

the most fanatic believers in the ability of free markets to solve all human problems can still hold that the questions raised are purely “economic” and not also political, matters of destiny rather than human choice.

*Victor Ferkiss is a Professor Emeritus of government at Georgetown University in Washington, DC. Source: America, Feb. 19, 2000. <[http://www.findarticles.com/cf\\_dls/m1321/5\\_182/59474878/p1/article.jhtml](http://www.findarticles.com/cf_dls/m1321/5_182/59474878/p1/article.jhtml)> (October 1, 2001)*

© 2000 America Press, Inc. in association with The Gale Group and LookSmart. © 2000 Gale Group

Articles appearing in *Issues in Global Education (Issues)* represent the opinion of the authors and are not necessarily those of the sponsoring organization. The intent is to encourage dialogue throughout the global education community. Although the editor believes that materials mentioned in *Issues* to be of interest to its readers, it does not reflect an endorsement. We have sought permission to reprint as required. If we have erred, please advise.

Comment on *Issues* articles, announcements, ideas and information about global education should be sent to the editor.

© 2001 The American Forum for Global Education ISSN: 1088-8365.

**President:** Andrew F. Smith

**Editor:** Don Bragaw <[dhb@prodigy.net](mailto:dhb@prodigy.net)>

**Managing Editor:** Ria Boemi

**Design:** The Seymour Design Group

**URL:** <http://www.globaled.org>

**Issues in Global Education**

The American Forum for Global Education

120 Wall Street • Suite 2600 • New York, NY 10005

800-813-5056 • 212-624-1300

FX: 212-624-1412 • email: [globed120@aol.com](mailto:globed120@aol.com)

# ISSUES IN GLOBAL EDUCATION

For thirty years, the American Forum for Global Education has been nationally recognized for providing leadership and assistance to school systems, state departments of education, and colleges and universities. The American Forum initiates programs and teacher training seminars, and develops curriculum material and publications. Check our web site for free curriculum materials <<http://www.globaled.org>>.

This publication of the American Forum covers the important issues that an interconnected, rapidly changing world raises for educators and education policy makers, and the ways that schools are dealing with them. Each issue highlights one topic and includes articles, classroom activities, print and Internet resources, and outstanding programs.

RECENT TITLES HAVE INCLUDED:

- Democracy: The Global Wave of the Future? • Global Science
- The World Trade Organization • The United Nations\*
- Globalization and Opportunity for Peace? • Global Culture
- Globalization and Progress in Africa • Statelessness in a Global World

\*Multiple copies of the ISSUES on the UN can be obtained GRATIS through written request. State the amount wanted and the shipping address. Include your name and phone number.



If you are a global educator, curriculum coordinator or classroom teacher, subscribe and receive 6 issues per year for \$30 (US); \$36 (Canada); \$48 (International).

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Position \_\_\_\_\_

Org/School \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_ E-Mail \_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_

Check enclosed. Make payable to the American Forum, Inc.

Credit Card. Please check one:

AMEX  Visa  MasterCard  Discover

Account # \_\_\_\_\_

Exp. Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Return form with payment to:  
**The American Forum for Global Education**  
 120 Wall Street, suite 2600, New York, NY 10005

## THE AMERICAN FORUM FOR GLOBAL EDUCATION

A private, not-for-profit organization founded in 1970. Our mission is to educate United States citizens for responsible participation in our communities, our nation and our interdependent world. We offer consultation to global education programs and to those schools planning to “internationalize” or “globalize” their curriculum. We provide global and international education materials for classroom use and professional development programs for teachers and administrators. We are a forum for the exchange of ideas and practices on content and directions of global education.

<<http://www.globaled.org>>