

Global Citizenship and Deliberative Democratic Education: Focusing on the Controversy in Political Philosophy and Philosophy of Education

Yusuke Hirai, Ph.D

(Faculty of Human Science, University of Tsukuba)

SEAMEO-The University of Tsukuba Symposium VI February 11, 2018



Introduction

The Purposes of this presentation

1. To clarify the features of the educational-philosophical controversy on global citizenship
2. To think about how we teach students global justice and the values of deliberative democracy

Educational trend and citizenship education in Japan

- Since 1998, we have aimed to foster in students a zest for life (*ikiru chikara*) in Japan. It is necessary for future citizens to live a good life and to use acquired knowledge and skills to solve many problems in this complicated and rapidly changing world.
- In response to the realization of the 18-year old voting rights in 2015, ideal citizenship education in schooling has been considered as part of educational studies.

What is “global citizenship” ?

How do we nurture it in our students?

- There is a gap between studies of citizenship education and educational practices.
- This presentation aims to explore the ideal direction of citizenship education to respond to globalization, mainly based on political philosophy and the philosophy of education on global justice and citizenship education.

CHAPTER 1

The Trend of Citizenship Education in Japan

- The revision of the next school curriculum guidelines at the high school level is being debated, and contents of the new subject “the public” (civic education) are being explored.
- The purpose of civic education will be described as following: “To cultivate the dispositions and abilities needed for a citizen who can be a significant creator of a peaceful and democratic nation and society, and subjectively live in the global society” (MEXT 2016: 4).

The educational goals of “the public”

- Teachers need to nurture dispositions and abilities related to sovereignty in the global world as follows:
 - to cultivate an awareness about a way to live in modern society or a way of living as a human being, inclination to love our own nation state and to pursue its peace and prosperity, and awareness of the importance that each nation mutually respects each other’s sovereignty and each citizen and cooperates with each other, through multifaceted and multilateral considerations and deep understanding (ibid: 16).
- It is suggested that students will be asked to think first about their nation in the global era.

Citizenship education in Asia

- Asian countries, similar to Japan, is promoting curriculum reform, introducing new academic ability view and the new forms of teaching and learning, and also promoting citizenship education.
- As Yuto Kitamura insists, there is implicitly a political intention that the state keep the social order to educate citizen submitted to the state in Singapore and Hong-Kong (Kitamura 2016: 105).
- In this sense, our present tendency to educate global citizen might restrict the development of the global thinking in students.

The Idea of Multicultural Education

- Japanese taught students about the way of life in the global world under the name “education for international understanding” until the 1990s. Moreover, multicultural education has been introduced in educational practices.
- Multicultural education is “an educational ideal aimed at the coexistence and mutual prosperity of diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural groups from the viewpoint of minorities and the standpoint of social justice, accompanied by educational practice and the educational reform movement” (Matsuo 2010: 158).
- Ideally, what is sought is that multicultural education will be developed in the context of social justice, that is, global justice.

CHAPTER 2

The Controversy on Global Justice in Political Philosophy

- In modern political philosophy, philosophers have argued about global justice over John Rawls's theory of justice.
- Rawls derived two principles of justice (principle 1: the liberty principle, 2-a: the different principle, and 2-b: the fair equality of opportunity principle) for forming a fair/cooperative and just society in *Theory of Justice* (1976).
- Rawls tried to expand liberal principles to global justice in *The Law of Peoples* (1999).

The two principles of Justice

FIRST PRINCIPLE

Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all.

SECOND PRINCIPLE

Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both:

- (a) to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged, consistent with the just savings principle, and
- (b) attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity.

(Rawls 1999a: 266)₉

The Law of Peoples (Rawls 1999b)

1. Peoples are free and independent, and their freedom and independence are to be respected by other peoples.
2. Peoples are to observe treaties and undertakings.
3. Peoples are equal and are parties to the agreements that bind them.
4. Peoples are to observe a duty of non-intervention.
5. Peoples have the right of self-defense but no right to instigate war for reasons other than self-defense.
6. Peoples are to honor human rights.
7. Peoples are to observe certain specified restrictions in the conduct of war.
8. Peoples have a duty to assist other peoples living under unfavorable conditions that prevent their having a just or decent political and social regime.

The duty for assistance

- The sixth principle is about respect for human rights
- The eighth is about the duty for assistance.
“The long-term goal of (relatively) well-ordered societies should be to bring burdened societies, like outlaw states, into the Society of well-ordered Peoples. Well-ordered peoples have a *duty* to assist burdened societies” (Rawls 1999b: 106).
- Rawls assumes that the subjects of global society are well-ordered, just governance and morally characterized people (Kamishima 2015).

11



Criticism by Thomas Pogge

- Pogge criticizes from a stand of resourcism that Rawls thinks the international injustice is attributable to the different levels of cultural politics in each state rather than the difference of holding amount of resources.
- His awareness of global injustice is based on the global economic system that unjustly creates persistent global poverty. He claims an institutional concept of moral cosmopolitanism and the justification of “the duty toward *every* other not to cooperate in imposing an unjust institutional order” (Pogge 2008: 177).

Criticism by Onora O'Neill

- O'Neill also criticizes Rawls, claiming that his “account of global justice remains an account of ‘international’ justice, in which the supposed legitimacy of assigning control of bounded territories to ‘peoples’ is presupposed, and limits and perhaps undermine his arguments for justice beyond borders” (O'Neill: 162).
- For O'Neill, Rawlsian global justice is insufficient because the primary agents of justice are assumed to be the states; it is not enough to view states as primary agents of justice (ibid: 164-5). She supposes that non-state institutions and non-state actors are the agents of justice.

The essence of global justice

- It is necessary to think about relativizing the states, and to position individuals as the agents of global justice.
- Global justice aspires to override the global issues that stem from states, depending on the individual power or forming fair institutions.
- Global citizenship is the ideal goal for a citizen who can think about global justice without being held back by their own state's interests.

CHAPTER 3

Global (Cosmopolitan) Citizenship and National Identity

- Nussbaum questioned:
“Should students be taught that they are, above all, citizens of the United States, or should they instead be taught that they are, above all, citizens of a world of human beings, and that, while they happen to be situated in the United States, they have to share this world with the citizens of other countries?”
(Nussbaum 1996: 6).
- She supports cosmopolitan for four reasons.

15

Cosmopolitanism and national Identity

- Nussbaum does not reject the nationalism in education because she thinks the proponents of it make a weak concession to cosmopolitanism.
- For example, they argue that “a commitment to basic human rights should be part of any national education system, and this commitment will in a sense hold many nations together.” (ibid.: 5-6)

Criticism by Anthony Appiah

- Appiah claims the notion of cosmopolitan patriot (Appiah 1996).
- Appiah considers citizens of the world (cosmopolitan citizens) to face a danger of unification of cultural differences, and supports cosmopolitan patriots from the standpoint that global thinking is possible while respecting differences.

Criticism by Amy Gutmann

- Gutmann criticizes Nussbaum's claim that our "allegiance is to the worldwide community of human beings," and indicates an alternative:
"to reject the idea that our primary allegiance is to any actual community, and to recognize the moral importance of being empowered as free and equal citizens of a genuinely democratic polity" (Gutmann 1996: 68).
- For Gutmann, a truly democratic political regime is right for justice, and therefore it does not need to be given priority in order to cultivate loyalty to a particular community.

Implications of criticisms

- Global justice in the context of education is inevitably considered alongside states because, in actuality, a fair global system has not been affirmed, and ideal educational theory has to be constructed starting with that assumption.
- The types of thinking in political philosophy and in philosophy of education have some minor deviations from each other.

CHAPTER 4

The Need for Deliberative Democratic Education

- Why does Gutmann adhere to democracy?

“A philosophy of democratic education rejects the idea that national boundaries are morally salient. If they are politically salient, however, then public education ought to cultivate in all students the skills and virtues of democratic citizenship, including the capacity to deliberate about the demands of justice for all individuals, not only for present-day citizens of the United States. Deliberating about the demands of justice is a central virtue of democratic citizenship, because it is primarily (not exclusively) through our empowerment as democratic citizens that we can further the cause of justice around the world”

(Gutmann 1996: 69)¹⁰



Two Principles of Democratic Education

- Gutmann claimed in *Democratic Education* (1987) that the ideal educational goal is *conscious social reproduction*, and education is based on two principles.
- The nonrepression principle “prevents the state, and any group within it, from using education to restrict rational deliberation of competing conceptions of the good life and the good society,”
- The nondiscrimination principle “prevents the state, and all groups within it, from denying anyone an educational good on grounds irrelevant to the legitimate social purpose of that good.”

(Gutmann 1987(1999): 44-5)

Toward a deliberative theory

- Gutmann's theory of democratic education was complimented by the concept of deliberative democracy in 2000s.
- There are two reasons for extending her theory : because preference-aggregated democracy has the risk of not being just, and because there is a possibility that the participants will change their own beliefs through deliberation (Hirai 2017).

The principle of the economy of moral disagreement

- Gutmann emphasize the second aspect as *the principle of the economy of moral disagreement*.

“In giving reasons for their decisions, citizens and their representatives should try to find justifications that minimize their differences with their opponents. ...Practicing the economy of moral disagreement promotes the value of mutual respect (which is at the core of deliberative democracy). By economizing on their disagreements, citizens and their representatives can continue to work together to find common ground, if not on the policies that produced the disagreement, then on related policies about which they stand a greater chance of finding agreement.”

(Gutmann and Thompson 2004: 7)

23

Deliberative democratic education as method of nurturing global citizens

- Such an assertion can be applied to the method of nurturing citizens who can pursue justice across national boundaries while recognizing the nation states.
- It is essential to develop the ability to relate the interests of others and think comprehensively while limiting their interests through deliberative or interactive education.

Conclusion:

Toward a Fair Global World

- As long as education is governed by nation states, its national contents inevitably take priority to those of the global world. But this educational thinking, counterposed by political philosophy, must now be questioned and reconsidered.
- What should be emphasized in the global society is not to educate citizens who participate in the global society but primarily contribute to their own state, but to educate citizens who can relativize their state, sometimes be critical of it, and pursue global justice.
- Toward that end, disposition and the ability to overcome the desire to give priority to their own interests are necessary; this is consistent with the ideal pursued by deliberative democracy.

25



References

- Appiah, K. A. (1996) “Cosmopolitan Patriot,” in: Cohen, J. eds. *For Love of Country?*, Beacon Press.
- Gutmann, A. (1987) *Democratic Education*, Princeton University Press, (New edition, 1999)
- Gutmann, A. (1996) “Democratic Citizenship,” in: Cohen, J. eds. *For Love of Country?*, Beacon Press.
- Gutmann, A. & Thompson, D. (2004) *Why Deliberative Democracy?*, Princeton University Press.
- Hirai, Y.(2017) *The Educational Theory of Amy Gutmann*, Seorishobo Publishers (in Japanese)
- Kamishima, Y. (2015) *Rawls and His Critics in a Globalizing World*, Minerva publishing (in Japanese).
- Kitamura, Y. (2016) “Education for Global Citizen in Multiple Asia,” in: Sato, M. et al. ed. *Citizenship Education in Global Era*, Iwanami Publication (in Japanese).

References

- Matsuo, T. (2010) “Multicultural Education,” in: The Japan Association of American Educational Studies ed. *Handbook of Modern American Education*, Toshindo (in Japanese).
- MEXT (2016) “Summary Report of deliberations in the working group about social studies, geography and history, and civics.” [http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo3/071/sonota/1377052.htm](in Japanese)
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1996) “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism,” in: Cohen, J. eds. *For Love of Country?*, Beacon Press.
- O’Neill, O.(2016) *Justice Across Boundaries*, Cambridge University Press.
- Pogge, T. (2008) *World Poverty and Human Rights (second edition)*, Polity Press.
- Rawls, J.(1999a) *A Theory of Justice (revised edition)*, Oxford University press. (First original version was published in 1976)
- Rawls, J. (1999b) *The Law of Peoples*, Harvard University Press.