10-24-2012

Global Education in Canadian Schools: Formative Influences, Ideological Perspectives, and Emerging Christian Fundamentalist Critiques.

T.W. Mouat

Earl Choldin

M. Zachariah

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cie-eci>

Recommended Citation

Mouat, T.W.; Choldin, Earl; and Zachariah, M. (1995) "Global Education in Canadian Schools: Formative Influences, Ideological Perspectives, and Emerging Christian Fundamentalist Critiques.," *Canadian and International Education / Education canadienne et internationale*: Vol. 24: Iss. 1, Article 3.

Available at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cie-eci/vol24/iss1/3>

This Research paper/Rapport de recherche is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Canadian and International Education / Education canadienne et internationale by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact kmarshal@uwo.ca.

GLOBAL EDUCATION IN CANADIAN SCHOOLS: FORMATIVE INFLUENCES, IDEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES, AND EMERGING CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALIST CRITIQUES

Thomas W. Mouat

Earl Choldin

Mathew Zachariah

This paper investigates the critiques of global education put forward by certain Christian fundamentalists. These critics object to global education on the grounds that it teaches a value system comprising ideological, philosophical and religious beliefs -- a single, transformative, leftist, humanist, "new age" value system -- which they contend is contrary to the Judeo-Christian heritage and hostile to Judeo-Christian thought. In order to provide a context for understanding these criticisms, the formative influences on global education of development, peace, multicultural and environmental education are briefly reprised; a conformist, reformist, transformist typology of the ideological stances taken by global educators is outlined; and the recent history of efforts to promote global education in Canadian schools with the support of the Canadian International Development Agency is described. A comparison of the aims and ideologies of global educators demonstrates that these Christian fundamentalist criticisms are directed toward the transformative perspective. Although these criticisms do not generate much public discussion, they deserve careful scrutiny due to the effect which similar, recent attacks have had in the United States.

Cet article examine les critiques de certains fondamentalistes chrétiens sur l'éducation globale. Ces critiques protestent contre le fait que l'éducation globale enseigne un système de valeur comprenant des croyances idéologiques, philosophiques et religieuses -- un système de valeur du "nouvel âge" singulier, transformiste, humaniste et de gauche - - qu'ils prétendent contraire à l'héritage Judéo-chrétien et hostile aux pensées Judéo-chrétiennes. Pour mieux comprendre le contexte de ces critiques, on redonne brièvement les influences formatives de l'éducation globale sur le développement, la paix, l'éducation multiculturelle et environnementale. On retrace également la typologie conformiste, réformiste, et transformiste de la position idéologique de l'éducation globale; on décrit aussi le développement récent des efforts pour encourager l'éducation globale dans les écoles canadiennes avec le soutien de la *Canadian International Development Agency*. Une comparaison des buts et idéologies des initiateurs de l'éducation globale démontre que les

critiques des fondamentalistes chrétiens sont dirigées contre la perspective transformiste. Quoique ces critiques ne suscitent qu'une participation minimale du public aux débats, il faut les examiner avec rigueur à cause des effets produits par des attaques semblables, récemment entreprises aux États-Unis.

INTRODUCTION

One of the justifications for the comparative study of educational goals, means, processes and systems has been that better and more accurate knowledge of different nations and cultures can build bridges of understanding among people of diverse origins and loyalties. In this sense, global education in schools is applied comparative education. Although global education is, as we shall argue below, many things to many people, the common denominator in global education is its commitment to promote respect for people of all cultures and nations through education. Because much of the funding for programs promoting global education in Canada originates with the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), global education has actively promoted greater understanding and respect for countries and for peoples who are mostly in the poorer regions of the southern hemisphere.

Global education has attracted considerable attention since its inception two decades ago. While most of this attention has been supportive, the foundational theories and practices of global education have been criticized by some academics, educators, politicians and fundamentalist Christians.

All of the criticisms, explicitly stated or implied, warrant discussion. While some criticisms that appear invalid to proponents of global education may stem from misunderstanding, other criticisms would indeed be valid from a particular perspective that most proponents of global education would not share. In these instances there is need to explicate the grounds of the criticisms and the responses so that at least the potential to promote genuine dialogue between proponents and opponents is enhanced. But there is a problem. Academic criticisms and defenses of global education constitute a dialogue of sorts which appears in scholarly and professional publications. Political criticisms and responses enter the public domain through news media such as the popular press, as well as through popular periodicals, radio and television. However, Christian fundamentalist critics have not chosen, for the most part, to address their criticisms of global education to either global educators or the general public. Instead, their criticisms are raised during oral discussions and appear in limited circulation fundamentalist newsletters and regional publications, most of which are neither distributed to nor readily available to non-fundamentalists. These

discussions within the fundamentalist community are important, however, as they serve as a spring board for political action to suppress global education.

Objective

The purposes of this paper, therefore, are to review the formative influences on and the ideological strains comprising global education, to present the objections to global education raised by Christian fundamentalist critics, and to explicate the major grounds of differences. In order to keep this article manageable and focused on the objectives mentioned above, we have chosen not to discuss the criticisms raised by academics, non-formal educators or politicians. We have, however, noted these other valuable criticisms in Appendix 1.

Formative Influences on Global Education: A Confluence of Four Streams

Four main streams of educational thought flow into the river of global education. Two of these, development education and peace education, have their modern roots in post World War II reconstruction and the Cold War era of mutually assured nuclear destruction. The other two, multicultural education and environmental education, can be traced in Canada from the mid 1960s.

The following delineation of four movements for societal change is necessarily brief and incomplete because it highlights only a few of the myriad facts that can be assembled to depict their origins and development. The selection is based primarily on two criteria: a focus on Canadian dimensions of what are genuinely international movements and a focus on providing background for some Christian fundamentalist objections. It is also necessary to mention that people of many political and religious persuasions who believe that small or large scale human intervention can initiate processes for constructive change in society have been active in these movements.

Development Education began at a time when industrialized nations were shifting their competitive focus from direct socio-political domination through military confrontation to indirect domination through economic control. With the end of World War II and the advent of the Cold War, the search for allies and the struggle for spheres of influence dominated international politics. Although many non-governmental agencies and many individuals within national and international aid agencies promoted development for moral and compassionate reasons, the development of "less developed nations" was seen by western governments chiefly as a means of ensuring the survival of a world order which they dominated. The major powers used aid to garner the support of developing nations in their cold war struggle. At the same time, business interests acting through international financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, as well as their national governments, whose economies were dominated by large corporations, encouraged international development for economic reasons,

since it provided them with inexpensive labour, expanding markets for their products, and access to highly valued raw materials.

Jean Christie (1983) has persuasively argued that the roots of development education in Canada can be traced to ordinary, somewhat idealistic Canadians who returned from work in poorer countries with the conviction that if Canadians were better informed about the great disparity between the rich and poor areas of the world they could be persuaded to become active participants in the construction of a more humane world. Christie identifies four phases in the evolution of development education in Canada. The first phase began in the late 1960s and "involves public information about the Third World. ... This approach makes very little effort to establish the relationship or interdependence between Canadians and the problems of international development. It encourages people to do little other than contribute funds." (p. 17) The second phase began in the early 1970s and attempted "to illustrate a direct relationship between a specific corporate, institutional or government policy or practice, and some development concern. Such efforts are most often directed at changing a specific policy or practice." (p. 17)

As Christie notes: "The advantage of such programs is that they are action-oriented, and permit people to do something tangible about solving a clearly discernible problem, while at the same time learning about the power structures at work in the world." (p. 17) The third phase of development education began in the late 1970s with programs which seek "to establish parallels and point out similarities between underdevelopment as it occurs in a specific Canadian context and some specific Third World situation." (p. 18) The fourth phase involves solidarity work, which "assumes that the forces which oppress Third World people operate also in Canada, and that it is in our own best interest to oppose those forces" (p. 18).

Interestingly, western theories about development have also been undergoing evolutionary change. This change effectively began with the post-war creation of modernization theory. In essence, modernization theory argues that nations which are in the process of developing progress through the same series of stages that the mature ("core") industrial powers passed through during their process of development (Rostow, 1960). One fundamental weakness of this theory is that it largely ignores past and present exploitation of developing nations by developed nations. It does so by arguing that the "stages of development" represent "natural law" and by predicting that the outcome for developing nations will be equality through "mature industrialization." By the mid 1970s this theory and models of development based on it had been largely discredited.

The search for a more realistic and successful model of development led to an intense period of intellectual debate and to a reconceptualization of the structure within which development takes place as well as of the processes which

govern interactions. One such reconceptualization was proposed by Wallerstein (1974), who argues that modernization theory failed because the real system does not comprise independent states nor even an interstate system per se, but rather a global system which he terms the capitalist world-economy. According to Wallerstein this world-system is founded on capitalist economic relations and created by commodity transactions. Wallerstein argues that the system constrains the development potential of each nation; that each nation is further influenced by inherent geographical and material constraints, as well as political, educational, cultural, infrastructural, and other factors unique to that nation; and that the direction of development taken by one nation affects the development possibilities of other nations.

Seen in this light, the use of modernization theory produces development initiatives which are imposed by the industrial powers on the basis of their own historical development, and since these initiatives are ethnocentric they commonly fail. In contrast, Wallerstein's theory suggests that development will be most successful when it is tailored to local needs and to local human and material resources. This, in turn, means that successful development must ask what aid --if any -- is needed, and it means that successful responses must develop within the local context and flow from local wants and needs. According to this theory, such a strategy will succeed, in part, because it empowers individuals and groups to direct change within their cultural and national context.

Viewed from this perspective, development ceases to be a process undergone only by "less developed nations." All nations can be seen to be in the ongoing process of development, although this development may at some times be regressive. Further investigation demonstrates that within even the most developed nations reside such marginalized populations as aboriginals and deskilled immigrants: third worlds within the first world (Zachariah, 1984, p. 66). Moreover, as "development" progresses, marginalization of large population segments can be seen to increase, while the gap between developed and developing areas within and among nations in many cases widens at a continuously accelerating pace.

Thus, the nature of the interconnections within the developing world begins to be recognised as a web of ever greater complexity, intricacy, and immediacy, which forms a global system that transfers wealth to the core. (Wallerstein, 1979 and 1984) Researchers, educators and theorists attracted to this perspective began to argue for an entirely new conceptualization of development and development education. Jean Christie's fourth stage -- solidarity among people who are not part of the economic and political elites -- refers to this reconceptualization.

Within this conceptualization, it is argued, people -- and in the context of this article, students -- need to develop an awareness of global interrelationships

such as exploitation and interdependence. As well, they need to become aware that each individual's perspective is unique and informed by the individual's own experience of environment, culture, religion, etc.. In order to facilitate appropriate development, students need to develop for themselves an awareness and acceptance of difference: they need to learn how to take the perspectives of others. In order to realize the importance of local decision making, they need to learn to make their own decisions, which necessitates a consultative classroom environment in which their views are appropriately valued. This, in turn, will both empower them and teach them the value of empowerment.

Peace Education has a long history in both secular and religious thought. However, the development of chemical, biological and high-explosive weapons of mass destruction, especially thermo-nuclear weapons with the ability to eliminate life on this planet, brought a new urgency to the efforts of peace educators following World War II.

At that time, motivated by the threat of global destruction, peace education developed the theory and practice of conflict resolution. Peace educators reasoned that increased military expenditures create a climate that promotes violence as a solution to international and intra-national as well as interpersonal conflicts. They also argued that governments make authoritative decisions without the consent of the governed, who have the right to peaceful dissent from such decisions and the right to demand justice, basic human rights, and the peaceful resolution of conflicts.

Peace educators realized that the inability of individuals and groups to communicate effectively results in part from an inability to adopt alternative perspectives. Without the ability to take alternative perspectives, individuals are unable to accept and accommodate to individual, cultural, and national differences. Peace educators also realized that producing non-violent solutions to problems requires the development of critical thinking and problem solving abilities which are often omitted from the educational process. Therefore, they sought to introduce these skills to the curriculum.

Multicultural Education received its impetus from the demographic changes in Canadian society due to the significant alteration of immigration policies in the early 1960s. Increased numbers of people immigrating from the southern hemisphere resulted in changed population profiles and greater ethnic complexity. The changes challenged Canadians' perception of their society as one of relative homogeneity. Concurrently, education in basic human rights and later the promulgation of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms led to demands by minorities for a recognition of the multicultural nature of Canada. The concept of Anglo/Franco-conformity, so long held by assimilationists in Canada, was challenged by pluralist values that demanded respect for ethnic, linguistic, and cultural diversity.

Educators who responded to these changes held that social harmony requires students to develop an acceptance of cultural differences and a respect for others different from themselves, and further held that students should be made aware of the potential for strength through diversity which is present when people from a variety of backgrounds work together. Thus, multicultural educators, like development and peace educators, saw the need for significant curricular changes.

Multicultural educators argued too that, at one level, acceptance of and respect for cultural differences is enhanced by an appreciation of the richness offered by another culture's food, dance, music, religion, literature, and the like. At another level, acceptance and respect are promoted by the development of perspective-taking skills, by the realization that there are many perspectives on life and that the different meaning of the same event will appear equally valid from each of these perspectives. Once a respect for alternative perspectives is developed, dialogue based on mutual appreciation can lead to resolutions that are often stronger and more complete when a diversity of perspectives is, sometimes painfully, taken into account.

Environmental Education, of which Rachel Carson's (1962) *Silent Spring* was the harbinger, resulted from a growing awareness among the general population that human activities, especially the production of chemicals, are degrading the eco-system and threatening human existence. Environmental education's development in Canada received strong reinforcement with the founding of the activist group Greenpeace in the late 1960s, when David McTaggart confronted the French over atmospheric nuclear-testing in the South Pacific. Thus, like development, peace, and multicultural education, environmental education originated from the recognition of a serious global problem by a movement which had a non-formal educative dimension.

Because the only requirement for admission into most environmental groups is a concern for the environment, environmentalists include: Christians, who hold that humans are the stewards of God's creation; Gaians, who believe that the earth, the god "gaia", is a living organism which includes all life and gives all life; and those who worship God, however variously conceived, directly through nature, as well as animists, humanists, pantheists, "new age" adherents, and others too numerous to mention. The implications of this diversity will become apparent later.

From these beginnings, environmental education moved into the formal educational setting. Environmental educators realized that the earth is not necessarily composed of isolated environments which are locally or nationally contained, but that the environment is a single, globally-interconnected system. In addition, they believed that students need to develop a global perspective in order to understand and deal with environmental problems, and that students need to link global problems to local initiatives; hence the phrase, "Think globally, act

locally." These educators further reasoned that, since no world body capable of safeguarding the threatened global environment exists, students must empower themselves, within a democratic classroom environment, and through the development of critical thinking and problem solving abilities, to recognise and solve environmental problems by accepting personal responsibility for initiating action at all levels, from local through to international. This understanding by environmental educators, in turn, caused them to seek curriculum changes also often sought by development, peace, and multicultural educators.

The four movements which have influenced the development of global education have helped give it a broad, and some critics argue, diffuse mission and mandate.

Government Initiatives

In Canada, international development has always been a federal responsibility, with active participation of some provinces. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) was created in 1968, built on and intended to expand earlier small-scale international development initiatives. In 1971, recognising the need to stimulate awareness in the Canadian public of development issues and problems, and the need for increased participation in the development process by non-governmental organizations, CIDA created the Public Participation Program (PPP). This program provides funds to development agencies, churches, community-based development education centres (often called "learner centres"), educational institutions, community groups, cooperatives, unions, and professional associations for the purpose of raising public awareness of and increasing participation in the development process in "less developed nations" in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean basin. "In 1987-88, PPP contributed \$11.62 million to more than 350 projects carried out by 160 Canadian groups," says CIDA's 1987-88 Annual Report (pp. 84-5). Most of these were non-formal educational projects such as "Ten Days for World Development," an inter-church organization based in Toronto.

Beginning in 1987 the PPP introduced a global education strategy in collaboration with provincial and territorial teachers' federations and in cooperation with ministries of education. The aim of this strategy was to promote the study of development and "North-South" issues in the school curriculum. The objectives of this strategy were spelled out in several documents. The following excerpt from *Sharing Our Future* (CIDA, 1987) states it well:

CIDA, in cooperation with the provincial education authorities, will encourage the integration of global development issues into the existing curriculum guidelines. Efforts will also be made to support the in-service and pre-service

professional development of teachers, to assist them in teaching global issues. ...By encouraging the full participation of the formal educational sector, in conformity with provincial jurisdiction over education, CIDA can help to sensitize young Canadians to global challenges. (p. 81)

By 1992 CIDA sponsored global education projects had been set up in eight provinces and territories. The projects develop and publish teaching materials and present workshops, conferences, and summer institutes to assist teachers in providing their students with a global perspective. The projects liaise with the other development education agencies funded by CIDA through the PPP -- particularly the community outreach development organizations known as "learner centres". They also cooperate with the communication department of CIDA which has published such teaching materials and periodicals as *Under the Same Sun* and *Somewhere Today*.

Global Education

To say that global education and its objectives have evolved out of a synthesis of development education, peace education, multicultural education, and environmental education and that, in Canada, a global education strategy has been consciously incorporated into CIDA's mandate, prepares the basis for appreciating Ploman's statement in *Learning and Development: A Global Perspective*: "Global learning has not and probably should not at this stage be given a restrictive definition but be left open-ended. The concept of global learning represents an emerging confluence of diverse trends in thinking and in practice: it is like an evolving web of ideas and activities." (1986, p. xix) Since global education is an emerging concept, it can best be understood through the positions taken and the activities promoted by its adherents.

The positions taken by various global educators span the political spectrum. However, based upon their different understanding of a global perspective, they can be grouped as conformist, reformist, or transformist.

Conformists are preparing students for the opportunities and challenges posed by the interdependence of the global age. They want students to be able to take advantage of the technologies that bring people and goods together rapidly and economically and they want students to be able to deal with the challenges posed by migration. From their perspective, understanding of global issues is only important in as much as it enhances the ability to operate effectively in the global marketplace. Thus, conformists are supported by the business world as they provide students with skills for international commerce and tourism. These global educators also want to prepare students to deal with the opportunities and challenges of serving and working with immigrants.

Conformists are more interested in Europe, Japan, and the rest of the North than they are in the developing nations of the South. The imbalance of political and economic power resources between the North and South is not an issue of particular concern; however, when addressing it they would teach that the imbalance will be reduced as the nations of the South industrialize and become "modern". Conformists seek to maintain stability by reproducing and extending the social norms of the dominant North. They believe that exposing people in the South to the discipline of the marketplace will eventually assist them, also, to become modern and affluent.

Gary Warner speaks of this group as using "the 'market' or 'corporate' model in which the world is viewed as a global marketplace where nations and institutions compete for markets, ideas and influence. The dominant image is global competition: the favoured term is 'globalization.' The central goal of globalization is the enhancement of the power, status and influence of the state or institution initiating the activities." (1991, p. 4) Those who share this orientation may speak, as did the Calgary Chamber of Commerce, of "internationalizing the curriculum", where "international education in this context [of analyzing global trends] is understood to encompass all activities which improve our ability as a city, province and nation to function successfully on a global basis and in a manner *which enhances our ability to develop and maintain an enviable quality of life in our community.*" (italics and emphasis added) (Memorandum, 1990)

Conformist global education instruction therefore focuses on: (1) area studies, to insure that students understand political, social, and economic institutions around the world; (2) foreign language instruction, to insure that students are able to communicate outside of their homeland; and (3) multicultural education, to develop students' familiarity with other peoples' customs and cultures. Student and teacher exchange and the use of telecommunications are powerful assets to the work of conformist global educators.

Reformists, unlike conformists, are concerned about social justice issues and feel a responsibility to teach about human rights and the environmental and economic problems of the world today. They believe that all people are interdependent -- economically, politically, culturally, environmentally, and ethically; so problems in countries far away do matter to their students. Reformists are concerned about global problems and believe that with proper attention and adequate resources we can solve those problems through the existing institutions and within the existing systems. They believe that we must educate our students to meet their responsibilities as citizens by making sound decisions and periodically expressing those decisions at the polling place.

Since reformists promote a liberal-technocratic ideology, they seek to enhance the marketplace while also seeking to give an enlightened transformative role to the state, in contrast to the conformists' objective of creating capitalism-

based global marketplaces which necessarily weaken the state. Following from this ideological commitment, the reformists aim to ensure national or institutional competitiveness by managing the unstable process of globalization. Reformists are acutely aware of global interdependence, the web of interactions which tie all people together, and the existence of a world system; yet, at the national level they are likely to adhere to either a modernization model or a nationally-oriented world system model of development.

Social reformists are described by Warner as belonging to "the liberal model" of globalization which emphasizes global co-operation, without denying the element of national or institutional self-interest. (1991, p. 4) Since reformists have an interpretation of interdependence, which, as Toh points out, is "essentially self-centred", in which the aim is to manage instability while maintaining the planetary hierarchy (1993, pp. 10-11), they are likely to see development as the replication of technological growth and to measure progress in comparison to "advanced industrial civilization, powered by the engine of unbridled economic growth and high mass-consumption." (p. 11)

The vision of reformist-oriented global educators shapes their content objectives. Although they recognise that a world system exists, their vision is primarily nation-centred. As a result, they aim to use the strength of cultural diversity to ensure national and institutional competitiveness, while also aiming to use technocratic means to manage the unstable process of globalization. Both aims reinforce the need for restricted, subject-area studies. Thus, the activities through which reformists might be expected to promote their vision of global education would likely take place within a particular subject field such as social studies or language arts. They would promote international exchanges between teachers and students to deepen intercultural and international understanding. At the elementary school level, typical activities might revolve around the study of other cultures' songs, dances, literature, food, customs, and holidays. According to reformist aims, the process of such subject area study should help students: develop an understanding of others; learn to tolerate differences; develop a better understanding of themselves and their culture; and ensure maintenance of the nation's competitive position in the global marketplace, with some concessions to other nations.

Therefore, like conformists, reformists focus on area studies -- studying geography and history, and multicultural education -- studying other cultures' songs, dances, literature, food, customs and holidays. Concerned with poverty and hunger around the world, however, reformists also encourage their students to raise funds for worthy charities and to reach out to people in the developing world by adopting a "foster child" and corresponding with him or her.

Transformists share an ideological commitment to social justice. Based upon their ideological convictions, transformists are committed to changing the

fundamental roles, rules and relationships in society and regulating the marketplace. Unlike conformists, who seek further aggrandizement, and reformists, who seek gradual, cumulative change, transformists seek the global redistribution of power and wealth as a first step to global justice. However, like reformists, transformists also seek to secure and ensure universal human rights. Reflecting this position, Warner states that "the 'social transformation' model [of globalization], differs from the liberal model in that it adds a dimension of critical social analysis to the idea of international consciousness. ... It sees internationalization as a process which should contribute to the reduction of these global inequalities. ... In this model, priority is given to activities which narrow the gap between the have and the have-nots." (1991, p. 4)

Thus, the transformists' primary aim is social transformation which achieves the equitable distribution of goods and secures and ensures universal human rights through education. Having much broader goals than conformist or reformist global educators, transformists practice teaching methods designed to help students empower themselves as participatory citizens. To achieve this aim they borrow many of the curriculum reforms and instructional methods pioneered by development, peace, multicultural, and environmental educators. An understanding of these borrowing is important because it is toward the transformative vision of global education, and especially its environmental roots, that those Christian fundamentalists who oppose global education direct the brunt of their criticism.

For development education, transformists borrow the world-system model. As a result, the transformative global educator views the world as a complex, interrelated, evolving web of interactions in which every action influences, however minutely, every other action. Since the world is everywhere interconnected, they reason that our education about the processes of the world must be everywhere interconnected. Seen from this perspective, decontextualized study is meaningless: Global education cannot merely be a theme-oriented, subject-based investigation; it must -- whenever possible -- be coordinated across and through the curriculum.

Transformist educators add to this perspective knowledge of conflict resolution borrowed from peace education and infuse it with multicultural education's insights into the nature of humanity. If we affirm the multicultural nature of humanity and recognise that different cultures view the world in their own unique way, to co-exist peacefully we must learn that there is more than one perspective on every issue and that the perspectives of others may make very good sense to them even when they appear inscrutable to us. In addition, we must discover how to take alternative perspectives and learn that each perspective on an issue, problem or event is established by the participant's unique vantage point. For human beings, perspective taking is a relativistic action, i.e., it involves an

accommodative shift in the conceptual framework of knowledge. Seen in this light, perspective taking requires that the individual must first be able to solve the problem of which conceptual elements need to be transformed, and that s/he then discover how to affect the transformation. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that perspective taking requires the mastery of problem solving and critical thinking abilities.

But, according to the transformative perspective, an entirely teacher-centred classroom cannot fully stimulate students to empower themselves through the acquisition of such abilities. In order for students to develop perspective taking, problem solving, and critical thinking, along with decision making, cooperation, democratic values, and an understanding of human rights and responsibilities, they must be active participants. In addition, transformative educators typically accept a Freirian development model of literacy-acquisition and empowerment. This model holds that the relevance of content and process must be understood before transformative learning can take place. On this view, to be seen to be relevant, learning must arise out of the articulated needs and wants of the learners, rather than being imposed from outside by the teacher. Therefore, the committed transformative global educator, like a Peace educator, requires a classroom environment in which the teacher acts as guide and facilitator, rather than dictator or governor. Within this environment, the learners must be empowered to act by the recognition that their actions will have meaning. However, effective action is possible only when the ever present interconnection between global and local is appreciated; hence the prominence of the previously mentioned concept from environmental education, 'Think globally, act locally.'

Transformist global educators believe that when students connect themselves into the global network, the evolving web, they will accept responsibility for their actions, recognise that humans can find and implement solutions to problems, and understand that justice requires peaceful local action leading to global change. This learning, in turn, will both liberate and empower individuals and cause them to seek liberation and empowerment for others. Central to this view is the belief that, while learning about the past is relevant to the present, it is primarily valuable insofar as it serves as a guide to planning for the future.

Since transformative global educators seek to produce learners who are critically aware of themselves, others, and relationships among people, things, and ideas in the global system, the thought process undergone while learning is at least as important as the content of study. Learning activities are important. Within the transformative global classroom activities initiated by the teacher/guide are interdisciplinary, although school structures often force teachers to teach within subject areas, particularly at the secondary level, even in schools which are committed to global education. A growing belief in global education's

transformative potential is demonstrated by publications such as *Global Teacher*, *Global Learner* (1989), *Global Environment Resource Handbook* (1990), and *Global Primer: Skills for a Changing World* (1991).

The transformative global classroom, whether subject-oriented or interdisciplinary, is cooperative, experiential, community based, democratic, and future oriented. Common activities might include: self-esteem enhancement, group discussion, direct experience, role play, simulations, community involvement, feedback and evaluation (Pike and Selby, 1989).

The foregoing exercise does not mean to suggest that most global educators conceive of themselves as conformists, reformists, or transformists. Rather, these artificial quanta represent a transparent attempt to group global educators on the basis of commonalities when in reality their unique perspectives comprise a continuum. Nonetheless, the groupings have purpose. Grouping makes clear that concepts of global education vary considerably and each concept has an ideological component. Further, when the following Christian fundamentalist criticisms are compared with the aims held for global education by proponents of the conformist, reformist, and transformist perspectives, it will become clear that, almost exclusively, fundamentalist critics are attacking the transformist vision.

Neither global education nor Christian fundamentalist attacks on it are limited to the Canadian context. Although many of the criticisms levelled against global education by Christian fundamentalists originate in the United States, and although the United States has a rich and diverse history of global education and challenges to it, this paper concerns itself with criticisms levelled within Canada, particularly Alberta. Moreover, due to the limitations of space and time, the presentation of specific criticisms will be restricted to those put forward, persistently, by some Christian fundamentalists.

Christian Fundamentalist Criticisms of Global Education

Before beginning a presentation of these criticisms, it may be well to remind ourselves that not all Christians share the perspective which is about to be put forth. Global education owes a large debt to and is in the mainstream of Christian thought; many prominent transformative global educators are also committed Christians; Christianity offers continuing support for global education as witnessed by books such as *Tales of the Heart* (1991) and the annual activity "Ten Days for World Development", begun in 1973 and continued yearly by five prominent Canadian churches: Roman Catholic, Anglican, United Church, Lutheran, and Presbyterian.

Nonetheless, some Christian fundamentalists are vehemently opposed to global education. Although their criticisms are mostly made in a non-academic mode of argument, that is, they are often put forward without clearly referenced supporting evidence and are difficult to categorize, there is a central thrust. They

argue that global education teaches a value system comprising ideological, philosophical and religious beliefs -- a single, transformative, leftist, humanist, "new age" value system -- which is contrary to the Judeo-Christian heritage and hostile to Judeo-Christian thought.

Christians fundamentalists are so named because they hold that the Bible is the literal word of God. For them the Bible is not metaphorical; it is not open to contextual and historical interpretation. There is only one meaning, which the initiate can know if s/he allows the spirit of God to guide her/his thought. Thus, Christian fundamentalists have an unchallengeable and unchangeable framework for knowledge, since that framework is provided by God. When they criticize global education, they are acting not on their own behalf, but as agents of God.

As mentioned, categorizing these criticisms is no simple matter because they tend to appear as an overlapping tangle. Although a variety of non-discrete categories could be constructed, perhaps the simplest and most orderly method is to dichotomize the criticisms into two broad groups: general educational criticisms and specific ideological criticisms. Under the first category will fall general criticisms of educational aims, orientation, processes and outcomes. Under the second category more specific religious, political, and philosophical criticisms will be dealt with.

Educational Criticisms

Christian fundamentalist critics argue that global education is not a body of knowledge but a way of thinking and believing, an ideology, which approached problems from one viewpoint. These critics also contend that global education takes a "decisionmaking" approach to values formation, and that decision making by children leads to confusion regarding moral values learned at home. They further argue that global education teaches that there are no absolutes, which leads children to conclude that questions of right and wrong are subjective and relative. Moreover, they argue that a global approach crowds out the study of western civilization.

A defense of the Christian fundamentalist assertion that global education is "not a body of knowledge, but a way of thinking and believing" (Calvert and Calvert, 1989, p. 3) is found in D. W. Calvert's 1989 letter to Jim Dinning, then Minister of Education in the Government of Alberta. In it Calvert quotes from the Alberta Global Education Project's initial funding proposal to CIDA: "Global education is a concept not a course of study, a way of thinking and believing, rather than a body of knowledge." (Calvert, 1989, p.3) In the article previously mentioned the Calverts state: "Since it is not a body of knowledge but a way of thinking and believing, Global Education is obviously an ideology. ... The ideological mode selects supportive evidence only, in presenting pre-digested 'truth'." (1989, p.3)

It would be pointless to deny the Calverts' assertion that global education is ideologically based. However, there are two questions of note which need answering as the Calverts' perspective is investigated. First, which of global education's ideological variants are they attacking, and second, since we often attack that which threatens, why does it threaten them?

A clue appears in the passage quoted from Calvert's letter to Dinning. Calvert has presented part of a sentence as though it was the complete thought and he has misquoted a word. The original sentence reads: "This *workshop* reflects the principle that global education is a concept not a course of study, a way of thinking and believing, rather than *the* body of knowledge" [italics and emphasis added]. (Alberta Global Education Project, 1988, p.2) Although it may seem unlikely that a single principle from one workshop should be used to define global education, Calvert has done just that. So the idea must be key. Moreover, the concept that *the thought process which is gone through by the learner is at least as important as the content under study* is articulated only by the transformist perspective. Therefore, it seems safe to assume that Calvert is specifically attacking the transformist perspective and that the sense which he makes of the text will help identify the perceived threat.

By changing the "the" to an "a", Calvert makes clear sense of the statement. For him, *global education is a way of thinking and believing rather than a body of knowledge*. Calvert does not mind if educators transmit a body of knowledge; he does mind if they teach a "transformative" way of thinking and believing -- a value system -- which appears to him to threaten his particular Christian value system.

Echoing Calvert, an article by Cousins and Strom states: "This new 'world view' or value system is being promoted through such issues as environmental concerns, overpopulation, peace studies, and understanding one's place in the universe. ... Education approaches these from one viewpoint" (1990, p. 16).

Moreover, seen from this perspective, not only is global education a way of thinking which approaches problems from one unacceptable perspective, but it teaches individuals to make personal decisions and form values based upon those decisions; whereas, as Cousins and Strom point out:

A Judeo-Christian outlook would say there is a personal God who has expressed a loving commitment to help us if we would only humble ourselves to submit to His leadership. Furthermore, there is no hope for real solutions unless we do things God's way rather than our own. (1990, p.)

Thus, these Christian fundamentalists attack global education because they feel that for global education, "in the tradition of 'values clarification', there is no moral standard outside of ourselves" (Calvert and Calvert, 1989, p.3).

Higginbottom takes up the Calverts' argument and explains, in part, why global education represents a major threat to Christian values when he details what happens as a result of new age concepts that he feels are being taught to children. "Global education ideology does not believe in absolutes. Instead, people are responsible for developing their own realities and values. But when people's arbitrary value systems conflict, problems arise." (1989, p.1) When "children are encouraged to create their own realities, they become very self-centred. It also creates a discipline problem." (Higginbottom, 1989, p.3) Cousins and Strom concur with Higginbottom when they conclude: "We are living in a social setting wherein the individuals demand their right to personal freedom to live as they wish, breaking God's laws and seeking to find answers outside of any form of absolute standard." (1990, p.16)

This loss of Christian values comes about, according to these critics, as a direct result of the introduction of global education into the curriculum, because global education not only teaches values which are in direct opposition to Christian values, but also crowds out the teaching of Christian history. Speaking of the Alberta Global Education Project, Cousins and Strom state that:

A direct result of this project is the new Social Studies 20/23 curriculum. Gone from this curriculum is any reference to Judeo-Christian history. The previous teaching on the Renaissance, Martin Luther and the Protestant Reformation have been omitted [sic]. Students jump into the French Revolution of 1789, a society in turmoil and with no Christian ethic or values.

A study of the global environment and global concerns completes the curriculum. (1990, p. 16)

Seen from this perspective, the teachings of global education, in particular the transformist global vision with its resultant aims, orientation, and processes, has one broad outcome: a direct challenge to the teachings of fundamentalist Christianity as these critics see it.

Political, Philosophical and Religious Criticisms

However, these Christian fundamentalists criticize not only the broad educational aims and orientation of global education, but also its specific political, philosophical, and religious teachings. They accuse it of politicizing, rather than teaching about politics. They argue that it seeks to politically re-socialize students into a philosophy which is humanistic, socialistic, and "new age." Moreover, they contend that the "new age"/Global philosophy is an ideology that is hostile to Biblical Christianity. This is true, they argue, because the basic philosophy of

Global Education rests solidly upon monism, which they equate with the belief that all is one. In fact, they hold that global education does not teach about religions; it teaches the religion of the "new age" cult. In doing so, they claim, global education teaches that all paths lead to God and that we are all Gods; therefore, there is no moral standard outside of ourselves. Global education emphasises human responsibility for solving problems; whereas, according to these critics, only God can solve problems, since man has fallen through sin.

These critics argue that this new age religious philosophy also promotes a new political world view in which family is replaced by local community, while patriotism and nationalism are replaced by globalism. The values of our past, the family unit and the extended family of church, school and nationalism are replaced with the idea that we are all one. According to the Calverts, global education "teaches politically; not about politics." (1989, p. 3) Building on this theme, Cousins and Strom incorrectly identify Robert Muller as the founder of global education and explicitly link the political aim of re-socialization to a philosophy:

In 1977 the then assistant secretary-general of the United Nations, Robert Muller introduced to the UN a new world care curriculum.

... His works lay [sic] the foundation for the goals, objectives and need of Global Education. In summary this paper, although flowing with religious terminology, is totally humanistic, socialistic and very New Age. (1990, p. 16)

The supposed result of global education's ideological basis is found in the same article by Cousins and Strom, who state: "We are looking at the deliberate development of philosophical and religious views in school-age children." According to them, this "philosophy will not lead to tolerance of Christianity or any other belief that lies outside of New Age practices, but will lead to an intolerance of life styles opposed to its thinking." Calvert would agree with this assessment; he argues that Christian parents should not be "unconcerned enough to allow their children to be fed an ideology totally hostile to Biblical Christianity - the New Age/Global philosophy." (1989, p. 3)

Fundamentalist critics are less unanimous about what this global philosophy is, even presenting what appear to be conflicting assessments within a single article or essay. However, this should not be surprising since it appears to them that global education inherited from the mass origins of environmental education a wide and often conflicting variety of religious and philosophical perspectives. Thus, within a single article, the Calverts argue that:

The basic philosophy of Global Education rests solidly upon the New Age world view known as MONISM: all is one. This material world is mere illusion; good and evil are opposite sides of the same coin; there is no single reality, for we all

create our own realities. ...there is no difference between political philosophies or religions, and all paths lead to God. (1989, p. 3)

And that: "PANTHEISM, which permeates monism and solidifies it into a more comprehensible form, holds that God is in everything, therefore we are all gods." (p. 3) And that: "New Agers often call the world Gaia, the ancient Greek goddess of the earth; 'she' is viewed as a living organism, with all her parts inter-related and interdependent." (p. 3) And further, that, "Despite the connotation of the term 'humanist', Globalism seems more 'animist'" (p. 3). While Cousins and Strom contend that:

Education approaches these [global topics] from one viewpoint, the philosophy of Humanism. Humanism is the belief that there is no God, we are here by chance and when we are in trouble' ...no deity will save us; we must save ourselves.' Along with this we have New Age philosophy which also centres on the self (individuals)/Self (collective selves) as the source of solutions to our global problems through the divinity we all share. (1990, p. 16)

At the same time, according to Dr. Benno Przybylski "the basic view of reality espoused by the New Age is that of Hinduism." (1990, p. 12) He claims that: the new age movement can be "designated as cult"; "some New Age devotees worship religious leaders as gods"; "crystals are valued"; and "perhaps the best known New Age cultic practice is channelling." (p. 12)

However, there is a unifying theme of sorts. Like the Calverts, Przybylski, and Cousins and Strom contend that this anti-biblical view of reality centres on the concept of monism: that "All is one... All distinctions are said to be illusory. For example, there is no essential difference between good and evil." (Przybylski, 1990, p. 13) Thus, we are back to setting our own values. More importantly, "not only is all one but that one essence is God. From this conclusion necessarily follows the most startling teaching of the New Age Movement: man is God! ...Nothing is beyond our scope." (Przybylski, p. 13)

As gods, Cousins and Strom say, global education teaches that "the emphasis is placed on man to solve the problems." (1990, p. 16) However, Przybylski states that, according to Christian teaching "all is not one. God is the creator. Man is a created being. ...To be saved we cannot rely on our inner strength, no matter how deep [sic] we dig. Salvation comes by God's grace." (p. 13) The Calverts, (1989) agree with Przybylski that for the new age movement "there is no single reality, for we all create our own realities. ...and all paths lead to God." (1989, p. 3) And, like Przybylski, they conclude that "Global Education, in the final analysis, does not teach about world religions; it teaches a religion -- that of the New Age cult." (p. 3)

However, according to this perspective, global education's assault on Christianity does not end there:

Very subtly, it breaks down the fabric of our society, beginning with the nuclear family. Emphasized in its place is the world community. ... and values such as patriotism and nationalism are replaced with globalism.

In short, the values of our past, the family unit and the extended family of church, school and nationalism are being replaced with the idea that there is no need for national sovereignty because we are "all one". (Cousins and Strom, 1990, p. 16)

And Przybylski adds: "The gravity of the situation must not be underestimated. The New Age Movement attacks the very fibre of Christianity." (1990, p. 13)

CONCLUSIONS

At the literal level, it seems fair to conclude that those Christian fundamentalists who oppose global education do so because they sincerely believe that global education is hostile to their traditional Christian value system. They attack what they view as global education's ideological and philosophical assumptions; they attack the educational aims and content which they see as arising from those assumptions; and they attack the supposed religious beliefs which they perceive as underlying the whole.

The vision which they are attacking is, of course, neither conformist nor reformist in nature; it is transformist. The transformist ideology, however, is essentially Christian: we are all equally human and potentially deserving. Likewise, transformist global educators share Christ's philosophical beliefs. They believe that everyone has an equal right to the bounty of the earth and that it is our duty to share. They believe that we should treat others as we would wish to be treated ourselves. The fundamentalist interpretation of Christ's teaching, however, holds that we must welcome Him into our hearts and know His will through a literal reading of the Bible, by which means He solves our problems and directs our lives. In contrast, Christian global educators hold that Christ expects people to think for themselves, to solve their own problems, to take responsibility for the care of society and the care of the earth.

This philosophical stance leads transformative global educators to advocate educational aims which are in direct conflict with the aims of their fundamentalist critics. Clearly, the development of and reliance on individual problem solving abilities undermines fundamentalist teaching. The belief in individual agency, from the critics' perspective, denies the belief that only God can appropriately direct human affairs. Moreover, the democratic classroom directly attacks the fundamentalists' hierarchical, authority based, social structure.

For them, God, Father of the heavenly family is omniscient and omnipotent and as the giver of truth He is always to be obeyed. In His place, as head of the family on earth, the father makes the decisions. In school, the teacher as authority figure makes the decisions. A democratic classroom threatens one pillar of this structure which in turn threatens the whole. If the questioning of values and taking of alternative perspectives is permitted, where will it end?

In addition to this literal level at which conflict occurs and of which many other examples could be given, there is also, it seems, a metaphorical level of conflict. That is, global education can be seen as a dragon and the fundamentalist critic as the Red Cross knight. In this case, the dragon's name provides the literal clue: "global". Viewed from this perspective, the attack on global education is an attack on the extensive interaction between people and cultures that is now occurring in Canada. The fundamentalist attack on the content of global education reinforces this assessment. Global education, according to these fundamentalist critics, displaces the study of the Judeo-Christian heritage and in its place studies a variety of cultures. This process relativizes Christianity. As such it produces a threat of enormous magnitude, a threat which in the absence of the symbol provided by global education would be more difficult to confront.

The relativism which results from globalization threatens all immutable hierarchical structures. More so those structures which hold themselves out to be universal and singular but which the process of globalization demonstrates to be bounded and but one among many. Nor does the process of globalization present just the possibility that there may be more than one path along which to approach God. It also relativizes, as the fundamentalists point out, family structure, society, even nationalism. Since all of these pillars have been incorporated into the fundamentalist's unchangeable and unchallengeable foundation of thought, none can be allowed to tremble.

While it may be difficult for non-fundamentalists to accept this Christian fundamentalist perspective, we should recognise that, given the perspective taken, Christian fundamentalists have considerable justification for their alarm. Insofar as global education seeks to be a perspective-taking, inclusive discipline, capable of accommodating diverse perspectives, global educators ought to at least address the significance of these criticisms and begin a search for meaningful dialogue with their critics. Perhaps the basis of such a dialogue can be found in the golden rule that is the very essence of global education and is important in Christianity: Love thy neighbour as thyself.

At the same time, those Christian fundamentalists who oppose global education should, themselves, take note of several problem areas. They should recognise that there are multiple models for conducting global education and that each model has its own perspectives of what constitutes content and purpose. While the market model and the reformist model predominate, fundamentalists are

attacking the transformist model. Moreover, Christian fundamentalist opponents of global education attack it on the basis that it teaches that man must solve his own problems, when only God can solve problems. In attacking global education, these Christian fundamentalists at least implicitly claim to act as God's agents, while denying this right to others. After all, why should a global educator be denied the same right of agency on God's behalf? Finally, by making their criticisms within a relatively closed forum, these fundamentalists deny the importance of interfaith dialogue, although people of many different religious faiths, including other Christian fundamentalists, strongly believe in its importance.

Those Christian fundamentalists who criticize global education should take note of the inconsistencies in their argument. It is also possible that, after a more careful scrutiny, these critics might find some common cause with, for instance, the conformist model of global education. However, although we bring no direct evidence to support the latter aspect of our claim, we suspect that, in the end, those fundamentalists who attack global education do so not only because they feel threatened by the transformist global vision, which we believe that we have documented, but also because they fear and resist the process of relativization through globalization, of which the term "global" in global education represents one of few visible and relatively concrete targets.

If this is so, and Christian fundamentalists wish to resist some of the apparent outcomes of the process of globalization, then an explicit awareness would perhaps be more productive. Again they might find common cause. Many global educators seek to resist the relativism which seems a product of globalization as it is now occurring. Maintaining local identity while embracing the global nature of humanity seems a difficult but necessary dichotomization. It is hardly a project over which well meaning people should contend.

At the same time, educators who wish to maintain the right to teach a varied and progressive curriculum should not discount the danger, of which these attacks represent perhaps only the first portents. In conjunction with the political right with which they are relatively co-extensive, these Christian fundamentalists represent a threat to global education which is often dismissed offhand because it is essentially hidden from academic scrutiny. But events in the United States have demonstrated that such criticisms, if unheeded, can have far reaching negative impact on the wellbeing of great numbers of people in society. (Schukar, 1993)

Appendix 1.

Academics Criticize Global Education on Educational, and Political Grounds

A. Among the Educational Criticisms, they argue that Global Education:

- 1) is a movement rather than a field of study;
- 2) involves a tremendous range of tactics, strategies, and locations;
- 3) includes a tremendous scope of educational concerns;
- 4) addresses ideas which are inherently controversial;
- 5) has different, conflicting meanings and motivations for different academics
 - conformist, exploitive-technocratic, being transnational oriented
 - reformist, liberal-technocratic, being status quo oriented
 - transformist, radical-egalitarian, being change oriented.
- 6) has conflicts between area studies and across and through the curriculum perspective.
- 7) lacks balance in curriculum development, selection of resource materials, and classroom instruction.
- 8) is embroiled in a struggle for control over content and instructional strategies;
- 9) rejects the discipline-specific conceptual framework which values specialized, decontextualized knowledge, in favour of holistic, global interconnectedness.

B. Among the Political Criticisms, they argue that Global Education:

- 1) has an ideological basis, a value stance and reformist tendencies;
- 2) espouses structuralist beliefs in an oppressive social system which can be transformed through education;
- 3) results in conflicts between moral realism and idealism.

Teachers, Trustees, and Parents Criticize Global Education because: Educational Criticisms

- 1) back to basics, not global education is needed to cure our problems;
- 2) there is too much to do in school already;
- 3) global education teaches cultural relativism;

- 4) the issues are too complex and depressing for students;
- 5) students are already overwhelmed;
- 6) global education lacks a specific content focus;
- 7) global education suggests separateness -- content over process.

References

- Alberta Global Education Project (1988). *Initial funding proposal to Canadian International Development Agency*.
- Calvert, D. W. (1989, June 30). *Letter to Jim Dinning*, then Minister of Education in the Government of Alberta.
- Calvert, Don and Calvert, Joan. (1989, Summer). Global Education -- What Is It?. *The Christian Family Advocate*. 9(2). 3.
- Canadian International Development Agency. (1989, May). *Annual Report 1987-88*. Hull: CIDA. pp. 84-85.
- Canadian International Development Agency. (1987). *Sharing Our Future*. Hull: CIDA.
- Carson, Rachel, L. (1962). *Silent Spring*. Houghton Mifflin: Boston.
- Choldin, E., Jensen, L., Meunier, A. and Newbold, M. (Eds.). (1990). *Global Environment Resource Handbook*. Edmonton: AGEF.
- Christie, Jean. (1983). A Critical History of Development Education in Canada. [Special issue, Mathew Zachariah, ed]. *Canadian and International Education*. 12:(3). 8-20
- Collins, H. Thomas and Czarra, Fred R. (1991). *Global Primer: Skills for a Changing World..* Denver: CTIR.
- Cousins, Ron and Strom, Sylvia A. (1990, January). Global education -- the truth. *Sonshine News*. p. 16.
- Hampson, Tom and Whalen, Loretta. (1991). *Tales of the Heart*. New York: Friendship.
- Higginbottom, Henry. (1989, September). Cult experts proclaim educational system embracing New Age. *City Lights News*. 2:(10). pp. 1, 3.
- Maltais, Jean-Luc. (Ed.). (1988+). *Under the Same Sun*. Hull: CIDA.
- Mieszkelski, Ted. (1990, January 19). *Memorandum, Calgary Chamber of Commerce*.
- Morin, Louise (Ed.). (1989+). *Somewhere Today*. Hull: CIDA.

- Participants comment. (1989, November 28). "Globalization Seminar", University of Calgary. Unpublished manuscript.
- Pike, Graham and Selby, David. (1989). *Global Teacher, Global Learner*. Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Ploman, Edward W. (1986). Global Learning - A Challenge. In Alan Thomas and Edward W. Ploman (Eds.). *Learning and Development: A Global Perspective*. (pp. xix-xxvi). Toronto: OISIE.
- Przybylski, Benno. (1990, March). The New Age and the Old Gospel. *Alberta Sonshine News*. pp. 12-13.
- Rostow, W. W. (1960). *The Process of Economic Growth*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Schukar, Ron. (1993). Controversy in Global Education: Lessons for Teacher Educators. *Theory Into Practice*. 32:(4). 52-58.
- Toh, Swee-Hin. (1993, January 1). Bringing the world into the classroom: Global literacy and a question of paradigms. *Global Education - Global Literacy*. 1:(1). 9-17.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. (1984). *The Politics of the World-Economy* London: Cambridge UP.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. (1979). *The Modern-World System*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. (1974). *The Modern-World System*. London: Academic.
- Warner, Gary. (1991, September 10) Internationalization models and the role of the University. *The McMaster Courier*. p. 4.
- Zachariah, Mathew. (1984). The Berger Commission Inquiry Report and the Revitalization of Indigenous Cultures. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*. 5. 65-77.
- Zachariah, Mathew. (1992). "Linking Multicultural and Development Education to Promote Respect for Persons and Cultures: A Canadian Perspective." in *Cultural Diversity and the Schools 4: Human Rights, Education and Global Responsibilities*. (James Lynch, Celia Modgil and Sohan Modgil eds.) Falmer: London. pp. 273-288.