The Educational Forum

Digital Democracy and Global Citizenship Education: Mutually Compatible or Mutually Complicit?

Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti [a] & Karen Pashby [a]

[a] Faculty of Education , University of Oulu , Oulu , Finland

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Digital Democracy and Global Citizenship Education: Mutually Compatible or Mutually Complicit?

Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti and Karen Pashby
Faculty of Education, University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland

Abstract

This article uses a critique of modernity to examine the perceived relationship between global citizenship education (GCE) and digital democracy (DD). We review critiques of citizenship education in the global imperative and of the relationship of technology to democratic engagement. An analogy expresses the problematic way that GCE and DD are both mutually compatible and complicit in ethical global justice issues. We end with a suggestion of a pedagogical framework through which educators can engage with an ethical approach to GCE and DD.

Key words: *complicity, digital democracy, global citizenship, modernity.*

The educational literature on global citizenship education (GCE) has grown exponentially over the last decade (e.g., Abdi & Shultz, 2008; Andreotti & Souza, 2011; Banks, 2004; White & Openshaw, 2005). Responding to a global imperative (Pashby, 2008), the educational agenda to prepare students to live together in increasingly complex, uncertain, plural, and (unfortunately) unequal societies may be one of the drivers behind the expansion of this field of educational inquiry. The meanings attributed to GCE vary; different understandings and agendas reflect distinct ideas regarding what is considered to be "global" (and local), what it means to be a "citizen" (and a non-citizen), and what is the purpose of education. Each understanding is rooted in specific discourses about what is real and ideal. Correspondingly, different configurations of meaning lead to different educational approaches and various envisaged outcomes. Educational research suggests that GCE initiatives tend to prescribe the adoption of strategies for "making a difference" in the world (Andreotti, 2006). These strategies are very often blind to historical power inequalities embedded in global issues and international relations, as well as in the (re)production of knowledge and

Address correspondence to Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti, University of Oulu, Faculty of Education, P.O. Box 2000, FIN-90014 Oulu, Finland. E-mail: vanessa.andreotti@oulu.fi

identities. Thus, despite claims of inclusion and globality, the lack of analyses of power relations and knowledge production in GCE often results in educational practices that unintentionally repeat the historical patterns that maintain conditions of inequality and injustice (see Andreotti, 2011).

Similarly, the discourse on digital democracy (DD) tends to amplify the potential benefits and accessibilities of technologies and to downplay the unevenly distributed hidden social, cultural, economic, and human costs of the push for technological development and dissemination. At the same time that there remain unexamined celebrations of technology as a fantastic and ideal tool for facilitating and constructing a global democracy, there is a lack of engagement with ideological and political frames within which new technologies are produced and propagated. This combination may lead to practices that ironically work against fairness and democracy. As a response to the problems identified in both GCE and DD, there is a growing body of educational literature that affirms the need for a better understanding of the social and historical forces that connect us to each other and to the idea of the global community. Therefore, in this article, we offer a review of recent critiques of GCE and DD with a view to support educators to consider carefully existing approaches and to enlarge possibilities for classroom practice.

The High Stakes Implications for Assuming that GCE and DD are Mutually Progressive: A Metaphor

We offer a metaphor to illustrate what is at stake in GCE and DD, and the contingent possibilities there may be for classroom practice: A group of people see many young children drowning in a river with a strong current. Their first impulse would probably be to try to save them or to search for help. But what if they looked up the river and saw many boats throwing the children in the water, and these boats were multiplying by the minute? How many different tasks would be necessary to stop the boats and prevent this from happening again? Andreotti (2011) suggested that in this metaphorical context, there are at least four inter-related tasks: (a) rescuing the children in the water, (b) stopping the boats from throwing the children in the water, (c) going to the villages of the boat crew to understand why this is happening in the first place, and (d) collecting the bodies of those who have died to grieve and raise awareness of what happened. In deciding what to do, people would need to remember that some rescuing techniques may not work in the conditions of the river, and that some strategies to stop the boats may invite or fuel even more boats to join the fleet. They may realize that they are actually in one of the boats, throwing children with one hand and trying to rescue some of them back with the other hand. Therefore, we suggest that education should help people in the task of learning to "go up the river" to the roots of the problem. In this way, the emergency strategies down the river can be better informed in the hope that one day no more boats will throw children in the water.

Going up the river in GCE work involves asking essential, difficult, and often disturbing begged questions that may implicate rescuers in the reproduction of harm. Questions include: What creates poverty? How do different lives have different value? How are these two things connected? What are the relationships between social groups that are over-exploited and social groups that are over-exploiting? How

are these relationships maintained? How do people justify inequalities? What are the roles of schooling in the reproduction and contestation of inequalities in society? What possibilities and problems are created by different stories about what is real and ideal in society? When do institutionalized initiatives, such as the human rights declaration or military interventions, become helpful in promoting justice, and when do they help reproduce the problems they are trying to address? How would people respond if they realized that bringing justice to others meant going against national/ local/economic interests? Why and for whose benefit are relationships among people mediated by nation-states?

The metaphor of helping the drowning children can be applied to the tensions inherent to assuming that DD promotes positive global interconnections and is mutually progressive as it relates to GCE. What if there were smart phones for those helping the children out of the river to instantly contact their friends from all parts of the world to ask for their support? They could tweet about it, write on Facebook about it, blog about it, or ask celebrities to participate in YouTube videos about it. This would help to get more and more resources and even tools to make the helping of children out of the water or the stopping of boats faster and more efficient. In effect, it would reinforce all approaches to the situation. At the same time, it is possible that these quicker, larger, more globally interconnected resources may not work in the context of this particular river which may have a particular flow or tide that no one other than locals could anticipate. People all over the world could know about the tragedy in a way they would not have before. They could feel impacted by the pictures being broadcast through Instagram and news Web sites (and then as special Web-based features on the nightly television news). The consumers of these images might even be inspired and moved to donate money to the children's cause and wear wristbands to show support. However, to what extent are these donors actually more interconnected to these children as a result of technology? Can the speed of digital connections between the helpers and the digital consumers/donors help interrupt what triggers the boats to throw the children in the water? These questions raise the importance of interrogating the good intentions of those who feel compelled to help their fellow global citizens and the assumption that technology will aid them.

In the next section, we build a theoretical framework for examining the interrelated discourses of digital democracy and global citizenship education through a critique of modernity and a distinction between soft and critical versions of GCE. Then, we review some critical literature on discourses of GCE to argue that the good intentions of educating for global citizenship are embedded in competing ideologies defining what it means to be a global citizen. Despite some key distinctions between ideologies, this ideological constellation reflects an overall lack of critical engagement with the Enlightenment-inspired ideals underlying GCE. Building from this critique, we review critical literature on digital democracy to argue that the assumption that technology increases the democratic potential of 21st-century global citizens is also embedded in a set of modernist assumptions and Enlightenment-inspired discourses. Thus, coming back to the metaphor of the children drowning in the river, we present some critical questions emerging from a review of critical literature in both fields. We end by advocating

for a skeptical and ethical approach to educating the 21st-century citizen. We propose a pedagogical framework that takes up the importance of interrogating both the good intentions of GCE approaches and the underlying assumption that technology enhances democratic engagement.

Recognizing the Dark Side of Modernity in Soft Approaches to GCE

Mignolo (2011) offered a useful framework to map debates related to both GCE and DD that is grounded on different interpretations of modernity, stating that modernity is usually presented in its bright and shiny side through key tropes and themes such as homogeneous and cohesive nation-states, representational democracies, empowered individualism, scientific empiricism, neutral secularism, technological advancements, human rights, and economic growth (see also Andreotti, 2012). These institutions and principles depend on ways of thinking that are based on Enlightenment tenets, such as universal reasoning, linear time, anthropocentrism, and a seamless idea of progress and civilization. These concepts and sets of assumptions define what counts as knowledge/reality and what knowledge/reality counts. Mignolo (2011) argued that this bright shiny side of modernity hides a significant, large shadow. His argument is that Modern principles and institutions can only exist on the back of huge injustices, including violent practices, such as colonialism; slavery; unfair trade rules; militarization; human, animal, and environmental over-exploitation; patriarchy; racism; and land theft. The shadow of modernity is reinforced by the cognitive violences necessary to justify these things, to make them appear "natural," and to present those who carry out these violences as "innocent." He implies that the hiding or forgetting of modernity's shadow in education alienates students to the realities beyond their contexts and closes down possibilities for different collective futures.

Andreotti's (2006) analysis of North–South representations and engagements in the context of GCE in Europe offers a distinction between "soft" and "critical" approaches to GCE, as illustrated in Table 1. It highlights the importance of making explicit a notion of complicity in the project of modernity and of interrogating the underlying hierarchies propping up in modern reasoning. The soft versus critical GCE framework reflects central tensions inherent to how GCE is conceptualized in Western countries of the global North. Drawing on the works of Dobson (2006) and Spivak (2004) (see also Andreotti, 2007), she states that there are at least two common trends in educational initiatives that promote concern for others (especially distant others). The first proposes the idea of a common humanity heading toward a common "forward," commanding a feeling of "noblesse oblige": those who were born into privilege have a responsibility for those who were not. This is represented in the "soft" approach, which is firmly grounded on the idea that modernity needs to be completed and universalized. The second approach proposes the idea that the imposition of one common forward is the central root of inequalities and injustices. This critical approach is based on the acknowledgment of complicity in harm and the need to think "otherwise" about our collective present and possible collective futures. It aims to equip individuals to go beyond a benevolent discourse of "helping others" and promotes recognition of complicity within geopolitical power relations and the reproduction of inequalities. Students are to think differently and to reflect critically on the legacies and processes of their own cultures and contexts so that they can imagine

Andreotti and Pashby

Table 1 Soft versus Critical Approaches to GCE

	Soft GCE	Critical GCE
Problem	Poverty, helplessness	Systemic inequality, injustice
Nature of the problem	Lack of "development," education, resources, skills, culture, technology, etc.	Complex structures, systems, assumptions, power relations, and attitudes that create and maintain exploitation and enforced disempowerment and tend to eliminate difference
Justification for positions of privilege (in the North and in the South)	"Development," "history," education, harder work, better organisation, better use of resources, technology	Benefit from and control over unjust and violent systems and structures
Basis for caring	Common humanity/being good/sharing and caring Responsibility *FOR* the other (or *to teach* the other)	Justice/complicity in harm Responsibility *TOWARD* the other—accountability
Grounds for acting	Humanitarian/moral (based on normative principles for thought and action)	Political/ethical (based on normative principles for relationships and commitment to addressing systemic injustices)
What for	So that everyone achieves development, harmony, tolerance, and equality	So that injustices are addressed, more equal grounds for dialogue and power are created
What individuals can do	Support campaigns to change inequitable structures, donate time, expertise, and resources	Analyse own position/context and participate in changing structures, assumptions, identities, attitudes, and power relations in their contexts
Basic principle for change	Universalism (belief that we all have the same needs and aspirations)	Reflexivity, dialogue, contingency, and an ethical relation to difference (radical alterity)
Goal of global citizenship education	Empower individuals to act (or become active citizens) according to what has been defined for them as a good life or ideal world	Empower individuals to reflect critically on the legacies and processes of their cultures and contexts, to imagine different futures, and to take responsibility for their decisions and actions

Adapted from Andreotti (2006, pp. 96–97).

different futures and take ethical responsibility for their actions and decisions. Andreotti (2006) argued that soft approaches, although productive in certain contexts, tend to close down possibilities for more critical approaches, particularly of those that offer alternative ways to conceptualize development, knowledge, and solutions from the perspective of people who have been historically subjugated (see also Bryan & Bracken, 2011; Eidoo et al., 2011).

GCE Overview of Critical Analyses

Taken together, Mignolo's distinctions (2011) and Andreotti's framework (2006) can be used to identify and understand different positions in the educational literature related to GCE and DD. There are wider discourses of citizenship that reflect the dominance of a neoliberal ideology, according to which education should support the development of

future workers and consumers to maintain a competitive edge in the global market. Other discourses reflect soft liberal versions of respecting an individual's right to be included in the status quo (Joshee, 2009). Much of the GCE literature reacts against the dominance of neoliberal versions of citizenship (Pashby, 2008). Some of these GCE approaches lean toward liberal-humanist positions (e.g., Noddings, 2004; Nussbaum, 2002), while other approaches lean toward critical and post-critical positions (e.g., Andreotti et al., 2010; Pike, 2008b; Richardson, 2008; Shultz, 2007). Drawing on research that considers GCE in the contexts of the United States, Canada, and the UK, the analyses we review in this section mirror Mignolo's (2011) shine versus shadow and reflect Andreotti's (2006) soft versus critical GCE framework. This selection of research demonstrates the wider ideological landscape framing citizenship education in the context of the global imperative. Each analysis focuses on specific problematic elements of perceived dominant positions in each regional context and offers a significant dimension to be considered when selecting GCE approaches in a specific classroom context. If the use of digital technology as an enhancement of democratic engagement is reflective of the new global reality of teaching and learning in the 21st century, it is both being framed by and is itself shaping discourses of global citizenship; thus DD is implicated in the ideological context described below.

In their study of contemporary discourses of citizenship in the United States, Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) found a strong dualism framing what it means to educate for citizenship in the current context of globalization. On one hand, the two most influential discourses are civic republicanism (neoconservative) and liberalism (both neoliberal and political social justice liberalism). They call these the "Enlightenment-inspired" discourses (p. 654). On the other hand, the relatively silent discourses are "critical" and include feminism, cultural citizenship, reconstruction or social justice, queer citizenship, and transnationalism (p. 657). While the Enlightenment-inspired discourses are dominant, the critical discourses "have developed or retained vigor as a result of the unfulfilled promises of the civic republican and liberal discourses, shaping new forms of civic agency, identity, and membership" (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 657). Their findings suggest that the current formal curriculum of citizenship in the United States presents a narrow scope and set of meanings of citizenship that are firmly ensconced in what Mignolo (2011) would call modernity's light. The dominant discourses of civic republicanism, neoliberalism, and political liberalism do not reflect what Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) call the "lived curricula of citizenship," which is ideologically diverse and suggests "multiple forms of democratic engagement" (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 657). They advocate for an explicit recognition of how citizenship meanings are "reduced, confin[ed, and] diminished" by Enlightenment-inspired discourses (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 657; see also Parker, 2011).

Global orientations to citizenship education are caught in the middle of this dualism and represent somewhat of a pivot-point between Enlightenment-inspired discourses of citizenship (arguably soft GCE) and those that challenge and interrogate the exclusions and inequities embedded in dominant discourses (or critical GCE) (Pashby, 2013). Although Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) included transnationalism among critical discourses, they argue that it is significant in the flexible way it can reflect different ideologies. Transnational is another word for global discourses of citizenship; transnational discourses can reflect both populist, Enlightenment-inspired versions and more critical forms of

citizenship. The rhetoric of transnationalism often reflects a universalist, humanitarian value system. Furthermore, transnational and global discourses of citizenship "can alternatively be assimilated within neoliberal goals of expanded markets and consumerism" (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 679). Thus, critical discourses of citizenship represent a significant strategic space through which educators can use the global dimension of transnational citizenship to challenge the dominant conventions of citizenship. Although critical discourses may be quieter, they are definitely there.

Similarly, Richardson (2008) observed two key impulses inherent to teaching for global citizenship in Canada. He found educators and theorists struggling to unite the overall idea of global citizenship amid two distinctly different global imaginaries. Reflecting a "soft" approach to GCE, a monopolar imaginary is based on individualism and neoliberal economic ideals. It emphasizes superficial differences and sees individuals as having the same fundamental wants and needs. Correspondingly, in this version of global citizenship, by serving one's own self-interests, one is serving the interest of the planet and all its inhabitants. In a monopolar imaginary, GCE is about developing the knowledge and skills that students will need to be competitive and successful in the global arena; globalization is inevitable and is essentially a positive force. The other discourse of global citizenship is encapsulated by notions of ecological relationships, interrelatedness, and the importance of physical and cultural diversity. Richardson (2008) referred to it as the ecological imaginary. In this view, GCE serves to develop in students a sense of connectedness, empathy, and appreciation for diversity and differences and to contribute a critique of globalization as essentially a negative force. This imaginary is strongly iterated in scholarly work and less so in curriculum and school-based documents (Evans, Ingram, MacDonald, & Weber, 2009). According to Richardson (2008), curricula are caught in a tension between these competing discourses of the monopolar and ecological imaginaries, while Pike (2008b) found there was less of a dualism and more of an outright dominance of neoliberalism. Yet, it is signficant that there are still whispers of social justice discourses amid the dominant neoliberal views (Joshee, 2009). Richardson (2008) noted that in the curriculum for Alberta, Canada, students are expected to develop an ability to respond to a rapidly changing world by being self-motivated and self-directed problem solvers; this is a monopolar imaginary. Reflecting an ecological imaginary, they are also supposed to demonstrate an appreciation for diversity of peoples and perspectives and to understand the interdependent nature of the world (see also Pashby, 2013). This evidence of the ecological imaginary appears to offer a space for a critical approach to GCE. However, given that, as Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) found, global citizenship is a flexible discourse, it could easily be taken up in a liberal humanistic view or reframed through a neoliberal discourse to reinforce a monopolar imaginary. The ecological imaginary represents a space for both a critical GCE approach and for a soft GCE approach that extends the celebratory approach to multiculturalism and which fails to engage or critique cultural hierarchies, embedded racism, and imperialist roots (Andreotti et al., 2010).

Marshall's (2009) study of agendas of GCE in the UK context also reflects the broader dualism of neoliberalism versus more critical approaches. Her research exemplifies the usefulness of the soft versus critical GCE framework (Andreotti, 2006) for exposing unintended negative consequences of un-interrogated good intentions. Marshall (2009)

identified a significant tension in GCE materials and in the calls for GCE in media that reflect two key instrumentalist agendas. The first, "technical-economic instrumentalism," is based in pragmatism and reflects an arguably neoliberal understanding of legal structures, rights, and responsibilities. The focus is equipping learners for participation in the global economy. The second, "global social-justice instrumentalism," is more emotional and arguably more of an "active" commitment to and understanding of economic, political, legal, and cultural injustice (Marshall, 2009, p. 255). Marshall (2009) acknowledged that the economic-global social justice binary represents somewhat of a false dichotomy. Both "are based upon exclusionary underlying principles upheld by a legal, liberal-democratic ideological and political stance, value system, and understanding and experience of human rights" (Marshall, 2009, p. 255). In this sense, both agendas are instrumental to the modernist project, which, as illustrated by Mignolo (2011), is based on exclusionary notions of political community. Thus, there is a need for a stronger, more critical approach to GCE, given both the dominating context of neoliberalism—as well as in certain contexts, neoconservatism, e.g., civic republicanism found by Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006)—*and* the context of soft, liberal approaches failing to critique the systems of power and cultural hierarchies.

This brief review of literature on the tensions underlying global citizenship education in U.S., Canadian, and UK contexts reflects Marshall's (2011) point that GCE discourse must be understood as operating within normative structures and dominant ideologies. Despite differences in types of GCE and agendas, there are particular similarities that define conceptualizations of GCE, "especially when placed in Western, liberal-economic country contexts" (Marshall, 2011, p. 415). Marshall (2011) pointed out that a unifying feature among different types of GCE is the assumption of global interconnectivity, which is very much a part of the social imagination of global citizenship, saying:

> *…global citizenship education discourse rarely recognises that this presumed "empirical reality" is entrenched within a liberal-democratic framework that assumes all citizens have the same rights, opportunities and responsibilities, when some marginalised communities and individuals in the world experience a very different lived-reality. (p. 415)*

The soft versus critical GCE framework helps to distinguish between approaches that are (a) reinforcing existing and historical processes of global interconnections based on individual humanism (be it a neoliberal or social justice approach), and (b) interrogating assumptions around global interconnectedness toward significantly revising those relations. Educators make decisions about resources and pedagogical approaches to GCE from within this wider context; calls for and celebrations of the role of digital learning in building democracies are also embedded in this ideological constellation. By being aware of the distinctions, educators can make better informed decisions about the approaches they choose in their own contexts.

Digital Democracy and Enlightenment-Inspired Discourses

Applying the soft versus critical framework (Andreotti, 2006) to DD can make visible the difficulties of dissociating dominant understandings of technology from Enlightenment-inspired discourses (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006). Indeed, Enlightenment-inspired

discourses operate in both global social-justice and technical-economic forms of instrumentalism (Marshall, 2009). A soft approach to DD would think of technology through a monopolar imaginary (Richardson, 2008). Soft DD associates digital learning with singular ideals of progress as technological acceleration, and with the "liberation" of mankind as the removal of obstacles to progress itself. Both of these associations entail the aims of "mastery" of the self and of nature, as well as the universalization of modernity's shine ironically perceived as a "cure" for its own shadow, where violence is perceived as collateral damage. Thus, given the way it intersects with discourses of global citizenship and embedded assumptions of modernity, the good intentions of DD must also be interrogated. The critical literature on DD both reinforces this argument and raises important questions regarding the inclusion of digital learning as part of a GCE agenda.

Pinar (2013) warns us that we have created a technoculture that now re-creates us and escapes our grasp, highlighting Grant's (1969, 1986) foresights into the reckless dreams of the completion of modernity through technology, written before the digital age. Grant makes several interesting points about the dangerous side of technology and the difficulties of manipulating it without being manipulated by it. He argues for example that, in liberal conceptualizations, technology is objectified as a freedom, and that freedom is conceptualized as a choice of consumer goods. This translates, in the public sphere; in the correlation of technology with productivity, rationalization, and profit; and in the private sphere, the correlation of technology with pleasurable stimulation—the next "hit" (Pinar, 2013). The former naturalizes a materialistic utilitarianism that subsumes morality and ethics within product development and profiteering. Similarly to how a discourse of global interconnections reinforces modernity's light (Mignolo, 2011) and soft GCE (Andreotti, 2006), the latter generates an illusion of connectivity while increasing isolation, thereby creating a culture of individualistic and narcissistic presentism. Within this context, instrumentalism is conflated with action, exhibitionism with communication, image with reality, and resistance with witnessing (Pinar, 2013).

More contemporary analyses of DD overlap and expand the GCE discussions presented so far. Dahlberg (2011), for example, identified four different positions in relation to digital democracy. These positions are reconstructed in relation to different conceptualizations of the democratic subject, of democracy, and of democratic affordances of digital media technologies. They include liberal-individualist, deliberative, counter-publics, and autonomist-Marxist positions. First, according to Dahlberg (2011), a liberal-individualist position on DD sees digital media as facilitating the transmission and dissemination of information between individuals and representative decision-making bodies. It enables individuals to make informed choices about competing worldviews in a marketplace of ideas. The assumed democratic subject in a liberal-individualist position is a rational, self-seeking, instrumental utility maximizer who knows his/her own best interests and who makes strategic cost–benefit calculations and choices. The assumed ideal type of democracy in this position is oriented toward the individual and the rule of majority, prioritizing the protection of individual rights and the freedom to make individual choices. Second, the deliberative position on DD sees digital media as facilitating "rational communication and public opinion formation that can hold decision makers accountable" (Dalhberg, 2011, p. 859). Oriented toward the common good, the assumed democratic subject of the

deliberative position is committed to rational deliberation and consensus building in order to examine and guide public decision making processes. Correspondingly, the ideal type of democracy is consensus-driven, where consensus is an aggregation of individual instrumental interests.

According to Dahlberg (2011), the two remaining positions are often associated with "radical democracies." The third, a counter-public position on DD emphasizes the role of digital media in facilitating both the reproduction of dominant systemic practices of exclusion and injustice, and in creating spaces for activism, contestation, and the formation of political groups that can challenge the status quo. It promotes the latter particularly in terms of enabling the expression of voices that have been historically marginalized. The assumed democratic subject of a counter-position on DD is one whose actions are motivated by a will to eliminate injustice and exclusion and who bonds in solidarity with marginalized others and allies in particular struggles. The assumed ideal type of democracy is oriented towards alternative, marginalized, or oppressed groups. Conversely, in the fourth position, an autonomist-Marxist orientation, digital media enables a "radically democratic politics in the sense of self-organized and inclusive participation in common productive activities that bypass centralized state and capitalist systems, which are understood to be necessarily anti-democratic" (Dahlberg, 2011, p. 863). The assumed democratic subject envisions an organically created and radically new form of society. Finally, in the fourth position, what Dahlberg calls the autonomist-Marxist position, "the commons" is "constituted through a decentralized, networked, open source intelligence, [and through] the 'general intellect' of 'the multitude' [which is understood as] a community of singularities" (Dahlberg, 2011, p. 863). This position claims to offer a revolutionary democracy that is very different from the forms of liberal democracy of the three previous positions, as it seeks forms of autonomous organization that "challenge the necessity of a capitalist organization of society" (Dahlberg, 2011, p. 864). We place Dahlberg's critical deconstruction of calls for DD in the context of GCE reinforcing Enlightenment-inspired discourses of citizenship. We argue that educators can recognize claims for using digital technology to enhance a democratic approach to GCE in these four positions. Approaches to GCE combine with positions on DD to create a matrix of assumed citizen-subjects and goals for education. All these different positions are conflated in claims that GCE is mutually reinforcing with DD.

Hoofd's (2012) critical work on technology furthers a critical probing of the assumption that digital learning is a natural companion to GCE. She points to inherent contradictions in the enthusiastic claims of the pursuit of liberal or radical democracies through digital media in all four positions identified by Dahlberg (2011). She refers to their embeddedness in the modernist project and unarticulated complicity in systemic discursive and/or structural harm. In her critical examination of Indymedia, which is a collective of independent journalists and commentators associated with global and social justice movements critical of neoliberalism (exemplary of the counter-position and autonomist-Marxist position), she emphasizes that the obsession with technology as a tool of progress repeatedly masks modernity's shadow: a highly militarized, exploitative, and unstable technocratic politics. She affirms that the aspiration for progress toward liberation through the promises of freedom and empowerment of new technologies depends on an

acceleration of technocratic neoliberalism to affirm its fantasies of borderless encounters with others (within or beyond capitalist frameworks). Hoofd (2012) probed the notion that technologies are inherently neutral, progressive, and accessible, arguing that this claim feeds capitalist over-production and consumption, thereby reinforcing the very mechanism that sustains systemic inequalities. She sees the acceleration of capitalism as producing a "speed elitist" form of (allegedly) democratic engagement, which is expressed as a call for freedom, connectivity, mobility, and fun. In this sense, digital engagement "increasingly disenfranchise[s] many who fail to catch up with accelerated change" (p. 27), despite its aspirations to do the opposite:

> *…speed-elitism engenders a violent destruction of non-commensurable idioms and ways of life under globalisation, resulting in turn in a compulsion, or fever, for what Jacques Derrida …has called 'archiving' such ways of life—to understand, preserve, and to finally encapsulate them. The futility of such archiving fever becomes clear when we consider that one cannot archive peoples or ways of life, since the technology renders what was once "alive," "dead" or "static." (Hoofd, 2012, p. 27)*

With reference to Spivak (2002), she suggests that digital media pretends to reach out to the Other when it actually drives people to reach out to their own narcissistic projection. In a similar way as Marshall (2011) critiqued the assumption of global interconnections in agendas of GCE, Hoofd (2012) highlights that the illusion of interconnectivity increasingly implies a withdrawal of responsibility, as it allows people "to turn a blind eye to the larger global exclusions these connections require" (p. 35). One practical example of these exclusions is expressed in the online deliberative process of consensus building, where participants are assumed to be on equal footing with each other. However, the person with the best tools to articulate and manipulate perspectives through technology will have a much stronger chance to steer the debate:

> *A specific humanist and middle class, highly connected and individualist idea of the subject underlies [DD initiatives]: a subject who can express him or herself convincingly and coherently, and who is enabled by cultural and economic capital to use the media communication tools to his or her personal enhancement. (Hoofd, 2012, p. 45)*

Pike (2008a) makes a similar argument about GCE when he acknowledges that "postnationalism is a luxury of the prosperous and secure" (p. 43). Thus a review of the wider dominant discourses of citizenship and democracy framing calls for digital democracy and global citizenship teases out troubling underlying assumptions in both fields and in their relationship. Critiques of DD combine with critiques of GCE to pose significant questions regarding their mutual compatibility and mutual complicity.

So What? Now What?
If we go back to the analogy of the people on the shore trying to figure out how to aid the drowning children in the river, some critical questions emerge: Does the use of technology develop a substantial shift in their citizenship engagement that changes the conditions of these children? Does this enhanced, intensified digital interconnection require a change in the comfortable condition from which consumers of these images sign petitions

and donate money? Is this an example of global citizenship or of a form of consumption that masks self-interest as altruism? Will the images of the children and their helpers be broadcast before or after the latest Beyoncé video or update on the Kardashians or online petition against global warming? Will the videos and blogs and testimonials from the river make students and their teachers aware of the modes of production and consumption that create the conditions that motivate the boats to throw the children in the water?

The river metaphor implies that, if global citizenship education is to prepare people to engage with the complexity, plurality, inequality, and uncertainty of our interdependent lives in a finite planet, we need to "raise our game" and expand the legacy of possibilities that we have inherited:

- We need to understand and learn from repeated historical patterns of mistakes, in order to open the possibilities for new mistakes to be made.
- We need more complex social analyses, acknowledging that if we understand the problems and the reasons behind them in simplistic ways, we may do more harm than good.
- We need to recognize how we are implicated or complicit in the problems we are trying to address: that we are all both part of the problem and the solution (in different ways).
- We need to learn to enlarge our referents for reality and knowledge, acknowledging the gifts and limitations of every knowledge system and moving beyond "either ors" toward "both and mores."
- We need to remember that the paralysis and guilt we may feel when we start to engage with the complexity of issues of inequality are just temporary, as they may come from our own education/socialization in protected/sheltered environments, which create the desire for things to be simple, easy, happy, ordered, and under control.

This kind of global citizenship education should support people in moving from naive hope toward skeptical optimism and ethical solidarities where we learn to face humanity, the world, and our place in it without fear and with courage and strength. This should help us to go through the difficulties and discomforts of confronting our past legacies and current inequalities in order to pluralize the possibilities for living together in the present and the future. Ultimately, this about is remembering how to be open, to relate beyond the need for common causes or identities, and to be taught in a plural world where justice starts with the forms of relationships we are able to create.

There are some examples of political and pedagogical engagement of DD that could support this type of GCE. For example, the Norwegian Students' and Academics' International Assistance Fund (SAIH) has produced a Web page and YouTube video that challenge the stereotypes of Africans being exploited by fundraising campaigns in the global North raising money to "help" Africa. The fabricated campaign, Radi-Aid, attempts to reverse the lens of development aid as a way to assert a critical view. It represents an interesting case for considering the complexities of who is assumed to be a subject of and who is a witness and responder to global issues. A critical GCE engagement with this video could

raise an important question around the extent to which reversing the traditional subject and responders reveals or reinforces complicity (see also Jefferess, 2013). The mock campaign video has "Africans" encouraging other Africans to donate their radiators to save the suffering cold children of Norway. The organization's Web page summarizes the rationale for the initiative:

> *The truth is that there are many positive developments in African countries, and we want these to become known. We need to change the simplistic explanations of problems in Africa. We need to educate ourselves on the complex issues and get more focus on how western countries have a negative impact on Africa's development. If we want to address the problems the world is facing we need to do it based on knowledge and respect. (SAIH, n.d.)*

Another example of the potential for DD to work with a critical GCE approach is the #GlobalPOV project. It is a collaboration between Ananya Roy (professor of city and regional planning at University of California–Berkely), Tara Graham (International and Area Studies lecturer and an expert in digital media), and digital artist Abby Van Muijen. Together they have created two online videos that express the nuanced contexts of global poverty issues and the complex interplay of social, economic, and political relations that together contribute to problems and frame various solutions (Blum Centre for Developing Economies, 2013). The videos combine strong scholarship with digital artistry to offer a provocative and stimulating engagement with the issue of poverty. Roy runs a live Twitter feed of responses to the videos and to the #GlobalPOV discussions on Twitter during her lectures (Ness, 2013). While we argue for an interrogation of the premise that DD necessarily mutually reinforces GCE, we see important possibilities arising when DD and GCE are combined through a more critical lens, as the two examples illustrate.

The extent to which these examples of DD integrate with a critical lens of GCE relies strongly on the pedagogical framing of these digital sites of learning. As a way of asserting a critical approach to GCE that exposes the shadow of modernity and resists both a neoliberal and soft liberal approach, in our own global citizenship educational practice, we offer our students a checklist that can be used to start conversations about those local/global initiatives (documentaries, campaigns, teaching resources, etc.) that may inadvertently reproduce seven problematic historical patterns of thinking and relationships. Andreotti (2012) called this checklist HEADS UP (Hegemony, Ethnocentrism, Ahistoricism, Depoliticization, Salvationism, Uncomplication, and Paternalism):

- *Hegemony* is the pattern of justifying superiority and supporting domination. Moving beyond this pattern involves asking questions such as, Does this initiative promote the idea that one group of people could design and implement the ultimate solution to inequalities? Does this initiative invite people to think about its own limitations?
- *Ethnocentrism* is the pattern of projecting one view as the only moral option. Questions that can help identify this pattern include, Does this initiative imply that anyone who disagrees with what is proposed is immoral? Does this initiative acknowledge that there are other logical ways of looking at the same issue?

- *Ahistoricism* is the pattern of forgetting historical legacies and complicities. It can be spotted with questions such as, Does this initiative introduce a problem in the present without reference to why it is like that and how "we" are connected to that? Does this initiative offer a complex historical analysis of the issue?
- *Depoliticization* is the pattern of disregarding power inequalities and ideological roots of analyses and proposals. This can be observed through these questions: Does this initiative present the problem/solution as disconnected from power and ideology? Does this initiative acknowledge its own ideological location and offer an analysis of power relations?
- *Salvationism* is the pattern of framing help as the burden of the fittest. It can be identified with questions such as, Does this initiative present people "in need" as helpless victims of local violence or misfortunes and helpers or adopters as the chosen "global" people capable of leading humanity toward its destiny of order, progress, and harmony? Does this initiative acknowledge that the desire to be better than/superior to others and the imposition of aspirations for singular ideas of progress and development have historically been part of the problem?
- *Uncomplication* is the pattern of offering solutions that do not require systemic change. Key questions to detect this tendency include: Does this initiative offer simplistic analyses and answers that do not invite people to engage with complexity or think more deeply? Does this initiative offer a complex analysis of the problem acknowledging the possible adverse effects of proposed solutions?
- *Paternalism* is the pattern of seeking affirmation of superiority through the provision of help. Paternalism can be recognized with the following questions: Does this initiative infantilize people in need and present them as people who lack education, resources, and civilization, and who would and should be very grateful for your help? Does this initiative portray people in need as people who are entitled to disagree with their saviors and to legitimately want to implement different solutions to what their helpers have in mind?

The questions we propose aim to identify the reproduction, awareness, and contestation of the patterns in the HEADS UP checklist. However, it is important to acknowledge that some initiatives may do both at the same time (in different ways). It is also important to recognize that in any initiative/resource, it will be very difficult to move completely beyond those patterns—and this is due to our historical conditioning, especially when it comes to mass communication or institutional politics. For example, if a media campaign was to break with these patterns all at once, it would probably become unintelligible for most people, and therefore it would be an ineffective campaign. The aim of the HEADS UP checklist is not to find a perfect ultimate solution for engaging with global issues, but to support people with the ongoing wrestling with concepts, contexts, choices, and implications that we face every day as teachers and learners working toward deeper and more ethical ways of relating to others and to the world. This constant wrestling is at the core of relevant and ethical global citizenship education and of schools and universities themselves as spaces for critical and independent thinking and in their role as critics and conscience of society. The HEADS UP checklist represents a potential way to evoke and reinvigorate critical discourses of citizenship and to relate DD and GCE. It is an approach that aims to expose the potential complicity in the sets of unexamined assumptions that guide even the best of intentions around GCE and DD.

References

Abdi, A., & Shultz, L. (Eds.). (2008). *Educating for human rights and global citizenship.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, 3*, 40–51.

Andreotti, V. (2007). An ethical engagement with the Other: Gayatri Spivak on education. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 1*(1), 69–79.

Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable postcolonial theory in education.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Andreotti, V. (2012). Education, knowledge and the righting of wrongs. *Other Education: The Journal of Educational Alternatives, 1*(1), 19–31.

Andreotti, V., Jefferess, D., Pashby, K., Rowe, C., Tarc, P., & Taylor, L. (2010). Difference and conflict in global citizenship in higher education in Canada. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning, 2*(3), 5–24.

Andreotti, V., & Souza, L. M. (Eds). (2011). *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education.* New York: Routledge.

Banks, J. A. (2004). Introduction: Democratic citizenship education in multicultural societies. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 3–15). San Francisco, CA: Wiley & Sons.

Blum Centre for Developing Economies. (2013). The #GlobalPOV Project [Web page]. Berkeley, CA: Author. Retrieved from http://blumcenter.berkeley.edu/globalpov/.

Bryan, A., & Bracken, M. (2011). *Learning to read the world? Teaching and learning about global citizenship and international development in post-primary schools.* Dublin: Irish Aid/Identikit.

Dahlberg, L. (2011). Re-constructing digital democracy: An outline of four "positions." *New Media & Society, 13*(6), 855–872.

Dobson, A. (2006). Thick cosmopolitanism. *Political Studies, 54*(1), 165–184. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9248.2006.00571.x

Eidoo, S., Ingram, L., MacDonald, A., Nabavi, M., Pashby, K., & Stille, S. (2011). "Through the kaleidoscope": Intersections between theoretical perspectives and classroom implications in critical global citizenship education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 34(4), 59–84.

Evans, M., Ingram, L. A., MacDonald, A., & Weber, N. (2009). Mapping the "global dimension" of citizenship education in Canada: The complex interplay of theory, practice and context. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning, 5*(2), 17–34.

Grant, G. (1969). *Technology & empire.* Toronto: Anansi.

Grant, G. (1986). *Technology & justice.* Toronto: Anansi.

Hoofd, I. (2012). *Ambiguities of activism: Alter-globalism and the imperatives of speed.* New York: Routledge.

Jefferess, D. (2013). Humanitarian relations: Emotion and the limits of critique. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 7*(1), 73–83.

Joshee, R. (2009). Multicultural education policy in Canada: Competing ideologies, interconnected discourses. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education* (pp. 96–108). New York: Routledge.

Digital Democracy and Global Citizenship Education

Knight Abowitz, K., & Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary discourses of citizenship. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(4), 653–690.

Marshall, H. (2009). Educating the European citizen in the global age: Engaging with the post-national and identifying a research agenda. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 41*(2), 247–267. doi: 10.1080/00220270802642002

Marshall, H. (2011). Instrumentalism, ideals and imaginaries: Theorising the contested space of global citizenship education in schools. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9*(3–4), 411–426.

Mignolo, W. (2011). *The darker side of Western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ness, C. (2013, April 8). #GlobalPOV: Art, videos and Twitter take poverty curriculum to the world. *UC Berkeley News Center*. Retrieved from http://newscenter.berkeley.edu/2013/04/08/globalpov-art-videos-and-twitter-take-poverty-curriculum-to-the-world/

Noddings, N. (Ed.). (2004). *Educating citizens for global awareness*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Norwegian Students' and Academics' International Assistance Fund (SAIH). (n.d.). Why Africa for Norway [Web page]? Oslo, Norway: SAIH. Retrieved from http://www.africafornorway.no/why.

Nussbaum, M. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 21*(4/5), 289–303.

Pashby, K. (2008). Demands on and of citizenship and schooling: "Belonging" and "diversity" in the global imperative. *Brock Education, 17*(1), 1–21.

Pashby, K. (2013). Related and conflated: A theoretical and discursive framing of multiculturalism and global citizenship education in the Canadian context. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Toronto, Canada.

Parker, W. (2011). "International education" in U.S. public schools. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9*(3–4), 487–501.

Pike, G. (2008a). Citizenship education in global context. *Brock Education, 17*(1), 38–49.

Pike, G. (2008b). Reconstructing the legend: Educating for global citizenship. In A. Abdi & L. Shultz (Eds.), *Educating for human rights and global citizenship* (pp. 223–237). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Pinar, W. (2013). The first task of thought in our time. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 7*(1), 3–16.

Richardson, G. (2008). Conflicting imaginaries: Global citizenship education in Canada as a site of contestation. In M. O'Sullivan & K. Pashby (Eds.), *Citizenship education in the era of globalization: Canadian perspectives* (pp. 53–70). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Spivak, G. (2002). Pax electronica: Against crisis-driven global telecommunication. In G. Lovink (Ed.), *Uncanny networks: Dialogues with the virtual intelligentsia* (pp. 74–81). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Spivak, G. (2004). Righting wrongs. *The South Atlantic Quarterly, 103*(2/3), 523–581.

Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 53*(3), 248–258.

White, C., & Openshaw, R. (Eds). (2005). *Democracy at the crossroads: International perspectives on critical global citizenship education*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.