

Bettina Lösch

## The Political Dimension of Global Education: Global Governance and Democracy<sup>1</sup>

Political and economic global transformation processes are encompassing the field of political education. The subject matter of political education, namely *the political*, has itself undergone a radical transformation. The changes have had a particular effect on democratic structures and opportunities for participation in the political process. Focusing on a conception of critical education for democracy, this article will highlight the democratic deficits of the globalisation process, and shed light on political-theoretical conceptions of global governance. As opposed to the paradigmatic reorientation of political education into democratic and (European) citizenship education, which has taken place in Germany, the case will be put forward for political education for global democracy which goes beyond Eurocentric thinking and the concept of the nation state. Global political education involves a broad conception of politics and incorporates the new democratisation processes as well as the accompanying expanded forms of participation.

Die globalen Transformationsprozesse von Politik und Ökonomie erfassen auch die politischen Bildungsprozesse. Der Gegenstand der politischen Bildung: das *Politische* ist einem radikalen Wandel unterzogen. Die Veränderungen wirken sich insbesondere auf die demokratischen Strukturen und Partizipationsmöglichkeiten aus. Im Fokus einer Konzeption kritischer Demokratiebildung werden in diesem Artikel die Demokratiedefizite des Globalisierungsprozesses sowie der politiktheoretischen Konzeptionen einer Global Governance beleuchtet. In Kontrast zur paradigmatischen Neuausrichtung politischer Bildung in Deutschland als Demokratie-Pädagogik und *european citizenship education* wird in diesem Beitrag für eine globale Perspektive politischer Bildung plädiert, die über ein nationalstaatliches und eurozentristisches Denken hinausweist. Eine globale politische Bildung legt einen weiten Begriff von Politik an und greift die Impulse neuer Demokratisierungsbewegungen sowie die damit einhergehenden erweiterten Partizipationsformen auf.

### Keywords:

Global Education, political education, citizenship education, critical education for democracy, globalisation, global governance, democracy, participation

The dramatic upheavals and crises of our age, which are commonly denoted by the term *globalisation*, are affecting both the institutional framework and the content of education in general, as well as political education in particular. Both education and political education are tasked with shedding light on global transformation processes. At the same time, educational processes and political education itself are being affected not only by global political and economic changes, but also the accompanying erosion of democracy (Butterwegge, Hentges 2002, 8; Lösch 2011a). Political education in Germany, which is the subject of this article, has not only been affected by drastic public spending cuts – its own field of knowledge is also changing the processes of the formation of political opinions and consensus, political participation and political decision making. Through the processes of globalisation and Europeanisation, politics is being shifted onto more and more levels – new political actors are appearing, and in general an

acceleration of political processes can be observed (Lösch 2011a).

In the field of political pedagogy and political education in Germany, up until now there have been only a few conceptual and theoretical studies which deal with the topic of globalisation (see Steffens 2010; e.g. Overwien, Rathenow 2009a; Steffens 2007). There was a similar problem for business pedagogy and economic education, especially in the late 1990s (see Hedtke 2002). By contrast, there have been important contributions in pedagogical approaches to *global learning* (see e.g. Adick 2002; Scheunpflug, Hirsch 2000; Scheunpflug, Schröck 2000; Seitz 2002a, 2002b; Selby 2000; Selby, Rathenow 2003; Steffens, Weiß 2004). Political didactics and political education are currently opening themselves up to a European and global perspective by means of a conceptual reorientation (For a critique of European citizenship education see Lösch 2009; for the English debate see e.g. Davies, Evans, Reid 2005). With regard to pedagogical approaches to global learning and the current conceptions of European citizenship education, not only should the individual and pedagogical dimensions of the subjects be focused on, but the *political dimension* of the structural context of the globalisation process should also be included.

The global political and socio-economic changes are mainly affecting the long-established, and hard-won democratic structures and opportunities for participation in the political process. For a long ti

1 The article presents a re-worked English version of the article: Lösch, Bettina. 2008. Governance globale e democrazia. In: Fiaschi, Giovanni, ed. Governance: Oltre lo Stato? Soveria Manelli: Rubbettino, 281–295.



me the nation state was the framework for the democratic structures and procedures. With all its accompanying difficulties and exclusion mechanisms (Lösch 2011b), the concept of citizenship ought to nevertheless enable democratic participation. By means of the transformation of the nation state and the devolvement of national sovereignty to supranational entities such as the European Union, the structural and social conditions of democracy are changing. Political education is thereby also losing its framework of reference of the nation state. Conceptions of global governance aim to analyse these shifts in the structures of government, power, and representative participation.

This article will, on the one hand, elucidate the pedagogical concepts of global education with regard to the political and democratic aspects. On the other hand, it will elaborate on the challenges for democracy in the process of globalisation. The paper argues that the pedagogical concepts should take these challenges into account in a more profound way. For this purpose it suggests a concept of critical education for democracy. The first section expounds on the pedagogical approaches to global learning (1.). Then the political dimension of global learning will be examined, and the question as to what role a critical education for democracy could play in global education will be assessed (2.). Sections (3.) and (4.) give a brief overview of the theoretical debate about globalisation, global governance and democracy and highlight some of the democratic deficits of global governance that political education should reflect upon. In the final summary, a political education for global democracy and participation (5.) will be advocated that builds on concepts of global education and combines them with a more thorough analysis of the global political transformations and their democratic impacts.

### **1. Pedagogical Approaches: Global Education and Education for Sustainable Development**

In educational science in Germany there are currently two concepts dealing with the theme of globalisation which have become established, and which aim to be incorporated into education, school and teaching: on the one hand, the concept of *education for sustainable development (ESD)* (see e.g. de Haan 2004; Brodowski et al. 2009; Overwien, Rathenow 2009a; Riss, Overwien 2010); and, on the other hand, global learning (see e.g. Adick 2002; Scheunpflug, Hirsch 2000; Scheunpflug, Schröck 2000; Seitz 2002a, 2002b; Selby 2000; Selby, Rathenow 2003; Overwien, Rathenow 2009b). Following the publication of the *Orientierungsrahmen für den Lernbereich Globale Entwicklung (Framework for the Teaching of Global Development)* (BMZ, KMK 2007), both concepts have been incorporated into syllabuses, teacher training, and text books.

The first concept goes back to the UNESCO initiative which called for a UN decade of *Education for Sustainable Development* in 2004. The nation states have been given the opportunity to introduce educational measures which result in the integration of the topic of sustainability into schools and teaching by 2014. The countries have been requested to ensure that these measures are brought to life. However, due to the federal structure in Germany, these measures have been implemented in very different ways in the German federal states (Overwien, Rathenow 2009a, 14f.).

Important events in the international debate on environmental issues and the concept of sustainability include the UN Environment and Development summits of the 1990s and the Agenda 21 process which began in Rio de Janeiro (the UN Conference on the Environment and Development in 1992 in Rio de Janeiro; the *World Summit on Sustainable Development* 2002 in Johannesburg). The issue of sustainability is currently debated against the backdrop of climate change and the scarcity of resources. As early as the 1970s, the *Club of Rome* drew attention to the issue of limited raw materials – however, it was not until the 1990s that world-wide measures were introduced with the Agenda 21 process. The current situation is rather sobering. The UN summit in Copenhagen in December 2009 (*United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change* – UNFCCC) revealed for example how international agreements collapse due to the politics of national interest (Wissen 2010). Thus, education for sustainable development has the difficult task of not only identifying the progressive trends and the actors in the politics of the environment, but also tackling the issue of set-backs and areas of conflict.

The concept of global learning emerged from the tradition of political education for development, and includes issues such as environmental and peace education, and human rights and intercultural education. While earlier conceptions of political education for development focused on the living conditions of the countries in the global south, current conceptions of global learning try to illustrate and analyse the relationships and dependencies between the global north and south, and thereby overcome a Eurocentric world perspective (Humpert 2009, 244). Thus, global learning not only provides an umbrella for different educational sub-disciplines, but also undertakes a different perspective in terms of content.

Initially the pedagogical practice of global learning developed outside schools – it was linked to the activities of churches, non-governmental organisations, organisations for development cooperation, and solidarity initiatives (Overwien, Rathenow 2009a, 16). Many different types of learning materials were developed for both youth and adult education. Increasingly global learning is finding its way into schools (see the survey by VENRO 2010); however, this is taking

place in a rather haphazard manner. It is mainly motivated teachers who are introducing this topic into the classroom, or are effecting a globally aware and ecologically sustainable organisation of the school. The recommendation by the KMK (Standing Conference of Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Regions of the Federal Republic of Germany) in 1997 (*Eine Welt/Dritte Welt in Unterricht und Schule: One World/The Third World in Teaching and School*) led to a systematic positioning of the topics into the curricula of individual regions. As has already been mentioned, the publication of the Framework for the Teaching of Global Development (BMZ, KMK 2007) was a further important step towards integrating a global perspective into daily school life and teaching.

## 2. The Political Dimension of Global Education and Critical Education for Democracy

In Germany it is thanks to the pedagogical concepts of global learning and education for sustainable development that the theme of globalisation has been incorporated into the education system, schools, and teaching practices, albeit in a rudimentary way. However, the pedagogical concepts often lack a *political dimension*, as the political scientist Nicola Humpert asserts: "Although global learning confronts highly political questions, it still remains apolitical in that it describes phenomena instead of analysing them" (Humpert 2009, 245; translation by the author BL). Humpert argues, for example, that it does not suffice to discuss the topic of *fair trade* in the classroom from a viewpoint of personal responsibility of individuals and their consumer sovereignty. Much more exciting and urgent would be, for example, the question "what needs to be done in order for fair trade to no longer be necessary" (ibid.).

If one accepts Humpert's assessment with respect to the political dimension of global learning, then first of all it is necessary to engender an understanding of global political processes, "how and why decisions are made at an international level, and secondly what opportunities there are to influence these decisions" (Humpert 2009, 247; translation by the author BL). Issues such as global trade, human rights or climate change should be linked to questions of political procedure, political decision-making, and the exercising of political influence. Global learning should "examine topics such as the national, bilateral and multilateral power and decision-making processes in formal and informal types of organisations, thereby making these processes clear and comprehensible" (ibid.).

Analysing socio-political structures is the task of the social sciences, which examine the political, sociological, economic and cultural dimensions of globalisation in an interdisciplinary way. Incorporating a

global perspective promotes interdisciplinary thinking more than ever before. With regard to this, one could follow the suggestion by Reinhold Hedtke to form political education into an interdisciplinary subject within the social sciences (Hedtke 2006, 2007). On the one hand, the individual sub-disciplines of global learning would be brought together, since, for example, not every project which is aimed at protecting the environment is also socially responsible. In particular, the connections and contradictions between ecology and economics must be assessed. On the other hand, it is important to prevent the current competition between political and economic education, and their tendency to drift apart (Steffens, Widmaier 2008), and also to strengthen other related disciplines such as sociology, philosophy and geography.

The pedagogical conceptions of global learning are not, however, lacking a socio-theoretical basis. Above all, Klaus Seitz's theory can lay claim to providing a socio-theoretical basis of global learning (Seitz 2002a). Indeed, the analysis of causes and paradigms of globalisation which are discussed within the mainstream of the social sciences are often drawn upon. From the viewpoint of political education, however, the principle of controversy is not always appropriately taken into account. The principle of controversy indicates that theories and approaches which are discussed within academia should also be incorporated into teaching. However, if only theories within the academic mainstream are drawn upon, i.e. those which attract the most attention, and which may well reach the feuilleton sections of the serious press publications, then other analyses which have not achieved great popularity, but which nevertheless may aptly describe societal development, will be lacking.

In the conceptions of global learning the new political rules of *global governance*, for example, or the normative demand of *good governance* have been affirmatively adopted, even though within political science there is disagreement about the democratic deficits of these approaches to new types of governance. The assumptions about the role and influence of national government policy are also problematic. In global learning, as well as in some political-didactical approaches, the analysis of the 'post-national constellation' (1998) which was put forward by Jürgen Habermas in the 1990s is often drawn upon. Within the social sciences, the transformation of the nation state and democracy is interpreted and analysed in very different ways.

While Habermas assumed the loss of importance of national governments, and underestimated the politics of national interest and the exertion of influence in global and European political conflicts, other analyses from the field of political science now credit the (nation) state with a more active and endu-



ring political role in international processes (see e.g. Brand 2007).

This is where the conception of critical education for democracy can be applied within a global context (Lösch 2010). In contrast to the established conceptions of democratic pedagogy in Germany, which are based on a normative concept of democracy, and describe democracy as an ideal, a critical education for democracy also analyses the processes of de-democratisation and the deconstruction of democracy. Alongside a critical analysis of and a reflection on the global political and economic transformation processes, a critical education for democracy also examines the opportunities for intervention and action of the subjects. A critical education for democracy seeks to deal with the issue of the opportunities for participation as well as the exclusion mechanisms of democracy and politics.

Such a critical approach should bring in the controversial debates of the socio-political sciences, especially with regard to the transformation of democracy and the welfare state, in order to stimulate the discussion about global education. It can extend the pedagogical approaches of global learning using aspects of the theory of democracy and put forward questions such as: how are democratic structures, procedures and institutions changing within the global transformation process? What forms of de-democratisation can be observed, what demands for democratisation are made, and what democratic practices are becoming accepted?

Therefore, the next section will reflect on the socio-political discussion with regard to globalisation and global governance. Above all, attention will be given to the democratic deficits of global political and economic transformation processes, since this is central to democratic education within a global perspective.

### 3. Globalisation, Global Governance and Democracy

In the 1990s there was widespread discussion about a new world order after the tearing down of the Berlin wall and the fall of the communist states. Whereas in the mid 1970s over two-thirds of all states could reasonably be called authoritarian (Held 1997, 1), this percentage has fallen dramatically. The number of democracies is now growing steadily – if we understand democracy as a formal organisation of a political community where free elections can be held and

where a minimum standard of political rights is respected.<sup>2</sup> Some neo-conservative political advisers, such as Francis Fukuyama, even proclaimed after the crisis of 1989/90, the “triumph of liberal democracy,” and along with this the “end of history” (Fukuyama 1992).

The 1990s can also be seen as the era of important United Nations (UN) Conferences, where many people – not only members of government – came together to deliberate about ecological problems, world-wide poverty or questions of gender and human rights. New actors such as non-governmental-organisations (NGOs) participated in this world-wide process. Politics was perceived not only as a governmental issue but also as the concern of civil society. The United Nations emerged as a workshop for new forms of global governance – global governance meaning politics which deals with global problems that go beyond the borders of nation states and affect people all over the world. The process of globalisation has led to a transformation of the state. This process is based above all on the globalisation of trade and financial transactions as well as the new phenomena of modern communication networks and information technology. For a while in the 1990s, commentators were talking about the end of the nation state or a “post-national constellation” (Habermas 1998). Others have analysed the new function or role of the state: thus the concept of global governance emerged (Messner, Nuscheler 1996; Brand et al 2000; Brunnengräber et al. 2004; Brand, Scherrer 2005; Behrens 2005).

Governance means turning away from dirigiste forms of policy-making and traditional top-down approaches (Benz 2004; Blumenthal 2005). Theorists such as James Rosenau have used the term *global governance* to denote the regulation of interdependent relations in the absence of an overarching political authority or world government (Rosenau, Czempiel 1992). Global governance is used to signify the transformation of politics from a hierarchical, state-based order to dynamic, multi-level networks. The term points towards the emerging structure of an international system *beyond Westphalia*. (The term *Westphalian order* refers to the establishing of nation states in Europe. It characterises a system of sovereignty of states, legal equality of states and non-intervention in the international affairs of one state by another, as originally embodied in the Peace of Westphalia, 1648). The new architecture of institutions, rules and procedures as well as the cooperation between governmental and non-governmental actors on an international level indicates a new mode of political and social order.

In an increasingly globalised and interconnected world nation states depend more and more on the decisions of international organisations and agreements. New forms of political organisation and

2 It is true that the number of states in the world which can be labelled as democratic is increasing. However, regimes can also label themselves as democratic when in fact they only provide the minimum of formal democratic processes, such as holding elections without there being true freedom of opinion, or without other fundamental political rights being guaranteed.



regulation have emerged as a result of the growing interaction of foreign and domestic policy and the desire of most states for forms of international governance and regulation to deal with collective policy problems. This development can be illustrated by the following:

1. New forms of multilateral and multinational politics have been established, and with them different styles and processes of collective decision-making. Alongside the UN, which is weak in many respects, other international governmental organisations (IGOs) are very powerful. There are organisations which at first glance mainly have an economic function, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank or the World Trade Organisation (WTO). In fact they are political actors, which strongly influence international politics.
2. Apart from the national governments, new political and private actors are participating in this new process of decision-making: for example, not only international governmental and non-governmental organisations but also wide varieties of transnational pressure and lobby groups like the International Chamber of Commerce, the Institute of International Finance, or the European Roundtable of Industrialists.
3. A further important point is that the relation between political and economic power is shifting. Economic power is no longer regulated within the context of a nation state. For example: Multinational corporations (MNCs) can respond to variations in interest rates by raising finance in whichever capital market is most favourable; they can shift their demand for employment to countries with much lower employment costs; they can move their activities to where the maximum benefits accrue. As a result, the autonomy and the decision making power of democratically elected governments has been constrained by sources of unelected and unrepresentative economic power (Held 1997, 7). The increase in economic power of the Multinationals has also caused fundamental changes in our value systems. Instead of democratic values or principles such as participation, emancipation and so on, economic criteria such as effectiveness and efficiency have greater dominance.
4. Finally, new military conflicts and new geo-strategic politics contribute to global instability and have motivated calls for a new era of world order.

In contrast to what had been hoped in the 1990s, world politics did not undergo a change that resulted in greater democracy and peace. Aims of the global civil society such as finding solutions for ecological problems, supporting sustainable development and

reducing or abolishing poverty seem even less attainable than in past years. While the decade of the 1990s was marked by enthusiasm generated by the UN World Conferences, the perception that significant progress was being achieved has today been replaced by a sense of disappointment.

#### **4. The Democratic Deficits of Global Governance**

In the context of globalisation, democracies have to deal with various problems even at a national level (Schmalz-Bruns 2005). Some academics are already speaking about a crisis of representative democracy or a period of “post-democracy” (Crouch 2004). This relates to a political community in which elections are held, but where election campaigns have become nothing more than huge spectacles where competing PR teams control the public debate and influence it by means of their campaigns. We can also observe a certain loss of confidence in political representatives. No one really knows who is responsible for specific political decisions and where the centre of power really lies. It is not clear what role the national parliaments still have. Are they a place of proper political debate and deliberation or just a place where decisions are rubber stamped? Democracy seems to be located *nowhere*. As a result we are faced with problems of how to politically organise our society.

The global transformation of politics indicates a loss of democracy not only on a domestic but also on a global level (Benz, Papadopoulos 2006). These challenges for democracy in a globalised world could be summarised as follows: (1) *The Internationalisation of politics*: With the internationalisation of politics and the accompanying transformation of the state, democratic institutions and the democratic process are fundamentally changing. Democracy is no longer located within the boundaries of a single nation state. In a complex interconnected world the idea of democracy can no longer be simply defended as an idea attributable to a particular closed political community or nation state. Deliberative and decision making centres go beyond national territories. The internationalisation of politics has seen a shift in decision making on to an international level, and the associated loss of democratic control in the traditional democratic institutions such as parliaments. (2) *The Informalisation of politics*: As a result, the new types of policy making are mostly informal and opaque. New networks and actors are often uncoupled from the official representative bodies. Policy making is increasingly influenced by private interests and has lost its public character. The decision making process is not transparent and lacks legitimacy.

Some people still think of global governance as global government, because the domestic analogy is so familiar. However, on a global level there exists nei-



ther a monopoly of power, nor democratic institutions which would be able to control a world government. Even the European Union, which is based on the institutionalisation of a specific political system, cannot be compared with the structures of a nation state. Whether the particular political system of the EU can be seen as a system of governance is a controversial subject. Some say the institutional framework of the EU is closer to the model of network governance than to the classical model of government (Benz 2004, 125ff.).

Democracy requires a *demos* which does not exist on an international level – a *demos* in whose name governance could take place. Therefore, democratic governance beyond the nation state faces serious problems. In order to solve these problems, theorists of global governance look for new actors within a global civil society. But, who are these new actors? Are they able to constitute a transnational public sphere where policy-makers are induced to give reasons for their options and where deliberation can take place? Are they a source of legitimacy and counteractive power? Over and above that, if all the actors participate in the political process who holds the political power, and who is holding this power to account? The main problem of transnational or global governance concerns the lack of congruence between those who are being governed and those to whom the governing bodies are accountable. Mechanisms to enhance democratic legitimacy cannot simply be transposed from the domestic level onto the international level (Risse 2006, 180).

A brief overview of the function of these new political actors will illustrate some problems of democracy on a global level:

1. States: States continue to be key actors in world politics, although it is no longer reasonable to think of world politics simply as politics among states. A large variety of other organisations exercise authority and engage in political decision making all over the world. However, states create IGOs and determine what actions they can or cannot take (Karns, Mingst 2004, 16). Many states have a privileged position in IGOs such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO, because they founded them, constitute their membership, monopolise voting rights, and provide financial support. Of course, states cannot monopolise all the institutions of global governance, but certain states are very powerful. For example: although Article 1 of the UN Charter says that the people of the world should hold the democratic sovereignty, the national states and governments control the agreements and make the important decisions. Much worse than the UN voting system is the distribution of power in IGOs such as the WTO or the IMF. These IGOs depend on the power of the

highly industrialised countries of the global north which have the majority of votes.

2. IGOs: Although international governmental organisations are based on national governments, they have developed their own administrative systems and therefore a life of their own. As well as the nation states they serve as key actors or agents in global governance, and they have the power to induce states to act. Some individuals such as the president of the World Bank and the executive director of the IMF form a powerful global elite.
3. NGOs: NGOs come in such a variety of forms, with such a variety of emphases that it is difficult to generalise about them. The growth of NGOs and NGO networks in the 1990s has been a major factor in their increasing involvement in governance at all levels. The majority are not part of formal networks, but may have informal links, for example, to large international human rights or environmental organisations (Karns, Mingst 2004, 17). Most of the NGOs – in particular those which are small and not well organised – have little voice in global politics. NGOs tend to become involved when it is a question of avoiding conflict or acquiring information. They are mainly seen as a source of legitimacy although it is sometimes unclear whom they represent, and some are very single issue orientated.
4. MNCs: In contrast to NGOs, the Multinationals are profit-orientated and their huge financial capital is one of the reasons why they are much more powerful than other actors, and why they are able to influence world politics to their advantage. Since the 1970s, MNCs have been increasingly recognised as significant international actors, controlling resources far greater than those of many states. As actors in global governance, MNCs have profoundly altered the structure of the global economy and how it functions. By choosing where to invest or not to invest, MNCs shape the economic development opportunities of countries and entire regions.

Concepts of global governance sometimes neglect the differences between the new political actors, as has been highlighted above. For example, some actors are more powerful than others and they have different opportunities to exercise power or to participate in the political process. The underlying reason could be that theorists of global governance focus mainly on the transformation or the new functions of the state, and not on the democratic modifications within the process of globalisation. This leads to the disregarding of the inequality between the actors as well as the necessity of the public character of politics. The new forms of decision making within global governance are often located in non-public forums and the actors, such as public-private partner-

ships, are not elected or legitimated by a public. The informalisation of politics has been accompanied by the privatisation of politics and a loss of a public sphere. Theorists of global governance tend to think about democracy in categories of input and output legitimacy (Scharpf 1999; Risse 2006, 191). If there is a problem with input legitimacy, that is the possibility of participation within politics, they think it is necessary to focus on the output legitimacy, which is to improve the communication of political decisions made by political actors to the people. The main criterion for output legitimacy is not participation or the equality of participation, but the efficiency of problem solving (Scharpf 1999, 16ff.). Therefore, global governance often goes along with a concept of weak democracy – and not that of a more demanding participatory democracy, such as that which advocates of deliberative democracy have put forward (Lösch 2005). It is clear that global democracy cannot be organised in the same way as representative democracy within the nation state. However, given that democracy depends on the participation of people, it needs to be located not in informal arrangements among various actors but in public forums which guarantee transparency, legitimacy and a process of deliberation.

## 5. Summary

From these observations on democratic theory and global governance, central aspects for global learning and political education can be ascertained: on the one hand, the fields of global learning such as development and peace education, as well as intercultural and human rights education should be supplemented by the political dimension and the aspect of democratic questioning. This relates to an area of political education which I have termed critical education for democracy. A critical education for democracy examines problem-oriented structural, global, political, and socio-economic relationships, i.e. new political actors, forms of politics, participation and decision-making procedures, as well as the processes of the de-democratisation and democratisation.

On the other hand, global learning opens up a socio-global perspective for political education. This change in perspective makes it possible to go beyond the concepts of nationalism and Eurocentric thinking which are still widespread within political education today. Political education for global democracy and participation also reach beyond theories of identity which are based on European citizenship education (Lösch 2009). This change in political education, which is distanced from a narrow political understanding as well as a nation-state oriented approach, will possibly contribute to efforts for global democratisation.

A critical education therefore builds on concepts of global learning and combines them with a more thorough analysis of the global political transformations and their democratic impact.

## References

- Adick, Christel. 2002. Ein Modell zur didaktischen Strukturierung des globalen Lernens. In: *Bildung und Erziehung*, Jg. 55, Heft 4, 397–416.
- Behrens, Maria, ed. 2005. *Globalisierung als politische Herausforderung. Global Governance zwischen Utopie und Realität*. Wiesbaden.
- Benz, Arthur, ed. 2004. *Governance – Regieren in komplexen Regelsystemen: Eine Einführung*. Wiesbaden.
- Benz, Arthur; Papadopoulos, Yannis, eds. 2006. *Governance and Democracy. Comparing National, European and International Experiences*. London, New York.
- Blumenthal, Julia von. 2005. Governance – Eine kritische Zwischenbilanz. In: *Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft (Journal of Political Science)*, Jg. 15, Heft 4/05, 1149–1180.
- Brand, Ulrich. 2007. Die Internationalisierung des Staates. In: Becker, Joachim; Imhof, Karen Jäger, Johannes; Staritz, Cornelia, eds. *Kapitalistische Entwicklung in Nord und Süd*. Wien, 260–279.
- Brand, Ulrich; Brunnengräber, Achim; Schrader, Lutz; Stock, Christian; Wahl, Peter. 2000. *Global Governance. Alternative zur neoliberalen Globalisierung?* Münster.
- Brand, Ulrich; Scherrer, Christoph. 2005. Contested Global Governance: Konkurrierende Formen und Inhalte globaler Regulierung. In: Behrens, Maria, ed. *Globalisierung als politische Herausforderung. Global Governance zwischen Utopie und Realität*. Wiesbaden, 115–130.
- Brodowski, Michael et al., eds. 2009. *Informelles Lernen und Bildung für eine nachhaltige Entwicklung. Beiträge aus Theorie und Praxis*. Opladen und Farmington Hills.
- Brunnengräber, Achim; Dietz, Kristina; Hirsch, Bernd; Walk, Heike. 2004. *Interdisziplinarität in der Governance-Forschung*, Discussion Paper 14/04, Zentrum Technik und Gesellschaft. ([http://www.tu-berlin.de/uploads/media/InterdiszGov\\_01.pdf](http://www.tu-berlin.de/uploads/media/InterdiszGov_01.pdf)) accessed January 20, 2012.
- Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (BMZ); Kultusministerkonferenz (KMK), eds. 2007. *Orientierungsrahmen für den Lernbereich Globale Entwicklung im Rahmen einer Bildung für nachhaltige Entwicklung*. Bonn, Berlin.
- Butterwegge, Christoph; Hentges, Gudrun, eds. 2002. *Politische Bildung und Globalisierung*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.
- Crouch, Colin. 2004. *Post-Democracy*. Cambridge, Boston.
- De Haan, Gerhard. 2004. Politische Bildung für Nachhaltigkeit. In: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, Heft 7–8/2004, 39–46.
- Davies, Ian; Evans, Mark; Reid, Alan. 2005. Globalising Citizenship Education? A Critique of 'Global Education' and 'Citizenship Education'. In: *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 53, No. 1, 66–89.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. London.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1998. *Die postnationale Konstellation. Politische Essays*. Frankfurt/Main.
- Hedtke, Reinhold. 2002. Editorial: Globalisierung. In: *Journal of Social Science Education*, Vol.1, No. 1. (<http://www.jsse.org/2002/2002-1/editorial-hedtke.htm>) accessed January 20, 2012.
- Hedtke, Reinhold. 2006. Integrative politische Bildung. In: Weißeno, Georg, eds. *Politik und Wirtschaft unterrichten*. Bonn, 216–230.
- Hedtke, Reinhold. 2007. Politikwissenschaft oder Sozialwissenschaften? Zur Referenz Politischer Bildung. In: Lange, Dirk, ed. *Strategien der Politischen Bildung. Handbuch für den sozialwissenschaftlichen Unterricht*. Band 2. Baltmannsweiler, 22–30.
- Held, David. 1997. *Democracy and Globalization*, Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung, Working Paper, 97/5, May 1997. (<http://www.mpifg.de/pu/workpap/wp97-5/wp97-5.html>) accessed January 20, 2012.
- Humpert, Nicola. 2009. Die politische Dimension des Globalen Lernens – Implikationen für die konzeptionelle und praktische Weiterentwicklung. In: Overwien, Bernd; Rathenow, Hanns-Fred, eds. *Globalisierung fordert politische Bildung. Politisches Lernen im globalen Kontext*. Opladen und Farmington Hills, 243–250.
- Karns, Margaret P.; Mingst, Karen A., eds. 2004. *International Organizations. The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*. Boulder, London.
- Lösch, Bettina. 2005. *Deliberative Politik. Moderne Konzeptionen von Öffentlichkeit, Demokratie und politischer Partizipation*. Münster.



- Lösch, Bettina. 2008. *Governance globale e democrazia*. In: Fiaschi, Giovanni, ed. *Governance: Altro lo Stato?* Rubbettino, 281–295.
- Lösch, Bettina. 2009. Internationale und europäische Bedingungen politischer Bildung – zur Kritik der *European Citizenship Education*. In: Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, Kritik der politischen Bildung, redaktionelle Bearbeitung: Roland Reichenbach und Ludwig Pongratz, Jg. 55, Heft 6, 849–859.
- Lösch, Bettina. 2010. Ein kritisches Demokratieverständnis für die politische Bildung. In: Lösch, Bettina; Thimmel, Andreas, eds. *Kritische Politische Bildung. Ein Handbuch*. Schwalbach/Ts., 115–127.
- Lösch, Bettina. 2011a. Globale Krisen und Transformationsprozesse der Demokratie. Mögliche Konsequenzen für die politische Bildung. In: Hentges, Gudrun; Lösch, Bettina, eds. *Die Vermessung der sozialen Welt. Neoliberalismus – extreme Rechte – Migration im Fokus der Debatte*. Wiesbaden, 55–67.
- Lösch, Bettina. 2011b. Keine Demokratie ohne Partizipation: Aktive Bürgerinnen und Bürger als Ziel der Politischen Bildung. In: Widmaier, Benedikt; Nonnenmacher, Frank, eds. *Partizipation als Bildungsziel. Politische Aktion in der politischen Bildung*. Schwalbach/Ts., 111–124.
- Messner, Dirk; Nuscheler, Franz. 1996. *Global Governance: Herausforderungen an die deutsche Politik an der Schwelle zum 21. Jahrhundert*. SEF Policy Paper 2. Bonn: Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden.
- Overwien, Bernd; Rathenow, Hanns-Fred, eds. 2009a. *Globalisierung fordert politische Bildung. Politisches Lernen im globalen Kontext*. Opladen und Farmington Hills.
- Overwien, Bernd; Rathenow, Hanns-Fred. 2009b. *Globales Lernen in Deutschland*. In: Overwien, Bernd; Rathenow, Hanns-Fred, eds. *Globalisierung fordert politische Bildung. Politisches Lernen im globalen Kontext*. Opladen und Farmington Hills, 107–134.
- Pierre, John; Peters, B. Guy, eds. 2000. *Governance, Politics and the State*. London.
- Riss, Karsten; Overwien, Bernd. 2010. *Globalisierung und politische Bildung*. In: Lösch, Bettina; Thimmel, Andreas, eds. *Kritische politische Bildung. Ein Handbuch*, Schwalbach/Ts., 205–216.
- Risse, Thomas. 2006. *Transnational Governance and Legitimacy*. In: Benz, Arthur; Papadopoulos, Yannis, eds. *Governance and Democracy. Comparing National, European and International Experiences*. London, New York, 179–199.
- Rosneau, James N.; Czempel, Ernst-Otto, eds. 1992. *Governance without Government. Order and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge.
- Scharpf, Fritz. 1999. *Regieren in Europa. Effektiv und demokratisch?* Frankfurt/Main, New York.
- Scheunpflug, Annette; Hirsch, Klaus, eds. 2000. *Globalisierung als Herausforderung für die Pädagogik*. Berlin.
- Scheunpflug, Annette; Schröck, Nikolaus. 2000. *Globales Lernen: Einführung in eine pädagogische Konzeption zur entwicklungsbezogenen Bildung*. Stuttgart.
- Schmalz-Bruns, Rainer. 2005. *Demokratie im Prozess der Globalisierung: Zur Demokratieverträglichkeit von Global Governance*. In: Behrens, Maria, ed. *Globalisierung als politische Herausforderung. Global Governance zwischen Utopie und Realität*. Wiesbaden, 79–98.
- Seitz, Klaus. 2002a. *Bildung in der Weltgesellschaft. Gesellschaftstheoretische Grundlagen Globalen Lernens*. Frankfurt/Main.
- Seitz, Klaus. 2002b. *Lernen für ein globales Zeitalter. Zur Neuorientierung der politischen Bildung in der postnationalen Konstellation*. In: Butterwegge, Christoph; Hentges, Gudrun, eds. *Politische Bildung und Globalisierung*. Opladen, 45–58.
- Selby, David. 2000. *Global Education as Transformative Education*. In: Zeitschrift für Internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik, Jg. 23, Heft 3, 2–10.
- Selby, David; Rathenow, Hanns-Fred. 2003. *Globales Lernen: Praxishandbuch für die Sekundarstufe I und II*. Berlin.
- Steffens, Gerd, ed. 2007. *Politische und ökonomische Bildung in Zeiten der Globalisierung. Eine kritische Einführung*. Münster.
- Steffens, Gerd. 2010. *Politische Bildung ohne globale Perspektive?* In: VENRO, ed. *Jahrbuch Globales Lernen 2010. Globales Lernen als Herausforderung für Schule und Zivilgesellschaft*. Bonn, 22–27.
- Steffens, Gerd; Weiß, Edgar, eds. 2004. *Globalisierung und Bildung. Jahrbuch für Pädagogik*, Frankfurt/M. u.a.
- Steffens, Gerd; Widmaier, Benedikt, eds. 2008. *Politische und ökonomische Bildung. Konzepte – Leitbilder – Kontroversen*. Wiesbaden.
- VENRO, ed. 2010. *Jahrbuch Globales Lernen 2010. Globales Lernen als Herausforderung für Schule und Zivilgesellschaft*. Bonn.

