CHAPTER 10

Parallaxes and Paradoxes of Global Citizenship: Critical Reflections and Possibilities of Praxis in/through an International Online Course

Dalene Swanson

> *An ecopedagogy can only achieve the goal of creating a planetary consciousness (and thus a planetary citizen) as each individual undertakes "the grand journey... in his interior universe and in the universe that surrounds him" (Gadotti, 2000, p. 8)*

Global Citizenship: Perspectives, Politics, and Possibilities

"Global citizenship" has become a popular term in recent times. Often its deployment is intended to evoke the full ambit of intersectionalities of the global justices. An interest in the concept and its rationalization in the contemporary era are marked by a response to global ecological and economic crises in an increasingly interconnected and globalized world. It also comports with a moral liberal response to new place-based formations of gender, race, ethnicity, and class inequalities globally in complex arrangement with increasing politically invested ideologico-religious polarizations; persistent and pernicious levels of poverty, global violence and human degradation; the rise of new forms of nationalism and differentiated capitalist formations geopolitically (as in the case of the U.S. versus China); and a concomitant rise in cosmopolitanism and new integrations (as exemplified by the inception of the European Union). It is also associated with a resurgence of humanism and humanitarianism, and it can be said to be caught up, at least partially, in the globalization project of neo-liberal spread and capitalist imperialism.

Concomitantly, global citizenship offers imperatives, even if often contradictory, for resistance to such mandates in the name of democracy, inclusivity and social justice. One such contradiction can be witnessed in prevalent discourses on economic development, in which the wealthy North "assists" a vulnerable South through "strategic partnerships." Here, the development project attempts to find moral justification through the invocation of certain interpretations of global citizenship that draw on an ideology of modernization reifying industrialization, technocentrism, and progressivism. It can be argued then, that a politics of benevolence, often associated with global citizenship as an agenda for social justice, equality and inclusivity, nevertheless is granted justification on the grounds of existing material relations. Such an agenda for global citizenship founded on extant social and material relations inadvertently perpetuates and draws on normalized exclusionary discourses and constructed differences thereby (re)producing entrenched notions of otherness. In this sense, and with a cau-

tionary note, some current interpretations of the term reify difference as much as hide the dangerous universalisms they evoke, entrenching silences in the attempt to create a new platform for a set of global justices for all.

From an academic institutional perspective, prevalent in Canada and elsewhere, global citizenship has been used to promote and advertize an image of the "cutting-edge" and "internationally relevant" learning taking place within that institution. This is exemplified in the case of the University of British Columbia's slogan, *Education for Global Citizenship*, and in the University of Alberta International's initiatives on Global Education, a Global Citizenship Education conference (held on October 2008), and a Global Citizenship Curriculum Development project. Such strategic initiatives and their incorporation into institutional vision statements align with current trends toward the intensification of internationalization of education and academic research emanating predominantly from Northern universities in competition with each other for international students, partnerships and funding. As a force of unfettered neoliberalism, this trend unfortunately most often works together with increasing institutional controls and the diminishment of intellectual freedom and autonomy over research mandates for academic researchers within those institutions. Often, in its take up within the institution as a strategic mandate, global citizenship is often a vague, floating (Hall, 1996) or empty signifier, one which can either mean everything, anything or nothing. While its repeated enunciation in institutional vision statements may serve to endorse possibilities for innovative and ethical pedagogic engagement on one level, such articulations also participate in messianic utopianisms of (transformative) educations providing a better world without access to the political means to realize it. The term is further tainted by its reduction as a public relations strategy and convenient form of sloganism for the university riding on its faddist and popularist conception. At the very least, it is a highly contested and variously interpreted term within the university (see Roman, 2003).

Roman (2003) also notes the problem and prevalence, at the policy level of the university, of global citizenship's being implemented from "above," thereby masking its ideological deployment through uneven power relations. She asserts that a more ethical engagement that views the local and global as unfixed, contested, and socially constructed would be one that, instead, arises from "below" through activist initiatives at grass roots level. She also notes that global citizenship, as operationalized through policy mandates within the North American university, and in so far as it conjoins with the globalization project, participates in three normative hegemonic discourses: firstly, that of intellectual tourism, voyeurism, and vagabondism; secondly, one that produces agents of civility and democratic nation-building, an approach which is unreflective/unreflexive and premised on existing social relations as normative and natural conditions; and, finally, promoting exchange relations that are premised on multicultural consumerism of ethnic, racial, gendered, and (inter)national difference. Based on

her experience of a conference on global citizenship hosted at the University of British Columbia in September 2002, she avers that, as deployed by the North American academic institution in particular, these discourses reinforce constructed differences, stereotypes, orientalist binaries, and entrenched inequalities, leaving the structural, national and political status quo undisturbed.

Tracing the contemporary context of global citizenship's dominance within the North American university (and now farther afield to include the Western university per se through its ubiquitous investment in globalizing competition), is to recognize it as a legitimizing text for, and/or legitimated by, the seepage of neoliberal discourses into the academic institution. In this sense, the North American/Western university is culpable in responding to (mostly financial) pressures and demands of neoliberal agendas made of them within more powerful governing institutions surrounding it. These may be provincial/federal/state governments that influence the academy and on which it depends for funding. This rise to favour of neoliberal tenets in which global citizenship becomes strategically subsumed is set against the increasing diminishment of the public sphere and its desirably robust forms of agency in favour of privatization, corporatization, and the concomitant internationalization of the university.

It is in this context that the Bakhtinian (Holquist, 1981) sociolinguistic notion that words carry with them the vestiges of the places in which they have lived is evoked in the heteroglossic performances of global citizenship. It is in this sense that global citizenship has been caught up in the (re)circulation of discourses in the social domain, carrying the baggage of the ideological discursive field in which it has been articulated, interpreted, or performed. Nevertheless, in a Deleuzian flight of imaginative interpretability (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) that assists in a return to the implicit imperatives evoked by "global citizenship," divorced from the stranglehold of neoliberal and colonizing/imperialist discourses at play, it can be argued that these imperatives offer the possibility of a revitalizing of the cultural commons (Bowers, 2006) within an expanded public sphere, in the Arendtian sense (1958).

Thus in reclaiming the term, if one were to dislocate it from the contextual historical embeddedness of neoliberal and imperial discourses of globalization, and begin afresh with it untainted, what questions might be asked of it? Perhaps the first might be: What does/might global citizenship actually mean? And in a flurry of other questions that the first precipitates: To whom might it mean this and why? What is demanded of an ethic of global citizenship in a world suffocating under poverty and environmental destruction and human degradation on a massive scale; state, gender, race, ethnic, and religious violence; discrimination and prejudice; oppression, terror, and new forms of totalitarianism; new borders and territorialities; ideological and political polarizations, as well as gross global inequities and injustice of every kind? With these challenges in mind, how might global citizenship practice be lived, recognized, identified (with), enacted, or performed? What might such a practice and/or way of

being look like, feel like? What new agendas are being set and in whose name by whom? What is the unsaid in the evocation of the term? For whom is "the local" and for whom is "the global?" But, what also are the possibilities and imperatives of challenging normative discourses, and resisting the relativism and fragmentation of postmodernism, as well as the asserted neutrality and objectivity of (neo) liberalism, in the critical embrace of a pedagogy and praxis of global citizenship? Nevertheless, in asking about its counter-hegemonic possibilities for responsible action and symbolic and material resistance, one simultaneously needs to ask about the ambivalences, contradictions, and the impossibilities of uncompromisingly enacting a lived pedagogy of global citizenship in contemporary times. In committing to ethical action in its name, one needs to be reminded of the paradox of its imperative.

Global citizenship: Education and pedagogy

Understanding the complexities of global citizenship, its limitations and possibilities, draws our attention to questions of *education* in investing in an ethic of being/becoming. While not wanting to become enmeshed in a simplistic "correspondence theory" (Bowles & Gintis, 1976) of education's directing known outcomes in society, or capitulate to a "messianic"(Bowers, 2001) approach to education saving the world without full appreciation of the fact that the existing educational process lacks "the political means necessary to transform the controlling political and economic interests" (p. 1), nevertheless the inevitability of the agenda's already having been set must be recognized—an agenda that ties lines of agency between global citizenship, education and the internationalization project within the North American/Western university. Here, cultural, economic, and symbolic capital can be exchanged between the internationalization and neoliberal agendas, and that of educational discourses, via conceptions of global citizenship as a mandate for the moral/ideological/economic legitimacy of the exchange relationship. In this sense, we are already within the agenda and the discursive field of education in the Bourdesian (1992) sense, interacting as agents with other agents from within and without the field, maneuvering and struggling within discourse in pursuit of an investment in such a game, an *illusio*, "as tacit recognition of the value of the stakes of the game and as the practical mastery of its rules" (ibid., p.117). We know that what is or is not possible lies within the power and play of discourse. In this regard, we are reminded of Foucault (1981):

> We must conceive of discourse as a series of discontinuous segments whose tactical function is neither uniform nor stable; discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it. (p. 101)

That we might begin to thwart the existing relations or begin an opposing strategy against an accepted neoliberal and modernist status quo, we need to engage with dis-

course within the field at play, but also in the broader social spaces that constitute it. From the perspective of an agenda already set (but ripe for contestation), and given the ubiquitous thrust of internationalization of higher education, what kinds of questions should be asked? Bringing understandings of education and pedagogy together, perhaps the following might serve as viable entry point to the discourse at play: How might we consider a pedagogy and praxis of global citizenship at the university level, and what might this look like? How might it be enacted, performed and lived within and outside the university community? From the point of view of a university caught up in internationalization agendas, what might, for example, *a course* on global citizenship look like that might meaningfully engage with the contradictions and dilemmas evoked? What might such a course on global citizenship look like that provides a supportive forum or pedagogic commons for participants of the course to enable resistance to the hegemonies previously asserted, while also understanding their own implicatedness in investing in the global injustices they attempt to resist? What might such a course feel like that embraces rather than avoids the contradictions of being/becoming a global citizen, emulating the problem and paradox of the "pronounced parallax" (Kant, 1766) [1] of straining to "see" one's own gaze on the other, and recognizing where the agent both forges and is forged by social relations in the Bourdesian sense.

A Pedagogy of Glocalization: Thinking Globally, Acting Locally

Through my own experience as a facilitator ("instructor") in such a course I describe, I assert that the possibility exists, in the study of concepts of great global importance associated with the term, for a highly self-reflexive, thought-provoking, critical and "transformative" pedagogic experience for participants. I believe that, as a "curriculum as experienced" rather than "official" or "perceived" (Goodlad et al., 1979), engagement for many participants in such a course enables a humbling experience that simultaneously challenges their self and their disposition to others and the world. As I have evidenced it, I believe that for a significant number of participants (over the few years and several terms of its being offered as a modular online course), the course and participants' ("instructors" and "students") experiences of it tend to foster what might be recognized as responsible judgment, ethical action and sustained commitment through a pedagogy of "glocalization," even while allowing for an appreciation of the vast complexities of the issues at hand.

Before further description of the course, "Perspectives on Global Citizenship," and an ensuing debate on the (im)possibilities, merits, contradictions and moral imperatives of a critical global citizenship pedagogy and praxis, I return once more to some earlier identified problematics and a further discussion on global citizenship within the framework of globalization mandates as an ethic and philosophy of en-

gagement. This is with the purpose of attending with some nuance to several ambiguities and paradoxes that are produced by some dominant interpretations of the term and the ideological positions they locate. This will underscore and maintain the complexity of the later discussion on the merits of reflectivity and reflexivity within and beyond the course itself. It will set the stage for a final, but unclosed, discussion on the (im)possibility and imperative of a self-conscious, critical global citizenship pedagogy as a lived/living praxis.

An ethic of global citizenship: paradoxes, dilemmas, and ambivalence

Perhaps the first remark that can be made about the term "global citizenship" itself is that it is juridically oxymoronic. Citizenship is historically and legally tied to the concept of a state with geopolitical borders and differential access to rights between insiders and outsiders, citizens and non-citizens. "Global" is an escape from those differentiations. It offers a commitment to transnationalism, and even suggests the future viability of a possible leap to a condition of being beyond the concept of the nation-state. Global citizenship therefore, at best, acts metaphorically as an ideal or aspiration, and therefore is not realizable in contemporary material relations. Within the imaginative realm, what then are the possible interpretations of the term that locate various discursive constitutions that live within social spaces?

Jefferess (2008) notes that "to be addressed as a global citizen is to be marked as benevolent" (p. 28). This statement sets the discursive parameters, for Jefferess, for what can be said about global citizenship as a purported global citizen, but it also recognizes the difficulty of positionality and relationships. As Jefferess notes: "The notion of aid, responsibility, and poverty alleviation retain the Other as an object of benevolence" (p. 28). In this sense, it establishes a consumptive difference within relations of exchange on which the constitution of the global citizen finds legitimacy. This consumptive difference is produced and reinforced through the subjectivity of the global citizen, thereby naturalizing the uneven relations and rationalizing the need for the existence of the global citizen. Jefferess draws us to the attention that global citizenship, "while it represents the idea of universal inclusivity, produces insiders and outsiders: not everyone is a global citizen" (p. 27). While the global citizen "helps" the Other as a commitment to compassion and/or a form of activism, the agency which constructs this relationship constitutes and establishes the conditions of privilege and power on which the global citizen acts in others' interests.

Jefferess avers that global citizenship, as a broad international philosophy of ethical engagement, is reflected in Dower's contention that it is: "premised on the belief that agents have global responsibilities to help make a better world and that they are part of large-scale networks of concern" (2003, p. vii, in Jefferess, 2008, p. 27). As agency is invested in unequal relations, and its effect does not always follow moral codes, this may be somewhat naïve or utopian. In echoing this escape from reality,

Kachur (2008) remarks that: "Within an idealist and humanist—and many times romantic—approach to citizenship in North America, Western frames of reference dominate the discourse on 'global citizenship.'" He notes that:

> Foregone in this premature escape from reality, in both a realist and materialist sense of reality, this kind of discourse over global citizenship inadequately accounts for the *real-politik* of the biological character of human existence, the global political economy, and the state-controlled mechanisms of citizenship which includes many simple inconveniences to such a visionary project as passport identities, border guards, military borders, and a whole host of international security apparatuses which culturally survey, politically regulate and violently enforce existing notions and realities of citizenship which are based on the nation-state in the absence of a global state which could secure the possible realization of global citizenship. (p. 4)

Kachur criticizes discourse on global citizenship that ignores the material territoriality that makes it unrealizable, and sees such discourse as a flight of imagination that ignores geopolitical power structures and the situated contexts of the lives of those who are untouched by any benefits of global citizenship or who cannot themselves become global citizens and participate in its philosophy. He says:

> Many imagine the possibility of a global citizen as a feasible and viable projection. Adherents to the view range from technocrats, activists, missionaries to religious zealots who go beyond promoting the concept as more than a desirable utopia or a regulative ideal to treat it as an actualized existence. For people who identify with it there is an imperative for political struggle or for social mobilizations to create a better world. However, in some state of error, delusion or fiction, they believe that they are not only striving for global citizenship but that they have somehow arisen above the Earth's material horizon and are themselves already global citizens. (p. 3)

Jefferess sees the problem as being related to the "unselfconscious celebratory appeals to global citizenship that currently circulate in OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) states (that) are indebted to earlier European, and specifically, Eurocentric formulations of humanity, civilization, and peace" (p. 28). The conception of the global citizen is formulated "outside of history" and is constituted as an identity-position that an individual has the choice of taking on, and which is morally rationalized through benevolence and responsibility, and on society's "structure of feeling" (Williams, 1961, Jefferess, 2008, p. 28), which is based on pity. Critically for Jefferess, this ethically constituted identity escapes the material history of social relations globally in which the constitution of the global citizen is embedded, but more importantly, it "normalizes the conditions of the privilege that allow some to be in the position to help or 'make a difference'" (p. 28), and more specifically, *for* an Other, rather than *with* an Other. In similar terms, Kachur sees the problem as being with the escape from a historically conscious and material reality:

> While flights of imagination are necessary, they are not sufficient and must be grounded in the reality of a kind of in-gear liberation which must also account for the reality and materiality of citizenship that is implicated in geopolitical and interstate conflicts; national and transnational agonisms, social movements and class struggles; and many new mechanisms for interstate trade, commerce and labor mobility. (p. 4).

To conceive of global citizenship outside of a naïve utopianism, unachievable hope, and a modernist variation on the status quo, is to address the latent contradictions, the dilemmas that they proliferate, and the historical legacy of citizenship itself, grounded in European imperialism. This Euro-centered citizenship constitutes the "good citizen" as benevolent, inclusive and "forward thinking," thus masquerading as such under the continued mandates of economic progress and nation-building that appropriate colonial forms of difference and "diversity" as symbolic capital (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) within relations of exchange. To ask questions about these contradictions requires deep levels of (self)consciousness, conscientiousness, and conscience. Acknowledging the discomfort of irresolvability and ambivalence, and embracing the contradictions and ambiguities reflexively, is necessary grounding for an ethically engaged comportment and disposition of mind that permits asking "What then *is* possible?" As Roman (2003) infers:

> Given the context of a new discourse of security and restrictive draconian policies of immigration in a number of "advanced" countries, some pressing questions surge forth: What frameworks might mobilize "global citizenship," in whose interests, and to what normative ends? Is "citizenship" fundamentally and inextricably linked to the fabric of colonial and neo-colonial nation-building? Or, can citizenship be reconceived within anti-colonial global, transnational, local, and grassroots forms of community and democracy? (p. 270)

On this note, I return to the online international and transdisciplinary course on global citizenship and continue the arguments affirming the course's potential for "community and democracy" in the light of the critiques just offered. The course provides an empirical example of global citizenship in an educational context. I believe this example holds promise for the beginnings of an ethical engagement with a form of pedagogy and praxis that views and enacts global citizenship differently to the ways I have critiqued it thus far. Roman, Kachur, and Jefferess have offered valuable and convincing critiques of how the term has generally been taken up in the social domain and specifically within the North American academic institution (for which some high-profile Western Canadian universities provide examples), as have I, but I assert that these are specific interpretations of the term that have been rendered through more (con/sub)suming discourses of neo-liberalism, modernism, and neo-colonialism and have become generalized under the weight of the critique. I believe that it is equally important not to participate in discursive generalizations that become too cynical and nihilistic and leach the term, global citizenship, of its interpretive potential for critical pedagogic action and activism.

The urgency of addressing global oppressions inflicted through difference discourses operating in complex arrangement under the auspices of various forms of border production and nationalisms is undeniable. Such is the contemporary imperative of global justice and human rights that an abandonment of debates on global citizenship, ones that would reclaim the discursive space to which it has been co-opted by insurgent neoimperial interests, would be tantamount to a dismissal of a moral obligation to challenge injustice, oppression, and inequality glocally. This is especially important in an era where new forms of totalitarianism and global oppressions are insidiously on the rise despite being less tangible and more difficult to challenge given their ongoing seepage into public structures and the quotidian on economic, social, cultural, and political fronts. Maintaining spaces for robust political action of a democratic nature is equally important given the current neoliberal/neoimperial trend toward a shrinkage of the public realm and political sphere in ways that constitute a form of global political evil in the Arendtian sense[2] (see Patrick Hayden, 2009).

By introducing a brief description and discussion of a specific university-based online course on global citizenship (one which is transdisciplinary and international with regard to both its content and participants' involvement), I argue that an academic forum exists for engendering a (self) reflexive global citizenship praxis. This praxis enacts a pedagogy of glocalization, thinking from participants situated contexts in terms of global connections, responsibilities, and consequences, but acting locally (or glocally). Rather than participating in the violence of "global" universalisms, modernist essentialisms and nationalistic divisions, a critical global citizenship pedagogy seeks ways, within the quagmire of contradictions, to foster counter-hegemonic discourses and capacities for justice-seeking action, both individually and collectively, even while residing within the acknowledged structures and strictures of institutional neoliberalism.

"Perspectives on Global Citizenship": Beginning a Pedagogy in/of Praxis

In 2005, an initiative was undertaken at the University of British Columbia to launch an online international undergraduate course, offered to international students of *Universitas21* consortium of worldwide universities. This course would serve as the university's contribution to an international program of courses that would constitute a certificate on global issues, credited to each successful candidate at their home institution. The course could also be taken as a fully credited upper-undergraduate course toward a participant's degree program. The development of the course within the international certificate program and otherwise presented an opportunity for a critical global focus on some of the most important social, political, and ecological issues of our time.[3] Platformed on WebCT and later Vista, the course was conceptualized as having a strong transdisciplinary mandate, and consistent with the university's Trek 2010 strategic initiative, it would be operationalized under a banner of global citizenship. Under the co-

ordination and initiative of Dr. Leah Macfadyen, collaboration from academic experts and interested parties across the university and further afield took place in developing the various themes, modules and content, as well as multimedia materials, for this distance education course.[4] Although it can be argued that the concept of global citizenship was being bandied about for the purposes of international marketization as well as to assert a justice-oriented pedagogic and research vision for the university prior to the development of the course, there was in fact no clear conceptualization at the administrative level of how this might be taken up in interpretive practice or operationalized within academic structures. Even further from the imagination was any idea of what content should be in a course carrying "global citizenship" in its title. Under Dr. Macfadyen's leadership, and independent of administrative influence in the development or conceptualization of the course, cross-disciplinary debate ensued amongst interested academics within the university as to what might be the key areas of focus for such a course, while not foreclosing on any set definition.

I have been involved in facilitating several offerings of the twelve module course since its second offering in 2006, and since then have contributed at times to its evolution of ideas and improvements. I have been involved as well with a collaborative research project that critically analyzes the discourse of participants in online discussion boards *within* the course as well as surveys *of* the course in order to better understand what appears to be the course's "transformative" potential. As said by Dr. Macfadyen, "I have presented on the global citizenship course itself, on my experiences facilitating it, and on participant discussions within it, at various conferences and invited speaking opportunities, often with fellow facilitators (instructors) and with past students." (Some recent examples include: Macfadyen, Swanson, & Hewling, 2006; Swanson, 2007; Macfadyen & Swanson, 2007; Swanson, Abdi, Ahimbisibwe, Berger, Jones, Macfadyen, & O'Donovan, 2008; Swanson, Macfadyen, O'Donovan, Fuller, O'Connor, Cox, Avasadanond, Land-Murphy, & Chin, 2008; Swanson, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c; Swanson & Jones, 2009). There are also further written contributions that include various journal articles and monograph chapters (Swanson, in press; Macfadyen, 2008; Macfadyen, Dombrowski, & Swanson, 2009; Macfadyen, 2009; Macfadyen & Hewling, 2010).

The modular course addresses some of the most critical glocal issues of our time: world trade; global health; endemic poverty; nationalisms and alternatives (trans/supra/super-nationalism; cosmopolitanism); orientations to multiculturalism; inequality and global injustice; issues and intersectionalities of gender, race, sexuality, religion, ethnicity, socio-economic status, and privilege; ideological and political hegemonies; impact on the environment; climate change; development; sustainability; ecological justice, amongst others. At every level the inextricable connections between the global and local, the universal and the situated, the general and the particular are made through a rhizomatic pedagogy and praxis of glocalization, much like the Aristo-

telian notion of *phronesis*, or as a form of practical wisdom (see Henderson & Kesson, 2004) toward, for and through, democracy and justice. Participants located in far-flung reaches of the world, with backgrounds representing a vast proportion of the various regions, ethnicities and cultures of the world, dialogue together in an online discussion board forum on key themes of the course, bringing in their own inquiry and lived experience into the debate. The "distant" is brought "nearer" and more immediate through the discussion board forum and collective commons, diminishing the orientalism (Said, 1979) and "othering" that is otherwise more possible. The participants also bring their "habitus" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) into play with a consciousness of identity, place, position, perspective, and the need for self-interrogation regarding participants' deepest held values, socialization, and privileged gaze on the world, recognizing the symbolic violence such a gaze commits on the underrepresented in maintaining their marginalization. Perceptions, attitudes, and assumptions are challenged and debated and points of view heard across spaces, places, and cultures, as positions shift and identities are reconstructed. A major intention of the course is to encourage and permit such dialogue in a supportive online commons created by the course, which values intersubjective discourse that sets a tone of respect and openness. The challenge, of course, is always to arrest slipping into "othering" and deficit discourses in debates of such a sensitive and critical nature.

Each debate within the online discussion board platform invites and invests in the dilemmas, ambiguities, and possibilities of global citizenship. I aver that it does so in a way that "calls upon" (den Heyer, 2009) each participant, in their own geopolitical and situated contexts, to acknowledge their complicity and implicatedness in the interconnected global injustices faced today, while "moving them" beyond mere acknowledgement to enabling ethical judgment and responsible action in response to political/moral culpability and structural privilege. I believe that it does so discursively (Foucault, 1981) in ways that many may begin, within community, to actively/activist-ly arrest, resist, and reverse injustice and oppression, with individual and collective commitment. The course is promoted as "an online international distance education course that is transdisciplinary and designed for upper-undergraduate interest." "Perspectives on Global Citizenship" hosts participants from across the academic disciplines and fields of study, across the world, and is based at the University of British Columbia. I attest to this course's motivational potential in providing an opportunity for a "third" form(um) of/for pedagogy that resists the neoliberal agenda of internationalization and economic globalization, while working within and against it, both institutionally and structurally. In and through the course, critical connections between the global and local are made in ways that challenge participants to reflexively consider their identities, commitments and responsibilities to a range of glocal injustices urgent to our times, while nevertheless creating a supportive commons for participants to come to terms with the ethical dilemmas and ideological contradictions

that are inevitably evoked in any embrace of political action and justice-seeking in an era of globalization.

"Transformative learning": toward a critical global citizenship pedagogy/praxis

The "transformative" qualities of the course were noted early on in its offerings. From a report written by a group of instructors of the course in 2006, the following was remarked:

> Instructors observed extensive inter-student discussion, idea-sharing and peer-teaching within the course. Student writing, discussion contributions and feedback suggest that the course was a challenging, inspiring and unusual learning experience. Students displayed evidence of increased critical thinking, understanding of linkages between "global issues," and reflection on their learning and experience. Many described an increased commitment to participatory action as citizens, locally and globally. (Macfadyen, Hewling, & Swanson, 2006, p. 2)

While the impact of the course on participants has been the subject, or at least some focus, of several of the above-mentioned presentations or written contributions, my purpose is not to delineate such impact or provide empirical examples in this chapter. Nevertheless, I wish to address the issue of "transformative" education on a philosophical and discursive front with the purpose of complicating it, as I simultaneously advocate for it as a strategy of internal reflectiveness within a robustly, critical global citizenship pedagogy and praxis. I believe this to be important in respect of the language that might be appropriated to describe such impact and sense of implicatedness that participants express in respect of the underlying assumptions and paradigmatic positions these infer. This is again important in thinking through the associations of "transformativity" with various connotations of global citizenship, an already highly contested term in which a competing number of ideational and ideological positions are invested. It is a question of how the notion of "transformative learning" reveals itself to be and what identity/identifying positions it performs (Butler, 1997) discursively and ideologically in various contexts of its elaboration within the social domain.

There are many advocates of "transformative learning" (see for example, Mezirow, 1978, 1991). Chet Bowers has much to say about the take up of "transformative learning" in no uncertain terms. Such direct critique draws attention to the hidden curriculum and underlying agendas behind the advocacy talk of "transformative learning" and much of our "progressive education." On his Eco-justice Dictionary website page (http://web.pdx.edu/~pdx01401/CAdictset.html) he "defines" transformative learning in the following terms:

> A widely held way of thinking about the central purpose of educational reform—which is now being promoted on a global scale; tradition of thinking that can be traced back to progressive and emancipatory educational reformers whose thinking is based on the same Enlightenment cultural assumptions that gave conceptual direction and moral legitimacy

to the past and current phases of the industrial revolution; these assumptions include equating change with progress, viewing nature as an exploitable resource or simply as the background that is irrelevant to the development of human freedom, recognizing that there is only one-true approach to knowledge—and that it should be adopted by all the world's cultures; "philosophic" justification for viewing individual life as an ongoing process of transformation can be found in the writings of John Dewey, Alfred North Whitehead, and Paulo Freire; the scientific justification can be found in chaos theory and the theory of evolution—which are both expressions of scientism that has become an ideology; all proponents of transformative learning are ethnocentric thinkers who do not recognize that there are other cultural ways of knowing; as the metaphor suggests, transformative learning is supposed to overturn all traditions by freeing the creativity of individuals to construct their own knowledge and to determine their own values—a way of thinking that helps to undermine the forms of intergenerational knowledge that provides for living less consumer dependent lives; transformative learning is the Trojan Horse of the industrial culture that requires a rootless, unskilled, autonomous form of individualism.

This is not the "transformative learning" that we might hope for in a course on global citizenship, especially one from critical perspectives. Promulgating a conception of economic development and technocentric industrialization that naturalizes poverty and oppression and supports the assumptive view of "civilization" as advancing "evolutionarily" lies within the mandate of the course to contest and make problematic for a "global citizen." Assumptions about a linear progressive model of social/global development that is premised on an Enlightenment model of European Rationalism demand to be challenged, and the hegemony of a neoimperial Western cultural conception that views the environment anthropomorphically as a resource to plunder rather than as indistinct from humankind in recognition of the ecological and inextricable interconnectedness of all Earth's citizens to the vitality and sustainability of the planet, is another issue that requires critical reflection, contestation and collective debate within a global citizenship course of worth. Understanding one's complicity in such structures that support the status quo is, I believe, an uncomfortable but necessary further step. Such is a form of pedagogy and praxis that I believe enacts the principles and advocacies of a critical global citizenship by providing an opportunity for developing an empowering language for critical reflective action while appreciating the complexity and complicity of any social response to hegemony, injustice, and oppression. In returning to the notion of transformativity within the global citizenship course I have described, the use of the term is more in the sense of shifts in identity and being called to ethical action within a supportive pedagogic commons than the context and connotations described by Bowers, from which we would necessarily distance ourselves. These debates, and others like these, honour the internally reflective quality of the course. Such debates should always be present to remind us of dangerous absences, as Derridean (Derrida, 1994) ghosts embody warnings of assumptions left unaddressed and critical areas of focus abandoned. It is such a philosophy of pedagogic

action and of ways of being in the world that are the principles to which we aspire for the course on global citizenship.

Consideration of ecological and indigenous perspectives and philosophies, are some of the areas of critical focus not often present in "transformative learning" discourses, inadvertently maintaining the hegemony of European Enlightenment traditions of rationalization of the world. A global citizenship pedagogy without a deeply democratic sense of holism that gives importance to alternative and indigenous ways of knowing and being, is of little value to contesting the status quo or breaking form from existing development models and progressivist agendas that work within an anthropomorphic, industrialization paradigm. The contributions, for one, of the southern African indigenous epistemology, *Ubuntu*, that offers a collectivist, spiritual, humanistic, and democratic way of engaging in the world has a considerable amount to offer to a meaningful global citizenship praxis and awareness of global injustice (see Swanson, 2007, 2009d). Jefferess (2008) notes that grass roots solidarity movements, often arising within indigenous contexts and the global South, have influenced "the development of a transnational politics of identity and solidarity" but have also helped to provide a "conceptual framework for thinking beyond race and nation." He says that:

> ... the conception of subjectivity articulated through the southern African concept of Ubuntu, the Zapatista concern with understanding the interconnections of human beings, or the Narmada struggle's focus on the relationship of humans to other animals and the environment all provide alternative epistemologies to the European Enlightenment thought of Kant, Locke and Hobbes, to which the political philosophers of global citizenship confine their theoretical framework. Significantly, as well, these movements and projects have been understood not as "development" initiatives but initiatives seeking economic and social justice. (p. 33)

While perhaps generalizing the "political philosophers of global citizenship" a little too much, Jefferess' point about indigenous contributions holds. I would also add that such indigenous perspectives and grass roots movements have strong ecological dimensions, in general, such that they tend to contribute to a far more holistically inspired social as well as ecological justice.

The (im)possibility and imperative of a critical global citizenship

The transdisciplinary as well as international nature of the course offers opportunities not easily available in other courses, ones that permit intellectual and paradigmatic border crossing, and a forum for participants from far flung contexts to be able to debate, from their situated perspectives and local experiences, critical global concerns and possibilities from multiple perspectives as if looking at the world in parallax. In this sense, in providing a pedagogic and activist commons, where participants can contribute ideas, knowledge and debate from their various locales, also contributing to course materials and shaping the curriculum, it opens up the possibility of performing

glocalization pedagogically.[5] Generally, far from being consumptive of the other, the course offers rhizomatic engagement with a myriad of interconnected global and local issues, grounded in the personal histories and experiences of international (or diversely place-based) participants in the course and that of their local communities. Through connections with each other in critical engagement with course material and open debate, participants are directly challenged, or in other terms, "called upon and implicated" (den Heyer, 2009) in problems and paradoxes of global justice from local perspectives.[6] While still administered by the university and conducted in English (and the hegemony of this Anglo dominance, as well as the privileged position of participants as university students and academic instructors cannot be ignored, nor can the fact that no African universities are yet participating in the program even if African students from participating universities are often in the course), the openness of this upper undergraduate course permits participants from universities in Hong Kong, United Kingdom, United States, Australia, South America, across Canada, and so on to participate in real and non-real time discussion from their own situated and place-based perspectives and localized contexts, contributing to the learning and support of others. Students and instructors from diverse interests, ethnic groups, cultures, spiritualities, immigrant and indigenous experiences, and political persuasions, interact with each other on a Vista discussion board, with threads and sub-threads being produced as rhizomes to nested conversations in a highly emergent and ecological way (as might be understood within a Complexity Science framework). Importantly, students bring their expertise and interests from different disciplinary perspectives (highlighting the ideological, paradigmatic, and assumptive differences between them), thereby intensifying and enriching the critical and multiple forms of engagement—whether from education, business, sociology, nursing, social work, forestry, biological sciences, and other fields.

In this sense, this transdisciplinary course provides some possibilities of an alternative globalization project within the academic institution. While the course is overtly political, it resists foreclosure, maintaining an internally reflective mandate by asking iteratively what global citizenship and its value might be across the modules, returning cyclically to the question of what it might mean for each participant from their situated and personal perspectives, thereby blurring the modernistic binaries of "local" and "global" so that they are never fixed or foreclosed. Fostering a sense of reflective judgment (King & Kitchener, 1994) and discernment, enables personal choice and a sense of identity/identifiableness in relation to concepts of global citizenship in critical perspective. This self-positioning and ethical engagement is encouraged from informed positions within the learning collective and activist commons. Rather than avoiding uncomfortable and difficult knowledge (Britzman, 1998), the course critically encourages the embrace of the dilemmas, paradoxes, and contradictions of global citizenship, while nevertheless committing to an ethical stance in the world.

Participants are challenged to reflexively understand their own complicity and implicatedness in the broader social structures of oppression and injustice, denaturalizing these conditions and offering opportunities to develop an empowering language and means for reflective, responsible action. In this sense, I assert that this course begins to counter the effects of neoliberalism even as it makes use of its instruments within the university. I believe this is achieved through the strong focus on critical, reflexive perspectives, the openness and dialogicism encouraged through the course, the embrace of a pedagogy and philosophy of glocalization, and in the course's internally reflective focus. The course reflects its collective investment in an activist pedagogic commons by encouraging participants to respond to the call for reflective judgment and ethical action and for participants to contribute to its curriculum and further development, even while deeply acknowledging the multiple ambiguities and paradoxes produced by such personal and political foci and their interconnectedness. Although far from perfect and still tentative in providing a vision for a critical global citizenship pedagogy and praxis, I nevertheless believe that the course exemplifies the "transformative" possibilities of challenging participants' privileged worldviews, attending to oppressive social structures, and encouraging a forum for ethical choice and self-determined responsible action in response to being implicated in the maintenance of a status quo that entrenches global injustice of every kind.

Notes

1 As Kant states: "I put myself into the position of another's reason outside of myself, and observe my judgements, together with their most secret causes, from the point of view of others. It is true that the comparison of both observations results in pronounced parallaxes, but it is the only means of preventing the optical delusion, and of putting the concept of the power of knowledge in human nature into its true place" (p. 15).

2 Drawing on the work of Hannah Arendt, Patrick Hayden (2009) avers: "Even as globalization shapes the horizon of current political thought and action, it does so at the risk of drawing that horizon ever tighter; it is less certain that the concept of "globalization" continues to express transformative potentials rather than functioning as a token of the very effacement of the political. Globalization has become not only the political foundation of the present, but also the suspect guardian of the future of the political itself. ... I argue that neoliberal economic globalization is a form of political evil." (p. 92)

3 Themes (modules) in the course include:

- Ethics of global citizenship
- What is citizenship?
- The challenge of global divisions: race, ethnicity, nation, state
- Challenging old conceptions of citizenship: diversity and multiculturalism
- The challenge of being informed: media, communications and critical thinking
- Globalization, world trade and poverty
- Requirements for a healthy society

- Consumerism and consumer choices
- Human impact on the environment
- Sustainability
- Global citizenship in action

4   Driving questions in the course's conceptualization is reflected in the following from the 2009 Syllabus of the course (see Macfadyen, Dombrowski, & Swanson, 2009): How can we engage students personally and professionally with the practical and ethical complexities of global challenges? How do we create a forum for students to engage in issues of social and ecological justice through critical thought, moral commitment and meaningful engagement in their learning and coming to know as global citizens?

5   I wrote the following into the Syllabus (see Macfadyen, Dombrowski, & Swanson, 2009):

Further, this course commits to a pedagogic vision that enacts the principles of global citizenship in its structure, form and design. The fact that it is interdisciplinary, transnational, and draws on the situated experiences of each student offered in a collaborative environment of a community of learning, makes its pedagogy, like its "content," one of global citizenship. Not only does the course encourage students to discuss, debate, and pontificate over issues of global citizenship, but it encourages them to be informed, discerning, make responsible choices, and commit to positions of advocacy within their local contexts with a vision of the global impact of the choices they make. The "private choices" and "public commitments" encourage a way of not only thinking about the world ethically, but as an ethical way of being in the world. In this way, global citizenship is enacted through and in the course and its pedagogic and political vision.

6   As Macfadyen & Hewling (2005) wrote:

The course explicitly introduces notions of social justice, equity, sustainability and social action, and it directly challenges students to examine their privileged worldview. Because exploration of such themes necessarily involves asking hard questions about whose interests are being advanced over others, and can involve proposing changes to social or political structures "that are already quite congenial to some people in the community..." (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 131), some may contend that the course has overtly political aims. We agree!

References

Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition:* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Holquist, M. (Ed). (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. C. Emerson, & M. Holquist, (Trans.),

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology.* Chicago: the University of Chicago Press.

Bowers, C. A. (2001). *Educating for eco-justice and community.* London/Athens: The University of Georgia Press.

Bowers, C. A. (2006). *Revitalizing the commons: cultural and educational sites of resistance and affirmation.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bowers, C. (2009). Eco-justice Dictionary (Transformative Learning). Retrieved from http://web.pdx.edu/~pdx01401/CAdictset.html

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life.* New York: Basic Books.

Britzman, D. (1998). *Lost subjects, contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative.* New York: Routledge.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia,* translated by Brian Massumi, University of Minnesota Press.

Den Heyer, K. (2009). Implicated and called upon: Challenging an educated position of self, others, knowledge and knowing as things to acquire. *Critical Literacies: Theories and Practices, 3*(1), 26–35. Retrieved from http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/secondaryed/pdfs/implicated%20and%20called%20upon%20-%20critical%20literacies2.pdf

Derrida, J. (1994). *Specters of Marx.* London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1981). *History of sexuality, vol. 1: An introduction* (R. Hurley trans.) London: Penguin.

Gadotti, M. (2000). *Pedagogia da Terra.* [Pedagogy of the Earth] São Paulo: Peiropolis.

Goodlad, J. I.,,Ammons, M. P., Buchanan, E. A., Griffin, G. A., Hill, H. W., Iwanska, A., et al. (1979). *Curriculum inquiry. The study of curriculum practice.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hall, S. (1996). *Race: The Floating Signifier* [video-recording]. Produced, directed, & edited by Sut Jhally. Classroom Edition. Northampton, MA: Media Education Foundation, 1996.

Hayden, P. (2009). *Political evil in a global Age: Hannah Arendt and international theory.* London: Routledge.

Henderson, J. G., & Kesson, K. R. (2004). *Curriculum wisdom: educational decisions in democratic societies.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Holquist, M. (Ed). (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. C. Emerson, & M. Holquist, (Trans.),

Jefferess, D. (2008). Global citizenship and the cultural politics of benevolence. *Critical Literacies: Theories and Practices, 2*(1). 27–36. Retrieved from http://www.criticalliteracyjournal.org/

Kachur, J. (2008, October). *The imperative and the impossibility of global citizenship in an age of neo-imperialism.* Paper presented at the conference, Global Citizenship Education and Post-Secondary Institutions: Policies, Practices and Possibilities, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.

Kant, I. (1766). *Dreams of a Visionary Explained by Dreams of Metaphysics.* In Peter Y. Chou, WisdomPortal.com (Ed.). Retrieved from http://wisdomportal.com/Cinema-Machine/Kant-DreamsVisionary.html

King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). *Developing reflective judgment.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Macfadyen, L. P., & Swanson, D. (2007, May). *Global village, global classroom, global citizen?* Paper presented at the Canadian Association for Distance Education/AMTEC Annual Conference, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Macfadyen, L. P., & Hewling, A. (2007, March). *How the earth moved: the significance of difference for realising transformative learning in an online course on global citizenship.* Paper presented at Ideas in Cyberspace Education 3: Digital Difference, Loch Lomondside, Scotland. Retrieved from http://www.education.ed.ac.uk/ice3/papers/hewlingmacfadyen.html

Macfadyen, L. P., Swanson, D., & Hewling, A. (2006, November). *Teaching towards social and ecological justice online: Introduction to global citizenship at UBC.* Paper presented at the annual

conference of the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, Washington DC. Retrieved from https://circle.ubc.ca//handle/2429/1336

Mezirow, J. (1978). *Education for perspective transformation: Womens' re-entry programs in community colleges.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Macfadyen, L. P. (2008, May). Constructing ethnicity and identity in the online classroom: Linguistic practices and ritual text acts. *Proceedings of the Networked Learning Conference 2008, Greece.* Retrieved from https://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/2429/1334/1/MacfadyenNL2008.pdf

Macfadyen, L. P., Dombrowski, E., & Swanson, D. (2009). *SOCI430: Perspectives on Global Citizenship-* Syllabus 2009–2010. Retrieved from http://olt.ubc.ca/Soci430_Syllabus.pdf

Macfadyen, L. P. (2009). Being and learning in the online classroom: Linguistic practices and ritual text acts. In M. N. Lamy & R. Goodfellow (Eds.), *Learning Cultures in Online Education.* London: Continuum.

Macfadyen, L. P., & Hewling, A. (2010). How the earth moved. "Difference" and transformative learning in an online course on global citizenship. In R. Land & S. Bayne (Eds.), *Digital Differences: Perspectives on Online Education.* Rotterdam: Sense.

Parks Daloz, L. A. (2000). Transformative Learning for the Common Good. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.), *Learning as Transformation*(pp. 103–124). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Roman, L.G. (2003). Education and the Contested Meanings of "Global Citizenship," *Journal of Educational Change [Special Issue, Guest Edited by Fazal Rizvi], 4*(3), 269–293.

Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage.

Swanson, D. M. (2007a, February 18–20). *Global citizenship: Ivory and irony?* Paper presented at the Fourth International Conference on Complexity Science and Educational Research, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

Swanson, D. M. (2007b). Ubuntu: An African contribution to (re)search for/with a "humble togetherness." *The Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education, 2*(2), University of Alberta, Special Edition on African Worldviews. Retrieved from http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE/issue/view/56

Swanson, D. M. (chair and panelist), and invited panelists: Berger, G., Abdi, A., Ahimbisibwe, D., Macfadyen, L., Jones, S., O'Donovan, T. (2008, May/June). *A Failure of (In)sight?: Re-imagining global discourses and public policies on development, poverty, literacy, ICT, media and education from developing country contexts.* Panel discussion: 2008 CIDA CFHSS Collaborative Program Award, Invited International Panel "C co-sponsored by the Canadian International Development Agency and the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences (double session), held at the national annual conference of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education and the congress of the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. http://educ.ubc.ca/csse/ en.html

Swanson, D. M. (2009a, February 11). *Earth in parallax and paradox: reflexive learning in an online international transdisciplinary distance education course on global citizenship.* Invited Public Lecture, School of Education, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

Swanson, D. M. (2009b, March 27). *"Glocalization" as live/d pedagogy?: insights on an online international course on global citizenship,* Invited Public Lecture, International Centre and the Curriculum and Pedagogy Institute, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Swanson, D. M. (2009c, July 1–4). *Paradox and Parallax: Possibilities for Transformative Learning in an Online International Trans-Disciplinary Course on Global Citizenship.* Paper presented at the Sixteenth International Conference on Learning, University of Barcelona, Spain.

Swanson, D. M. (2009d, August). Where have all the fishes gone?: Living Ubuntu as an ethics of research and pedagogical engagement. In. D. Caracciolo & A. Mungai (Eds.), *In the spirit of Ubuntu: stories of teaching and research.* [In book series: Transgressions: Cultural Studies and Education, Series Ed. Shirley Steinberg.] Rotterdam: Sense.

Swanson, D. M. (in press). The owl spreads its wings: global and international education within the local from critical perspectives. In Y. Hèbert & A. Abdi (Eds.), *Critical Perspectives on International Education.* Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense. [Series: Comparative and International Education: A Diversity of Voices. Series editors: Allan Pitman, Vandra Masemann, Miguel Pereya].

Swanson, D. M., & Jones, S. (2009, May 29). *Terrains of Transformative Learning: Taking a Look at Service Learning from Global Citizenship Course Perspectives.* Paper presented in panel, Learning-Volunteering Abroad and Global Citizenship, *2009 Canadian Association for the Study of International Development annual conference, Ottawa.*

Swanson, D. M., Macfadyen, L., O'Donovan, T., Fuller, J., O'Connor, B., Cox, A., et al. (2008, October). *Narratives of transformation: Critical reflections on pedagogy and practice in/through an international online course on global citizenship.* Paper presented (by Dalene Swanson) at the conference, Global Citizenship Education and Post Secondary Institutions: Policies, Practices and Possibilities, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada. Retrieved from http://www.iweek.ualberta.ca/nav02.cfm?nav02=82503&nav01=71443

Willliams, R. (1961). *The long revolution.* London: Chatto and Windus.