

Committee II
Ethnocentrism vs. World Unity:
Impacts on Socialization and
Education

DRAFT - 9/15/88
For Conference Distribution Only

**UNIVERSAL VALUES VS. LOCAL PREFERENCES AND GUILT COMPLEXES
IN TRANSITION TO GLOBAL EDUCATION**

by

Alexander Shtromas
Department of Politics
and Contemporary History
University of Salford
Salford, ENGLAND

The Seventeenth International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences
Los Angeles, California November 24-27, 1988

© 1988, International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences

I. Where and How the Problem Arises

The problem put in the title of my paper arises in the first place in the fields of education in humanities. Education in sciences and technology is by its very nature universal and global. The Newtonian laws of mechanics, Einstein's theory of relativity, the physical laws of Boyle-Mariotte and Joule-Lenz are everywhere the same, attributed to the same persons, and included in the educational process everywhere equally. Quantum theory, wherever it is discussed, cannot avoid references to Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz and Louis-Victor de Broglie, and it is impossible to establish the origins of nuclear energy without mentioning the pioneering work of the Cavendish Laboratory in Cambridge and of people such as Lord Ernest Rutherford and Pyotr L. Kapitsa. Some arts are approaching similar universal standards. Among them logic, mathematics, visual arts, and music should be mentioned in the first place.

A special case is literature. Great nations with rich literary traditions are here the first that tend to succumb to ethnocentrism. Anglo-Saxon countries, no doubt, are the champions of such literary ethnocentrism. Students in Great Britain, Australia or the U.S. who do not study German may leave school without having ever heard of Schiller, Goethe or Heine, and Pushkin is associated for most of them with the name of their neighbours' dog rather than with that of mankind's greatest poet of whom, because he wrote in Russian, they have never heard at all. In terms of such literary ethnocentrism the Anglo-Saxons are closely followed by the

French- and Spanish-speaking peoples. The Germans fare here much better with their curricula including a great deal of Anglo-Saxon and French classics as well as a few prominent Russian and Spanish authors. Smaller European nations are perhaps the best at trying to absorb in their education the entire world's literary tradition. They are closely followed in this endeavour by the Japanese and Koreans.

Education in literature, and even in music and visual arts, as well as in certain aspects of sciences too, encounters special problems under ideocratic régimes. It is not so much ethnocentrism as ideological intolerance and selectivity applied on a universal, that is transnational, scale which is here the main issue. In Nazi Germany the so-called Jewish science, literature and art were forbidden and thus, to name but a few, Mendelsohn, Heine and Einstein became the "unmentionables". In both Nazi Germany and the USSR modern visual arts (e.g. abstract art) and music (e.g. serial music) were considered decadent and thus subversive - hence, together with their creators, they were excluded from the educational process. In the USSR at certain points in time genetics and cybernetics were proclaimed "false bourgeois sciences" and prohibited. All literature even slightly critical of the official ideologies, let alone of the political systems and leaders, is banned in ideocratic régimes. Hence, sometimes the best contemporary foreign authors may be excluded from the educational process whereas some insignificant but "friendly" ones are introduced as the most important representatives of the literature of a particular nation.

In the Soviet Union, for example, the communist English author James Aldridge, of whom very few people in England have ever heard, has been (and still is) portrayed as one of the most significant English novelists of this century. In summer 1988 the Soviet authorities decorated Aldridge for "an outstanding contribution to world literature" with one of the highest Soviet orders. George Orwell, on the contrary, when mentioned by the Soviet media before 1988 at all, was uniformly denounced as a reactionary literary charlatan. Only now, due to glasnost' and its present anti-Stalinist emphasis, Animal Farm has been made available to Russian readers for the first time and 1984 is promised to follow suit soon. Whether Aldous Huxley's The Brave New World will be also published in the USSR remains, however, to be seen. The recent declaration (January 1989) of the new Soviet Chief Ideologist Vadim Medvedev states that works which renounce the idea of socialism and which are thus directed against the Leninist foundations of the Soviet state will continue to be banned in the Soviet Union. Although this statement was made by Medvedev in response to the growing demands of publishing in the USSR the works of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, it leaves no doubt about the very principle of ideological censorship of literature remaining intact in the USSR, despite of glasnost'.

Similar examples could be quoted with regard to non-Communist or non-Nazi ideocracies, e.g. the theocratic Iran of the ayatollahs, the semi-theocratic Gadaffi régime in Libya or the Baasist régimes of Saddam Hussein in Iraq and Hafiz al-Assad in Syria. Under all ideocratic régimes even the study of the "acceptable" to these régimes world's truly great classical literature is subordinated to preset dogmatic ideological interpretations. In such a guise it becomes so boring an indoctrinational enterprise that it either kills the students' interest in world culture altogether or awakens in some of them the quest for true culture but rarely achieves ideological indoctrination, which it is supposed to serve.

Censorship and indoctrination in many aspects of education quite prominently figure also in a number of states that, though authoritarian, are not exactly ideocratic. In South Africa 18.000 books have been banned. In Pakistan students are still not permitted to study Darwin. In Zaire, a Music Censorship Commission guards against any impulse to sneak in a forbidden thought in rhyme or rhythm. Egypt pursues a ban on Bahai religion and the Egyptian educational system portrays it as an incarnation of evil itself. Similarly, in the education of many an Arab state, Israel, and thus the Jews as the nation of Israel, is demonised on an almost hysterical level: the students are taught that it is virtuous to kill Israelis, to inflict upon Israel any thinkable damage and that to seek the destruction of Israel is the sacred duty of every "conscious Arab". It goes without saying that the Israeli views and positions on contentious issues are banned; censorship does not allow them to appear either in the media or in school textbooks even for criticism and denunciation. Conversely, in Israel the educational system concentrates on presenting the plight of the Palestinians as mainly self- or Arab-inflicted and, despite of censorship being much weaker than in any of the Arab states, practically does not allow to present to the Israeli students an authentic Arab point of view blaming Israel - often not without justice - for the sufferings inflicted upon the Palestinian Arabs and the scorn with which it treats them.

II. What is the Problem's Substance

Bias, double standards and other infringements of universal values figure most prominently in religious and historical education. We will leave alone here the education in these fields as construed by ideocratic régimes. They teach and preach only one creed to the exclusion and refutation of all the others and arrange history (by ignoring some facts, names and events, willfully exaggerating or diminishing others, and inventing, if need be, events and facts that have never taken place) so that it fits their particular ideological preferences and prescriptions as perfectly as possible. That much, as far as teaching of history in the USSR is concerned, has been ^{now} admitted by the Soviet authorities themselves who, because of that, even decided to cancel history exams for students graduating from schools in 1988. It remains to be seen how objective is going to be the new version of history that the Soviet authorities are supposed to approve this summer for the students to read during the next academic year. Judging by the current Soviet official pronouncements on historical matters, one could say with assurance that all the main ideological "sacred cows" of Soviet history will remain unrevised and the "sanctity" of the Bolshevik endeavour to transform Russia into the present Soviet socialist state is going to be vigorously reinforced. Nor are we going to delve here into the cases of indoctrination and censorship on religious and historical subjects taking place in theocracies and authoritarian régimes that are at war with a particular religion, philosophy or nation. Their biases and preferences

are rather obvious. What has, however, to be pointed out as strongly as possible is that even in the most liberal nation-states, educational standards suffer from the deeply entrenched tradition of religious and national self-righteousness. It is this self-righteousness which often clashes with universal humanitarian values. For from a self-righteous point of view the wars one's nation waged were always just, the enemies or competitors of that nation not simply wrong but very often entirely evil, and one's own nation's moral and cultural standards assumed to be if not entirely impeccable then in any case superior to those of the hostile or competing nations.

Universal standards by occupying an increasingly prominent place in national mentalities of the more advanced Western nations produce a clash with the entrenched tradition of self-righteousness with quite dramatic results - not only in education but in overall national self-awareness. One of such results is the so-called national "self-hatred" which represents an inversion of self-righteousness and which is responsible for a lot of confusion in educational curricula and practice; another is guilt complexes related to some national deeds that are contrary to the universal humanitarian standards and that are therefore difficult to accommodate into an educational system based on the traditions of national and religious self-righteousness. In many instances such shameful historical episodes are either entirely ignored or hushed up by the extant educational curricula. There is, for example, a lot of confusion about the treatment of British colonial history in British education; or of the fate of

American Indians in the USA education; and West German, Italian and Japanese educational systems are still experiencing grave difficulties in coping with the problems related to the emergence in their countries of the fascist-type régimes and with the role these countries played in World War II. Hence, not only self-centredness, self-congratulatory attitudes and prejudices against other religions and nations, but also national "self-hatred" and guilt complexes are the derivatives of self-righteousness. Consequently, the main problem in historical and religious education is the overcoming of the tradition of self-righteousness in a way that would make national education compatible with universal humanitarian standards without, at the same time, inducing national guilt complexes and self-hatred.

III. How to Begin to Overcome Ethnocentrism

Educational standards devised for overcoming ethnocentric self-righteousness should continue to be based on the extant principles that give priority to the study of the national language, literature, history, arts, geography, etc.. Priority should also be given to the study of the students' own religion. As it is already the case in many places now, the study of the national language should be extended to the study of classical and foreign languages (one of the foreign languages being studied on a par with the native one) and the study of national literature, history, arts and geography to that of the literature, history, arts and geography of the world at large. The emphasis on, and attention (e.g. the number of hours)

devoted to, "world studies" should be increased, with these studies acquiring a more systematic (i.e. less episodic) character.

More novel would be the proposition to introduce into educational curricula as an obligatory subject the study of the world's major religions other than one's own. That course should be taught either by the representatives of those "alien" religions or by non-religious experts on the religions in question. By no means should the study of other religions be left in the hands of the clergymen representing the students' own religious faith. The problem of ^{such "multifaceted"} religious education is especially complex in the secularized educational systems (not only the USSR's but also the USA's) where students receive religious instruction not in school but, if at all, in their own denominational churches.

It could be quite easily solved, however, by including the major religious texts, such as the Bible, the Koran, the Vedas and Upanishads, the Sutras, etc., into the curriculum of the course on world literature that should be made compulsory to all students. It is this solution that, in 1988, under the cloak of glasnost, Soviet educationalists have started vigorously to advocate in specialist publications and in the mass-media.

Every nation without exception has a historical, cultural and ethical heritage of which it can be justifiably proud by any standards. At the same time, in every nation's history are some "dark episodes" of which as such it should be made aware by educational means without losing face or being denigrated.

In the process of education students should also be taught about the negative or critical views on their nation's historical record propounded by the historians of other nations, both the supposedly hostile and neutral ones. This approach to teaching must be of course reciprocal - indigenous explanations of the contentious "dark episodes" should be presented to students of all nations as well as to the indigenous students. For example, the Prussian militaristic tradition, negatively assessed by almost all non-German (and many German) historians, should be explained in the context of the Golden Bull (1356) and the devastation ^{caused by} the Thirty Years War (1618-1648) in order to be properly assessed and understood. Every injustice has a plausible "good reason" in the eyes of the perpetrators of that injustice, and such reasons should be presented to the students however spurious they may seem to be from the victim's or even an outsider's point of view. In the process of education students should learn to put themselves into the shoes of their nation's competitors and alleged enemies and try thus to gain a much more balanced and wide view of the subject of their study. The old Roman principle audiatur et altera pars (Hear out the other party) must indeed become the first universal principle of historical education all over the world. Without the application of this principle ethnocentric biases in education will never be overcome.

This is, however, only the first part of revising the process of education in history. The second and more important and fundamental part should consist of an objective evaluation of the historical record which should be equally acceptable to

all national educational systems however conflicting with one another they may at present be.

IV. What Values Are Universal

The objective criteria for such universally acceptable evaluation were, in my view, adequately formulated by Immanuel Kant in his Perpetual Peace (1795), and I would suggest to use them as the main guide in our research on universally acceptable educational standards.

According to Kant, people are naturally divided by language and religion into separate entities. Each such separate human entity, or nation, is entitled to its own state and in fact is such a state, whether actually or as yet only potentially. Kant puts forward six preliminary conditions that in his view have to be fulfilled before perpetual peace among states could be established. The first two of these six conditions, which I deem to be most crucial to our purposes, are:

1. Cessation of hostility between states by a peace treaty providing for a mutually acceptable solution of all contentious problems and in the first place those that caused hostility. In Kant's own terms, "No peace treaty can be accorded that status if at its conclusion there had remained a latent cause of a new war". If such a latent cause of a new war remained in the peace treaty, such treaty would be no more than a mere cease-fire agreement. Kant is convinced that there are no such problems between states that could not be fully resolved by their mutual agreement, provided the states entering a peace

treaty are guided by the universal moral values and principles elaborated by Kant's moral philosophy. Kant believes that sooner or later all states will have to accept these universal moral values as the only alternative to peace established on their terms will be the peace of mankind's common cemetery.

2. Inviolable independence of every state, big or small.

"No state", Kant says, "... can be acquired by another state either by inheritance or exchange, purchase or gift", let alone by conquest or coercion. Thus for Kant, the corner-stone of a viably peaceful world order is the practical realization by every nation without exception of its primordial and inalienable right to establish and maintain an independent state. The incorporation of any actual or potential nation-state, in full or even partly, into another nation's state is a priori a gross injustice that is bound to foster enmity and war as long as that injustice is perpetrated. Kant concludes that for perpetual peace to materialise it is necessary for the extant states to agree that each nation should also be a state and that thus no nation state is entitled to include and/or contain within its borders another nation. Equal statehood for all nations is for Kant the primary universal moral value, the first principle safely to base perpetual peace upon.

There is, however, much more to making perpetual peace a reality than just the universal recognition of this particular principle of national independence and equal statehood for all nations. In Kant's view, the first definitive article of perpetual peace among states has to establish that the civil order of each state should be republican. Kant defines the .

republican civil order as the one that is based, "firstly, on the principles of individual liberty of the members of society (as people); secondly, on the principles of dependence of all (as subjects) on single common legislation; and, thirdly, on the law of equality of all (as citizens)". Only republican states could agree on each nation's equal and inviolable right to independent statehood; only in republican states the decisions on war and peace would require an agreement of the people, and the people who have to carry the burdens of war are not likely to give their agreement to wage war easily. This view of Kant has been indeed vindicated by latest historic experience. With one marginal exception (that of the so-called Roman Republic War of 1849 between at that time temporarily democratic Rome and France), there were no wars between liberal democratic states either in the 19th or the 20th centuries. (For more details, see: J. David Singer and Melvin Small, Resort to Arms: International and Civil Wars, 1816-1980, Beverley Hills, CA.: Sage, 1982, Table 4.2; R.J. Rummel, "On Fostering a Just Peace", International Journal on World Peace, Vol. I, No. 1, Autumn 1984, pp.4-15, esp. pp.10ff).

This first definitive article of perpetual peace, having provided for the universal establishment of a republican civil order, would create the necessary conditions for the conclusion of the second definitive article of perpetual peace, according to which a federation of free states is to be instituted and, consequently, a new basis for international law and its application created. This federation would have to be "a union of peoples but by no means a state of peoples". The state

benefits only one people and the co-existence of many peoples in one state would reduce them all to one people only, which would deny the fundamental right of each nation to equally independent statehood and thus also undermine the very foundations of the republican civil order.

For the federation of free states to remain stable, a third, and the last, definitive article of perpetual peace is necessary. According to that article, "the right of world citizenship should be limited by the conditions of universal hospitality", which means that foreigners are granted only the right of visiting a state without being treated by it as enemies but are not granted the automatic right of becoming that state's guests. The granting to a foreigner of the right to be another state's guest, as well as the rights of settlement and naturalization, will always have to remain an exclusive prerogative of the host states themselves. This clause on hospitality is aimed at effectively preventing any attempts at surreptitious colonization, forceful acculturation and assimilation of one nation by another and, thus, at securing the continuity of the federation in its original, stable and peaceful shape.

It follows that for Kant the basic universal value on which perpetual peace could securely rest is the rule of law, ensuring maximal equal freedom to all individuals and all nations, ^{established on a global scale.} The same basic universal value should be recognised as the underlying principle of a truly global education. The application of that value to the teaching of history of those ancient nations and city-states that have ceased to exist .

does not represent too much difficulty. Once applied to the uncontroversial historical past, that same value could then be extended to the evaluation and interpretation of the history of the existing nations and states.

Almost all nations in the course of their history have been both aggressors and victims of aggression, oppressors and victims of oppression. Both England and Russia, countries that later developed into huge colonial empires, were themselves colonised and ruled for centuries by the Vikings. In Britain that foreign rule was never formally terminated, but the Norman Vikings, having become the rulers of England, did not append the conquered country to their larger empire but made it the metropolis, a center from which they ruled other areas under their dominion (e.g. Normandie itself). Because of that, the Normans had to adjust to England, assimilate with it and thus acquire there a status of legitimate national rulers. This in time they managed to achieve. Within about two centuries from the year 1066, the trauma of foreign rule had almost entirely dissipated indeed, and the English nation recovered its consciousness of being independent, which it has never lost since. The same adaptation of Viking rulers to the ruled nation took place within about 150 years (during the mid 9th-end 10th centuries) in the Russian Viking state of Kievan Rus, which is regarded by all historians as the first and fully authentic Russian nation state. This state, however, was destroyed in the 13th century by the Tatar-Mongol invasion, as a result of which Russia, for about 300 years, was subjugated to ferocious foreign colonial yoke, a traumatic experience from which Russia has never fully recovered.

Poland, which is usually perceived as a constant victim of Russo-German imperial designs, has always been in its own right an imperial nation which for long centuries oppressed and tried, with some success, to assimilate the Ukrainians, Belorussians and even the non-Slavic "allied" Lithuanians. In the 16th and 17th centuries, Poland also attempted to get Sweden incorporated under the Polish crown, but, alas, to no avail. In the beginning of the 18th century the Swedes definitively defeated Poland and practically brought about the destruction of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (Rzeczpospolita Obojega Narodów) of which the main beneficiary was Russia whom Poland in the 16th-17th centuries also desperately tried to put under her control. After having lost the war against Russia (by the Nystat Treaty of 1721), the Swedes unconditionally conceded defeated Poland to Russia's "sphere of influence". The division of Poland followed shortly afterwards and was completed by 1795.

According to Kantian standards, the Spanish have to recognise that the conquest of Mexico and Peru, their rule of the Netherlands and attempts at conquering England in the 16th century represent shameful instances of Spanish history. Conversely, the English must admit that their treatment of Ireland throughout centuries belongs to the most abhorrent experiences recorded in human history. Generally speaking, by Kant, each nation's efforts at establishing independent statehood, resisting foreign assault and rule should be approved of, whereas all attempts by one nation at subjugating another nation to its rule, all instances of colonization and

incorporation of a separate nation into a larger imperial or nation-state system should be condemned. This principle provides the most important, universal value-based, guiding line for our understanding of the problems of the present world, where about 1800 nations are divided into only about 180 states, some of which can hardly qualify as even full-fledged nation states. (The borders of many extant states blatantly cut across natural ethnic boundaries; this is the case with a great number of new African and Asian states which inherited the artificial borders of former western colonial entities to which these states were the political successors, let alone the two German and two Korean states.)

Kantian values underlying his plan of perpetual peace also call for the approval of all movements in history that have sought to undermine despotic régimes in order to advance the republican civil order. According to Kantian criteria, the Glorious Revolution of 1688, the American Revolution of 1776, the French Revolution of 1789, the Russian Revolution of February 1917 have thus to be commended, as they were seeking to replace despotic rule by a republican régime; and, on the contrary, Pride's Purge, the Jacobine coup or the Bolshevik seizure of power should be condemned, as they sought to destroy the emergent republicanism and, when successful, introduced a new, and in most cases a much more ferocious, form of despotism. Foreign intervention by invitation and on behalf of the indigenous forces fighting for a republican civil order, such as General Lafayette's or Kosciuszko's troops' participation in the American war for independence, is also fully justified, as it corresponds to Kant's third definitive article concerning hospitality.

As mentioned above, Kant's concept of perpetual peace envisages the necessity of establishing a world federation of free states as opposed to the world state envisaged by the Marxist and some other concepts of mankind's future. The world federation of free states could also effectively be adopted as the universal value and goal on which global education should be based. Ensuring the freedom of every nation and its full independence in dealing with its internal problems, such a federation provides an ideal framework for effectively dealing with supra-national, regional and/or global, issues. Kant emphasizes that such a federal arrangement would submit all nations equally to the rule of international law and to the régime of arbitration and adjudication which would serve all of them as the firmest guarantee of peace and security. Global education could take up that Kantian point in order to dismantle with its help the very concept of an "enemy-nation" and to show that all conflicting issues between nations seeing each other at present as implacable enemies could be resolved amicably and on a permanent basis, provided all nations adhered to republicanist values and installed republican-type régimes.

Although in a nuclear age the guarantee of peace and security is, no doubt, the issue of primary and overriding importance, there are many other vitally important issues for mankind's survival that only a world federation of free states would be able effectively to tackle and solve. One of such issues, as Professor Klaus Schleicher tirelessly emphasizes in his pioneering works, is the protection of mankind's natural environment. Among other similar issues, one could name the

rational use, distribution and management of mankind's common resources: energy, world ocean, outer space, international territories (e.g. Antarctica); protection against famine, epidemic diseases, natural calamities and other disasters; regulation of the growth of the world's population and organization of rational use of the planet's manpower resources; effective protection of universally recognized human rights; and some others.

Against the background of the ever-growing need for international, indeed global, cooperation on these issues, most international conflicts would look rather petty and demand urgent resolution for the sake of making such a cooperation not simply possible but truly effective. This is one of the most important points that global education has to put forward and constantly emphasize. Global education, if it is worth that name, has to stress the fundamental unity of mankind's tasks and purposes, advocate global cooperation on all vital issues that affect mankind's survival and wellbeing, and, by proposing practical solutions to international conflicts, put these conflicts in their right perspective as concerning issues that, compared with unifying factors, are of secondary importance and that, given the good will to adhere to Kantian universal values, are also perfectly soluble.

V. How Global Education Could Be Introduced

Educators who are committed to the development of global education, after having agreed on adopting the Kantian concept of perpetual peace as the basis for universal values on which

global education should be based, could organise themselves into various national and international committees for revising the existing national curricula and textbooks. To proceed with their work fruitfully, such committees could adopt the methodology of repentance and self-limitation set out for nations as wholes by Alexander Solzhenitsyn in his essay "Repentance and Self-Limitation as Categories of National Life" written for the collection of articles, From Under the Rubble (1974), that he edited in Moscow and issued there as a samizdat publication which was later reprinted in the West.

According to Solzhenitsyn, mankind can be saved only if nations radically change their basic orientation from self-glorification and self-justification, that is from "blaming all the others - neighbours and the distant ones; geographic, economic, ideological competitors - and always justifying only oneself", to "repentance and search for one's own mistakes and sins". Speaking about Russia, Solzhenitsyn maintains that every Russian is to a certain degree an accomplice of the horrible crimes of the Soviet régime that cost the Russian nation alone about 70 million lives and that it is therefore false to blame for these crimes simply "them", the régime, as if it were an abstract alien force, and to portray the Russian nation as a mere victim of that alien force. Repentance, not only in Russia, but everywhere else, has thus to start as an internal process affecting everyone with regard to what she or he did to other individuals and groups and then rise to external dimensions, concerning one's nation's sins against other nations. Such repentance should be totally uncompromising. "I think", Solzhenitsyn writes, "that if one is to be mistaken in one's

repentance, it is better to make a mistake on the bigger side, to the benefit of others". And, he adds, "one has to assume beforehand that there are no such neighbours before whom we are innocent". Repentance to Solzhenitsyn is, however, not a purpose in itself but a means for "opening the path for a new relationship. A new relationship also among nations". For that new relationship to be achieved, the process of repentance has to be a mutual one and result in a mutual pardon.

It is in this way that globally-minded educationalists could initiate the revision of their respective national curricula and textbooks and then bring the revised versions together with those of other similarly revised national curricula and textbooks, trying to make them all not simply compatible but also universally acceptable. Globally-minded educationalists may thus become the pioneers paving through education the way to true international harmony and perpetual peace.

There is, however, one specific but crucially important issue with which neither Kant nor Solzhenitsyn deal in an explicit and practical manner. This is the issue of how and on the basis of what principles territorial disputes between nations have to be settled. The basic value system that both these thinkers share should point in the direction of application to the settlement of these issues of the following principle: Insofar as a nation has its own homeland and an established capital city within it, that nation can claim only such territories not in its possession in which that nation at present constitutes a compact majority. Purely historical claims to territory should thus not be considered as valid.

Hence, if the Finns were to claim Moscow and Leningrad or the Lithuanians East Prussia, these claims should be dismissed in spite of their perfect historical justification. On the contrary, the Jews as a nation without a homeland had a justifiable claim to their historic homeland in Palestine and the Lithuanians to their capital city Vilnius occupied in 1920 by Poland under the pretext that Poles constituted there a compact majority. According to the same standards, one has to recognize that the Armenians have a justifiable claim to Nagorno-Karabakh but not to Nakhichevan, which although historically an Armenian territory, is now populated mainly by the Azerbaidzhanis. It is significant to note that the Armenians do not even start to claim Nakhichevan, while the Azerbaidzhanis refuse to renounce their possession of Nagorno-Karabakh. Apparently Armenian education has been much closer to universal standards than the Azerbaidzhani education, although both were developing for the last 65 years or so within the uniform framework of the Soviet educational system.

Solzhenitsyn's concept of national self-limitation is wider than the nation's mere commitment to keeping itself within its own ethnic boundaries and thus to its withdrawal from all foreign parts, to non-expansionism and non-aggression. Solzhenitsyn preaches self-limitation also in terms of industrial and technological expansion at the expense of the environmental balance. He calls it farsighted self-constraint. In his view, there can be no limitless progress on a planet with a limited surface and finite resources. This is yet another fundamental universal value worth of being seriously considered by globally-minded educationalists. It goes without

saying that such farsighted self-constraint could not be implemented without a globally-achieved consensus on the development and distribution of available resources. It is both morally and realistically impossible to demand of the rich and the poor nations that they equally renounce development without making the necessary provisions for a gradual improvement of living standards and, at the same time, for the gradual levelling ^{of living standards} across the globe and among different social strata. Education for rational and cautious use of our finite resources, for treating environmental protection as the primary issue in the developmental process, and for the enhancement of social justice, should become, together with national and individual freedom, another cornerstone for the standards of a truly global education.

VI. Globalism and Ethnocentrism


One should beware of total counter-opposition between global and "ethnocentric" educational standards. Global educational standards based on universal humanitarian values may be successfully introduced only if they were treated as an extension of, and elaboration upon, the national educational standards. On the whole, globalism may be valid only insofar as it is able successfully to encompass and accommodate all separate nations with their diverse interests and cultural legacies into one entity (e pluribus unum). If globalism is to be introduced from above and in opposition to "ethnocentrism" (or nationalism), it will not only not work but, if insisted upon, would inevitably become oppressively counter-productive.

Globally-based education can be successfully and fruitfully evolved only on the basis of education firmly entrenched in the traditional system of positive national values, such as love of, and pride in, one's nation; ~~fond~~ ^(though not necessarily unselfish) appreciation of its historical and cultural heritage; primary concern about one's nation's continuous wellbeing; and determination to keep that nation's separate identity intact and unsubordinated to any other national identity.

One of the methods that could be successfully used to advance global education is "interpenetration" of national curricula. As in schools where classical education is not yet totally extinct, students learn about Pericles, Mucius Scaevola, the Gracchi brothers and other heroes of ancient history exemplifying the Greek and Roman traditions of civic virtue, all schools could introduce in their curricula the study of the heroes of extant foreign nations. It would be good to study in Austrian schools the lives and works of such Hungarian national heroes as Lajos Kossuth and Sandor Petöfi, and in Spanish schools those of such Cuban, Filipino and Dutch national heroes as, respectively, José Marti, José Rizal, and the stadholder William of Orange. The lives and works of such ^{national} heroes should be studied not only in the schools of "opponent" nations but also in the schools of the neutral ones. The globally-minded educationalists could compile an international list of national heroes to be recommended for study in the schools throughout the world. This would certainly make a substantial contribution to mutual empathy among the nations of the world, to their better understanding of each other's problems and thus to the promotion of globalism.

Only love for, and devotion to, one's own nation creates a proper understanding of, and empathy with, all fellow human beings that love their own nations and are devoted to them. Internationalism that demands the abrogation of national sentiments and loyalties, substituting them with the love of mankind as a whole, is in essence inhuman and leads to most dangerous ideological aberrations. It is on such internationalism that ideocracies of the theocratic, marxist or fascist nature are based. Only such internationalism is solid, humanitarian and valid, that organically evolves from nationalism and, consequently, from "exchanges of nationalisms". The task of the global educational standards is thus not the elimination of nationalism but the capitalization on the positive nationalist values in such a way which would prevent the degeneration of nationalism into either blind patriotism (devotion not to one's nation but to one's state - "my country, right or wrong") or jingoistic chauvinism (belief in one's nation's exclusivity and/or superiority over other nations).

One could justifiably argue that the ideas and proposals put forward in this paper are in the present circumstances rather utopian or, at least, politically unrealisable and thus impractical. Unrealisable at present they may be, but impractical they are not. For if a considerably large and influential group of international educators would set itself the task of elaborating, along the lines of these and similar ideas, model global curricula on the main controversial subjects (such as religion, history and literature in the first place) taught in the schools, the fruits of their work could become the seed from which the tree of global education in the practical world would start growing.


(A. Shtromas)