Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences (2010) Vol 2, Special Issue No 1,151-191

Neoliberal Globalization and "Global Education" in Urban Secondary Schools in India: Colonial Reproductions or Anti-Colonial Possibilities?

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

Abstract: *National educational systems across the globe are being influenced by neoliberal globalization. In North America and Europe, globalization is one of the themes that recieves consideration under the rubric of what is refered to as global education. This article reports on some of the ways in which global education (utilizing Euro-American conceptions of global education as a point of departure) and more specifically, perspectives on globalization are being taken up (or not taken up) in schools in Delhi, India. Qualitative case study research (based on a preliminary/initial or early analysis of specific data sets across 4 school sites) suggests that despite decolonization in 1947, the neo/colonial project rooted in European capitalism (now in the guise of neoliberal globalization) is being reproduced in Indian schools in urban centers like Delhi. However, the research also points to potential spaces for critical intervention as would appear to be the case from (tentative) emergent themes shared by a smaller segment of student/teacher/other participants. Based on a critical colonial/anti-colonial engagement with emergent themes, this paper advances the perspective that it is both plausible and necessary to introduce an anti-colonial global education which allows for a multicentric framework of global education that extends beyond hegemonic Eurocentric onto-epistemes (and attendant political-economic projects), i.e., global education can and needs to be enlisted in a counter-hegemonic project in order to address the colonial implications and impacts of a neo/colonial neoliberal globalization project. Such an approach would allow Indian schools, students and teachers to begin to play a part in an anti-colonial global education praxis for democratization and social change as opposed to remaining complicit in continuing to assist with the reproduction of neo/colonial realities in India; reproductions that were challenged, confronted and addressed during the nationalist struggles for independence from British/colonial rule in the early-mid 20th century.*

1. Introduction

The world has undergone a "great transformation" (Polanyi, 2001[1944]) which has resulted in a politically and economically interconnected globalized world. Unlike previous centuries in which societies governed their respective economies, today, the capitalist market economy governs nations and their societies at both the interstate and intrastate levels. The hegemonic economic, structural, and organizational integration of the "core and periphery," "North and South," "colonizer and colonized," "First World and Third World," "West and Rest," and/or "developed and developing" world based on trade, capital, labour, investment, production, consumption, and financial markets is referred to as globalization. Globalization is rooted in a set of worldwide historical socio-political and economic processes such that the local has been, and continues to be impacted by the global and vice versa" (Arnove and Torres, 2007; Held and McGrew, 2007; Steger, 2003). Improved modes of communication, transport, technology, and the enforcement of neoliberal globalization in which private foreign trade, investment, and export govern local economies with deregulated control by local governments within the last two decades have further expedited the process of globalization. Neoliberal globalization rooted in the core's "free market logic" has pressed the majority of the world's nations to move towards a "similar path of development" (Hopkins and Wallerstein, et al., 1982: 41) thereby making no country external to the world economy. Within Euro-America, this worldwide economic integration and universalization of Western liberal democracy has been referred to as the end of history with no existing alternatives to capitalism (Fukuyama, 1992).

It has been argued by some scholars that global economic integration has observed many positive features within a relatively short period of time. For example, life expectancy, literacy rates, food security, and GDP (gross domestic product) rates have all increased, whilst poverty rates and population growth have declined (see for example, Bhagwati, 2004; Norberg, 2003; Wolf, 2004). However,

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

according to others (including some institutions that champion the process), the gap between the rich and the poor, both between and within nations, has widened (Arrighi, 2005; Peet and Hartwick, 2009; UNDP, 2008; World Bank, 2006). Many negative impacts of globalization on the majority of the world's peoples extend beyond impacts and changes in the economic realm (production, consumption, and investment) but also include the political, cultural, and environmental realms (Spring, 2009; Toh, 2004). This worldwide governance and organization based on the historical and asymmetrical juxtaposing of "core and periphery," "North and South," "colonizer and colonized," "First World and Third World," "West and Rest," and/or "developed and developing" divide is the root cause of structural violence (i.e., poverty, forced slavery, warfare, cultural annihilation, displacement, exploitation) particularly in the "developing" world, (Bales, 1999; Toh, 2004), despite the promises and projections of political peace and economic prosperity made by Western financial leaders at Bretton Woods post-colonization to the present (Bello, 2002; Foster, 2006; Harvey, 2003; Held and McGrew, 2007; Peet and Hartwick, 2009).

The increased economic interconnectedness is also having an impact on educational systems around the world. The "globalization of education" (Spring, 2009), where by national schools systems are being influenced by globalization's processes and ideologies, are not only posing structural and organizational challenges (i.e., financing, governance, curriculum, foreign privatization, demand for English medium schools) for nations, but are compounding problematics and issues concerning educational equality, access, opportunities, and outcomes for those already marginalized (Arnove and Torres, 2007; Burbules and Torres, 2000; Neeraj, 2007; Spring, 2009). It is clear that the intensification of neoliberal globalization is one of the most pressing issues of our times given the contradictions it presents for the future trajectory of education and human-social development worldwide.

In education in the West, the theme of "global education" has emerged to equip students with the knowledge, skills, and outlook for participation in a globalized world (Goldstein and Selby, 2000; Mundy and

Manion, 2008; Toh, 2004). Global education (as defined in the West) cultivates global literacy (Toh, 1993) through formal, informal, and/or non-formal education by emphasizing "the concept of interdependence and the need to set contemporary issues in a global context" (Hicks, 1993: 19). A comprehensive review of the literature indicates that the bulk of literature available on global education (as defined in the West) comes primarily from the perspectives and paradigms of the West (Hicks, 2004; Pike and Selby, 2000; Reardon, 1988). The lack of engagement with and inclusion of other perspectives and paradigms within global education has been heavily critiqued by some Western and non-Western scholars resulting in a widely recognized need for more intercultural approaches (Arnove and Torres, 2007; Burbules and Torres, 2000; Inayatullah, 1998; Scholte, 2005).

Given that neoliberal globalization is a pervasive force in global governance (including educational governance) today, this article reports on some of the ways in which global education (as defined in the West) is taken up in a "South" (developing) nation, by drawing on case study research conducted in urban secondary schools in Delhi, India. After providing a brief overview of the historical processes that have contributed to the formations of globalization, the paper focuses on neoliberalism in India and Indian education along with a brief overview of global education (as defined in the West) and related official curricular constructions in Indian education/schooling. The following section builds on this emerging understanding of global education in Indian schooling by elaborating on case study research-related perspectives and observations developed from 4 school sites in Delhi. The central and emergent thesis from this case study research is that although three centuries of British colonial rule in India ended in 1947, the neo/colonial project and accumulated violence rooted in the culture of European capitalism continues to work through neoliberal globalization metastasizing within Indian education at an accelerated pace vis-à-vis educational policies, practices and pedagogies. A critical engagement with anti-colonial education/praxis is called for along with a multicentric and multiperspectival framework of global education that extends beyond

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

hegemonic Eurocentric onto-epistemes in order to address structural violence across the globe.

2. Situating the Formations of Neoliberal Globalization

Although the term globalization was not in use until the latter part of the twentieth century in 1985 by the economist Theodore Levitt, its processes and impacts were nevertheless underway. It is important then to trace its multicenturic formations to better understand how the world is currently structured and operationalized, and why. Its evolution, contours, and undertakings can be traced back to the fifteenth century with the onset of European enlightenment which observed a radical shift in power initiated by the commercial middle class from religion/church to business/economics alongside the Puritan religious movement which preached the religion of capitalism (Arrighi, 2005; Chase-Dunn and Gills, 2005; Hopkins and Wallerstein et al., 1982; Tawney, 1938; Wallerstein, 2004). By the seventeenth century, the devotional preachings by European fanatics of the duty of commerce "for the greater glory of God" propelled the onset of global capitalism (Tawney, 1938: 216; see also Beaud, 2001; Hall and Gieben, 2005; Robertson, 1986). Through political coercion and violent militaristic invasions, Western Europeans forcefully invaded resource rich non-European countries and annexed global control vis-à-vis colonialization (Blaut, 1993; Goldberg, 2002; Magdoff, 1978; Robertson, 1986). Within India, European invasion and colonization occurred in the 1600s. Through the monopoly of trade (i.e., spice, tea, silks, porcelain), British colonials formed the East India Company in 1600 via the Royal Charter (Lawson, 1998; Wild, 1999). Through incessant aggressive military force, India's peoples, natural resources, socio-cultural, political and economic structures, and onto-epistemes were dominated and exploited for three centuries by this alien modern-like multinational corporation, not unlike today's TNCs.

Europeans justified and legitimized the global colonial project by developing biological and cultural theories of race

(Gould, 1996; Back and Solomos, 2002; Quijano, 2000). Without any "evidence" or "scientific" basis, Europe created biological theories of human "races" in which "racial groups were [hierarchically] ranked according to their resemblance to white Europeans" (Bock, 1988: 7), and declared that "physical appearance was a reflection, even a determinant, of moral and intellectual character" (Back and Solomos, 2002: 34). Similarly, cultural theorists argued that cultures progressed from simple "primitive" cultures to complex "civilized" cultures with the former being "living fossils" of obsolete Europeans (Bock, 1988; Gould, 1996). It was here that a universal unilineal history for all humankind, otherwise known as the grand narrative was postulated which positioned the elite European man and his onto-epistemes at the centre of the whole world (Hall and Gieben, 2005). The construction and implementation of this universal narrative ensured a common hegemonic ideological understanding between the colonizer and the colonized "rooted in the need to construct, in spite of the antagonism between them, an ideological 'world' shared by exploiters and exploited alike" (Balibar and Wallerstein, 2005: 4; see also Fanon, 1968; Freire, 1996; Memmi, 1991). It is widely known today that these biological and cultural theories of "race" rooted in a pseudo-science failed to produce any valid explanations of human diversity and evolution (Boas, 1911; Bohannan and Glazer, 1988), and were highly racist theories developed by armchair Europeans for Europeans to champion their own perceived evolutionary success, and justify the brutality of their colonial project (Blaut, 1993; Hall and Gieben, 2005). European colonialists' contact with non-Europeans not only marked changes in the political economy but also wrongfully birthed the local-global racism we observe and operate within today (Back and Solomos, 2002; Dei, 1996; Memmi, 1991; Said, 1979) in which the world's population is distributed into "ranks, places, and roles" (Quijano, 2000: 535). In the words of Blaut (1970: 118) colonization was the "white exploitation of the non-white world".

Today, the "new racism", or "differentialist racism" (Balibar and Wallerstein, 2005: 21) has conveniently gained rapid popularity. This contemporary racism is based on cultural differences in which the life-styles and traditions of

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

the "Third World" are believed to be incompatible with those of the European culture given that "Third World" people possess obstacles and "cultural handicaps" (Balibar and Wallerstein, 2005: 25). This new racism divides humanity into two main clusters: "one [is] assumed to be universalistic and progressive, the other [is] supposed irremediably particularistic and primitive" (Balibar and Wallerstein, 2005: 25). The "new racism" not only echos earlier theories of race, but it conveniently erases and dehistoricizes the multicenturic colonial project that continues at present.

"World-system theory" (Wallerstein, 1974) is useful in sketching out how centuries of colonization have shaped, and continue to shape and sustain the asymmetrical juxtapositions of "core and periphery," "North and South," "colonizer and colonized," "First World and Third World," "West and Rest," and/or "developed and developing". For Wallerstein, the world economy is based on two integral structures: core ("developed" nations) and periphery ("developing" nations). His theory focuses in on the ways in which the accumulation of wealth and development in the core continues to economically sustain itself within the world market-system via the international division of labour resulting in a flow of surplus from the periphery to the core. Wallerstein's model views the formation of the "world-system" solely as an economic entity, not a socio-political entity rooted in colonialism. As Blaut (1993: 206) points out:

> capitalism arose as a world-scale process: as a world system. Capitalism became centrated in Europe because colonialism gave Europeans the power both to develop their own society and to prevent development from occurring elsewhere. It is this dynamic of development and underdevelopment which mainly explains the modern world.

Wallerstein's model is a negation of earlier world economies that operated with similar structural factors (i.e., wage, profit) thereby making the European modern capitalist world-system nothing really unique in its formation except for its centralizing hegemonic factor (Amin, 1991; Appelbaum and Robinson, 2005; Behdad, 2006; Mignolo,

2000; Robinson, 2008). Europe alone was not responsible for the "development" of modernization, but rather Europe's conscious colonial geographical expansion, human and resource exploitation, capital production and accumulation, and interdependence based on the unequal division of labour makes the development of the world-system multi-national and not solely Eurocentric (Dussel, 2000; Frank, 2000; Ikeda, 1996; Mignolo, 2000).

It must be noted that critics and global capital apologists have long downplayed the importance of the core-periphery persistence as they believe that the core-periphery inequality ended after World War II during the period of decolonization which is clearly not the case (Appelbaum and Robinson, 2005; Bello, 2002). In their pursuit for continued world domination and wealth, Western economic leaders met at Bretton Woods (a New Hampshire spa) immediately after World War II/"decolonization", to discuss the management of the world's economy, commerce, and trade (Foster, 2006; Harvey, 2003; Held and McGrew, 2007; McMichael, 2005). From their armchairs, multilateral International Financial Institutions (IFI), namely, the World Bank (WB), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) were formed in 1944, and in 1947 the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT, now referred to as the World Trade Organization (WTO) since 1995) (Bello, 2002; Gélinas, 2002). Former colonies were pressed to keep their national borders open and economize from a mode of self-sufficiency to an export production economy for the global market. Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs), rooted in the modernization/"development" paradigm, were imposed on to countries in the periphery to provide the "necessary conditions for western-style development and growth" (Hall and Gieben, 2005: 10; Peet and Hartwick, 2009). The totality of this global "restructuring" gave the Western geopolitical core an open license to a "free" liberalized market economy by imposing economic standards for the "Rest" of the world to adhere to.

It was argued by the West that global economic intercourse would cultivate a culture of peace given the increased economic, social, and political interdependence between nations (Bello, 2002). After over half a century, this

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

clearly has not occurred as evidenced by ongoing warfare, militarization, structural violence, poverty, slavery, environmental destruction, cultural annihilation, and other socio-economic injustices (Bales, 1999; Bello, 2002; Groff and Smoker, 1996; Klare, 2001; Toh, 2004; World Bank, 2006). At its fiftieth year, a worldwide review of the economic restructuring revealed that "the World Bank's own evaluations were highly critical of its performance" (World Bank, as cited in Robbins, 2008: 98). The debt crisis accumulated by the periphery from the IMFs/World Bank's SAPs was identified as a root cause of the structural violence that is inflicted on to billions of people around the world (Kapoor, 2007, 2009; Neeraj, 2007; Sanyal, 2007; Singharoy, 2004). This is not surprising given that "the Bank is in the *business* of lending money for development" for profit (Gélinas, 2002: 107). This is referred to as neo-colonialism (Altbach and Kelly, 1978). Globalization, neo-colonialism, modernization are, to all intents and purposes, conceptually synonymous with "roots in the world-historical colonial project associated with the rise of capitalism" (McMichael, 2005: 111; see also Beaud, 2001; Capella, 2000; Dusell, 2000; Scholte, 2005; Stromquist and Monkman, 2000; Wallerstein, 2004). This calculated design by the West as a result of its dependency on the periphery for survival vis-à-vis resources (natural and human), has wrongfully trapped periphery countries into irrelevant economic systems that are at the root of the structural violence that is inflicted on to billions of peoples inhabiting the periphery (Robbins, 2008; World Bank, 2006). Furthermore, the rationale or lack of, of the obscene accumulation of debt accrued by "formerly" colonized countries requires further analysis and dialogue particularly since the colonizer exploited and robbed the resources (material and human) of the colonized for several centuries.

Neoliberal globalization took over from post-independence "developmentalism", taking root in SAPs and IFI-sponsored penetrations of the South and has been actively pursued since the 1980s by the economic reform agenda of the Washington Consensus through which the "free market logic" continues to secure the interests of the developed world (colonial/imperial powers). Neoliberalists/hyperglobalists regard nations as borderless

"business units" and champion the capitalist logic of endless production, accumulation, and profit "through the establishment of transnational [corporations] and networks of production, trade and finance" in the global market economy with no interference from national governments (Held and McGrew, 2007: 189). Colonialism and neocolonialism are obsolete, and the concepts of core and periphery are no longer applicable given the decentralization of production and the uniting of the world market in which the flows of labour and capital have "fractured and multiplied so that it is no longer possible to demarcate large geographical zones as center and periphery, North and South" (Foster, 2006: 32). Neoliberalists/hyperglobalists believe that "those states that fail to make this [economic] adaptation will fall behind and stagnate, eroding the opportunities for their people" (Foster, 2006: 189).

Postglobalists such as Escobar (2004: 210), on the other hand, argue that modernity's problems do not require modern solutions; its failures have given rise to imperial globality, and globalization's inescapability needs to be questioned, and what is required is a shift "from the sociology of absences of subaltern knowledges to a politics of emergence of social movements". What Escobar and other critics of capitalism (see for example Dusell, 2000; Mignolo, 2000) are calling for in the face of global empire are the socially emancipatory enactments of "new anti-capitalist imaginaries…the emphasis on non-Eurocentric perspectives on globality…[and]…place-based epistemologies, economies and ecologies" (Escobar, 2004: 208; see also Loomba, et al., 2006).

With this brief look at the global neoliberal turn and related explanations for what it can and does mean in terms of the march of progress, development, modernization, continuing capitalist and racially-specific colonizations and core-periphery structurations, the following section addresses the implications of neoliberal globalization for India, Indian education and global education prospects and current trajectories in India.

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

3. Neoliberal Globalization, Education in India and Global Education

Although India's economic liberalization policy can be traced back to the late 1970s, intense economic restructuring rooted in neoliberal globalization took shape in 1991 primarily as a result of the large accumulation of foreign debt (Panagariya, 2002; Prakash, 2009; Sikri, 2009). This economic restructuring was premised on the financial logic that foreign-exchange reserves would not only "develop" India and the Indian economy simultaneously, but eventually eliminate the debt (Panagariya, 2002; Prakash, 2009; Sikri, 2009). Today, India's neoliberal economy is an open economy with an emphasis on foreign trade and investment, export, and privatization with minimal government regulation. A post-1991 analysis indicates that India has the fifth largest economy in the world with a 3.611 trillion GDP, foreign exchange reserves exceeding $170 trillion USD, 50 million investing shareholders, and a rapidly growing middle class (Prakash, 2009; Varma, 2007). It is believed that the process of neoliberal globalization and "development" are imperative to solve existing national problems such as the large gap between the rich and the poor, population explosion, and environmental pollution. In other words, the very processes that brought on these conditions are also regarded as being ameliorative. It must be noted that this relentless economic growth and restructuring "has bypassed hundreds of millions of Indians…[as] [g]lobalizaion is not only destroying millions of jobs in the organized sector and small-scale industries, it is also devastating the livelihood of hundreds of millions working in India's unorganized sector" (Neeraj, 2007: 141), and is exploiting, displacing, encroaching upon, and annihilating the epistemic-ontologies of the *Adivasis* (original dwellers), agri-based communities, and land-based subaltern constituencies of India (Kapoor, 2007, 2009; Neeraj, 2007; Singharoy, 2004).

Education played, and continues to play a major role in the formation and sustainability of globalization. From the onset, colonial education and schooling were sites of deculturalization and were "designed to serve the needs of the colonizer" (Altbach and Kelly, 1978: 2). Within India,

British colonial educational policies were instrumental in the formation, implementation, and sustainability of the British empire in India (Basu, 1978). Lord Macaulay's landmark speech in 1835 in which he openly discouraged Indian education and culture, set the course for colonial education in India (Basu, 1978; Young, 1935). His approach to mass colonization and deculturing of Indians entailed developing and using a small class of English-like men "Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect" to educate the Indian population and spread western onto-epistemes (Young, 1935: 359). The use of English language education was an essential tool for the colonizer in ruling the colonized as it provided "a positive bond between the rulers and the ruled…[and] would stop the Indians from regarding their rulers as foreigners and in fact make them 'intelligent and zealous co-operators'" (Basu, 1978: 57-58). English became the medium of instruction in higher education with a strong emphasis on a literary curriculum. The deliberate focus on western English literature and humanities, and not economics, production, and technical/vocational education, prevented the emergence of a qualified Indian ruling class equipped for economic leadership, which as desired by the colonizer, resulted in a knowledge dependency on foreign rulers for governance and direction (Basu, 1978; Kamat, 1985; Seth, 2007).

Since "decolonization," the history of Indian educational developments can be categorized into four distinct phases (1947 to 1967; 1967 to 1985; 1986 to 1998; and 1998 to the present) (Mukhopadhyay, 2007; Thakur and Berwal, 2008). From 1947 to 1967, an analysis of Indian national documents (e.g., Indian Planning Commission; Kothari Report on Education) and international documents (e.g., UNESCO) in the late forties and fifties indicate that both Indian and non-Indian social scientists, politicians, and educational planners believed that education was the site for socio-economic, political, and cultural transformation and the move towards modern "development" was key. The second phase (1967 to 1985) observed the first important national event in Indian education which was the adoption of the first National Policy on Education (NPE) in 1968 which "aimed to promote national progress, a sense of common

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

citizenship and culture, and to strengthen national integration" (National Policy, 1986, p. 2). The third and fourth phases observed, and continue to observe, educational restructuring and trends aligned and embedded within neoliberal policies and orientation. It was the third phase of Indian education (1986 to 1998) which saw the introduction of the second National Policy on Education (NPE) in 1986. Its landmark development was "the acceptance of a common structure of education throughout the country and the introduction of the [British] 10+2+3 system by most states…[and]…science and mathematics were incorporated as compulsory subjects and work experience assigned a place of importance" (National Policy, 1986: 3). A 1992 review of India's National Policy on Education resulted in structural revisions in which local-state governments were empowered to self-manage education; education was enacted as a fundamental right; a recommitment to finance education was renewed; commitment to universalize secondary education and significantly expand higher education; ensure quality education at all levels and national institutes; and increased involvement of international agencies to mobilize resources for elementary education (Mukhopadhyay, 2007). Educational developments in the fourth phase (1998 to present) are not surprisingly dominated and being shaped by neoliberal orientations given India's economic emphasis on foreign trade, investment, and privatization (Panagariya, 2002; Prakash, 2009; Sikri, 2009). The Indian government is moving towards state deinvestment and withdrawal in education to a heavy commitment towards the privatization and marketization of schools (government and private) by private companies. This movement is highly problematic as the state is failing to educate its children; education and knowledge (for the new economy) are becoming a commodity for sale by a powerful elite which can be purchased thereby further widening existing educational inequalities; and no educational *alternatives* outside of capitalism and capitalistic frameworks are provided (Kumar, 2008; Neeraj, 2007). This educational trajectory poses urgent critical questions that centre around whose education? Education for who? Education for what? As a result of neoliberalism in India, the government has appointed the Central Advisory Board of

Education (CABE) to examine the critical issues facing Indian education at present and what additional educational policies are required (Aggarwal, 2007, 2008; Mukhopadhyay, 2007). While global education (as per Euro-American definitions) has not been spelled out as such, nascent and emergent themes pertaining to peace, ecology, economic modernization/skilling for the global economy, gender equality, etc. are becoming a part of the official curriculum, prompted largely by UNESCO-inspired influences in Indian education and the National Curriculum Framework (NCERT, 2006; UNESCO, 2001).

Global Education and Related Constructions in Indian Education and Schooling

From a Western perspective, the area of global education is defined as a process of cultivation of "global literacy" (Toh, 1993) where by contemporary issues and realities are situated within a global context, given the growing interdependence in the world (Hicks, 1993; Toh, 2004). The origins of global eduation in the West are recent given that the focus on local-global issues was not a priority among western educators during the last quarter of the twentieth-century (Hicks, 2004). According to Western academic literature, key binding thematics center around peace, militarization, human rights, poverty/inequality, the environment, anti-racist education, cross-cultural and intercultural relations, and social justice (Hicks, 1993; Goldstein and Selby, 2000; Kniep, 1986; Toh, 2004). However, there are many practical, pedagogical, and praxiological challenges that still need to be addressed adequately (Hicks, 2004; Mundy and Manion, 2008). First, the available resources are scarce (the area is under-funded), and the global education curriculum is fragmented and shadowed by the demands of the core curriculum (Hicks, 2004; Mundy and Manion, 2008). Second, many teachers do not have an understanding of what 'global education' is nor a grasp over the issues and related thematics (i.e., cultural, environmental, militarization, colonization), and therefore often feel ill-equipped to teach to these themes (Hicks, 2004; Mundy and Manion, 2008; Scholte, 2005). Third, there is substantial research indicating that teachers in the west

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

have little knowledge and understanding about racism, discrimination, inequality, and other worldviews/perspectives, and, possess stereotypical beliefs about various racial, ethnic, and cultural groups (Dei, 1996; Ghosh, 2002; Nieto and Bode, 2008; Sleeter, 2001), thereby stunting the prospects for cultivating global literacy and building international/intercultural solidarity. Lastly, global education remains heavily "west-centric" thereby excluding "Other" epistemologies and ontologies (Arnove and Torres, 2007; Burbules and Torres, 2000; Inayatullah, 1998; Scholte, 2005).

In Canadian classrooms for example, CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency) produces educational materials for teachers. Findings from the National Advisory Committee on Development Education reports that despite the positive findings that global education is being actively pursued in some Canadian classrooms "it seems that the Canadian people still have very little idea of what this whole subject is about, very little idea of the globality involved, the integration of issues, and the connection of Canada to this world of changes. It is still seen in terms of foreign aid: we are aiding them (Cronkhite, 2000). Similarly, Mundy and Manion's (2008) study with Canadian elementary school teachers and administrator's found that although they recognized the term "global education," they do not have a conceptual grasp of it. Teachers and administrators indicated that global education centred around the teaching of "Others" in different countries, educating Canadian students about how not to take things for granted comparatively, and is about "fundraising".

A document analysis pertaining to India's national curriculum indicates that there is no direct program of studies on global education (as defined in the West) per se. However, themes related specifically to global education such as education for peace, multiculturalism, human rights, gender equality, and environmental education, international solidarity are found in the 2005 National Curriculum Framework in the National Focus Group Position Paper 3.4 "Education for Peace" (NCERT, 2006). Core concepts of peace in Indian education as derived from UNESCO (2001) centre around

i. Absence of tensions, conflicts and wars;
ii. Non-violent societal system i.e., society without structural violence;
iii. Absence of exploitation and injustice of any kind;
iv. International cooperation and understanding;
v. Ecological balance and conservation;
vi. Peace of mind. (Pandey, 2004: 3-4)

Related values include love, compassion, harmony, tolerance, caring and sharing, interdependence, and spirituality (Pandey, 2004). It is important to note that the distinction between education for peace and peace education was emphasized given its pedagogical implications.

> Education for peace is different from peace education. In the latter, peace is subject in the syllabus. In the former, peace becomes the shaping vision of education. This implies a paradigm shift in the total transaction of education. Currently, the enterprise of education is driven by market forces. Education for peace is not antagonistic to the market, but it does not recognise the market as the purpose of education. The market is only a part of our life-world. Education for peace is education for life, and not merely training for livelihood. Equipping individuals with the values, skills, and attitudes they need to be wholesome persons who live in harmony with others and as responsible citizens is the goal of education for peace (NCERT, 2006: 1).

Given the increased involvement of international agencies in Indian education, Grewal (2004: 36-37) expands on the above by articulating that the themes of peace education can also be integrated with UNESCO's themes of (1) armament – arms race, arms trade, disarmament; (2) political system – capitalism, globalisation, discrimination, oppression conflicts; and (3) developmental problems – poverty, exploitation, (neo)colonialism, liberalisation of economy. As Aggarwal (2009a: 191-192) points out, the thematics within the 2005 National Curriculum Framework and the National Focus Group Position Papers run alongside "the desire to live together in our society on the one hand, and the global village on the other". Heavy investment in education by the

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

Indian government post-1991 is creating educational shifts towards an emphasis on education for modernization and meeting the demands of the global economy (Aggarwal, 2009b; 2008; Mukhopadhyay, 2007). Examples include an emphasis on digital teaching methods, computerized instruction, science and technology, vocational education, access to the knowledge economy, and increased literacy rates (Aggarwal, 2009b; 2008; Mukhopadhyay, 2007).

Given this nascent and emergent nature of any form of "global education" in Indian schooling, is what prompted the study around this theme with the view to begin to uncover current constructions of the global/ization, global education and globalism and the prospects for critical approaches to global education that prompted questioning of global orders while adopting a historical perspective, i.e., the march of colonization and the place for a decolonizing and anti-colonial pedagogical approach to global education given India's tryst with colonization.

4. Case Study Research: Preliminary Understandings of "Global Education" Pedagogy in Urban Indian Schools

Through interpretive case study research, the research examined ways in which Indian education is currently engaging in *global education* (as defined in the West) by focussing on urban secondary schools in Delhi vis-à-vis the perspectives and understandings of secondary education teachers and students, academics from higher education and research institutes, and educational administrators, planners and curriculum developers. The study was delimited to Delhi and select school sites given that it is the capital city of India and is the center for numerous national institutes and educational bodies, and secondly because of its diversified cosmopolitan demographics (urban, rural, religious and ethnic diversity) and associated socio-cultural dynamics, not to mention a segment of the population that has traveled abroad/has diasporic connectivity. Despite these observations, as stated by an Indian academic (research participant), it is important to note that "there are many Indias in India…[and that]…Delhi is a very unique city

in India in that it is more comparable to places like London, Germany, New York; it does not represent the vast diversity within India". Therefore, oversimplification and over-generalization of the findings of this study need to be avoided, not to mention that this are observations based on a prelimary analysis of a selection of some of the total data pool generated for/during this research.

A qualitative research methodology was employed to understand how participants "make sense of their world and the experiences they have in the world" (Merriam, 2001: 6), and how they interpret and construct the world in which they live in. Four different schools in Delhi that focussed on global education (as defined in the West) were the case study sites for the research. Methods of data collection included: focus group sessions, in-depth open-ended interviews, school and classroom observations, as well as curricula/document analysis to examine "official knowledge" and pedagogy (Apple, 2000). Employing a multi-method approach to better understand participants' perspectives helps to not only ensure the trustworthiness of the research findings but gain stronger phenomenological insights in constructing total meanings (Creswell, 1994; Denzin and Lincoln, 2005).

Given the existing heterogeneity of schools within India (i.e., government-run, Indian-run private schools, Western-run private schools, gender-based schools, CBSE vs ICSE curriculum, etc), the school site selection was purposive as the attempt was to find the most probable sites for "global education" inclusions in the curriculum. The common denominators between the four schools are as follows: (i) they are all Indian-run schools that follow the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) system, (ii) have student and teaching populations that are heterogeneous in terms of religious and cultural background, (iii) urban middle class schools catering to consumer-elite social groups and (iv) have English as the medium of instruction. *School 1* is a private, upper-middle class, gender-mixed school with primary and secondary age students. *School 2* is a renowned elite upper-middle class "brand-name" franchised private secondary school that is gender-mixed. *Schools 3 and 4* are both brother and sister gender-segregated Christian schools established during the

colonial period with primary and secondary age students of all socio-economic backgrounds.

Data were collected from a total of 75 secondary students who were either enrolled in a political science and/or economics class given that Principals indicated that curriculum material on globalization (and some of the related themes) was located in these classes. In *School 1*, a focus group was conducted with 7 mixed gendered students; in *School 3*, a focus group was conducted with 8 male students; and in *School 4*, two separate focus groups were conducted with two sets of 30 female students during class time. A total of 11 female secondary school teachers from various disciplines, and 3 female school Principals were interviewed individually for 1.5 to 2 hours. Outside school settings, 26 academics were interviewed for their perspectives on global education/teaching in Delhi schools.

5. Research Findings

Data thematics centering around: (a) perspectives and understandings of globalization, (b) global education, and (c) the pedagogical prospects for an anti-colonial global education are introduced in the following segments. Select quotes and document-related data are presented as emergent themes with the understanding/caution that this is a preliminary analysis of select data sets and that the shared research findings, while indicative of some of the key "emergent themes" are still in a state of elaboration/explication.

Perspectives and Understandings of Globalization

A majority of participants were of the view that India is currently "undergoing a rapid transformation of some kind" rooted in globalization as evidenced by the overwhelming presence of "TNCs and their products." As one academic explained:

> Societally speaking, we know this change is here and for now, we are taking things as they come, and you can say there is some improvising as we go along because we don't know what it (globalization) is

> suppose to be like within India. So together, we are all creating the society together based on what we see, based on what is happening around us, its impact, and our interpretation and interactions with the whole thing.

All participants articulated the beginnings of globalization in Europe, with acceleration after World War II which observed the global integration of "economics," "market demands," "trade," "investment," "exchange," "profit," and "development." However, the assessment of this integration differed significantly between participants. For instance, academics and most school teachers saw globalization as "a re-colonizing phenomena that is not favourable to the 'Third World'". For secondary school students, on the other hand, the material outcomes associated with globalization were "positive" and "exciting," particularly with regards to "development." As one student explained:

> It is very wonderful for us because now we have malls everywhere and you can get whatever you want in there from any part of the world, this is good because you don't have to travel there to get what you want. We have all of the latest things here. Our metro system is rockin' and you can go anywhere in Delhi now, this is something which you couldn't do previously. These things are changing all around us and it is very good actually… Why should we not have these things in our country.

Furthermore, in defining globalization, some students regarded British colonization as "positive," given that the British provided "trains, roads, and English" though they did not agree with the British using Indians as a cheap source of human labour for their own gain. "Trains and roads make traveling easier and because of English we can compete in the global market economy." When this perspective was shared with teachers and academics, although it raised concerns for them, it was explained away as a "generation gap."

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

> We have seen so many things in India over the past decades. Children today, they are always with their computers and they have no interest in history. They are into the internet and studying. For them, it is something that happened long ago, but for us no. We have school functions in which we celebrate India's Independence, but that's all it is for these children; a historical day.

Although a small percentage of secondary school students were critical of globalization they indicated that they "do not have enough knowledge or background to make an informed argument…but want to definitely learn more about it."

When discussing Indian society's overall perspective on globalization, there was a general consensus (among teachers, students and academics) that it was regarded as "positive" because of the potential economic prospects it has to offer. As one academic explained:

> There are people who believe that these latest economic reforms have done wonders for India than compared to previous economic policies. There use to be so much poverty here, you can't imagine; people had nothing to eat it was so bad at one time, I have seen this in my lifetime. We were struggling as a nation because of colonialism. We have joined the market, we have these TNCs that have come to India and I have seen with my own eyes how the kids are getting jobs and employment and how they are earning a living and becoming self-sufficient and what not…. There is still poverty yes, but it is reducing slowly than what it use to be, you can see the middle class here everywhere…but conditions for those already marginalized have worsened and this is of concern to us naturally. But even they too now believe that globalization is important…you see this everywhere in the schools today; even the poor want to send their children to English schools so they can have a good job and a better life than what they have now.

Globalization was also regarded as "inevitable" and so too was participation in the market economy both at the

national/international and individual level. However, participation in the market economy did not center around colonizing thematics such as those found in the West (TNCs, "helping," Christian-aid work), but rather as a depiction/manifestation of a "collective humanity". As one curriculum specialist explained:

> Western society and Indian society have different perspectives. We are very much a values-based society, you have seen this in our curriculum now. We give much values when educating our children to make sure they develop certain values, ethics, and behaviour. For us in India we believe in *Vasudheive Kutumbkam*, which means the world as a family. For us, this is how we view the world and the people in it. For us, the whole world is one family, doesn't matter your country, your religion, your race, we are all part of the humanity and one family. Because of this, we believe in living together in peace.

"Global Education" (as Defined in the West) in Urban Delhi Schools

In the Indian context, the term "global education" is often defined as "going abroad to the West for post-secondary studies" (Administrator). Although there are a number of reputable Universities in India, a "brand name degree from a Western University like America, or Australia is preferred." The synonymity between "global" and "Western" was a noteworthy finding in relation to the general theoretical point around the continuity of the colonial project, as is made evident by statements like this.

Delving into research conversations with participants on "global education" required a brief conceptual explanation/backgrounder on my part. Although students, teachers and academics indicated that there is no such set/designated area of study within the Indian curriculum, all were clear on what "global education (based on my sharing around what it means in the West) meant. In discussing the ways in which such a "global education" is taken up in schools and curricula, partcipant teachers were keen to discuss this thematic by describing and showing the

various classroom and school-based pedagogical activities they employ. Examples include:

- Tree planting.
- Afternoon science club. This year's theme was seeking alternative fuel sources that reduce pollution.
- Writing research reports on influential Indian women.
- Drawing and painting pictures of peace and/or constructing moulds that represent students' ideas of peace.
- Discussing world issues, such as the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.
- Acknowledging all cultural and religious days in the morning announcements by the School Principal. Teachers teach about them as well and celebrate them during school time.

School 1 has an existing exchange program with a British school in which to "learn about globalization and cultures." As one teacher explained:

> We were approached by a British school some years back and agreed to have this cultural exchange with them. Their students come here and we also go there. Basically the British children get an opportunity to see how we live and our students also get an opportunity to see how they live. I don't think it will continue past this year because the (British) teacher has indicated their government will not be providing further funding.…Overall I thought the exchange was okay to experience, but there were times that I felt that we were not treated very well…you know simple things like not regarding us as professionals as if only we had something to learn and they did not…Anyways, I believe some of the children still keep in touch with their friends abroad so at least that is something very good.

In, *School 2,* arguably the most elitist school (based on observable material indicators and school clientele), both Principal and teachers discussed how their students attend the annual United Nations' youth forums abroad in which

world issues are discussed and resolutions are sought and developed collectively with student representatives from other nations. Participants confidentally indicated that "our students represent all of the children in India at this global gathering."

For *Schools 3 and 4*, work related to the thematics of global education is addressed locally. These schools work to actively address global issues identified in the Millennium Development Goals such as HIV/AIDS, poverty and illiteracy, locally. For these school, the global is the local; this community service is carried out during assigned school time, for credit.

Pedagogical Prospects for Anti-Colonial Education

As previously indicated, secondary school students regarded globalization as an unproblematic positive, particularly given the "development" aspect. When discussing potentially negative aspects or impacts of globalization, students indicated they were not aware of any. To get at students' perspectives on pressing critical issues associated with neoliberalization in India, I engaged students in a conversation about the realities of mining, the encroachment of TNCs, displacement, and exploitation currently being experienced by of the Adivasis/Scheduled Tribes (see Kapoor, 2007; 2009). Students indicated that they were "not aware of these kinds of happenings in India" and were surprised to learn of this. Based on students' incessant questions, I provided a detailed background of the violations against the Adivasis as a result of the impacts of neoliberal globalization and economic "development" (Kapoor, 2007; 2009). On concluding our discussion, I asked students whether the knowledge and insights they just gained have affected their perspectives on neoliberal "development" in India in any way, and all of the students said "it did." I then asked students if they were open to having such discussions as a part of their school experience and they unananimously agreed that it would be a good idea. One student expressed his concerns around not fully understanding globalization and globalism as follows:

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

> We like that the companies from abroad are coming and developing India because we want the proper infrastructures that exist elsewhere in the world, so in that way globalization is very much needed here, so that is a positive aspect of globalization. Our government does nothing for us you see. They fight amongst themselves and they are completely unaware of what their duties are; what can we do? But this research and information you have told us, this is not right what the government is doing. It should not be treating Indians in this way. In fact, we really enjoyed learning about this and talking with you, we have learned something.

In discussing students' perspectives and understandings of globalization, both, during focus-group discussions and classroom teaching, it was found that students regarded the entry of TNCs in India as "one of the best things that is happening in India right now because of the job prospects." When we discussed the exploitation of resources and discrepancy in wage labour, or what is referred to as the "coloniality of labour" (Quijano, 2000), students accepted having TNCs in India given that "they create employment." As one student said "we will take whatever job we can get, what else are we going to do? We are not going to tell them this is wrong. They will find a thousand other people to do the job." In pursuing this further, a critical discussion of globalization ensued.

> Our labour should not be exploited by these foreign companies. We should be given the same wages as everyone else for the job that we are doing. They are here in India using our resources and we are not saying anything to them when they export everything from here. In fact, I am better understanding why they are here…it is for their benefit basically, to make money through profiting from our inexpensive labour….You have to look at how the world is, we really can't do much right now. Our economy is rising which is good but to get at the same level as them in the market will take some time.

To further engage students during focus-group discussions and classroom discussions around the various thematics of globalization, we discussed the recent violent attacks on Indian post-secondary students in Australia. Initially, students were divided on the issue as to whether it was racially motivated or based on media (television and internet) reports they viewed, and secondly because of their perception of Indian success around the globe.

> You see, we Indians are doing very well globally. If you look in America today for example, everybody is wearing Indian clothes and watching Indian movies like Slumdog Millionaire, and a lot of the music nowdays is mixed up with Indian beats and things, so they like our culture….I have family abroad and they are all very successful, so in this way, we are very successful people no matter where we go.

In response, a student who also has family abroad stated "…when I visit my family in the UK, there is racism there; people will tell you to your face…They see us Indians as inferior, I know this. So in that way it is not as wonderful as you have said it is." In facilitating a critical dialogue (classroom and group) in which multiple perspectives were collectively shared as to whether the attacks were racially-based or not, including a discussion on "race" and racism given that the majority of students had indicated they had not experienced at all, the majority of students indicated that the attacks were racially motivated and/or did not entirely dismiss "race" as a factor, and demonstrated an awareness that inequality does indeed exist in the world today. As one student stated "we are labeled a Third World developing country, it doesn't matter to them that our economy is doing very well. I don't think they have a right to treat us as Third class citizens; we never regard them in such a way. It is not how we are as Indians."

When the above findings were shared and discussed with teachers, they were pleased to learn about students' critical insights and their openness is engaging in such discussions. They indicated that a lack of engagement with local/national issues is primarily due to their professional

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

obligations to adhere to the curriculum given the pressures associated with the year-end national examinations.

> We are required to teach what is in the curriculum and textbooks….A very big part of our responsibility is to prep our students for their national exams; this is very important for these childrens' further studies and the competition is very high. These children are under so much pressure, it is really very unbelievable, and we must ensure we are always focusing on this when we teach….The majority of them will study further so we have to really work hard with them. It doesn't really leave much time for this unfortunately.

Based on teacher interviews, it is clear that there were three main categories of teachers represented among participants. Type one teaches strictly to the textbook and curriculum as it reflects her/his understanding of the material. Type two teaches strictly to the textbook and curriculum not because it is a reflection of her/his knowledge base but rather rather s/he is professionally bound despite knowing alternative perspectives. Type three, the most unique, teaches to the curriculum and provides alternative perspectives. As one type three teacher explained:

> Students love my class! In fact these students enjoy talking about social and political topics and they want to learn something beyond just the test test test….All of my students receive good marks and do well on their exams…. I have never had a problem with a parent ever, and I have been teaching now for over 20 years. These are my children also, so I want all the best for them, so it is about making sure they understand the society they live in; not everything has to be about what is happening elsewhere in the world….My girls tell me about what is happening to women in America, or Africa, and I tell them back, what is happening to the women here? They know more about what is happening elsewhere; what kind of citizens am I creating if they don't even understand their own local environment? … I know the exams are important but they are not everything. Until someone

> tells me to stop, I will continue to open my girls' eyes to what is happening all around them here. I want that they have the knowledge to understand and live and grow in society.

During my school and classroom observations as a participant-observer, representations found in Western classrooms of global education (as defined in the West) such as white doves and peace symbols were also present in these schools. When I asked teachers how they arrived at such representations, I discovered that teachers access their resources "from the internet…UNESCO and those kinds of sites" as resources on global/peace education are not readily available locally.

6. Discussion

This research suggests although neoliberal globalization is increasingly evident in India, Indian education is not preparing students to critically understand the ways in which the local is being affected by the forces of neoliberal globalization. Disproportionate emphasis is placed on production, consumption, investment, and participation in the world economy, and school and classroom activities that centred around the thematics of global education (as defined in the West) were done so via UNESCO's framework and resources thereby securing the colonial project (Morrow and Torres, 2000; Spring, 2009) by not allowing space for local onto-epistemes as well as a platform to critically engage with the local-global issues, realities, impacts, root causes and solutions to increasing structural violence being encouraged, if not directly caused by neoliberalization. In the overall analysis of education and schooling in Delhi (based on the data for this study that has been analysed thus far), it is becoming increasingly evident that it is the hegemonic structures themselves that are being viewed and praxied as emancipatory given the belief of the permanence and inevitability of neoliberal globalization. What is therefore urgently required in Indian education and schooling is an interruption of the romantic fallacy "that the world is becoming a better place to live in through an

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

intensification of economic interdependence, technological interconnectedness, and cultural linkage" (Behdad, 2006: 76).

It was clear that Macaulayian education continues to impact and shape Indian education, and as Krishna, John and Sundaram (1970: 2) point out "the real fact is that our educators and planners are themselves the products of a Macaulayan education which was oriented towards encouraging deracination, diffidence, and imitation". At present, the findings suggest that recurrent impact of colonial education in India in which "western knowledge is no longer seen as only one mode of knowing but as knowledge itself" (Seth, 2007: 3) is deeply penetrated within the structures and educational agents themselves. In understanding the cognitive imperialistic relationship between colonialism and de-colonization, Nandy (1998: 63) reminds us that "national freedom, however, does not automatically reinstate the authentic self-hood of a culture.... India's colonial past, too is part of its living history. Neither can the spirit of nationalism wipe it away".

As indicated by this preliminary analysis of case study data, what seems to be required is heavy engagement with an "anti-colonial global education/praxis", informed by the work of anti/critical colonial scholars (Dussel, 2000; Escobar, 2004; Mignolo, 2000; Nandy, 1998; Quijano, 2000). Anti-colonial education has as its foundation an anti and/or post-globalist perspective which suggests that modernity's problems do not require modern solutions (Escobar, 2004: 208), but rather are calling for (in the face of global empire) "new anti-capitalist imaginaries...the emphasis on non-Eurocentric perspectives on globality...[and]...place-based epistemologies, economies and ecologies". Furthermore, anti-colonial education requires as a whole "intra-modern perspectives" (Escobar, 2004: 210) which challenge the prevailing discourse on the inevitability of development, modernity, and globalism and offer prospects for "transition" (Escobar, 2004: 211). A case in point is Dussel's (2000) conception of "transmodernity" and the "transmodern project" which opens epistemological and ontologically spaces around the hidden omitted side of modernity, namely the violence associated with the rise of Europe – colonialism, slavery, oppression of peripheral groups, etc vis-à-vis the

"coloniality of power" (Quijano, 2000: 473) and "unmask the hegemonic process of modernization" resulting in a "pluritopic hermeneutics" (Mignolo, 2000: 16-18) to allow for a multicentric framework of global education that extends beyond hegemonic Eurocentric onto-epistemes to address structural violence in North-South nations.

Engagement with "race" and racism remains a salient component of anti-colonial education which moves beyond the recognition of the existence of "race" and racism (biological, cultural, and the "new" racism) to an understanding of how and why "race" and racism continue to drive globalization, and encourages praxis which attempts to interrupt and dismantle the structure(s) which distributes the world's population into "ranks, places, and roles" (Quijano, 2000: 535) in the name of economics.

Anti-colonial global education provides a platform within educational institutions to disrupt its role as a site for reproducing colonial constructions vis-à-vis teaching, pedagogy, curriculum, policies, and practices, which have historically been, and continue to be used to sustain the "core and periphery," "North and South," "colonizer and colonized," "First World and Third World," "West and Rest," and/or "developed and developing" divide. Although India is emerging as a global economic power, it continues to be classified as a developing country (South) which is facing ever-the challenges of poverty and inequality as a result of centuries of foreign domination. "Southern states have become trapped in a system of exploitation that forces them to be dependent on the North for capital and locks them into an unfair trading relationship" (Sens and Stoett, 2005: 22) in which the uniqueness and relevance of their own respective economies are disregarded (Prakash, 2009), while the wealth accumulated by the "developed" world continues to come at the expense of those in the South (Arrighi, 2005). Anti-colonial global/education is imperative if education is a to play a part in rupturing colonial control and the associated culture-race-economic violence.

Based on case study research conducted in urban secondary schools in Delhi, with secondary education teachers and students, academics from higher education and research institutes, and educational administrators, planners and curriculum developers, it would seem that the

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

prospects for and necessity of an anti-colonial global education in India is plausible as is seemingly evident from emergent themes and findings pertaining to anti-colonial pedagogy (TNCs, unpacking racism, and violence on the Adivasis) wherein, for instance, some students indicated an openness to engage with such educational experiences. It is apparent that there is an urgent need to formally introduce anti-colonial global/education in Indian education/schooling given the dehistoricization around the history and legacy of colonialism that was clearly articulated by students. The absence of such a critical global pedagogy will otherwise ensure that all encounters with the "core" will continue to ignore centuries of accumulated violence and help to reproduce the illusion of an uncritical appraisal of global promise.

References

Aggarwal, J.C, (2007). *Education Policy in India: 1992 and Review 2000 and 2005.* Delhi: Shipra Publications.

Aggarwal, J.C, (2008). *Educational Reforms in India for the 21st Century*. Delhi: Shipra Publications.

Aggarwal, J.C, (2009a). *Recent developments and trends in education*. Delhi: Shipra Publications.

Aggarwal, J.C, (2009b). *Education in the emerging Indian society*. Delhi: Shipra Publications.

Altbach, P.G, and Kelly, G.P (eds), (1978). *Education and colonialism.* New York: Longman.

Amin, S, (1991). "The ancient world-systems versus the modern capitalist world system", *Review*, vol. XIV, no. 3, Summer, pp. 349-385.

Appelbaum, R.P, and Robinson, W.I (eds), (2005). *Critical globalization studies*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M, (2000). *Cultural politics and the text, in official knowledge.* New York: Routledge.

Arrighi, G, (2005). "Globalization in world-systems perspective", in R.P. Appelbaum and W.I. Robinson (eds), *Critical globalization studies.* New York: Routledge.

Arnove, R.F, and Torres, C.A, (eds), (2007). *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (3rd ed.). Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Back, L, and Solomos, J, (eds), (2002). *The theories of race and racism.* London: Routledge.

Bales, K, (1999). *Disposable people: New slavery in the global economy*. Berkeley: University of California.

Balibar, E, and Wallerstein, W, (2005). *Race, nation, class: Ambiguous identities.* London, UK: Bookmarque Ltd.

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

Basu, A, (1978). "Policy and conflict in India: The reality and perception of education", in P.G Altbach and G.P Kelly (eds), *Education and colonialism.* New York: Longman.

Behdad, A, (2006). "On globalization, Again!", in A. Loomba, S. Kaul, M. Bunzl, A. Burton, and J. Esty (eds), *Postcolonial studies and beyond*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Beaud, M, (2001). *A history of capitalism: 1500 – 2000.* Monthly Review Press: New York.

Bello, W, (2002). *Deglobalization: Ideas for a new world economy.* London, UK: Cox & Wyman, Reading.

Bhagwati, J.N, (2004). *In defense of globalization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Blaut, J.M, (1970). "Geographic models of imperialism", *Antipode,* vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 118-125.

Blaut, J. M, (1993). *The colonizer's model of the world.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Boas, F, (1911). *The mind of primitive man.* United States of America: The Crowell-Collier Publishing Company.

Bock, P.K, (1988). *Rethinking psychological anthropology: Continuity and change in the study of human action.* New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Bohannan, P, and Glazer, M, (1988). *High points in anthropology* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Burbules, N.C, and Torres, C.A, (eds), (2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives.* New York: Routledge.

Capella, J.R, (2000). "Globalization, a fading citizenship", in N.C. Burbules and C.A. Torres (eds), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives.* New York: Routledge.

Chase-Dunn, C, and Gills, B, (2005). "Waves of globalization and resistance in the capitalist world-system: Social movement and critical

global studies", in R.P. Appelbaum and W.I. Robinson (eds), *Critical globalization studies*. New York: Routledge.

Creswell, J.W, (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cronkhite, L, (2000). "Development education: Making connections north and south", in T. Goldstein and D. Selby (eds), *Weaving connections: Educating for peace, social and environmental justice*. Toronto: Sumach.

Dei, G.S, (1996). *Theory and practice: Anti-racism education.* Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Denzin, N.K, and Lincoln, Y.S, (2005). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Dussel, E, (2000). *Europe, modernity, and eurocentrism: The semantic slippage of the concept of "Europe"*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Escobar, A, (2004). "Beyond the third world: Imperial globality, global coloniality and anti-globalization social movements", *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 25, pp. 207-230.

Fanon, F, (1968). *Black skin, white masks.* New York: Grove Press.

Foster, J.B, (2006). *Naked imperialism: The US pursuit of global dominance.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Frank, A.G, (2000). *ReOrient: Global economy in the Asian age.* University of California Press: Berkeley.

Freire, P, (1996). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum Publishing.

Fukuyama, F, (1992). *The end of history and the last man.* New York: AVON BOOKS INC.

Gélinas, J, (2002). "The pillars of the system", in R. Broad (ed.), *Global backlash: Citizen initiatives for a just world economy.* Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Tejwant K. Chana, PhD Candidate, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta)

Ghosh, R, (2002). *Redefining multicultural education* (2nd ed.). Toronto: Nelson Thomson Learning.

Goldberg, D.T, (2002). "Racial knowledge", in L. Back and J. Solomos (eds), *Theories of race and racism*. London: Routledge.

Goldstein, T, and Selby, D, (eds), (2000). *Weaving connections: Educating for peace, social and environmental justice.* Toronto: Sumach.

Gould, S.J, (1996). *The mismeasure of man.* New York: Norton.

Grewal, J.S, (2004). "Content and pedagogy for peace education", in S. Pandey (ed.), *Peace education: Self instructional package for teacher educators*. Delhi: Publication Department by the Secretary, National Council of Educational Research and Training.

Groff, L, and Smoker, P, (1996). "Creating global/local cultures of peace", in UNESCO (ed.), *From a culture of violence to a culture of peace*. Paris: UNESCO.

Hall, S, and Gieben, B, (2005). *Formations of modernity*. Cambridge: Open University Polity Press.

Harvey, D, (2003). *The new imperialism.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Held, D, and McGrew, A, (2007). *Globalization/Anti-Globalization: Beyond the great divide* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Hicks, D, (1993). "Preparing for the Millennium", *Alberta Global Education*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 18-27.

Hicks, D, (2004). "Teaching for tomorrow: How can futures studies contribute to peace education?", *Journal of Peace Education*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 165-178.

Hopkins, T.K, Wallerstein, I.M, et al., (1982). *World-system analysis: Theory and methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Ikeda, S, (1996). "The History of the Capitalist World-System vs. The History of the East-Southeast Asia", *Review*, vol. XIX, no. 1, Winter, pp. 49-77.

Inayatullah, S, (1998). "Listening to non-western perspectives", in D. Hicks and R. Slaughter (eds), *Futures education: The world yearbook of education.* London, UK: Kogan Page.

Kamat, A.R, (1985). *Education and social change in India.* Bombay: Somaiya Publications PVT. LTD

Kapoor, D, (2007). "Subaltern social movement learning and the decolonization of space in India", *International Education,* vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 10-41.

Kapoor, D, (2009). "Adivasis (original dwellers) "in the way of" state-corporate development: Development dispossession and learning in social action for land and forests in India", *McGill Journal of Education*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 55-78.

Klare, M.T, (2001). *Resource wars. The new landscape of global conflict.* New York: Metropolitan Books.

Kniep, W.M, (1986). "Defining a global education by its content", *Social Education,* vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 437-446.

Krishna, D, John, V.V, and Sundaram, P.S, (eds), (1970). *Indian education today: Prospects and perspectives.* Jaipur: Rajasthan University Press.

Lawson, P, (1998). *The East India Company: A history.* London: Longman Group UK Limited.

Loomba, A, Kaul, S, Bunzl, M, Burton, A, and Esty, J, (2006). *Postcolonial studies and beyond.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Magdoff, H, (1978). *Imperialism: From the colonial age to the present.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

McMichael, P, (2005). "Globalization and development studies", in R.P. Appelbaum and W.I. Robinson (eds), *Critical globalization studies.* New York: Routledge.

Memmi, A, (1991). *The colonizer and the colonized.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Merriam, B, (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco: Joseey-Bass.

Mignolo, W.D, (2000). *Local histories/Global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Morrow, R, amd Torres, C.A, (2000). "The State, Globalization, and Educational Policy", in N.C Burbules and C.A Torres (eds), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives.* New York: Routledge.

Mukhopadhyay, M, (2007). "Indian education since independence", in M. Mukhopadhyay and M. Parhar (eds.), *Education in India: Dynamics of development.* Delhi: Shipra Publications.

Mundy, K, and Manion, C, (2008). "Global education in Canadian elementary schools: An exploratory study", *Canadian Journal of Education*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 941-974.

Nandy, A, (1998). *Exiled at home: Comprising, at the edge of psychology, the intimate enemy, creating nationality.* Delhi: New York: Oxford University Press.

National Policy, (1986). *National Policy on Education*. Retrieved from http://education.nic.in/NatPol.asp

NCERT, (2006). *National Focus Group Position Paper 3.4: Education for Peace*. Delhi: Publication Department by the Secretary, National Council of Educational Research and Training.

Neeraj, J, (2007). *Globalisation or recolonisation.* Pune: Alka Joshi.

Nieto, S, and Bode, P, (2008). *Affirming diversity: The socio-political context of multicultural education* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

Norberg, J, (2003). *In defense of global capitalism.* Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute.

Panagariya, A, (2002). *India's Economic Reforms. What Has Been Accomplished? What Remains to Be Done?* Retrieved from http://www.adb.org/Documents/EDRC/Policy_Briefs/PB002.pdf

Pandey, S, (ed.), (2004). *Peace education: Self instructional package for teacher educators.* Delhi: Publication Department by the Secretary, National Council of Educational Research and Training.

Peet, R, and Hartwick, E, (2009). *Theories of development: Contentions, arguments, alternatives.* New York: The Guilford Publications.

Pike, G, and Selby, D, (1988). *Global teacher, global learner.* England: Hodder and Stoughton.

Polanyi, K, (2001[1944]). *The great transformation: The political and economic origins of our time.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Prakash, B.A, (ed.), (2009). *The Indian economy since 1991: Economic reforms and performance.* New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd, licencees of Pearson Education in South Asia.

Quijano, A, (2000). *Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America.* Durham: Duke University Press: Nepantla: Views from South: 1.3.

Reardon, B, (1988). *Educating for global responsibility.* New York: Teachers College.

Robbins, R.H, (2008). *Global problems and the culture of capitalism* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.

Robertson, R.T, (1986). *The making of the modern world: An introductory history.* London: The Bath Press, Avon.

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

Sanyal, K, (2007). *Rethinking capitalist development: Primitive accumulation, governmentality & post-colonial capitalism.* New Delhi: Routledge.

Scholte, J.A, (2005). *Globalization: A critical introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sens, A, and Stoett, P, (2005). *Global politics: Origins, currents, directions* (3rd ed). Toronto, Ontario: Nelson, Thomson Canada Limited.

Seth, S, (2007). *Subject lesson: The western education of colonial India.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Sikri, R, (2009). *Challenge and strategy: Rethinking India's foreign policy.* New Delhi: SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte Ltd.

Singharoy, D.K, (2004). *Peasant movements in post-colonial India.* New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Sleeter, C.E, (2001). "Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools", *Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 52, pp. 94-106.

Spring, J, (2009). *Globalization of education: An introduction.* New York: Routledge.

Steger, M.B, (2003). *Globalization: A very short introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Stromquist, N.P, and Monkman, K, (eds), (2000). *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures.* Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Tawney, R.H, (1938). *Religion and the rise of capitalism.* Harmondsworth: Pelican Books.

Thakur, A.S, and Berwal, S, (2008). *Development of educational system in India: A source book for teacher educators and teacher-in-training.* Delhi: SHIRPA Publications.

Toh, S.W, (1993). "Bringing the world into the classroom: Global literacy and a question of paradigms", *Global education*, January.

Toh, S.H, (2004). "Education for international understanding toward a culture of peace: A conceptual framework", in V.F. Cawagas (ed.), *Education for international understanding toward a culture of peace. Teachers resource book.* Seoul, South Korea: Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding.

United Nations Development Program [UNDP], (2008). *Statistics of the Human Development Report.* Retrieved from www.hdr.undp.org.en/statistics/

Varma, S.N, (2007). *India's rise and Asia: Dynamics of growth and cooperative relations.* Retrieved from http://www.nabh.go.kr/board/data/policy/410/paper4.pdf

Wallerstein, I.M, (1974). *The modern world-system.* New York: Academic Press.

Wallerstein, I.M, (2004). *World-System Analysis: An Introduction.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Wild, A, (1999). *The East India company: Trade and conquest from 1600.* London: Harper Collins Publishers.

Wolf, M, (2004). *Why globalization works.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

World Bank, (2006). *World development report 2006. Overview: Equity and development.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

Young, G.M, (1935). *Speeches by Lord Macaulay with his minute on Indian education.* London: Humphrey Milford