

Democracy in the Global World; from Dewey's Educational Aims for Social Efficiency to Educating a Global Mind

Biljana Samoukovic

University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, USA

Abstract

I am examining the state of democracy and education in current circumstances of global race of the superpowers for military and economic domination—race that creates impoverished nations, impoverished markets and dysfunctional educational systems. What Dewey foresaw and termed in the early 20th century as an annihilation of space is today's unprecedented mobility of people and goods, but not under the rule of free market and fair trade; what is taking place under the pretext of "democratization" of "non-democratic nations" bears many key characteristics of the first colonial conquests—pushing the world into a greater poverty and intensifying ethnic and national conflicts. With growing precariousness of life world-wide more unity, primarily among educators, could empower them to become leading agents of social change and progress, in the process democratizing and transforming the education itself. Educational aim is a freeing activity in Deweyan sense, but an activity that now needs to transcend the national borders, the same way a global mind that I discuss transcends cultural differences. We are initiated into a culture, but our human condition necessitates also a deviation from it. Progressive educators will thus have to abandon rhetoric of patriotism and recognize that they are united under the common

goal to preserve education as a public service and to preserve human development in and through education.

Key Words: concentrated power, corporations, democracy, domination, education, educational aims, economic powers, global market, globalization, hegemony, human development, neocolonial, neoliberal, patriotism, power relations, public education, perfectionist, recession, social efficiency, superpowers.

In *Democracy and Education* Dewey (2008) envisioned the “annihilation of space” evident in the turn of this century’s (and ongoing) globalization. He indicated that the intellectual and emotional significance of such annihilation remain to be seen (Dewey, 2008, p58). Almost a hundred years later Frances Moore Lappe (2011), the co-founder of three national organizations that explore the roots of hunger, poverty and environmental crises, as well as solutions now emerging worldwide through what she calls a Living Democracy, brings her audience the taste of “intellectual and emotional significance” of the annihilation of space in her work and its newest addition, *EcoMind: Changing the Way We Think to Create the World We Want*. The most conspicuous mark of the *annihilation of space*, or globalization, in Moore Lappe’s terms, is concentrated power, which is evident in agriculture, diplomacy and the financial industry (Moore-Lappe, 2011). The ultimate outcome (or ultimate goal?) of such domination, in her words, is a privately owned government, which aligns with the observations of many other scholars, warning us about the detrimental consequences of neoliberal hegemony.

I will first examine the state of democracy in the current circumstances. Current conditions are marked by the global race of rising economic

powers, such as India and China on the one hand, and the remaining superpower from a Cold War era—United States—for financial and market domination. However, in Steel’s (1995) words, the end of the Cold War temporarily left the United States without a major military rival (p2). He writes, “Once we [United States] had obedient allies; now we have trade rivals” and poses a question of what does it mean to be a superpower these days (Steel, 1995, p2). By ‘superpower’ he means the only remaining military superpower, United States, and contends that the end of the Cold War placed the US in a limbo of uncertainty about who the new enem(y)(ies) is (are). The ‘new enemies’, in my view, emerged rather fast in a form of various ‘non-democratic’ states, i.e. their regimes. As Steel (1995) argues, “Our version of democracy, most Americans are convinced, is the model to which all less advantaged peoples aspire” (p15). Under the pretext of ‘introducing’ democracy to ‘non-democratic’ nations the top-down demands of a remaining superpower for *democratic changes* incite perpetual ethnic and civil wars in recent decades and burden the impoverished economies of those states with enormous debts to various international financial institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank.

I will then discuss Dewey’s educational aims for social efficiency in an ought-to be democracy and juxtapose Deweyan collaborative, problem-solving democratic practices with what Saito (2009) qualifies as Emersonian perfectionism. The emergence of a global mind, as I see it as embodied in a personality of an educator, would be a hybrid of a Deweyan problem solver, an Emersonian dissident, and what Saito (2009) terms in relation to Emerson—a perfectionist—one able to transcend the scenery of local associations and recognize the need for a universal struggle for human development on the one hand, and preserve

the uniqueness of the one's individual culture on the other. An educator with a global mind is a revolutionary educator, able to overcome the persecution of corporatized educational administration, who must also be educated by critical educators. Only educators universally resisting the system of hegemony will be able to recreate the nexus between the education and its democratic purpose or, in Dewey's terms, educational aims. The educational system must remain public if we are to preserve its democratic value; however, it is evident that not only public education, but also other public sectors in what was formerly known as the First World, are under the attack of the ruthless global neoliberal market relations.

I: Democracy Today. Dewey (2008) has written in *Democracy and Education* that one of the means of a democratic ideal is change in social habit, "its continuous readjustment through meeting the new situations produced by varied intercourse." (p58). While we agree that this process does characterize the democratically constituted society, this definition fails to take into account power relations between different social groups. Who is "readjusting the social habit" and under which circumstances? In a world where annihilation of space is occurring, concentrated power of the financial, industrial and agricultural fields is replacing the repression of individual states. Deweyan democracy, as a "conjoint communicated experience" is readjusting, top-down, those who do not fit into the newest discourse of power. We see "democratic" initiatives intended to topple "non-democratic" governments of former colonial subjects, which in turn transforms their discourse with a global world into a nightmare of the second round of neocolonial world order, characterized by universal market domination, hunger and war.

Today's idea of democracy in practice is being increasingly conflated with consumer choice, as Hytten (2009) writes (p400). She notes the wide spread disengagement from political processes in many countries, while these processes, in her words, are marked by corruption and elitism (ibid). Quoting Vaclav Havel, who writes about democracy as a less and less open system, continually sought, redefined and brought into being (as Dewey envisioned a true democracy as well), democracy, in Hytten's words, is becoming "something that can be exported like cars or television sets, something the more enlightened purchase and the less enlightened do not (ibid).

The 'less enlightened' are living in their worlds of perpetual poverty, subjected to a new cycle of neocolonial domination. Moore Lappe (2011) describes what she terms a spiral of powerlessness, whose main cause lies in the most financially powerful corporations' dominating the market and wealth distribution. Too often we hear about the problem of the world hunger and about, mainly small scale, efforts to ameliorate its most detrimental consequences to the population in certain parts of the world, but only on a rare occasion do we hear about an initiative that offers a solution to end it. The current food market, according to Moore Lappe (2011) is dominated by ten corporations having absolute control over the distribution of agricultural goods. Concentrated power is also evident in the financial industry. Ultimate outcome of such domination in her words is a privately owned government. In her view, one way of combating such an unnatural world order, is to align our actions in harmony with, not against, nature. She calls this new awareness and the necessity to harmonize our lives with nature, an eco-mind. Now, in order for one to understand the idea of an eco-mind, one first needs to understand how the prevalent trend of market domination stands in the way of nature and the

eco-mind. In nature, she argues, there is no lasting domination, only interdependence; with an eco-mind one can see the “nature of nature,” or connections among living entities. Moore Lappe illustrates this by stating that, in nature, there are no parts, only participants.

Dewey was well aware of the issue of domination as an obstacle to productive life and democracy. In “*Mass Society, Democracy and Public Opinion*, (1927) he wrote, “Life has been impoverished, not by predominance of “society” in general over individuality, but by a domination of one form of association, the family, clan, church, economic institutions, over other actual and possible forms” (Dewey, 1927, p44). He found the dominating oligarchy to be that of the economic class, “a shifting, unstable oligarchy,” . . . “rapidly changing its constituents, who are more or less at the mercy of accidents they cannot control and of technological inventions” (p48). Similarly, instability of the global market and recursive recessions today are in power over a turn-of-the-millennium economic oligarchy which in turn, but only as a temporary solution, seizes more power and control over destabilized systems, to feed the illusion that such an economic structure can survive and usher the global world into a new progressive era.

Moore Lappe’s idea of a living democracy, a Marxist notion of collective action, and Deweyan participatory democracy all align in their call to overcome a class division and domination of one social group over another—ultimately creating a society in which everyone would be a valuable participant, not an exploited, expendable and alienated social element. History provides ample evidence indicating that certain historic moments brought out the worst in human beings. However, as Moore Lappe (2011) argues, it is not the historic times per se that brought out the

worst in people, but the conditions of “concentrated power,” “secrecy,” “blaming the other,” “competition” (not cooperation), the phenomena prevalent and evident in much of the today’s world commonly viewed as *democratic*.

An especially prevalent challenge to a democratic discourse among social groups and among nations in the globalized world is an ongoing neoliberal campaign to privatize what was known and enjoyed as public goods. Hytten (2009) connects this practice of privatization of almost all aspects of our lives, “from schooling, to water, to parks, to health care,” with a growing precariousness of lives of the working poor and those who formerly belonged to a so-called middle class (Hytten, 2009, p402).

Neoliberal, non-democratic forces are finding ever new ways of dismantling a Welfare State and alienating the collective rights of the working class, educators and unionized government workers. Stable jobs that characterized stable economic systems of what used to be known as liberal democracies are being relocated to those parts of the planet where the social consciousness of the working class hasn’t reached the level of collective organization and resistance to exploitation. Therefore, they are vulnerable to exploitation and their labor is not worth more than a slave wage of an unskilled, often underage laborer.

Arthur (2011) terms the attacking of public sector workers and cutting of social programs by referring to Noam Chomsky’s “threat of a good example” (Arthur, 2011, p192). This, in Arthur’s definition, means a destruction of a certain type of person, “a person who sees collective measures to protect against economic risk as necessary, possible and morally just” (ibid). He further states, borrowing from Chomsky and Barsamian, that this destruction leaves behind a “philosophy of futility,”

“that views as ‘utopian’ any change beyond neoliberal parameters” (ibid). Borrowing from the terminology of psychology, a disempowered society (similar to an disempowered individual) regresses into living a self-fulfilling prophecy, where one’s understanding of one’s own life and its prospects is determined by (a) dominant other(s).

In the process of the destruction of the Welfare State, one of the most devastating consequences is the destruction of a citizen who cares and feels responsible for others. And these also might be the economic conditions that Moore Lappe (2011) blames for bringing the worst in us, characterized not only by competitiveness, secrecy, blaming the other, but also by a general apathy in relation to other human beings. Such apathy is gradually turned into open animosity, where an average citizen of the formerly known First World blames the slave laborers of the developing countries for taking the jobs away, thus incarnating Moore Lappe’s blaming the other strategy, employed by centers of power. Those centers, or *nodes of power*, subjugating everything, even the interests of the state, to the laws of neoliberal market are not only redefining the political and economic order in the world, but gradually also the relations of power, by which such power (political and economic) will not be in the hands of what was formerly known as a political entity of a state (any state), but it will be in the hands of the executives of the few corporations (*economic oligarchy*). Given the success of this ongoing process, one can then foresee what More Lappe (2011) terms a privatization of the government.

II. Dewey’s Educational Aims for Social Efficiency and the Role of an Emersonian Dissident. In Dewey’s (2008) search for aims in education, he was concerned with the contrast that exists between “within the process in which they operate” and “when they are set up from

without” (Dewey, 2008, p67). The social relations, in his words, are not equitably balanced when the aims are determined by an external dictation, warning of lasting consequences of such imposition: confinement of a teacher to receiving aims laid down from above and confusion of the pupils by the conflict of their own natural aims, aims that correspond to their experiences and those to which they have to acquiesce (current example would be the standardization of the curriculum). If we were to avoid the intellectual confusion caused by the demand for adaptation to external aims, Dewey calls for the recognition of the “democratic criterion of the significance of every growing experience” (p73).

In defining the nature of an aim as it falls within an activity, Dewey set up three criteria for good aims: 1) aim set up as an outgrowth of the existing conditions, 2) the aim as it first emerges is only tentative and the act of its realization tests its worth. Finally, 3) the aim must represent a freeing of activities. Dewey (2008) suggested the term “end in view” to explain the tentativeness of an aim, where “the object [of an activity] is but a phase of the active end—continuing the activity successfully” (p68). Dewey’s tentativeness of an educational aim could then be the first step in transforming a democracy, evolving from his approach into, what Hytten names, a “creative, pluralistic and fallibilistic conception of democracy” (Hytten, 2009, p397). The author terms Dewey’s “reasoned, careful and creative approach. . . an alternative to current discourse surrounding globalization” (ibid). When discussing social efficiency as an aim within the context of a *freeing activity*, Dewey proposed that the social efficiency could be attained by “positive use of native individual capacities in occupations having a social meaning” and not by a negative constraint (Dewey, 2009, p81). An individual’s capacities have to be developed to the point of competency, but this does not mean, as Dewey

(2008) pointed out, that individuals must be assigned the industrial callings in advance, based on wealth and the social status of the parents. Dewey maintained that progressive education needs to correct unfair privileges, not to perpetuate them. The current state of public education compels us to pose a question if the unearned privileges are being corrected in public schools in the U.S. and abroad, with the system of financing public education that is currently in place and with the punitive NCLB legislation that prevents the poorest districts to receive the federal funding (1)

Dewey did not equal social efficiency with the maintaining of a status quo, but almost a century after he made his greatest contribution to the field of education, we see the detrimental effects of the very practices he condemned. Moreover, it is unclear what kind of social efficiency is currently being required from many students in public schools. While the entire economies of the once developed countries are submitted to birth pangs of globalization, public education is left to perpetuate its own national mythology and standardization – a mythology that lacks meaningful intrinsic value for teachers and students. Social efficiency in Deweyan sense is inevitably associated with personal value since a person, Dewey argued, is seen only in association with others, in a free give and take of intercourse (Dewey, 2008, p81). Though Dewey stated that this association transcends “both the efficiency which consists in supplying products to others and the culture which is an exclusive refinement and polish,” (ibid), Saito (2009) argues that Dewey’s theory of face-to-face communication is destabilized in the light of Emersonian notion of conversation, “with its implications for the place of the eccentric in the culture” (Saito, 2009, p108).

The engine of globalization in Saito's view is Amerikanization that "assimilates, in the name of hospitality, the different, the foreign, and the silent into its own home" (ibid). He poses the question, "If Dewey's philosophy is the problem of American thinking, how far is it itself a part of the problem of globalization?" (ibid). He then counters it with, "if [Dewey's philosophy] it aims to be a voice critical of its own culture and society, how far can Deweyan democracy resist the tide of Amerikanization?" (ibid). Though my intention in this essay is not to deconstruct Dewey's pragmatism and its limits, Saito's reproach might find a partial justification in Dewey's view of the "assimilative force of the American public school" as an "eloquent testimony to the efficacy of the common and balanced appeal" (Dewey, 2008, p17). However, I do support Saito's need to point beyond communication and Deweyan problem solving as the means of democratic discourse, toward dissolution—as an asset, in Saito's words, to contemporary democracy and education. As he writes, "The domestic is the scene of tragedy," and within domestic, one also realizes that "home is not totally secure" (Saito, 2009, p108). Saito argues that, in response to the above challenge, Dewey's maxim that "Democracy must begin at home" begins to be destabilized (ibid). In "*Mass Society, Democracy and Public Opinion*," Dewey (1912) refers to some kind of interconnected global order (by today's parameters) he calls a Great Community as conceivable, "in the sense of free and full intercommunication," but "it can never possess all the qualities which mark a local community" (p51). (2) Outside uncontrolled agencies, "invading and partially destroying" a life of the local community are, according to Dewey, the immediate source of the instability, disintegration and restlessness which characterize the present epoch" (p51). Now, if one views the local community as the *domestic scene* or a *home*, then it is natural that such a community cannot be

sheltered from the outside influences, which threaten its security, stability and relatively sheltered lives of its inhabitants who will, eventually, deviate from it or grow out of its limitations—and if not all of them, then at least a necessary few.

In the spirit of Emerson (2005), who says in “Self-Reliance”, “I shun father and mother and wife and brother when my genius calls me” (p16), Saito (2009) discusses the implications for the place of the “eccentric” [dissident] within a culture, and in light of Emersonian perfectionism. However, on the one hand, the very dissident in Emersonian sense may be equated with the idea of *minority* in Deweyan terms since, “It is true that all valuable as well as new ideas begin with minorities, perhaps a minority of one” (Dewey, 2008, p49). On the other hand, Dewey does not abandon the idea of debating, modifications of views, persuasion, inclusion, association with others, so that the idea, even if spread by a minority, can become the possession of the multitude. A dissident in my view is an individual without a country who stands against, as Saito (2009) argues, “political slogan of citizenship with inclusion” (p112). He sees the citizenship without inclusion “as the most sincere possibility of our neighborly relations with others,” (ibid) where, in my view, the very idea of the local community may transform or even dissolve completely. From this idea of a citizenship without inclusion, then the role of a dissident in a true democracy, I construct my view of a global mind and its importance in remaking of a democratic society and a democratic education.

III. Global Mind and the Implications for Democracy. Human capacities that we can count on are, as Moore Lappe (2011) writes, empathy, sense of fairness, curiosity, imagination. . . These capacities

counterbalance *the worst in us* and it is a ‘duty’ of her eco-mind (that overlaps and interacts with my idea of a global mind), to secure empathetic human relations in cooperative, not competitive environment, to nurture our sense of fairness, need for meaning, curiosity, imagination. . . We can develop these kinds of human relations in circumstances that bring out “the best in us.” Those conditions are mutual accountability, transparency (vs. secrecy) and continuing dispersion of power (Moore Lappe, 2011). In the current state of what was formerly known as liberal democracy, the term “global” evokes varied connotations; in some circles active in promoting humane and truly democratic interactions among diverse groups, “global” and “globalization” almost represent an anathema, blasphemy against humanity, while some others (a majority of passive, non-critical or apathetic recipients of meanings and relations imposed from without) possibly view the entire process in terms of progress, or as a positive outlook on the future.

In such contexts the term “global” has been used and abused by various entities and individuals in *handed-down* or, to borrow from Dewey, habitual ways, without reflecting upon what the term actually could entail. I shall refer to a global mind as an *enlightened*, yet not *elitist* mind, one who understands the dire conditions of globalization, but also one who knows that attempting to reverse it would be a Don Quixote’s battling the windmills. Global mind will have to be educated and informed by educators who are going to be able to resist corporatization of education and who will be able to evade administrative persecution. A scholar from the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee, Haberman (1998), once wrote about *star-teachers*, as the only ones capable of educating impoverished urban youth in highly segregated school districts. Those *star-teachers* will now have to educate morally and spiritually

impoverished youth, growing up in a vacuum of media and neoliberal deception. In creating a global mind, educators will have to give up rhetoric of patriotism, however dear to them, and introduce a new citizen—of the world where one wouldn't or couldn't be privileged anymore, even though the most elitist schools in what was formerly known as the First World still inculcate a certain mentality of a *manager* (or a member of a netocracy) to their protégés.

In order to secure a truly democratic social order in our global world, which ought to be cooperative, not competitive, one must also be able to see the deficiencies of the capitalist frame of reference in establishing the foundations for the new democracy. That is why a critical scholar, a critical educator cannot abandon the term *revolutionary* and everything it entails (in Marxist or similar interpretations). Therefore, global mind will be educated by revolutionary, visionary critical educators who will have to act united—at an international, not only local level. The universal struggle of educators in current times of neoliberal hegemony is a multi-level struggle to preserve the teaching profession as a public service and thus to preserve the most conspicuous democratic value—public education. Though small-scale and largely unnoticed, an initiative to unite educators in recognizing the universality of their struggle, came recently from Norma Yanina Parada Martinez (2011) from Honduras, who visited several universities in Midwest and spoke in front of the small audiences in a couple of graduate classes—at the University of Iowa among others (speech, November 10, 2011). Her presentation made it clear that the educational issues of the world where she comes from are fundamentally similar to those issues that educators face in the United States—given the elimination of the distance and of alienation that perceived power differentials impose on us. Even beyond such

realization Parada Marrtinez demonstrated what it takes to begin an educational dialog between the ‘first’ and the ‘third’ world, a dialog that will not consist in identifying various ‘deficiencies’ and various educational ‘needs’ that would, in turn, attempted to be met by a never-ending supply of necessary educational tools and temporary ‘export’ of qualified educators to teach the most important language of power—English. Are these attitudes a good starting point for the beginning of a dialog and the beginning of understanding?

The nature of educational crisis in Honduras, after a non-democratically elect government seized power in a military coup in 2009, as N.Y.P. Martinez framed it (2011), originates in the government’s ongoing violent initiative to dismantle the public education in Honduras and disenfranchise the teachers by outlawing their associations. She stated in one of the concluding remarks of her speech that the struggle of educators in Honduras with the non-democratically elect government after a military coup in Honduras, is not for the economic, but human development in and through education. What does this mean? If education does not have a critical, leading role in a society then, as she stated, “what we have, in Paulo Freire’s terms, is a primordial education, education for subservience, not empowerment” (speech, November 10, 2012).

Since the implementation of the No Child Left Behind legislation in 2002, public education in the United States is spiraling down to its annihilation. The only measure of public schools’ success has become standardized testing and adequate yearly progress based on the standardized test scores. If a school does not make the adequate yearly progress, it is being placed on the watch list and all the federal funding to

the school is denied. **(3)** Ample evidence in scholarly research (Mathis, 2006, Massell, 2008, Schoenfeld, 2007, Reichbach, 2007, Brown, et al, 2004), demonstrates that the schools in the areas most stricken by poverty regularly do not make the adequate yearly progress and are punished by being denied federal funding. In many cases, schools are closed and the entire teaching staff is terminated. Brown et al. (2004) claim that some charter school proponents have placed emphasis on a market perspective, “viewing competition for customers and profit maximization as the key to quality education” (Brown et al, 2004, p1037). Marketization of public schools, in my view, creates a fertile ground for corporate businesses to hire disenfranchised teaching staff without power to negotiate the curriculum design or their salaries. Saltman (2005) takes the position that “the largest corporation involved in public school privatization threatens to undermine not only public schooling but ultimately the American public itself” (Saltman, 2005, Intro). Many charter schools in the United States are public, but a large number of them are run by corporate businesses that very often don’t even have a stake in who they educate and for which purposes. The evidence of success of charter schools is mixed, but it is beyond the scope of this paper to further elaborate on, or supply data for this claim. Therefore, the truthfulness of the above described process justifies the claim that an initiative to privatize education is taking place in this country as well.

At this stage it does not mean that only elite student population will receive education, but that the quality of educational experiences of the elite and of their disadvantaged counterparts will differ fundamentally. This isn’t an ongoing process in the United States only; Bunnell (2010) analyzes the most recent attempt at an educational reform in Great Britain and its so called triage system. A

triage system tracks the most advantaged students into the prestigious, elite schools, where they are being educated for the most critical economic and political functions in the country's dwindling economy, while the rest of the youngsters occupy their 'placeholders' in schools that prepare them to become, or remain in the sphere of an economic underclass, unemployed and unemployable in an outsourced economy. As it appears, such is the role of many public schools in the United States, plagued by standardized testing and inadequate curriculum. Breaking down of such a school into smaller charter schools is a façade, behind which the neoliberal oligarchy of this and other countries are in effect stripping educators of their fundamental rights and extinguishing what is left of democratic, public institutions. The general public in the United States, entrenched in the power relations of the past, industrial era, still believes in the nation's dominant status in the world. In my view, the general public is wrong. The dominant status in the world is now reserved for the infamous "one percent," called on in the recent nationwide "Occupy" protests. However, the small turnout and the relatively small scope of the protest speaks in favor of my observation that the public still lives a lethargic illusion of the United States' dominance and those of them who represent the nation in various, more or less significant roles abroad—ranging from a teacher of English to an ambassador—fall into a predictable groove of habitually accepting and acting upon their perceived position of democratic messiahs.

Thus the language of Parada Martinez appears more understandable and more intuitive than a general *domestic* rhetoric and, as a result, her language depicts the relations in her country and in the world more accurately. If the general public, including teachers, in the United States is under the impression that what the educators in Honduras are subjected

to by their government (dismantling of teachers' unions, assassinations of non-compliant teachers and privatization of education in N.Y.P.

Martinez's (2011) account) has no relation to what the educators in the United States are facing, it is time to realize that similarities exist and that the ongoing process in the U.S. and the rest of what was formerly known as the First World, similar in the ultimate end yet different by means employed, might appear more insidious, but is nevertheless equally effective. The dilemmas facing the schools in the Third World are not those of how to fill in various deficiencies of the educational systems in its respective countries; educators as activists, including Parada Martinez, by far surpass their many counterparts in the United States in their understanding of global relations and what it takes for the educational system of any country to produce graduates who will, in turn, play a critical role in (re)building of a just and democratic society and sustainable, co-operative economy. Those educators and the educational systems they represent do not need donations, or 'export' of democratic values, but understanding—that the teachers of the world can preserve the value and role of education (primarily public education) only by transcending the local divisions and, though diverse linguistically and culturally, by forming a united front in breaking a chain of dominance, which stands in the way of a true democracy,

While many educational researchers in the United States are tackling the statistics of the standardized tests and succumbing to the climate of defining success and failure of schools as defined by those statistics, true critical educators and scholars are attacking the very cause of the world-wide educational crisis: its privatization that is leaving behind all whose social position and economic power do not allow them the benefits of good education and future prospects. True democratic teachers and

scholars are battling the reversal to a universal caste society, post-modern global aristocratic system, where masses of disenfranchised and poor are ruled by a few members of the elite. This is a process not well grasped by the population and the educators of what was formerly known as the First World, whose leading elites keep perpetuating a divide among the worlds and keep subjecting others to their scrutiny, and attempting to determine what those others need. In order to understand what they need, one perhaps needs to receive some of their Otherness, the same way Parada Martinez invites her audience to join her in her fellow countrymen and colleagues' struggle to liberate the education and the people of Honduras, and by doing so perhaps liberate the people of the world—from injustices, domination, hunger and disease.

By acting united at an international level, we will recreate the nexus between the education and its purpose or, in Dewey's words, educational aims. In *Democracy and Education* Dewey (2008) writes about the systematic attention to education by a state, in order to recover and maintain their political power, especially in Europe, after Napoleon's conquests. The system educated a citizen, to protect and strengthen the interests of the state. Education's function since, first and foremost, is social. One of the fundamental problems of education in and for democracy, as Dewey writes, "is set by the conflict of a nationalistic and a wider social aim" (Dewey, 2008, p65). He then poses a question if it is possible to conduct an educational system by a national state by not restricting, constraining, or corrupting the full social ends of the educative process. Saito (2009), quoting Cavel who says that "education for citizenship is education for isolation" addresses this issue (Saito, 2009, p110).

On one end of this spectrum is what I propose—educating a global mind in a global world, even though it is not clear, as Hytten notes, “who is driving this [global] engine” (Hytten, 2009, p399). In this sense it is justifiable to use the term *nodes of power*, that stand in opposition with the modern idea of the power of the state. On the other end challenges of globalization expand and seem out of control, without some sense of direction, as Hytten (2009) argues (ibid). However, a challenge of resorting to isolationism and nationalism would be even greater. Dewey (2008) states that “diversity of stimulation means novelty and novelty means challenge to thought” (Dewey, 2008, p21). This idea of novelty challenging the thought can be placed in any cultural frame in order for us to reconsider, what Saito calls “the whole metaphysics of expansive growth while sustaining its antifoundationalist line” (Saito, 2009, p109). The lack of sense of direction in a global world thus does not mean that we need to readjust the principles of good citizenship, whose only function would be to preserve local and provincial, while conducting business in a global and cosmopolitan sphere. It also does not mean that the ‘culture’ needs to be resuscitated and adhered to the way citizenship education proposed in the past but, as Saito (2009) states, the culture “awaits the prophetic voice of the dissident,” without whose resistance “within culture, resistance within home, the perfectionist language and expansive commitments to hospitality and sympathy can become merely rhetorical, ideological; or they can be assimilated into the totalizing force of standardization . . .” Standardization, in Saito’s view equals globalized covering over of difference (ibid).

In other words, we are initiated into a culture, but our human condition necessitates also a deviation from it. A global mind, as I see it, deviates from the culture, but not by assimilating into a *universal* culture,

established as an assimilationist by-product of concentrated, neoliberal power. A global mind also does not originate in any particular center of power. Thus conceived, culture, globalization and citizenship, instead of a suffix *with inclusion* (which is Deweyan in a sense of letting Otherness permeate and challenge the thought and then find the common language) we may, to borrow from Saito, start to think of a culture, globalization and citizenship without inclusion.

In order to secure a democratic social order in a global world, which ought to be cooperative, not competitive order of dominance and subordination, we need voices of dissidents, a global mind that is able to think beyond domestic, in many respects mythological scene of a home or homeland and therefore able to see the deficiencies of any frame of reference, especially a capitalist one. Amerikanization to which Saito (2009) refers, and Hytten's (2009) democracy as a commodity, currently represent a non-contested 'export' of a 'perfect social order', even after those living (or *practicing*) such an order are becoming increasingly disillusioned by its democratic value on the one hand, and harmed by its oppressive, competitive and dehumanizing effects as a consequence of the commodification and the 'market rule' on the other. By living in a culture *without inclusion* [read assimilation] and as a critical element of its indoctrination and oppression, a global mind itself is embodied in the voice of Parada Martinez from Honduras as much as in the voices of the unemployed and disenfranchised in the United States and elsewhere. They are different and cacophonous, many of them tragic and lost, yet ought to be united in creating a new, multi-faceted democracy on the ruins of the current necrotic system.

In conclusion, the idea of educating a global mind excludes the rhetoric of patriotism, however dear to educators and policymakers. The educators of the world will have to initiate new discourses and, in the process, create a new citizen of the world. Similar to the prevalent usage of the term ‘global’ and ‘globalization’, the phrase ‘citizen of the world’ hitherto evoked either elitist or superficial cosmopolitan connotations. Present and future educators of what was formerly known as the First World will have to nurture a different idea of a citizen—of the world where one wouldn’t or couldn’t be privileged anymore. Revolutionary critical educators will thus be able to grasp the importance of acting united—at an international, not only local level. As emphasized, the struggle of educators in current times of neoliberal hegemony appears to be a universal, multi-level struggle to preserve the teaching profession as a public service and to preserve the most conspicuous democratic value—public education. Modifications of the law (NCLB) that was de facto dismantling public education in this country within the last decade and conditioning funding by fostering competition among states and districts, are not going to grant the United States’ schooling system its former prestige. In fact, congruent with the necessity of educating a global mind as I propose, competition and prestige of a national educational system will not be the educational priority, but creating a nexus between education and its purpose at an international level. A global mind, educated to understand diverse discourses on the premises of equality of human beings, will represent a new educational paradigm and a new measure of humanity.

Notes

1. However, the Race to the Top program, a \$4,35 billion fund created under the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, of 2009* (ARRA) is a competitive education grant program (largest in the US history), designed to provide incentives to States to implement large-scale, system-changing reforms that improve student achievement, close achievement gaps and increase graduation and college enrollment rates. See: <http://www.ed.gov/open/plan/race-top-game-changing-reforms>
2. I would like to acknowledge that Dewey (1912) also states, “for the world’s peace it is necessary that we understand the peoples of foreign lands” (p51).
3. Modifications of the law (Sunderman, 2006) began in 2003 and some of the first changes (subsequently further modified) addressed the assessment of cognitively disabled students and English language learners and their inclusion in the adequate yearly progress, flexibility in requirements for a highly qualified teacher certification and allowing states to propose ‘a growth model accountability model for making AYP determinations’.
4. Klein and McNeil (2011) write in *Education Week* that the Obama administration intends to offer states relief from parts of No Child Left Behind Act, “if they agree to embrace unspecified education redesign priorities.” States that agree to overhaul low-performing schools and adopt more rigorous teacher evaluation systems may apply for relief from 11 of the Bush-era law’s unpopular provisions. See: <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility>

References

Arthur, Chris. (2011). “Financial Literacy in Ontario: Neoliberalism, Pierre Bourdieu and the Citizen.” *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, vol. 9. No. 1,

Brown, H., et al. (2004) “Scale of Operation and Locus of Control in Market- Versus Mission- Oriented Charter Schools.” *Social Science Quarterly*, Vol. 85, No. 5, pp1035-1051,
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.0038-4941.2004.00259.x/full>.

Bunel, T. (2011). “Post-16 curriculum provision in England: the emerging functional ‘triage’ serving Capital’s needs,” *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, vol. 9. No. 1,

Dewey, J. (1927). “*Mass Society*,” *Democracy and Public Opinion*, 1927. Google eBook.

Dewey, J. (2008). *Democracy and Education*. Seven Treasures

Publications.

Emerson, R. W. (2005). *Self-reliance and Other Essays*. Living Life Fully ebooks; <https://www.livinglifefully.com/ebooks/self-reliance.pdf>.

Haberman, M. & Post, L. (1998). "Teachers for Multicultural Schools: The Power of Selection." *Theory Into Practice*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp96-104. <http://www.metrostatecue.org/files/mscd/Documents/Effective%20Educators/Teachers%20for%20Multicultural%20Schools.pdf>.

Hytten, K. (2009). "Deweyan Democracy In A Globalized World," *Educational Theory*, Vol. 59, No. 4.

Klein, A. & McNeile, M. (2011). ("Waiver Plan generates relief, Fret." *Education week*, Vol. 31, No. 1.

Massell, D. (2008). "The Current Status and Role of Standards Based Reform in the States." A draft report prepared for the National Research Council Workshop Series on Standards based Reform: <http://www7.nationalacademies.org/CFE/Massell%20State%Standards%20Paper.pdf>.

Mathis, W. J. (2006). "The Accuracy and Effectiveness of Adequate Yearly Progress, NCLB's School Evaluation System." The Great Lakes Center for Education Research & Practice http://www.greatlakescenter.org/docs/Policy_Briefs/GLC_AYP_Mathis_Final.pdf.

Moore Lappe, F. (2011). *EcoMind: Changing the Way We Think to Create the World We Want*. Google eBook.

Reichbach, A. (2007). "Lawyer, Client, Community: To Whom Does the Education Reform Lawsuit Belong? *Boston College Third World Law Journal*, Vol. 27, No.1. <http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1058&context=twlj>,

Saito, N. (2009). "Reconstruction in Dewey's Pragmatism: Home, Neighborhood, and Otherness," *Education and Culture*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp 101-114.

Saltman, K. J. (2005). *The Edison Schools: Corporate Schooling and the Assault on Public Education*. Taylor and Francis Group, New York.

Schoenfeld, A., editor. (2007). *Assessing Mathematical Proficiency*. Cambridge University Press

Steel, R. *Temptations of a superpower*. Harvard university Press, 1995.

Sunderman, G. L. (2006). *The Unraveling of No Child Left Behind: How Negotiate Changes Transform the Law*. The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University. http://inpathways.net/NCLB_Unravel.pdf., Accessed on January 14, 2012

Author Details

Biljana Samoukovic is a doctoral student at the University of Iowa, Department of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies. Her particular academic interests are directed to critical pedagogy in terms of student and teacher empowerment, teacher unity and transcendence of national divides in education. Email: biljana-samoukovic@uiowa.edu.