NEOLIBERALISM, GLOBALIZATION AGENDAS AND BANKING EDUCATIONAL POLICY: IS POPULAR EDUCATION AN ANSWER?[1]

Carlos Alberto Torres
University of California at Los Angeles

ABSTRACT Discussing the tensions between the global and the local, this paper offers a description of cosmopolitan and local competing globalization agendas. Three agendas, as ideal types, are highlighted: the Hyper-Globalizers, Skeptics and Transformationists. After explaining the competing agendas for globalization and some of their potential impacts in education, three main claims are made in this paper. The first one is that the dominant technocratic rationale in policy making, which is part and parcel of a neoliberal regime, constitutes a form of banking education so brilliantly criticized by Paulo Freire. This technocratic rationality is based on instrumental rationality discussed by Max Weber, Herbert Marcuse and Jürgen Habermas. A second claim is that there is a great potential for challenging the intellectual narratives and praxis of neoliberal education in the new approach of a global citizenship education portrayed in the First Global Educational Initiative announced by the U.N. General Secretary and currently being implemented by UNESCO. The final claim is a question: could popular education be an answer to the growing inequality, poverty, and lack of solidarity in the contemporary world? The basic premise of this paper is that neoliberalism, emerging as the dominant face of globalization may be conducive to what has been termed banking education. The distinguished tradition

of *popular education* in Latin America is considered as a possible alternative.

Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism has utterly failed as a viable model of economic development, yet the politics of culture associated with neoliberalism is still in force, becoming the new common sense shaping the role of government and education. This 'common sense' has become an ideology playing a major role in constructing hegemony as moral and intellectual leadership in contemporary societies.

Neoliberal globalization, predicated on the dominance of the market over the state and on deregulatory models of governance, has deeply affected the university in the context of 'academic capitalism'. The resulting reforms, rationalized as advancing international competitiveness, have affected public universities in four primary areas: efficiency and accountability, accreditation and universalization, international competitiveness and privatization. There is also growing resistance to globalization as top-down-imposed reforms reflected in the public debates about schooling reform, curriculum and instruction, teacher training and school governance.

Torres has discussed the implications of neoliberal globalization in education and universities and K-12 education (Torres, 2011; 2013). The impact of neoliberal globalization on universities raises several important questions. Do shifts toward a market-oriented ideology within the wider society suggest similar and inevitable shifts within universities? Do such shifts bring about the inevitable commodification of professional activities, family life and the environment, or the life of the professoriate? If such responses are unavoidable, does this necessitate a move in the direction of a free-market ideology on a global scale and hence the obtaining of comparative data to assess who is who in higher education? To what extent can the emergence of a single, global monoculture in higher education be expected once we have established a firm ranking of quality

universities on a world scale? While not all these questions can be addressed in a conceptual paper like this one, I would like to submit a set of tentative answers which may guide empirical research on the subject.

How are we to cope with these challenges of globalization in the universities, and how we can produce models of global cooperation? What are the goals of a global university for the 21st century? Facing the challenges of globalization some universities aspire to become global research universities. They try to educate students but also develop new knowledge to take into account a changing world, a world full of hybridity, competing values, different histories and geographies, dynamics, social structures and population levels. Yet they operate in a world that is fully interlinked and interpenetrated, hence exposed to the world's epidemics, intensification of trade and circulation of people, shifting climates, consumer tastes, social imaginaries conveyed via mass media and the like. All of this is happening while global research universities are built around scientific models that are conducted in English and with metrics of evaluation in line with the Anglo-Saxon positivistic world—though standard scientific narratives, particularly in the social sciences and humanities, are contested and new narratives are emerging.

Thus, the traditional roles and functions of the universities are changing. In a recent document from UCLA it is highlighted there are five key dimensions that need to be incorporated in any analysis of the role and functions of global universities. These include global learning, global research, global reputation building, global engagement and global service. Occasionally, some global research universities attempt to become scientific and cultural hubs in specific regions of the world, fully supported by regional and national governments. These roles and responsibility contrast with the roles and responsibilities that are supposed to be carried out by the national oriented universities. (UCLA, 2014)

Global learning speaks to the way in which universities focus their theoretical and political orientation, trying to offer knowledge, skills and dexterities to specific individuals, many of them connected with elites or aspiring to be an elite, and joining the ranks of those constituting democratic cosmopolitanism.

Professors, researchers, and particularly graduate students in these universities see themselves as working with the depository of knowledge that has been created by humanity, and trying to enhance, via models of creativity and ingenuity, the new frontiers of capital accumulation. The movie *Social Network*, depicting the 'invention' of Facebook by Mark Zuckerberg while an undergraduate student at Harvard, or the folky stories associated with the way in which Steven Jobs and associates, and Bill Gates and associates, developed their digital culture products that changed the way we live, interact, communicate and produce commodities. They indicate that, though they ultimately were university drop outs, they were organically connected or at least linked to universities that facilitate these innovations. Most of these universities are ranked today as global research universities.

The pursuit of *global research* is in keeping with the nature of global research universities. Moreover, because research ranks so highly in the context of global universities, becoming a research university is the trademark of the global university. This reverberates in the quality of its researchers and professors and their contributions to knowledge, technology and productivity worldwide. Global research is a centerpiece of *global reputation building*, well represented in rankings such as Times Higher Education Global University Rankings,[2] though many are those who will argue that university rankings distort the function and structure of universities (Yeagle, Working Paper n/d). The majority of rankings focuses on teaching (and the number of international students attracted to the campus), international outlook, industry income resulting from innovations in the universities, the type of research and collaborations through publications that are made by scholars situated in diverse national borders, the citations that their research attracts, research funding and an overall score.

Finally, global universities aim to provide *global services* and in doing so seek avenues for *global engagement*. The

2 Reputation building is intimately related to rankings and they have all but proliferated in the last three decades. Consider for instance *The Times Higher Education World University Rankings*, the *Washington Monthly College Guide, QS World University Rankings,* and the most read in the United States, *US News & World Report,* among others.

type of service they aim to contribute goes beyond the national boundaries of the nations in which they are located, occasionally aided by contributions from major donors who are not even nationals but alumni and want to produce symbolic gestures with their funds so they are remembered and recognized in their *alma mater*. Many of the great global universities in the world, particularly the private ones, have sizable endowments. The type of global engagement that global universities pursue relates to institutions of the world system, multinational corporations or national and/or international activities of their own nation-states. The recent rush to create university hubs in the Asia-Pacific area, and the struggle to acquire international prestige in the region is another indicator of this global engagement.

There are a number of questions that one may pose looking at global cooperation and the role of universities. Should global cooperation be solely, exclusively or mostly based on the platform that global universities offer? After all they are, apparently, the quintessential cosmopolitan institutions and global cooperation is by definition the quintessential global cosmopolitan form of national diplomacy.

Cosmopolitan and Local Agendas: Hyper-Globalizers, Skeptics and Transformationists.[3]

There are at least three different positions or agendas to the limits and possibilities of globalizations and their impact on our lives (see Held et al 1999). There are the *hyper-globalizers* who believe globalization is a singular process encompassing all regions of the world and all aspects of human and planetary life and is the solution to poverty, inequality and all other social ills. Therefore, Thomas Friedman (2005) implied that the quicker we move to make this world a flatter world, the better. This is certainly the dominant view portrayed in the mass media, and is well represented in a number of international organizations such as the World Bank, the Import-Export Bank, the IMF, the World Trade Organization, some sectors of the United Nations, many Western and non-Western governments and is reflected in many OECD reports.

---

3 This section is taken from my article for the European Journal of Education entitled Global Citizenship and the Quest for Human Empowerment, published in September 2015.

At the opposing end are the *skeptics*, who could in their most extreme form, become anti-globalizers. Somewhere in the middle of this pendulum, always struggling to make sense of the limits and possibilities of the new realities, are different varieties of what I could call the *transformationists* who are also fragmented in different interest groups and, by implication, introduce different emphases.

There are several economic reasons that prompted the *hyper-globalizers*, and particularly those connected with corporations, neoliberal governments and some academics, to argue that globalization is a powerful tool to reduce inequalities within and across nations. Looking at the intersections between globalization and egalitarian distribution, Pranab Bardhan, Samuel Bowles and the late Michael Wallerstein argued the following:

> The freer flow of information, goods, and capital from the richer to poorer nations should raise productivity and increase the demands for labor in the labor-abundant and technologically lagging nations, inducing tendencies toward convergence of wage rates for equivalent labor throughout the world... Globalization might also induce more competitive products, markets, reducing profit markups -- the discrepancy between prices and marginal costs-- and thus raising real wages. Finally, competition among nation-states and the ability of citizens to compare institutional performance across nations might also provide greater popular accountability for state and para-statal institutions often dominated by elites" (Bardhan, Bowles and Wallerstein, 2006, p. 3).

The symmetrical counterpoint to an economists' position is built on a critique of globalization as enhancing rather than reducing the power of elites worldwide (within and across nations) and also affecting—some will even argue obliterating—culture and ways of seeing and living for individuals, families and communities who find themselves deeply affected by the changes in the world system. Of great importance is the way these changes are affecting democracies and nation states, particularly the welfare state models. Without entering into the debates of whether or not the multiple processes of globalization

have withered away the nation state, its autonomy and ability to actually control its own territories and policies, it is clear that the skeptics point to the crises of 2008 as another indicator not only of the maliciousness of global processes but also the failure of neoliberalism as an economic model.[4] They argue that the economic debacle resulted from voracious, greedy and irresponsible action of financial capitalism that brought the capitalist world system to the brink of its own dissolution.

One of the key elements for the *skeptics* in condemning globalization is that it has unleashed a wave of inequality worldwide without precedent. In his monumental study, Thomas Piketty argues that "Today, in the second decade of the twenty-first century, inequalities of wealth that had supposedly disappeared are close to regaining or even surpassing their historical highs. The new global economy has brought with it both immense hopes (such as the eradication of poverty) and equally immense inequalities (some individuals are now as wealthy as entire countries)" (Piketty, 2014, p.471). A well-known OECD inequality report shows how countries across the developed world are getting less equal, giving the skeptics much fodder for their criticism.[5]

For skeptics, globalization has been deleterious not only because of the increase in inequality, but also because technological change has generally favored skilled workers. Similarly, as Michael Wallerstein has suggested, there is a decline of unions, which are known to defend income and wages and therefore serve as a barrier to inequality in addition to defending the fundamentals of democracy (Austen-Smith, et al, 2008). Because of the decline of unions, there is a falling minimum wage (one of the key reasons for inequality). There is also a rise in immigration (legal and undocumented), producing a "brain drain" from poor nations towards richer nations. Furthermore,

---

4 See my work on neoliberalism in Torres 2009a, and 2009b, and specifically on adult education, Torres 2013c.

5 http://www.oecd.org/els/soc/ dividedwestandwhyinequalitykeepsrising.htm. A recent newspaper article claims that the 85 richest persons in the world have the same amount of wealth that the poorest half in the world. http://www. clarin.com/zona/mundo-vez-desigual-riqueza-multimillonarios-dolares_0_1253874893.html

some point to the rise of single-parent families, which are by definition one of the reasons for family impoverishment, which is seen as being one of globalization's adverse impacts. Finally the skeptics will point their finger to the voraciousness of elites who, owing to the presence of neoliberalism, have taken control of governments and international organizations, thus spawning even greater levels of inequality.

Documentation of income over the last thirty years show that top income shares have increased substantially in English speaking countries and in India and China, but not in continental European countries or Japan (Atkinson, Piketty and Sáenz, 2011, p. 3). Newspaper reports, concerning growing inequality in the UK, for instance, show that the top 10% have incomes that are 12 times greater than the bottom 10%, and this is up from eight times greater in 1985. There is no question that the skeptics have powerful arguments to be levelled against the impact of globalization in our lives and still consider the nation-state a lynchpin in articulating responses to globalization, but may not have great expectations for a successful performance of a democratic state.

Moreover, the *skeptics* would argue that democracy has become controlled by a plutocracy. Even scholars who had been traditionally close to neo-conservative positions are seeing that the declining (some would argue vanishing) middle class, considered the backbone of democratic politics, doesn't bode well for the future of democracy per se (Fukuyama, 2012).[6]

The *transformationists* would "argue that sovereignty, state power, and territoriality...stand today in a more complex relationship than in the epoch during which the modern nation-state was being forged" (Lauder, Brown, Dillabough and Halsey, 2006, p. 45).

There are many varieties of transformationists in different venues, pursuing political agendas and aggregated interests. On the left there are the *social democrats* who want to preserve some form of the welfare state and its intervention in the economy, despite the fiscal crises of the state that, they realize, need to be

---

6 http://jornalggn.com.br/sites/default/files/documentos/fukuyama_the_future_of_history.pdf

solved. There are traditional social democratic varieties, mostly in Europe, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and populist social democratic varieties in Latin America and the United States. Here the key element is how the nation-state can control the behavior of the markets, and how it can move beyond the class-conflict model assuming that the state could tax the earnings of capital and transfer the revenue to workers.

This has been studied by Adam Przeworski (2003) in several of his works, and has been advocated by Berkeley University Professor Robert Reich who was Secretary of Labor in the Clinton Administration and is today one of the **éminence grise** of the USA Democratic Party.

On the right, there are the *market liberals* who argue that the state should work around basic principles of privatization and de-regulation. However, they do not go as far as the hyper-globalizers in demolishing the welfare state, undermining the nation-state, or thwarting state interventions in sensitive areas of state policies—mostly connected with capital accumulation and political legitimation. The presence of a *comprador state* helps their merchandizing. Many of these market liberals are truly provincials and occasionally their interest will be at odds with those of multinational corporations. Some could be considered in the theoretical framework of theories of dependency as a national bourgeoisie or comprador bourgeoisie. Against both positions, one finds a group that, for lack of a better term, can be called *authoritarian libertarian,* a segment that could be easily characterized as protectionist or ethno-nationalist. They have proliferated in Europe in the last two decades, but there are representatives of this variety in many continents. Their ultimate goal is to seal national borders, preventing immigrants from coming into their territory, controlling capital influx, and outlawing outsourcing of jobs overseas. In a very authoritarian manner, they want to exercise the full power of the state to control various issues within national borders, from crime to culture to capital accumulation. They are against free trade, and the radical forms of globalization proposed by the hyper-globalizers.[7]

_____
7 The Freedom Party of Austria (German: Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs, FPÖ), the Italian Lega Nord, VMRO from Bulgaria, the Flemish Vlaams Belang, the Czech Republic OK Strana, Geert Wilders' Party of Freedom, and Marine Le Pen Front National are all examples of this orientation

Finally, I argue that there is another variety that I will call *New Democrats*, who confront capitalism seeking models of equality and equity, with an emphasis on ways in which the capitalist system could be challenged around key elements of class, race/ethnicity, gender, sexual preference, or disability discrimination, to name just a few.

Depending on whether these New Democrats espouse a strong or weak Critical Feminism, Critical Race Theory, Political Race Theory, or any other critical theoretical and political orientations, including Neo-marxism and Socialism for the Twentieth Century, they are usually immersed in domestic, regional, provincial and national oriented politics, and find themselves confronting globalization processes at several levels. They are very prominent and linked to multiculturalist and post-colonial traditions in the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Western Europe, and are present within a diversity of orientations in many other regions of the world, from Latin America to Sub-Saharan Africa to the Asian Pacific region. They may overlap with some social-democratic, populist or socialist (or post-socialist) traditions, but by and large they do not pay enough attention to the international developments regarding an emerging democratic cosmopolitanism.

Most varieties of New Democrats fall decisively within one of the ends of the spectrum or pendulum between *cosmopolitanism* and *provincialism*. They are deeply committed and unabashedly *provincial* in the defense of their learning and political communities, and their confrontation and engagement with the many processes of globalization are usually territorially, national, or regionally based. There is one important exception here. Solidarity matters to New Democrats, and international solidarity matters a great deal. While mostly provincial rather than cosmopolitan, New Democrats actively intervene in the national and international arena when they try to prevent wars, lending a hand to people who experienced distressing natural or man-made catastrophes, or struggling to find ways to help the planet by promoting sustainable development.

Technocratic Rationality

In a comparative and cross-cultural research on adult education that I conducted in the eighties and early nineties, I analyzed the role and purposes of adult education policy

by discussing six rationales for policy making. These rationales, when transformed into policy, may take the form of constitutional prescriptions, investment in human capital, political socialization, compensatory legitimation, international pressures, and social movements. Drawing from critical theory and research in adult education in Canada and developing countries, I concluded that, despite the rhetoric underlying a particular policy narrative, the dominant logic among policy makers in adult education is instrumental rationality, and the dominant *weltanschauung* in adult education policy planning is technocratic thinking.

Discussing the notion of instrumental rationality as developed by Weber (2013)—that is, the rule of impersonal economic forces and bureaucratic administration—I have documented how the ideology of the welfare state has resulted in a depoliticization of policy makers' views regarding the social world. While the notion of power is clearly expressed in the narratives of adult education policy makers, they have no conceptual expressions of emancipatory action or heuristic analyses of social action.[3] Let us take policy makers' language as an example. The language of policy makers tends to be technically aseptic and noncontroversial, borrowing conceptual categories from systems theories, human capital theories, and functionalist or neofunctionalist paradigms. Key dimensions in policy formation, such as social class differences, gender, and ethnic or racial discrimination remain subdued in the narratives of policy makers. This is so because the sharper the conceptual categorization of a phenomenon, the more difficult it becomes to set policy that will accommodate multiple interests and incompatible goals within any organization.

With these concerns in mind, and using a political economy of adult education, I studied literacy training, adult basic education, and skill-upgrading programs in Alberta, Canada, in Mexico, and in Cuba, Nicaragua, Granada, and Tanzania. These societies were selected for comparison not only because they represent distinct political and economic experiences but also because all of them have developed innovative and quality programs in adult education. Through a comparison of state-sponsored programs, and an analysis of opinions, aspirations, and expectations of policy makers, teachers, and adult learners, Daniel Schugurensky and I identified three different models of

adult education policy: a "therapeutical model" in Canada, a "recruitment model" in Mexico, and a "forced modernization" model in Tanzania.

Our analytical and empirical research shows that in the Canadian therapeutical model the state is a benefactor, and the problem of poverty and illiteracy are see seen either as the result of temporary economic dislocations that may be adjusted through market mechanisms or as the result of individual deficits in skills or attitudes that may be addressed through instructional means. The role of the experts is to determine the nature of the training given to the individuals, who should be integrated into the job market as soon as possible. Teachers are professionals and enjoy great autonomy in the programs. In the Mexican recruitment model the emphasis is on a constant and active attraction of large numbers of learners to adult education programs. The rationale seems to be the incorporation of a disenfranchised clientele into the dominant political model. Teachers are mainly volunteers and follow textbooks designed by central agencies. In this model, the main concern is not the quality of learning but the recruitment and massive control of large numbers of people who otherwise could remain outside the corporatist channels of political participation. Finally, in Tanzania's forced modernization model the emphasis is placed on capital accumulation through the implementation of modern agricultural techniques and, therefore, on increasing Tanzania's integration into the world market economy. Such a model is resisted both by women who produce for home consumption and by young males whose main interest in attending adult education programs is to get employment in urban areas and leave the rural enclaves.

The three models show common traits that are surprising considering the diversity of living conditions, state structures and political philosophies in each society. First, all three models are non-participative, where social and political issues and issues that may bring conflict into the operation of adult education services are ignored or perceived exclusively as problems that may be fixed through technical measures. Second, in all three societies, adult education is a clear instrument of the state contributing to capital accumulation and political legitimation practices, neglecting any emancipatory practices that may empower learners or communities. Third, in all three

models, literacy training is irrelevant and marginal, isolated from productive work and skill upgrading programs. Fourth, in the absence of participatory organizational structures and practices, a top-down decision-making system prevails. Despite the operation of three different models of adult education oriented by fairly different political and philosophical values, in all of them there are few opportunities for the learners or community to participate in policy making. Fifth, teachers generally have no training in adult education. In Canada, highly professional teachers trained to work with children and youth have a patronizing and paternalistic attitude regarding adult learners. In Mexico and Tanzania, paraprofessional and poorly trained teachers present high rates of job turnover and absenteeism, which in turn lead to high student dropout rates. Last, there is evidence that in Canada, Mexico, and Tanzania, adult education programs are organized in a two-track system: a more prestigious one that focuses on programs for upgrading skills, and a marginal one that emphasizes adult basic education and literacy training (see Torres, 1989, 1996, Torres & Schugurensky, 1996).

Banking Education and the Paulo Freire model

Traditional models of education built on the power of teachers in the classrooms through a teacher centered pedagogy, and the overwhelming power of educational bureaucracies had been challenged and criticized by Paulo Freire and a host of educational reformers as banking education. Paulo Freire collaborated with UNESCO for a long time, including working from 1987 to 1995 as a jury member of UNESCO's International Literacy Prizes, receiving the 1996 UNESCO Prize for Peace Education.

The metaphor of banking education, based on the idea that students are empty vessels that need to be filled with knowledge is a strong metaphor that calls for changes at several levels. One of the key changes is to recognize that the students that come to our classrooms of all ages, bring with them knowledge and experience, and they can make serious contributions to teaching and learning. Freire posits this in the analogy of the teacher as a student (which is an obvious fact since we continue to learn until our last breath) and the student as a teacher (since they bring questions, analysis or live experiences that enrich, challenge, defy, and even improve upon the instructional design). Authoritarian educational models, as

argued by Freire and a number of pedagogues of liberation, undermine student autonomy and creativity, and reproduce rules and regulations that perpetuate domination, exploitation, and oppression. The alternative that has been suggested is problem-posing education, that confronts the students with questions, and very often their own questions in learning and instruction, rather than "off the shelf" preconceived answers based on instrumental rationality.

For banking education, the teacher is the subject of the pedagogical adventure and the student is the object. Freire's contribution to understanding education as the act of freedom is an invitation to see the interminable dialectics in the struggle to free ourselves and to free others from constraints to freedom. In and of itself, the struggle for liberation is another form of intervention that can be considered part of the ethics of intervention. Certainly, education as the act of freedom implies a different perspective on local, socially constructed, and generationally transmitted knowledge. It also implies a perspective that challenges normal science and non-participatory planning, constructing a theoretical and methodological perspective that is always suspicious of any scientific relationship as concealing relationships of domination. At the same time, while freedom is still to be conquered, freedom can be conquered because unequal, exploitative relationships are built by human beings and can be changed by human beings (Torres, 2009b, p. 41-42).

The process of conscientisation appears as one of the most important processes of demystification of the ideological practices of the dominant classes. On the one hand, characterizing these practices (e.g., authoritarianism within the school, the separation of manual work and intellectual work, and so forth) as banking education outlines a significant watershed in pedagogical terms. On the other hand, the practice of popular education situates itself as the point of rupture and generator of contradictions and imbalances in the educational system.–The practice of popular education has a crucial importance in undermining the hierarchical ideological-scholastic mechanisms of social reproduction as instruments of the dominant sectors'

The main thesis of my *First Freire* book (Torres, 2014) is that Freire's original experience in Angicos anticipated a grand design for the social transformation of educational systems. As such, it brought together two key concepts that formed the basis of his educational system: *popular culture* as a counter-hegemonic project and *popular education*, more particularly, what was later called *citizen schools* or *public popular education* (O'Cadiz and Torres, 1994; O'Cadiz, Torres and Wong, 1998; Torres 1998a, 1998b).

Any traditional definition of a system will present it as "a set of detailed methods, procedures and routines created to carry out a specific activity, perform a duty, or solve a problem" (Business Dictionary.com, 2013).[8] I use the term Paulo Freire System to show that Freire's original attempts were more than simply a pedagogical challenge to the banking education system that was so pervasive in Brazil and Latin America at the time. In challenging the hegemony of banking education, along with its narrative, theoretical foundations, epistemology, and methodology, Freire and his team sought to create a new system that could replace the old one. They viewed banking education as not only as obsolete in terms of the modernization of systems but also as oppressive in gnoseological, epistemological, and political terms.

One could also use the term *Paulo Freire Model*, implying the design of organizational structures to enact a transformation of a given system. All models provide a narrative or coherence for a new architecture—in this case, a new architecture of knowledge—as well as capturing mechanisms to implement this new social and organizational venture.

What I argue in the book is that the original experiences of Freire in the city of Angicos in Rio Grande do Norte, or the previous experiments on literacy training that also took place in the Northeast were attempts to construct this new educational system, or what I have called, for the lack of another term: the *Paulo Freire System*. An important early experience was the one carried out in João Pessoa, Paraiba, in January 1962 when Freire and his team from the University of Recife advised the Campanha de Educação Popular (CEPLAR - Campaign for

---

8 http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/system.html

Popular Education) of Paraíba created by college students and professionals trained to work in adult literacy programs.

The experience and spirit of the 1960s implied a most dramatic radicalization of the tensions between those who actually create culture in their everyday lives, the common people, and intellectuals who analyze these processes making proposals for cultural action.

Another concept highlighted in the last years of his life was the *escola cidadā* (citizen schools). The concept of *escola cidadā* is very strongly linked to the movement of popular and communitarian education, which in the 1980s resulted in the movement for a public popular school, as a model to be implemented in various regions of Brazil. The concept of popular education is the most important contribution of Latin American educationists to universal pedagogical thought. The *escola cidadā* is a new type of school that does not simply impart knowledge, but creates and administers knowledge. It is an eco-political and pedagogical project; that is to say, it is an eminently ethical project, an innovative school, constructing meaning while it is intimately connected to the world. In an interview Freire gave to the TV Educadora do Rio de Janeiro, on 19 March 1997 (Paulo Freire archives, São Paulo]),[9] he defined *escola cidadā* as a social and political-pedagogical space which becomes a center of rights and responsibilities, a space where citizenship building takes place. This is a public and popular school system, one in which people from all walks of life, but particularly those who are discriminated against and marginalized, find ways to express themselves. They learn about themselves, the world and the cultural domains. Freire's conscientization is a way to work towards new models of social transformation of both social relationships and productive forces in a given society. Escola cidadā is a centre of rights and responsibilities, where citizenship is created. It cannot be an *escola cidadā* in itself and for itself: It is an *escola cidadā* insofar as it facilitates the building of citizenship among those who use its space. An *escola cidadā* is a school that is consistent with freedom, and with its formative and liberating discourse. It is a school that is struggling for itself, and for all those who educate and are educated, so that they can be themselves. And because

---

9 Paulo Freire archives (São Paulo).

111

people cannot be themselves alone alone, an *escola cidadā* is a school of the community, of camaraderie (*companheirismo*). It is a school where knowledge and freedom are produced in common, all together. It is a school that can never permit a kind of cavalier licentiousness and never allow authoritarianism. It is a school that, to the contrary, lives the tense experience of democracy.

The curriculum of the *escola cidadā* constitutes a space for socio-cultural relationships. It is not only a space for knowledge but also a space for debates about human and social relationships; the space of power, of work, and of caring; the space of respectfully living together (*convivência*). This is the link with ethics, with the notion of sustainability[10] (Gadotti, 2008a), with the question of violence. The curriculum and the eco-political and pedagogical project of the school are inseparable realities. The curriculum reveals the political-pedagogical trajectory of the school, its successes and failures. If the school will be ready to facilitate the achievement of the possible dreams and desires of all their members, teachers, employees, students and community, then the curriculum has to be intimately related to the life project of each one of them. That is why the curriculum needs to be constantly evaluated and re-evaluated. The project of an *escola cidadā* is considered, in terms of process and context, an institutional and individual life project.

Education for citizenship is at the same time an education for a sustainable society. *Escola cidadā* and eco-pedagogy underscore the principle that all of us, since we are children, have the fundamental right to dream, to make possible our projects, to invent. As Marx and Freire have argued, we all have the right to decide our own destiny, including the children defended by the distinguished Jewish-Polish educator Janusz Korczak who refused to be set free and stayed with his orphan students when the institution was sent from the Ghetto to Treblinka extermination camp, accepting to die in the Nazi gas chambers jointly with his students.

---

10 In this study, Gadotti (2008a) quotes Leonardo Boff: "The category sustainability is central for the ecological cosmos vision and possibly constitutes one of the bases of a new civilization paradigm that searches to harmonize human beings, development and Earth, understood as Gaia'." See http://www.acervo.paulofreire.org:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/7891/3080/FPF_PTPF_12_077.pdf

Yet, the issue is not to reduce the school and pedagogy today to *tabula rasa* and build from its ashes the ideal *escola cidadã* and eco-pedagogy. We are not talking about an alternative school and pedagogy in the sense that these would have to be constructed separately from today's existing schools and pedagogy.

Rather, this new pedagogical and political model has its starting point in the school we have and the pedagogy we actually practice, in order to dialectically build other possibilities without destroying what already exists. The future is not the annihilation of the past, but its improvement.

Global Citizenship Education[11]

Cosmopolitan democracy entails "a model of political organization in which citizens, wherever they are located in the world, have a voice, input, and political representation in international affairs, in parallel with and independent of their own governments" (Archibugi and Held, 1995, 13). From a perspective of cosmopolitan democracy, Richard Falk (2002) delineated five categories of global citizens: (1) the "global reformer" and supporter of supranational government, (2) the elite class of globe trotters engaged in global business activities, (3) individuals committed to global economic and ecological sustainability, (4) supporters of regional governance structures as in the example of the European Union, and (5) transnational activists involved in grassroots organizations fighting for human rights and democracy. Yet one may classify some of the representatives of democratic cosmopolitanism as a global variety of New Democrats.

Global citizenship is a form of intervention in searching for a theory and an agency of implementation because the world is becoming increasingly interdependent and diverse, and its borders more porous (Benhabib, 2005). There is "a deterritorializing of citizenship practices and identities, and of discourses about loyalty and allegiance" (Sassen, 2002, p. 6).

---

11 This section draws from my paper entitled *Global Citizenship Education and Global Peace: An Agenda for the Twenty First Century*. Paper presented to the *Second UNESCO Forum on Global Citizenship Education: Building Peaceful and Sustainable Societies – Preparing for post-2015, UNESCO* Headquarters in Paris, France, from 28 to 30 January 2015.

A claim in this paper is that any definition and theory of global citizenship as a model of intervention to promote global peace and sustainable development should address what has become the trademark of globalization: cultural diversity. Therefore, global citizenship should rely on a definition of multicultural democratic global citizenship. In addition, to be effective and acceptable worldwide, conceptualizing and implementing global citizenship and education, it is imperative that global citizenship adds value to national citizenship. Yet the expansion of a universalistic claim of world solidarity rests on the concept of cosmopolitan citizenship nested in a model of cosmopolitan democracies.

Global citizenship cannot be seen as an alternative to or a substitution to national citizenship. On the contrary, it is a substantive policy tool to reinforce the robustness of representative and participatory democracies worldwide. Global Citizenship education ultimately seeks to guarantee the social democratic pact on the rights of persons, and not only the rights of property (Bowles and Gintis, 1986; Torres, 1998). Yet there is more. We have learned, after a decade of educational for sustainable development, that we also need to guarantee the rights of the planet. Global citizenship will offer new contributions to expand education for sustainable development worldwide.[12]

The gist of my argument is that global citizenship adds value to national citizenship. Moreover, because the cause of national citizenship could be considered unfinished business or still work in progress, the value added of global citizenship may be another layer of support for a process of transforming citizenship making and citizenship education into models based on principles of liberty and equality for all, including what Seyla Benhabib called the 'rights of hospitality" in the Kantian sense (2011, viii).

I see global citizenship as being marked by an understanding of global ties and connections, and a commitment to the

___
12 Ministers and heads of delegation attending the UN Climate Change Conference 2014 - COP20 - (1-12 December 2014, Lima, Peru) have adopted The Lima Ministerial Declaration on Education and Awareness-raising. This Declaration calls on governments to include climate change into school curricula and climate awareness into national development and climate change plans.

collective good. Robert Rhoads and Carlos Alberto Torres advanced the idea of "democratic multicultural citizenship" in which education helps students to develop the dispositions and abilities to work across social and cultural differences in a quest for solidarity. They argued that such skills are essential to citizenship in a multicultural, global environment (Rhoads and Torres, 2006).

In an award-winning book, Robert A. Rhoads and Katalin Szelényi (2011) have developed this thesis into another level of complexity and understanding with a focus on the responsibilities of universities. I concur with Rhoads and Szelényi's position that we should "advance a view of citizenship in which the geographic reference point for one's sense of rights and responsibilities is broadened, and in some sense, complicated by a more expansive spatial vision and understanding of the world" (Rhoads & Szelényi, 2011, p. 160).

They go on to argue that "...the engagement of individuals as citizens reflects understandings of rights and responsibilities across three basic dimensions of social life: the political (including civic aspects), the economic (including occupational aspects), and the social (including cultural aspects)" (Rhoads and Szelényi, 2011, p. 17). In this vein, Soysal advanced a "postnational" definition of citizenship in which one's rights and responsibilities are rooted not in the nation-state, but in one's personhood: "What were previously defined as national rights become entitlements legitimized on the basis of personhood" (Soysal 1994, p. 7).

Other scholars speak of a denationalized definition of citizenship considering new conditions affecting citizenship in novel terms. With the onset of multiple processes of globalization (Torres, 2009a), the position of nation-states in the world and their institutional features have changed. Secondly, these transformations in the nation-state have a parallel effect in the emergence of new actors, including trasnational social movements unwilling to respect the traditional levels of political representation in nation-states (Sassen, 2002, p. 4).

Are Critical Theory and popular education an answer?
A few years ago, I was interviewing Freire and I asked him what he would like his legacy to be. He answered that when he died, he would like people to say of him: "Paulo Freire lived, loved, and wanted to know." *Torres, 2014, pp.)

In his poetic style, Paulo Freire provided a simple and yet powerful message about the role of critical intellectuals. For Freire, critical intellectuals should live their own ideas passionately, building spaces of deliberation and tolerance in their quest for knowledge and empowerment. They love what they do, and they love those with whom they interact. Love, then, becomes another central element of the political project of intellectuals who are agonizing over producing knowledge for empowerment and liberation. Following Gramsci, critical intellectuals know that common sense always has a nucleus of "good sense." From this "good sense" that can be distilled from common sense, critical intellectuals can develop a criticism of conventional wisdom, knowledge and practices. In educational policy and planning, this "good sense" could be a starting point for a critique of instrumental rationalization (Torres, 1994c).

The lessons of Critical Social Theory for education are clear, and need to be remembered: Politics and education continually intersect – there is an inherent politicity of education. Power plays a major role in configuring schooling and social reproduction. Social change cannot be simply articulated as social engineering from the calm environment of the research laboratory or the corridors of a ministry building. Social change needs to be forged in negotiations and compromise, but also through struggles in the political system; it needs to be struggled for in the streets with the social movements; it needs to be in the schools struggling against bureaucratic and authoritarian behavior, defying the growing corporatization of educational institutions, particularly in higher education, and striving to implement substantive rationality through communicative dialogue; and it needs to be achieved even in the cozy and joyful environment of our gatherings with our family and friends. Dialogue and reason cannot take vacations if one pursues the dream of social justice education and peace. The original intent of Paulo Freire, his pedagogy of praxis of the 1960s, is still viable and useful in the 21 st century.

References

Archibugi, D and Held, D (eds.) (ed.) (1995). *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An Agenda for a New World Order.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Atkinson, A. B., Piketty, T and Saez, M (2011) Top Incomes in the Long Run of History. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 49(1): 3–71
http:www.aeaweb.org/articles.php?doi=10.1257/jel.49.1.3

Austen-Smith, D, Frieden, J.A, Golden, M.A, Moene, K. O and Przeworki, A (eds.) (2008), *Selected Works of Michael Wallerstein The Political Economy of Inequality, Unions, and Social Democracy.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bardhan, P., Bowles, S and Wallerstein, M (2006), *Globalization and Egalitarian Redistribution,* Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press and Russell Foundation, .

Benhabib, S. (2002). *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era.* Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.

Benhabib, S (2005). Borders, Boundaries, and Citizenship. *Political Science and Politics,* 38 (4): 673-677
URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/30044348 . Accessed: 30/11/2011 17:36
http://www.yale.edu/polisci/sbenhabib/papers/Borders,%20Boundaries,%20and%20Citizenship.pdf

Benhabib, S (2006) *Another Cosmopolitanism.* Oxford,UK: Oxford University Press.

Benhabib. S (2011) *Dignity in Adversity: Human Rights in Troubled Times.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bowles, S and Gintis, H (1986) *Democracy and Capitalism: The Contradictions of Modern Political Life.* New York, Basic Books.

Business Dictionary.com, (2013)
http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/system.html

Falk, R (2002), An Emerging Matrix of Citizenship: Complex, Uneven and Fluid. In N. Dower and J. Williams (eds.), *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction.* New York, Routledge.

Friedman, T (2005) *The World is Flat.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux

Fukuyama (2012) The Future of History. Can Liberal
    Democracy Survive the Decline of the Middle Class?
    Foreign Affairs Jan-Feb:1-12
    http://jornalggn.com.br/sites/default/files/
    documentos/fukuyama_the_future_of_history.pdf
    Accessed 14 December 2017

Gadotti, M (2008), *Educar para Sustentabilidade*, São Paulo:
    Centro de Referência Paulo Freire
    http://www.acervo.paulofreire.org:8080/xmlui/
    bitstream/handle/ 7891/3080/FPF_PTPF_12_077.pdf
    Accessed 14 December 201

Held, D, McGrew, A, Goldblatt, A and Perraton, J
    (1999), *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics
    and Culture.* Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Lauder, H. Brown, P. Dillabough, J-A and Halsey, A.H.
    (eds.) (206),*Education, Globalization and Social Change.*
    Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Ministers and heads of delegation attending the UN Climate
    Change Conference 2014 - COP20 - 1-12 December 2014,
    Lima, Peru

O'Cadiz, M. d'P., and C. A. Torres. (1994) Literacy, Social
    Movements, and Class Consciousness: Paths from
    Freire and the São Paulo Experience. *Anthropology and
    Education Quarterly* 25 (3): 208–225.

O'Cadiz, M d' P, Torres, C. A. and Wong, P. (1998)
    *Education and Democracy: Paulo Freire, Social
    Movements, and Educational Reform in São Paulo.*
    Boulder, Colorado: Westview Pres

Piketty, T, (2014). *Capital in the Twenty First Century.*
    Cambridge (Harvard): Belknap Press.

Przeworski, A. (2003) Capitalism, Democracy and Science.
    Interview with Adam Przeworski. Conducted and edited
    by Gerardo L. Munck. February 24, 2003, New York..
    http://as.nyu.edu/docs/IO/2800/munck.pdf

Rhoads, R A. and Torres, C.A (eds) (2006) *The University,
    State, and Market. The Political Economy of Globalization
    in the Americas.* Stanford CA: Stanford University Press,
    2006

Rhoads, R. and Szeleny, K (2011) Global Citizenship and the
    University: Advancing Social Life and Relations in an
    Interdependent World. Stanford, CA: Stanford University
    Press.

Sassen, S (2002) The Repositioning of Citizenship: Emergent Subjects and Spaces for Politics, *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 46: 4-25

Soysal, Y (1994). *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Torres, C. A., and Schugurensky, D.A (1996). A Comparison of the Political Economy of Adult Education in Canada, Mexico, and Tanzania. In P. Wangoola and F. Youngman (eds.)*Towards a Transformative Political Economy of Adult Eucation: Theoretical and Practical Challenges.* DeKalb, Ill: LEPS Press.

Torres, C. A (1996) Adult Education and Instrumental Rationality. A Critique. *International Journal of Educational Development* 16(2): 195-206

Torres, C. A. (1998): *Democracy, Education, and Multiculturalism: Dilemmas of Citizenship in a Global World*, Lanham MD: Rowman &Littlefield Publishers.

Torres, C. A. (1998) *Education, Power and Personal Biography: Dialogues with Critical Educators.* New York: Routledge.

Torres, C. A.(2009a). *Globalizations and Education. Collected Essays on Class, Race, Gender, and the State.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Torres, C A. (2009b). *Education and neoliberal globalization.* New York: Routledge.

Torres, C. A.(1989) Political Culture and State Bureaucracy in Mexico: The Case of Adult Education. *International Journal of Educational Development* 9(1): 53–68.

Torres, C.A. (2011) Public universities and the neoliberal common sense: seven iconoclastic theses. *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 21(3):177-197.

Torres, C. A. (2013) *Political Sociology of Adult Education.* Rotterdam, Taipei and Boston: Sense Publishers.

Torres, C A (2014) *First Freire. Early Writings in Social Justice Education.* New York, Teachers College Press.

UCLA Global Strategic Priorities. (2014) *Change the World; Lead the World.* Unpublished Document.

Weber, M (2013). *Economy and Society.* Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Yeagle, P (nd.) Working paper: University rankings distort university structure and function, *Arts & Sciences*, Rutgers University, Newark, NJ USA