

Educating the Citizen of Empire

MICHAEL THOMAS HAYES

Washington State University

MELISSA SAUL

University of Idaho

CAN SCHOOLS PREPARE STUDENTS for global citizenship? This question is fraught with a number of difficulties. First and foremost is the problem of defining what is meant by the separate terms global, citizenship, and education. If left unexamined they are infiltrated by a set of assumptions that prevent a conceptualization that is appropriate to the given task. The very idea of modern citizenship and schooling has its roots in the development of the nation-state and may not be adequate for conceptualizing a global citizen or global citizenship. Recent developments in economic, cultural and political globalization suggest that global society operates on a very different set of assumptions, values and practices than does the historic seat of citizenship and schooling in the nation-state. Consequently, it is useful to conceptualize the global citizen and its relationship to schooling in ways that are consonant with contemporary notions of citizenship and what is known of the emerging global society.

The purpose of this paper is to conceptualize a global citizen and the form of education that would be consistent with the development of that kind of individual. Drawing from the conceptualization of global society presented in Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's (2000) book, *Empire*, we articulate a particular meaning for global society then suggest the contours of a global citizen that is consistent with this understanding of global society. Using Ivan Illich's (1971) *Deschooling society*, we will define the parameters of a form of education that would be suitable for developing this kind of citizen.

At its very foundation citizenship, assumes that people are not simply the subjects of social and political force, but agents who actively participate in and give form to social and political institutions. Some philosophical writings on the subject argue that during the enlightenment the very idea of sovereignty as the locale of final political authority and will shifted from being invested entirely in the monarch to residing with the people. In a democratic formulation of sovereignty, the people willingly give their sovereignty to the nation-state, and in return, the nation-state rules with magnanimity by protecting the rights of citizens and policing acceptable limits on the practice of the citizen (Hoffman, 1998). A central purpose of modern schooling, then, was to train/educate the people to be citizens who participate in social and political

institutions. They would be able to offer their sovereignty in an intelligent manner while being able to hold the government accountable for the proper exercise of their sovereignty (Heater, 2004). It is clear, however, that modern schooling, as conducted within the nation-state, also developed around principles supporting corporate and state sponsored propaganda and social control that were in direct opposition to a humanistic democratic tradition (Apple, 1979).

It is on the geographic, temporal, social, and political terrain of the modern nation-state that schooling and citizenship were to be struggled over. All conceptualizations of schooling and citizenship have this as their basic assumption and guiding principle. This means that instead of citizen or citizenship the more accurate terminology would be national citizen or national citizenship. Moreover, the concept of global citizen that we find in the extant literature tends to conceptualize global citizen as an extension of the national citizen rather than acquiring a unique identity that is consistent with a specific formulation of global society.

The National Citizen With Some Awareness of Global Issues

The most common variation on global citizenship acknowledges that the actions and perspectives of the national citizen should be coupled with an awareness of the global importance of national and/or local actions. James Banks (2004), for example, maintains citizenship within the sphere of the nation-state while only asking for an awareness of what is taking place in the rest of the world. Banks is clear that education for citizenship must remain within the purview of the nation-state, “citizenship should help students to develop thoughtful and clarified identifications with their cultural communities and their nation-states” (p. 17). The global seems to be infused into the national identification through immigration and immigrants bringing their different national/cultural affiliations and identifications with them into their new national home. Banks does not perceive a substantive role for individuals to actively participate in a global society. Certainly, he asks that students consider the global consequences of national cultural actions and the nation to nation status of global political activities, but the perspectives and the actions are to remain at the local and the national level.

A variant on this theme is the argument against global citizenship. Here, as Jonathon Burack (2003) argues, citizenship is only possible within the confines of the nation-state. His thinking is tinged by a wariness of extending the idea of national citizenship into the global sphere, because any form of citizenship requires a supporting institutional framework that guides political participation. Consequently, Burack fears that for the supporting institutional frameworks to develop at a global level there will inevitably arise a super global institution that usurps national sovereignty and that would be so bureaucratic as to be completely unresponsive to the people.

Carlson (2003) argues from a critical perspective that the radical utopianism of Hegel and Marx seems to undergird much of the thinking on cosmopolitanism and global citizenship and runs the risk of imposing a homogenous political and cultural order on the planet. He argues that while some form of universal citizenship may seem to embrace a postcolonial sense of universal human rights, it should not usurp the rights of peoples who have lived in particular places for hundreds if not thousands of years. Carlson is concerned with extruding a normative set of laws and rules in the global space that could possibly conflict with the rights of individuals and groups to self-determination; a right established through a long-term connection to a particular place.

For some the global space is hopelessly penetrated by the forces of neoliberal globalization that effectively delegitimize true democratic practice. Neoliberalism turns any notion of

citizenship into a variant of consumerism (Giroux, 2001; Spring, 2003). Rather than a citizenship that connotes political participation and action within a given supported framework, all that individuals have is a form of resistance, “New alliances among intellectuals, students, labor unions, and environmentalists are taking place in the streets of Argentina, the West Bank, and in many other places *fighting globalization from above*” (my emphasis) (Giroux, 2005, p. 3). Here, there is no conception of global society only the amorphous forces of globalization imposed upon the people, and the only viable action is to fight against it, that is, resist. The purpose is to salvage some progressive democratic action to dismantle oppression on a global scale. Yet, as with the other variations, there is little questioning of the government controlled school system or any detailed conceptualization of a global society.

Scholarly work that examines the interrelationship between global citizenship and education often leaves in place the modern nationalist dreams of a system of sovereign nation-states that are interconnected: a final realization of Woodrow Wilson’s family of nations. Consequently, what is recommended for education is often articulated as a specific curriculum content, such as human rights education (Parker, 2004) or a set of classroom or school practices that adhere to some form of critical pedagogy (Cesar, Allen, & Pruyn, 2006). While critical scholarship may critique the nationalist system of schooling, this form of education is never abandoned nor is an alternative *form* of education imagined that would be consonant with the contours of global society. In our view, it becomes increasingly difficult to hold onto a system of schooling that largely emerged to meet the demands of eighteenth century nation building as adequate for global society and global citizenship. At some point it is worth imagining a kind or form of education that would be more consistent with the unique demands of something that might be imagined as a global society.

To articulate an education that would be desirable for a global citizen requires an act of imagination. It takes the ability to imagine a society that is global in nature, conceptualize a citizen that would inhabit this space, and then articulate a form of education that would be consonant with both. We use *Empire* as our basis of analysis and generation as it is one of the few books that attempts to conceptualize the contours of an emerging global society. Most importantly, the authors imbue *Empire* with a sense of hope and democratic promise without being overly optimistic. They are clear that the road to a democratically oriented global society is fraught with perils from predatory corporate interests, the global arms trade and war, and the domination fantasies of certain nations. Against this backdrop, they imagine global society as a coherent and unique geography that is truly global in character and exists above and beyond a system of interconnected nation-states. Hardt and Negri (2000) conceptualize the global space and practice as *Empire* in an attempt to imagine the possibility for a new democratic politics that is practiced on a global scale. This practice they call global citizenship. We have taken to calling it the Citizen of *Empire* as it requires a practice of citizenship that is consonant with the deinstitutionalized and virtual topography of *Empire* (Hayes, Watson, Oviawe, Saul, 2010). Beginning with Hardt and Negri’s conceptualization of *Empire*, we attempt to imagine it as a deschooled society that lacks an institutionalized form of education that can be called school. Consequently, Ivan Illich’s (1971) recommendations for deschooling serve as a starting point for the conceptualization of an education that would prepare individuals to be citizens of *Empire*.

Empire, the Citizen of *Empire*, and deschooling are integrated acts of poesis that exist at the intersection of imagination and material life. Richard Kearney (1998), commenting on Heidegger’s conception of *dasein*, suggests that: “Imagination is *dasein* understood as being in the world, hermeneutically prefiguring one’s world horizon as that which one projects one’s

possibilities” (p. 53). In the global space of Empire society, schooling and citizenship must be integrated acts of creative imagination that emerge from a desire for interconnectivity and for the creation of a possible life. Society, school, or citizenship is not the end points or outcomes of imagination, desire, and creation, they are the concrete manifestation of these life forces articulated into a specific form.

The meaning of Empire as global society

Empire is a geographic concept that renders visible a particular kind of global space. Hardt and Negri refer to this as “Ou-topia” or no place. Rather than the concretely bounded and defined national space, with its visible centers of command and control, Empire is virtual and uncentered. As a non-place, Empire exists as a series of flows that cross and disrupt preconceived national boundaries. These are material flows of people and goods, as well as virtual flows of information, ideas and capital (Appadurai, 1996). These global flows render suspect the imagined and capricious boundaries that have been arbitrarily imposed on the planet.

The nation-state emerged in conjunction with a form of democratic sovereignty in which the people give their consent to be ruled, and the locus of political will and power is the nation-state. In Empire sovereignty is retained by the people as there is no final or privileged locus of political will that can act as the voice of the people. On the flip side there is also no global entity or institution to protect the rights and define the responsibilities of a citizen. Democracy and democratic action is generated strictly from the ground up and lies only with a globally connected people, or, what Hardt and Negri call the multitude.

Historically, the nation-state has been inscribed with the authority to unilaterally define citizenship and education within its boundaries and through its specialized institutions and legal mechanisms. Empire does not form a clean break from the nation-state but appropriates, rearticulates, and foregrounds some of its techniques and procedures of governance and rule. While the contemporary nation-state retains many of the centralized and visible locations of control and rule, one of its defining features is the disassociation of the techniques and rationalities of governance from these concrete manifestations that are then articulated into the abstract application of governmentality (Dean, 1999). The abstraction and distribution of these techniques of rule are required to regulate a large population within a geographically dispersed area. Since Empire radically expands population and distance and lacks any concrete and visible locations of governance, it relies entirely on the abstract rationalities of governmentality.

Biopower is the direct application of power within governmentality. As the driving force of governmentality, biopower is derived from the mechanization and regulation of a population so that it can be made highly productive. In the nation-state it is through everyday life lived within “complete and austere” institutions that biopower constrains, harnesses, and forms individuals into highly domesticated yet productive citizens (Nadesan, 2008). In the globalized Ou-topic space of Empire, where forms of established and concrete forms of governance are not available, the intangible rationalities of governmentality and the abstract techniques of biopower arise as the only forms of rule and regulation. Because governmentality and biopower lack a direct application of rule and coercion and rely on generalized, abstracted and diffused discourses, techniques and strategies, the Citizen of Empire is offered some agency to redirect, rearticulate, and reapply the techniques and rationalities of governmentality and biopower in a creative manner.

Citizen of Empire as a Nomadic Poesis

Foucault articulated governmentality and biopower as techniques and strategies of rule that emerged in the development of the nation-state and its supporting institutions. The conceptual terrain of biopower and governmentality overlap considerably with the primary difference being that governmentality focuses on citizenship and the “art of governance,” whereas biopower is more generally focused on the regulation of a population. Hardt and Negri unproblematically extrude these concepts into the space of global society without any modification. While these concepts retain a certain level of interpretive power in Hardt and Negri’s analysis of empire, when used to examine global society they require some reworking to match the demands of this new political, cultural and economic topography upon the notion of citizenship. We suggest that instead of biopower and governmentality as the defining moment of citizen action at the global level, it is biopolitical generativity. Biopolitical generativity suggests that the population of the globe, the multitude, must engage in acts of creative generation to assert their rights and responsibilities as citizens. While the coercive forces of the nation-state are still very much in play and must be considered, in Empire the lack of a direct means to apply biopower and governmentality suggests that the people are in a better position to harness these abstracted energies and redirect them into flows of political, cultural and economic power. The foundational imperative of the Citizen of Empire is to generate global society and global citizenship through creative acts.

Empire, as a global society, is not constituted by established and recognizable institutions, governmental structures, or an identifiable locus of control. The global citizen is not an identity waiting to be enacted, but is a way of being in the world that must be constantly and incessantly generated. The first and primary act of the Citizen of Empire is to generate global society and citizenship from his or her own will, consciousness, and poesis. He or she cannot just participate in the protected institutionalized citizenship structures that are supported through the mechanisms similar to those found in the nation-state. At the global level no such mechanisms exist to define or regulate citizenship. It is a virtual space constructed only through the various forms of generativity that are engaged in by the multitude.

Biopolitical generativity demands that the Citizen of Empire adopt a nomadic creativity that crosses multiple boundaries and is constituted in the cross cutting layers of consciousness, virtual, and physical space. This allows for the generation of new forms of practice to exist outside of current moments of identification and action (May, 1994). Crossing these borders and boundaries can be carried out in and through the physical, virtual or consciousness planes, thereby deterritorializing these spaces and existing comfortably within their interstices. The Citizen of Empire does not favor local relationships or actions over those formed at a distance, because they exist on the same virtual plane. If the lives of the multitude have become so inextricably enmeshed through globalization then a consciousness that favors this fact is required to conduct life as a citizen within the unique geography of Empire. With no institutional structures at its disposal, citizenship in Empire must not be constrained to the political domain and must be integrated into the cultural, social, and economic domains as well. It cannot be focused on participation and must be generative, aesthetic, material, and virtual, and it must be open to the variety of generative activities that seek to create global society.

A Deschooling Critique of Contemporary Education

What is an education that is proper to the Citizen of Empire? Hardt and Negri are silent here. One thing is clear, we must start with conceptualizing an education outside of the confines of the system of schooling that was defined and arose to support the nation-state: The government controlled public school. An education proper to the Citizen of Empire must be a creative and generative act, not one that takes for granted a preexistence within an already defined institutional framework. This is not only allowing for creativity within the school system, but also for the creative generation of the system through educational acts. First and foremost it must encourage in the students a biopolitical generativity focused into a will for self organization. This purpose is consonant with one set of recommendations by Ivan Illich for creating a deschooled society.

Illich's (1971) recommendation for a deschooled society rests on some of the same principles defined by Hardt and Negri. Just as Empire transcends and leaves behind the institutionalized guides that give form to the nation-state, Illich argues that society must go beyond, or using Prakash's (1998) language, "escape" the institutionalization of education as modern schooling. For Illich the problem is not so much the content of schooling, whether pedagogy or curriculum, but the entire structure of schooling as an institution. Tinkering with pedagogical practices or curriculum content cannot overcome the stultifying effects of institutionalized education, and another kind of education must be imagined. For these reasons, we will focus on reconsidering the overarching structure of schooling rather than specific curricular or pedagogical recommendations.

For Illich (1971), school is nothing less than the totalizing institution preparing children for a life of institutionalization: "School prepares for the alienating institutionalization of life by teaching the need to be taught" (p. 47). The institution of school requires participants to be dependent on its services, by making them unable to learn for themselves. Individuals become schooled rather than educated. In systems of schooling, people are coerced to consume a diet of pregurgitated information and inauthentic experience. As, what Foucault calls, a "complete and austere institution," schools trap, ingest, and regurgitate all forms of knowledge and experience into its institutional logic and turning into a mechanism of control no matter how honorable it may have originally been.

Most critics of schooling suggest that the democratic potential of school could be resuscitated through some form of critical pedagogy or infusion of a particular humanistic content. These are problematic as they tend only to promote familiar institutional imperatives of colonization, patriarchy, and elitism (Esteva, Stuchak & Prakash, 2005). Illich begins with the premise that there was never anything particularly democratic in the foundation or historical practice of modern schooling. Maybe the discourse of some elements of schooling could make it appear that way, like improving access or closing the achievement gap, but the fundamental assumption of schooling as a modern institution is to institutionalize. For Illich, this is a forced and policed institutionalization that comes in two forms: as a *de jure* state enforced compulsory education and the *de facto* complete institutionalization of schooling. In its *de jure* form, most industrialized countries compel mandatory participation in schooling that is enforced by a police apparatus. One must go to school for a certain period of time, which is enforced by national and local laws and a police apparatus. In a *de facto* sense, the entire educational mechanism, whether public or private is completely and thoroughly institutionalized. There is almost no viable

alternative, and one's potential choice of alternatives is really nothing more than refabricated versions of institutionalized education.

Poetic creation and the deschooled society

For Illich (1971), “deschooling is at the heart of any movement for human liberation” (p. 26) and must be the central act of a citizen. The deschooling program suggested by Illich has two related elements that can encourage a Citizen of Empire and includes a generative poetic focus and the possibility of using learning webs to constitute a global consciousness and praxis. Since global society lacks the institutional structures and frameworks of the nation-state it is the perfect place to begin a deschooling movement. Without federal or state supported institutional structures that secure and police educational participation, Illich's proposal favors *poesis*, or making, as opposed to praxis which places the emphasis on action or acting.

The key to understanding Illich is that the entire mission and focus of education was to be one of *poesis*, that is, created from the grassroots in each and every act of education. There is to be no reliance on governmental structures or professional organizations to provide an education for the population, it is up to the people to create, maintain and participate in educational systems. The government has a responsibility to provide funds for education, as it does for all truly social endeavors, but its involvement stops there. Illich helps us to begin rethinking the meaning of public education. The movement to privatize education through mechanisms such as charter schools and vouchers has given rise to a vigorous debate of the meaning of public in public education (Waks, 2010). Public education should be funded by the government, but rather than being government controlled, it should be a system of meaningful shared interactions through which the public is generated. Education is to be created, maintained and nurtured through forms of socially creative imagination in which individuals mutually and cooperatively create or generate the conditions of their lived experience. Illich (1973) refers to this form of creative imagination as a “convivial institution”:

I intend it to mean autonomous and creative intercourse among persons, and the intercourse of persons with their environment; and this in contrast with the conditioned response of persons to the demands made upon them by others, and by a man-made environment. I consider conviviality to be individual freedom realized in personal interdependence and, as such, an intrinsic ethical value. (p. 23)

Illich is not opposed to the idea of institutions, only those kinds of Foucauldian modern institutions that compel participation and act only as another kind of police. A convivial institution is one generated through creative interaction that begins with the libertory interdependence of people. This is an entirely generative system and not a participatory one.

A deschooled society would simultaneously generate education and global society. Illich (1971) acknowledges that education is central to human liberty, yet it must be an education that generates the conditions of liberty from the form and structure of its existence. Education should not follow the model of schooling in which information about liberty is dispensed, in which students are engaged in critical experiences about liberty, or, as Thomas Jefferson may have suggested, schooled as a citizen who would turn their education to the purposes of liberty. In a deschooled society, individuals are not taught didactically to be citizens or how to behave as

citizens, they engage directly and wholly in the act of citizenship as they mutually constitute education and global society.

Virtuality, Networks and the Generation of a Global Consciousness

One of the central tenets of Illich's plan for education is the establishment of learning webs. When Illich was writing about deschooling in the early 1970s, computers were run with punch cards and the idea of a computer generated network was little more than a dream. Yet Illich envisioned a future in which a network consisting of computers linked together over long distances would allow people to generate learning networks. In a network of linked computers, individuals could make decisions on what information they would like to access, share and explore. They could band together with others to form learning groups to share information and make common decisions on what to study and how it should be studied. They could also form social networks for the purpose of fomenting political action. Time and space would no longer define the parameters or confines of the educational endeavor. He called these associations "Learning webs" that are generated, fostered and maintained by the convivial institution.

What is a network, web, or, as some have preferred, rhizome? Illich seems to rely on a common understanding of a web as individuals linked together over some distance who participate in a common learning action. While this is certainly one criteria, a web also consists of intricate human relationships with a variety of other characteristics that must be considered. Latour (2007) suggests that networks are fundamentally ephemeral relying on the activity and creativity of participants to make the network viable. Networks of all kinds tend to emerge in response to a given problem then fade, only to reemerge in the face of a new problem. While Latour has focused much of his attention on scientific networks, political networks have similar qualities. Laclau and Mouffe (1995) suggest that, rather than working towards a cohesive and homogenous political movement, local and global political action needs to be redirected into building networks that are cobbled together through a process of coalition building, in which a variety of specialized interest groups can be held together for a period of time to achieve a commonly expressed, if only temporary, political goal. Hawken (2007) further extends the idea of a network to include groupings of people who are not necessarily consciously working together within a defined material network and may be networked only in the sense that they are working in parallel from analogous ideals and towards related goals. Their connectedness derives from a common spirit and a shared ethical responsibility, in his case, environmental activism. When thinking of a network, web, or rhizome in this manner it is clear that it cannot be energized by the authoritative expression of a charismatic leader or held together over time by the anonymous bureaucracy of an institution, it can only be created and nurtured through the generative activities of the participants.

A learning web should be conceptualized as a virtual space generated through a creative poesis. Returning to Kearney (1989), poesis generates a space of play and creation beyond the material conditions of the mind and the body. Poetic space is intimately connected to material existence yet allows for the opportunity to go beyond our spatial and temporal confines and generate new possibilities that do not exist here and now. In Empire, the multitude exists within a virtual space that Hardt and Negri define as "beyond measure," that is, they conduct their work as citizens outside modernist regimes of calculation. A virtual space lies beyond, yet is intimately connected to, a material presence. These spaces beyond allow for a multiplicity of

interconnections to be made between individuals, knowledge, social and natural objects, and experience. The image of a network, web, or rhizome generates a holistic and interconnected view of individuals and their relationships as formulated in the space beyond. A learning web decenters and distributes education across space and time to expand and deepen the educational experience. One is no longer constrained to a particular time and space for connecting with others for the purpose of teaching and learning. If the network is taken as a whole, each individual becomes part of a much larger energized and constantly generating system.

A global learning web establishes relationships between people, knowledge and objects across differences of space and time. It is through these learning networks or learning webs, generated on a global scale, that the educational experiences generate a being-in-the-world that is global in nature. Dreyfus (1990) suggests that Heidegger's conception of being-in-the-world, or *dasein*¹, is to be understood more as a verb, an action or process, rather than a noun that identifies a thing. *dasein* encompasses a perpetually creative integration of consciousness, action, and the world. The emergence of a global society constitutes the world, literally, as the world. One's sense of self and actions are inextricably global in nature and carry global import.

While our conception of an education that would be valuable for a Citizen of Empire is imaginative and focused on future developments, there are elements that have already emerged and are playing a significant role in the areas of citizenship and education. The goal is to try and determine how these might fit with education for a Citizen of Empire and determine its limits. For instance, the Internet and its forms of communication and learning is a preexisting context that is being utilized for purposes consistent with a Citizen of Empire. What we wish to focus on is the capability of the internet to link people together across vast distances, to form learning webs that foster a global *dasein* in which individuals see, experience, and take action towards each others' needs and desires, as they are inextricably linked to their own. Jeremy Rifkin (2009) makes this point in his recent book *The Empathic Civilization*. Globalization, particularly the Internet and cellular communications, has created the opportunity for humanity to resurrect its empathetic grounding and evolve to a new level of cooperation and community by enhancing society's ability to articulate networks of solidarity across distances that span the globe. For Rifkin, the promise of these new technologies lies much less in how information is distributed and more on how individuals and groups become enmeshed in the information and on their technical forms of distribution in ways that create and manage a sense of interconnectedness and belonging that transcends geography to formulate a global *dasein*.

A global *dasein* articulates citizenship as a form of interconnected poesis, and it is clear that internet services such as YouTube and social networking sites have given rise to new configurations of global democratic political action and have fostered a global consciousness (Kahn & Kellner, 2006). Political activists use these technologies to connect, communicate, organize, and distribute information on their activities (Bennett, 2003). The American feminist antiwar group, Code Pink, staged the Gaza Freedom March at the end of 2009 (Code Pink, 2009). While they encouraged a certain level of physical participation, the action was as much focused on virtual activism that linked people around the world through video, photography, social networking, and blogging. The purpose was to construct the event at the intersection of concrete and virtual activism in an effort to expand its reach and potential influence. Recent events in Egypt, Tunisia, and various other countries have shown the political, cultural, and economic power that can be derived from internet-based networking and communication (Krishnappa, 2011).

As Illich envisioned a global web-like form of communication and learning that matched his ideas for a deschooled society, the Internet has given rise to various forms of education that are consistent with Illich's recommendation. The ubiquitous learning framework suggests that the internet and other forms of computer media has fostered new learning ecologies that immerse and surround the learner with persistent opportunities for self-guided exploration and learning (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). On a more practical level, the International Education and Resource Network (IEARN), links teachers and students from across the globe to conduct collaborative educational projects. The focus of IEARN, as stated on its website, is on issues of social justice and human rights that are fostered through collaborative service projects. IEARN does not represent a deschooled form of education, but it is a currently available educational technique that has qualities consistent to Illich's recommendation for learning webs and could be useful in a globally defined deschooled educational practice.

The possible networks of an Internet focused learning web do not constitute a citizens utopia and can be used to enhance and foreground ideals and virtues that are oppressive and abusive (Goode, 2010). The Internet has given rise to new forms of racist discourses and practices (Dean, 2009) and has provided new outlets for homophobic bullying and aggression (Haskell & Burtch, 2010). The Internet is simply a social space that must be consciously claimed for purposes of citizenship, justice and freedom.

This caution can be extended to the rest of the argument presented in this paper. Global society, as envisioned by Hardt and Negri, lacks any mechanism to generate or protect the rights of individuals and groups and secure an appropriate education. Precisely because it lacks such mechanisms of regulation that are intended to protect people and ensure their rights, the global space is being rapidly colonized by the excesses of neoliberal development policies. In this colonized global terrain, schooling becomes narrowly focused into a globally standardized technical rational form that serves neoliberal development policies and a human capital ideology (Rivzi, 2009; Spring, 2008). Moreover, our ideas concerning Empire and deschooling are not intended to portray a system free from all forms of power. Empire and deschooling, though radically decentered, carry normative assumptions about the nature of citizenship, education, and social life that we wish to foreground. The active, engaged Citizen of Empire, operating in a deschooled environment, is a value we hold and believe a certain form of education can fulfill.

Our primary claim is that, through a deschooled and globally networked form of education, there exists a potential for individuals to become the kind of citizen that actively generates a cosmopolitan and democratic global society rather than being subsumed into a version that only validates global corporate interests. Citizenship becomes something much deeper and more profound than participation in established institutions or an awareness of global issues and presents an opportunity for people to reclaim sovereignty for the purpose of actively generating the kind of world in which they wish to dwell.

Conclusion

The argument constructed above leans heavily upon the kind of reasoning that animated John Dewey's (1916) philosophy of education. In *Democracy and Education*, for example, Dewey was not so interested in understanding the nature of school as it was articulated at the moment, but in how it could be possibly organized if a particular version of democracy and democratic citizenship were at its center. Since he envisioned a society in which Democracy stood at the

center of all human relationships, school should be constructed with this as its goal. What I have argued here is quite similar: decide what global society and citizenship is to look like, then construct education so that it is consonant with this goal.

We have sought to articulate a conception of citizenship and education that is consistent with a particular version of globalization and global society. Most versions of global citizenship focus on the kinds of political awareness, sensibilities, and actions that are similar to, if not identical with, the citizen of the nation-state who participates in a political institution or process. We find that there is little difference between the sensibilities and actions of the citizen of the nation-state and the global citizen as it has been recently articulated. The purpose of my discussion has been to work through and imagine a kind of global citizenship that generates the very foundations of a global society and does not take for granted the framework under which a society operates. This is more than just learning to participate in predetermined democratic institutions or in political actions of resistance, it is about creating democratic forms of political, cultural and economic relationship from the ground up where none have previously existed.

Notes

1. Following Dreyfus's convention *dasein* is spelled with the lower case *d* to denote a verb rather than the uppercase, which denotes a noun.

References

- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Apple, M.W. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London, England: Routledge.
- Banks, J. (2004). Introduction: democratic citizenship education in a multicultural society. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 3-16). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Bennett, W. L. (2003). Communicating global activism: Strengths and vulnerabilities of networked politics. *Information, Communication & Society*, 6(2), 143-168.
- Burack, J. (2003). Students, the world, and the global education ideology. In J. Leming, L. Ellington, & K. Porter (Eds.), *Where did social studies go wrong?* (pp. 40-69). Washington, D.C.: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Carlson, D. (2003). Cosmopolitan progressivism: Democratic education in the age of globalization. *JCT: The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 19(4) 7-31.
- Cesar, A.R., Allen, R.L., & Pruyn, M. (Eds.) (2006). *Reinventing critical pedagogy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Code Pink (2009). Retrieved from <http://gazafreedommarch.org/cms/en/home.aspx>
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.) (2010). *Ubiquitous learning*. Champagne Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Daniels, J. (2009). *Cyber racism: White supremacy online and the new attack on civil rights*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Dean, M. (1999). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. London: Sage.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. New York: MacMillan.
- Dreyfus, H.L. (1990). *Being-in-the-world: A commentary on Heidegger's being and time, division I*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- Esteva, G., Stuchal, D.L., & Prakash, M.S. (2005). From a Pedagogy for liberation to a liberation prom pedagogy. In C. Bowers & F. Apffel-Marglin (Eds.) *Rethinking Freire: Globalization and the environmental crisis* (pp. 13-30). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Giroux, H. (2001). *The mouse that roared: Disney and the end of innocence*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Giroux, H. (2005). The terror of neoliberalism: Rethinking the significance of cultural politics. *College Literature*, 32(1), 1-19.
- Goode, L. (2010). Cultural citizenship online: The Internet and digital culture. *Citizenship Studies*, 14(6), 527-542.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haskell, R., & Burtch, B. (2010). *Get that freak: Homophobia and transphobia in high schools*. Blackpoint, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.
- Hawkins, P. (2007). *Blessed unrest: How the largest movement in the world came into being, and why no one saw it coming*. New York: Viking.
- Hayes, M.T., Watson, F., Oviawe, J.O., & Saul, M. (2010). The citizen of empire. *Citizenship Studies*, 14(5), 511-525.
- Hoffman, John. 1998. *Sovereignty*. Minneapolis, Minn: University of Minnesota Press.
- Heater, D. (2004). *A history of education for citizenship*. New York: Routledge Falmer
- Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling society*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Illich, I. (1973). *Tools for conviviality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- International Education and Resource Network (n.d.). Retrieved from www.iearn.org
- Krishnappa, S. (2011). Social media sites like twitter deserve nobel for prodemocracy protests in Egypt, Libya and China. *International Business Times*. Retrieved from <http://uk.ibtimes.com/articles/114814/20110222/social-media-nobel-peace-prize-internet-pro-democracy-protests-iran-egypt-tunisia-china-government-j.htm>.
- Khan, R., & Kellner, D. (2006). Oppositional politics and the internet: A critical/reconstructive approach. In G. Meenakshi and D. Kellner (Eds.), *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works* (pp. 703-725). London: Blackwell Publishers.
- Kearney, R. (1989). *Poetics of Modernity: Toward a Hermeneutic Imagination*. Amherst, NY: Humanities Press.
- Kearney, R. (1998). *Poetics of imagining: Modern to postmodern*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1995). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.
- Latour, B. (2007). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- May, T. (1994). *The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism*. University Park, PA.: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Nadeson, M.H. (2008). *Governmentality, biopower and everyday life*. New York: Routledge.
- Parker, W. (2004) Diversity, Globalization, and democratic education: Curriculum possibilities. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 433-458). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Prakash, M.S., Esteva, G. (1998). *Escaping education: Living as learning within grassroots cultures*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Rifkin, J. (2009). *The empathic civilization: The race to global consciousness in a world in crisis*. New York: J.B. Tarcher/Penguin.

Rivzi, F. (2009). *Globalizing education policy*. London: Routledge.

Spring, J. (2008). *Globalization of education: An introduction*. London: Routledge.

Waks, L.J. (2010). Dewey's theory of the democratic public and the public character of charter schools. *Educational Theory*, 60(6), 665-681.

