

## NÚMERO 16

### COSMOPOLITANISM, EDUCATION, AND GLOBAL DEMOCRACY

Giovanni Pampanini

#### INTRODUCTION

In this paper the author introduces the two principles of his own *Theory of Global Democracy* that belong to the realm of ethics, philosophy and education. Such Theory is formed by other two political and economic principles as well, which are of political and economic nature. The two political and economic principles hold that: 1. A domestic democracy cannot exist if it is alone (or if its International Relations or Foreign Politics are not democratically inspired), and that, 2. No matter the government in charge, each state must respect the limits to development checked by the United Nations Organization (democratically reformed). In the present article, Pampanini discusses just the ethic and philosophical principles, letting apart the other two ones that are treated in other publications (Pampanini, 2015; Pampanini, Ed. 2017; Pampanini, 2019).

The two philosophical and educational principles assert the relevance and importance of: 3. Intercultural and International Education, and 4. The *Dialogue among Civilizations*. Those two articles form the corpus of the present article; in particular, the discussion will exam at some extent the interface between those principles and the most important international philosophical literature related to Cosmopolitanism, with specific reference to Martha Nussbaum's approach. In particular, the article suggests that International and Intercultural Education is crucial to renovate the Cosmopolitan tradition, showing the contribution that it *could and should* give to Global Democracy.

#### FROM COMPARATIVE EDUCATION TO INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

A trajectory of Giovanni Pampanini's educational activities since the '70s is useful to understand the topic. Those activities started in his native town Palermo, Italy, as Development Education activities. The principal sources of inspiration for those activities were Paulo Freire's, Ivan Illich's, and Noam Chomski's books on Pedagogy of the oppressed, de-schooling society, and counter-culture. After meeting Lê Thành Khôi in person in 1990, Pampanini became one of his disciples. Lê Thành Khôi (1923-) is a Vietnamese scholar specialized in History, Economics, and Comparative Education, Emeritus Professor at La Sorbonne University in Paris. All along his career, he accomplished more than forty UNESCO missions in many countries, developing a deep understanding of interculturalism. It is that understanding of interculturalism that dropped into Pampanini's approach to education. In fact, he mixed, during the '90s, his previous approach to Development Education on behalf of disabled students and marginalized sections of population, in particular, migrants, with an approach to education based on comparing civilizations and cultures, in tune with Lê Thành Khôi's contemporary research. The main idea was to accompany the concrete educational activities with developing two main theoretical insights: 1. The importance of a direct communication between educational groups of different countries on matters of common interest, and 2. The consciousness of the cultural essence of any human action and praxis, including education, *id est* teaching, explaining, understanding, and learning.

In the same year 1990, Pampanini also knew Jagdish Gundara and Peter Batelaan, the founders of the IAIE, International Association for Intercultural Education, becoming the correspondent from Italy of that Association (Pampanini, 1990; Pampanini, Ed., 1992). Thanks to these relationships, Pampanini organized in Santa Croce Camarina, Raguse province, Sicily, a first Euro-Arab symposium about Intercultural Education in September 1992, the main result of which was the establishment of a network of Mediterranean scholars in education (Pampanini, Ed., 1993). It was in that way that the idea of creating a Mediterranean society of Comparative Education finalized to peace was born. In fact, in January 1996 in Catania a second meeting about Adult Education in the Mediterranean area followed, thanks to the contacts established in the previous meeting (Pampanini, Ed., 1997). Finally, in November 1999 Pampanini was able to organize a third Mediterranean meeting in Catania, thanks to a growing consensus about the main idea of the usefulness of a Mediterranean society of Comparative Education (Pampanini, Ed., 2000). Actually, in parallel with that Sicilian series of meetings, Pampanini with the researchers known in those meetings animated specific panels devoted to the “Mediterranean Education” inside the contemporary official meetings of the CESE, Comparative Education Society in Europe, in Groningen, 1996, Athens, 1998, Bologna, 2000, and London, 2002.

The described series of conferences, workshops, and panels produced a large consensus among scholars and researchers from the majority of the Mediterranean countries about the opportunity to establish a formal Mediterranean Society of Comparative Education, which was actually born in March 2004 in Catania after another meeting over there: its symbolic acronym ME.S.C.E. clearly channels the idea of ‘mixing’ (Pampanini, 2004).

In order to understand better Pampanini’s trajectory relevance to the themes addressed in this article, one needs to mind the parallel development of relevant facts after the Berlin Wall’s fall in November 1989. Actually, in the same year 1990, the UNDP, United Nations Development Programme published its first *Human Development Report*, the result of preparatory meetings at the WIDER from 1985 to that date, to which Martha Nussbaum, Amartya Sen and others took part. In the same time, Hans Küng introduced his project of a Global Ethics, *Projekt Weltethos*, by which Cosmopolitanism’s idea spread in the greater field of social and human sciences. In fact, three years later the Parliament of Universal Religions in Chicago proclaimed the *Declaration for a World Ethics* (Küng, 2005, p. 45). The same Küng tells us that the idea of a Global Ethics came to him during many meetings he had especially with Mohammed Khatami, the then Iranian minister for Formation and Islamic Culture (idem, p. 35). After that, the same Khatami, once become President of Iran, proposed to the General Assembly of the United Nations to institute the *Dialogue among Civilizations*, a proposal that was unanimously accepted in November 2000. Unfortunately, such illuminate initiative, assigned to the UNESCO for the implementation, was blown away because of the September 11<sup>th</sup> 2001 terroristic attacks. However, Küng remembers that, along with him to support Khatami’s proposal, there were people like Nadine Gordimer, Literature Nobel in 1991, and, again, Amartya Sen, Economics Nobel in 1998 (idem, p. 50).

It is true that the ‘90s are very important to understand the reception of the contemporaneous Cosmopolitanism. Actually, a growing mass of citizens moved all along that decade from their home countries in the South of the Planet to the North. The Mexico Gulf, the Mediterranean Sea and the Indian Ocean were becoming zones of intense migrants’ traffic. Just at the beginning of that decade, two outstanding authors like Jürgen Habermas and John Rawls could develop their political theories of democracy, *deliberative* the former and *liberal* the second, *without taking too much into account* the evolution of the world into a multicultural direction (Habermas, 1992; Rawls, 1993). Nevertheless, both of them could not avoid, *during the same decade*, to integrate in their approach to social philosophy the prospects of International Relations and, above all, multiculturalism (Habermas, 1996; Rawls, 1999).

Rawls and Habermas, beyond their differences, help us in understanding in depth the problem of multiculturalism within a country and the Cosmopolitan approach to the International Relations. Actually, multiculturalism and Cosmopolitanism are the greatest problems that scholars, as different as the two above quoted ones, investigated at some extent in the '90s. In fact, we have the duplex crisis of the state-nation. That crisis is duplex, because the state-nation, under globalization, became unable to protect the human rights of its citizens or to obey to the electorate's willingness in the case this be opposed to the corporations' desiderata. In the same time, the ethnic minorities present in a single state-nation, due to the important migration flows from the South to the North of the Planet, transformed people's life importantly, stressing the democracy of the political, social, and cultural systems. Briefly, the migrations revealed the *mono-cultural essence* of the political structures of democracy, up to then deemed as a universal, say culturally and religiously neutral, social and political system. It is not par hazard that just in the middle of that decade Nussbaum focused the problem of being "world citizen" *today* stressing the need for a renovation of the liberal education in the Western countries in order to face the irruption of the non-Western cultures *into* the West (Nussbaum, 1997). On her side, the Indian writer Arundhati Roy, by means of her chef d'oeuvre *The God of Small Things* published in 1997, making superbly enter Dalit's question in the world literature, highlighted the paradox of the persistency of the deeply antidemocratic casts system in the biggest democracy on the Earth in the era of the jets (Roy, 1997). At the end of the '90s, Nussbaum published another important study on the notion of human rights in the interface with the struggles for woman's emancipation inside the optic of her *Capability Approach* (Nussbaum, 2002). In addition, in another publication of the same time Nussbaum developed the idea of the "duties of material aid" *beyond* the traditional approach to Cosmopolitanism (Nussbaum, 2008).

All along the '90s, the field of International Relations clearly reached a particular importance. Lê Thành Khôi developed his *General Theory of Education* thinking of them as the main framework of the different education systems and philosophies (Lê Thành Khôi, 1991). In his conception of Comparative Education, the "unit of analysis" is not the state-nation. Since education is an important part of each civilization, Lê Thành Khôi assumes that many state-nations share the same general idea of education; of course, this does not imply that the realizations should be the same in terms of concrete implementation of school system. For that reason, he prefers to refer straight to the civilizations, taking them as the true and more important "units of analysis" for the study. In order to make his approach operational, he identified five civilizations: the African-communitarian, the Arab-Islamic, the Euro-Christian, the Hindu, and the Sino-Japanese. In such approach, International Relations work as the general framework in which influences, borrows, and loans among civilizations can happen, due to many causes, not only educational ones, but especially political. Once clarified the theoretical lines, Lê Thành Khôi applied his General Theory of Education in the field of history, up to the present day, into two scholarly books (Lê Thành Khôi, 1995; Lê Thành Khôi, 2001). His last recommendation is that to reinforce *Intercultural Education* as the way to make the new multicultural societies more inclusive and democratic and, in the same time, to favour the *Dialogue among Civilizations*, a dialogue that should not be an exclusive and elitist exercise, but a normal, daily educational praxis.

While translating into Italian Lê Thành Khôi's books, Pampanini absorbed his point of view and merged it in his own elaboration. In fact, the *Dialogue among Civilizations* could be minded, not only as a dialogue among savants; in case, such an exercise could be thought of as a higher, world level exercise, say the level of the United Nations. However, that level does not exclude or better it includes that a daily educational praxis of communication among educational groups all over the world does exist. That was, in truth, the problem that Pampanini wanted to solve: *How* to export Lê Thành Khôi's point of view from the field of theoretical speculations into the realm of the educational practices. In fact, if one thinks of the *Dialogue among Civilizations* as a daily educational

practice, the problem is *how* to move from the global to the local or from the theory to the practice in the sense of the concrete reality of a whatsoever educational institution. Of course, one easily sees that the *Dialogue among Civilizations* actually *goes hand in hand* with Intercultural and International Education; naturally, democracy as such had all to gain from such a transformation; but at that point in time it was not yet clear *how*.

## INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE

Unfortunately, as said, the 2001 September terroristic attacks installed a “climax of fear” all the world around. However, despite that, Pampanini thought that *just that* was the main reason *to challenge the democratization* of the world, moving from the field of education. Once the WCCES, World Council of Comparative Education Societies, which is the main academic body of Comparative Education in the world, recognized MESCE as one of its constituent societies, Pampanini as MESCE’s founder and first president (2004-2006) entered its staff in October 2004 as by law. Endowed with Lê Thành Khôi’s assumptions, he had the chance to note some important *absences* over there. In fact, there was a large number of associations related to the European countries, plus another one for Israel, another for Turkey, and another for Egypt. The biggest, oldest and strongest ones were the societies of the USA, Canada, UK, Germany, France, Japan, Korea, and Australia that formed the WCCES in 1970. In addition, there was not a single association for Africa (letting apart that for South Africa), just one for Latin America (the Brazilian one), and one for the Indian Ocean countries (that of India, that was dormant at that point in time). That situation was clearly eloquent about the *non-democracy* existing inside the sphere of just education at a world level.

Assuming the WCCES as a sort of United Nations Organization *in vitro*, and looking at the world of education from a *Dialogue among Civilizations* perspective, Pampanini adopted a double agenda for his commitment at the world level of education. First, creating a *Mediterranean* meaning of education *erga* the WCCES (letting apart for now the meanings of the other macro-regions in front of the world); second, establishing new societies in the macro-regions of the world that were underrepresented.

As it regards the first point, Pampanini started a series of discussions with all the other founding members of MESCE, in particular, with Peter Mayo and Ronald Sultana (Malta University), Adila Kreso (Sarajevo University), Kemal Guçluol (Cankaya University, Ankara), Khalil Abou Rjaili (ILDES, Beirut), Antonio Novoa (Lisbon University), and Faten Adly (NCERD, Cairo), to quote a few (Pampanini, 2005). Moreover, those discussions were enlarged also to scholars beyond both the realm of education (e.g. the historian Abdallah Laroui, the philosopher Fernando Savater, and the writer Predrag Matvejevic) and the Mediterranean space (e.g. Mark Bray from Hong Kong University, Mark Ginsburg from Pittsburgh University, and Babacar Diop from Dakar University). As a result, the agreement was that the meaning that the Mediterranean education had to offer to the world as a whole was the matter of the Intercultural Dialogue, in particular, the realization of a world congress on this topic to be celebrated in Sarajevo. The identification of the venue in the capital of Bosnia Herzegovina was motivated by the very fact that the First World War stemmed from that city in 1914. The main idea was that a world congress of Comparative Education in Sarajevo would have meant the chance *to change*. For that reason, MESCE representative group decided to introduce the proposal to realize the 13<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Comparative Education in Sarajevo in September 2007 to the WCCES staff, charging Pampanini, as the then MESCE President, with the duty to show its reasons to the WCCES staff and to convince them. In effect, Pampanini brought such proposal to the WCCES staff in its meeting in L’Havana, Cuba, during the 12<sup>th</sup> World Congress in October 2004, where the process of acceptance started. That process



finished a few months later with the agreement between the WCCES and the MESCE; therefore, the 13<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Comparative Education was actually celebrated in Sarajevo in September 2007 (Pampanini, 2008a).

In order to reinforce such an educative meaning and message, Pampanini cared to write down a “letter of welcome” in the Mediterranean macro-region for the delegates coming from other macro-regions. To do that, Pampanini agreed a draft of “message of welcome” with Savater, Laroui, and Matvejevic, who signed it. In that message, the growing mass of migrants from non-Mediterranean countries was emphasized, making sense of the call for renovating not only the liberal education in Nussbaum’s vein, but also for opening a dialogue with non-Mediterranean civilizations according to the sense of Lê Thành Khôi’s Intercultural Education. In the final paragraph of that “letter”, the unique, wild symbolic relevance of Sarajevo under the profile of Intercultural Dialogue was stressed, wishing all the success that the enterprise of the WCCES and MESCE deserved.

The 13<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Comparative Education brought to Sarajevo roughly 800 delegates from 72 countries, marking a record in the history of the WCCES. At the end of it, the WCCES Assembly approved by acclamation the “Sarajevo Declaration on the Intercultural Dialogue” (the “letter of welcome” is reported in the volume Pampanini, 2008a, while the “Sarajevo Declaration” is reported in appendices in both the volumes Pampanini, 2008a and Pampanini, Ed., 2010).

Unfortunately, 2007 was also the year in which the world financial crisis broke. At the beginning of the decade, after the WTO, World Trade Organization’s implementation in the years 1999-2000, Peter Singer came back to the need for a Global Ethics, as if he had broken K ung’s project in the new decade (Singer, 2003). While some authors, like Emir Sader applauded the Brazilian initiative of the World Social Forum, the first edition of it was celebrated in Porto Alegre in 2002, Seyla Benhabib prolonged and deepened the deliberative approach to democracy promoted by Habermas, making sense of the “reiteration processes of social learning” (Benhabib, 2006). Other authors, like Kwame Anthony Appiah, encouraged by Nussbaum, nurtured the literature about the need of a new Cosmopolitanism (Appiah, 2007). On his side, Daniele Archibugi advanced the proposal of a Cosmopolitanism based on an international say global, *and not only national*, approach to democracy, in tune with the contemporary studies of David Held (Archibugi, 2008). If Nussbaum highlighted the capability of each individual in rapport to the world system, Michael Sandel outlined the ethical aspects of the current financial crisis (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 311; Sandel, 2009).

The year 2007 is also the year in which Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa decide to ally in one only group, the so-called BRICS. From a pure speculative point of view, that alliance indicated not only the representation of a huge front of non-Western countries, but also meant the potentiality of an alternative narration of the world ‘state of art’. Even if an educator does not address directly political matters in his/her work, it is evident that those events are of paramount importance for his/her understanding of the ‘world’ as a human matter.

Under a theoretical perspective, Pampanini packed and introduced his Philosophy of education just at the outbreak of the 2007 world financial crisis. He resumed it under the label of *Educational Enlightenment* (Pampanini, 2008). It consists of a complex of four theories to face the most important aspects of educator’s job: the archetypical one, the didactical one, the political one, and the comparative one. Even if for the ends of the present article, it is useful to make reference just to the last one, the “Regional Theory of Comparative Education” (which served to justify the constitution of regional societies of Comparative Education like MESCE), the general inspiration of Pampanini was a Deweyan, Tolstoian, and Gandhian one. Education holds in itself its own *raison d’être* that makes it congruent and autonomous, allowing it to interact with ethics and philosophy. – It does not need any adjective: in itself, it is critical, democratic, and valid *erga omnes*. What is new

in front of Dewey, Tolstoy, and Gandhi in Pampanini's elaboration, from a theoretical point of view, is the carrying education in the era of interculturalism and globalization.

In line with that Regional Theory, Pampanini kept his engagement after the Sarajevo World Congress as a co-opted member of the WCCES staff up to creating three new academic, regional associations. The first one is the IOCES, Indian Ocean Comparative Education Society, realized at the Peradeniya University, Kandy, Sri Lanka, in December 2009. The second one is AFRICE, Africa For Research In Comparative Education, put in being in Yaoundé, Cameroon (with other three bases in Dakar, Addis Ababa, and Nairobi), in December 2010. The third one is the Red Centro-Americana de Educación comparada, born in the UDELAS of Panama City, in September 2010. The first two associations, which are constituted formally as academic bodies, are nowadays constituent societies of the WCCES.

### **COSMOPOLITANISM, RIGHT TO EDUCATION, AND GLOBAL DEMOCRACY**

In the decade 2010-2020, the literature on global justice and Cosmopolitanism still expanded (for instance, Beardsworth, 2011; Nussbaum, 2012; Risse, 2012; Cassese, 2012; Achcar, 2013; Moyn, 2018; Nussbaum, 2019). However, as far as it regards philosophy and ethics, the pivotal points remain the same as before:

- the ever more needy knowledge, comprehension, and solidarity among citizens all around the world, different in culture but with the same human traits;
- then, the knowledge and the acceptance of the cultural differences, up to the ethic duties of the material aid (beyond traditional Stoicism);
- the transfer of wealth from the rich countries to the poor ones;
- the correct understanding of patriotism within the horizon of solidarity among nations;
- the strategy of the citizens in the rich countries to bind, through their political vote, their governments, but also the corporations, to the international aid, material and moral (including the field of education);
- the attention paid to the contradictory and paradoxical aspects of an “international democracy” that is “coherent” with the local exploitation and impoverishment.

In 2010, Pampanini created a voluntary International Group on the Right to Education that lasted up to 2015. Thanks to the benevolence of colleagues from four continents, that International Group held four *global meetings*: in France, 2011; Taiwan, 2013; Morocco, 2014; and Brazil, 2015. Moving from the setting of Katarina Tomacevsky, the then UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education, those *global meetings* were attended by the successive UN Special Rapporteur, Vernor Munoz and Kishore Singh. Camilla Croso, the Global Campaign for Education coordinator, attended the International Group's last meeting in Sao Paulo University in July 2015, where a critical assessment of the engagement of the United Nations on behalf of the Right to Education worldwide was made.

For Pampanini, the main gain of the five-year long engagement with that International Group was of conceptual nature: the Right to Education should be thought of as the right for everyone to form and express his/her point of view about the most important problems of the globalized agenda of humankind. From this point of view, the Right to Education as such links itself to International Education and Cosmopolitanism. In the same time, due to the more and more multicultural formation of each society in the globalization era, Intercultural Education becomes more relevant than before. Putting together these two insights, Pampanini advanced in the research

of a plausible answer to the question posed at the end of the first paragraph of the present article on *how* to implement in practice Lê Thành Khôi's vision.

As it is well known, in education research is both of theoretical nature and of practical nature. The above-described realizations brought Pampanini as a professional educator to implement in Catania a network of educators devoted to Intercultural *and* International Education aiming at Global Democracy minded as the "horizon of sense" in Paul Ricoeur's vein. Taking advantage from the centenary of the First World War, a group of representatives of different schools, associations, and NGOs serving migrant children, advised by Pampanini, established a formal agreement among themselves, the *Fontanarossa Global Teacher Centre* in Catania in June 2014 (coordinator Melita Cristaldi), to which Catania University added later on. That Global Teacher Centre was the main instrument to Pampanini and the associated teachers and educators to inventing new specific notions and educational settings of Intercultural and International Education aimed to develop the idea of Global Citizenship and Global Democracy. Already at the end of the precedent decade, Pampanini met Professor Howard Gardner in Harvard University and developed a dialogue with him finalized to identify a specific *intelligence* in the realm of *interculturalism*. The result of that dialogue has been the book *Intercultural Intelligence*, published in 2011, in which Pampanini makes it clear that *that intelligence* is the specific capability of our mind to overwhelm the difficulties in the communication that could arise from the cultural differences with our interlocutors (Pampanini, 2011. The correspondence between the author and Gardner is reported inside the book). There is no need to add that education today actually *should* develop *Intercultural Intelligence* in both the students and the teachers to contrast chauvinism and racism.

The notion of *Intercultural Intelligence* is pivotal to developing a new and fresh approach to Cosmopolitanism. Since it regards the fresh communication between people belonging to different civilizations, it denotes a capability of the mind that is yet to discover – and to develop. Cosmopolitanism is not only a noble tradition in philosophy, but also a living matter of everyday life. From a political point of view, the rupture/discontinuity of the 2016 USA presidential election won by Donald Trump has deviated the attention of scholars away from Cosmopolitanism: the idea of *America First*, actually, is extremely opposite to a benevolent approach to the world as a whole. That is why Nussbaum did well to come back on the argument of Cosmopolitanism, in countertendency (Nussbaum, 2019). Nevertheless, her criticism to Cosmopolitanism regards just the philosophical tradition started with Cicero (above all) and, at the light of the current world situation of global disparities, Nussbaum ends recommending putting it aside. On the opposite, taking into account the current, crucial need to develop the *Dialogue among Civilizations* and *Intercultural Intelligence*, Cosmopolitanism seems to be still interesting nowadays, even more interesting than before; or to put it down better, Cosmopolitanism is still of paramount importance, only should be refreshed with some modifications and adjustments. – Just Intercultural and International Education practices, as a practice of research, will demonstrate the way to go ahead. Of course, material aid is not the only integration needed to refresh Cosmopolitanism. In addition, an understanding of the International Relations deeper than that of the paradigms of Neo-Realism, English School, and Centre/Periphery is needed to sustain *cognitively* a renovated Cosmopolitanism. The content of these last sentences are the matter of the first two principle of the *Theory of Global Democracy*, which the author treated in other publications (Pampanini, 2015; Pampanini, Ed. 2017; Pampanini, 2019). In the present article, it is relevant to see the support to the renovation of Cosmopolitanism coming from Intercultural and International Education. In fact, in the years from 2015 up to the present date, the educational practices realized in the *Fontanarossa Global Teacher Centre* in Catania revealed to be of great importance to forging new notions and settings of Intercultural and International Education in the perspective of both Cosmopolitanism and Global Democracy. They are: 1. The *Global Teacher*, 2. The *Orbital Classroom*, and 3. The *Multi-versity of studying*. The *Global Teacher* is a teacher who, sensitized to the ideals of Global Democracy, develops

the ability to use the ICTs and a lingua franca in order to make his or her students communicate directly with the students and colleagues in other Continents to debating the mayor problems of the globalized humanity (Cristaldi, 2015; Cristaldi, Pampanini, 2016; Cristaldi, 2017). The *Orbital Classroom* is the concrete praxis of such debates between or among classrooms in different Continents *via* Skype, Meet, Zoom, and other socials of common use (Cristaldi, Majhanovic, Pampanini, Eds., 2017). In fact, the *Fontanarossa Global Teacher Centre* in Catania organized some educational initiatives by these tools, some of which reached a certain resonance. For instance, an Orbital Classroom between Catania, Mexico City, and Tokyo was realized in September 2015 to sing together, teachers and students, the *Hymn to Joy* by Beethoven and Schiller to fest the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Second World War end. Another Orbital Classroom has been realized in December 2016 on behalf of a large group of around 220 Catanese teachers who enjoyed a training course on Global Democracy with lectures held by academicians speaking *via* Skype from United Kingdom, Argentina, China, Japan, Senegal, India, Egypt, and Russia. A third initiative has been a video on the Covid-19 with teachers and students from Italy, Morocco, Japan, Burkina Faso, Guinea Conakry, and Mexico, realized in July 2020. Finally, the *Multi-versity of studying* is a polemical way to address the medieval label *Uni-versitas studiorum*, claiming for a change. The basic idea is to carry on the democratization of education *from within*, stressing the creativity of human intelligence when facing a problem from different perspectives, as it is usually the case in whatsoever intercultural classroom today around the world (Pampanini, in publication).

It is easy to see how those advancements in the field of Intercultural and International Education should not be left to the field of advanced educational research only. In particular, a consequential adjustment in the politics of education in each country is required in order to facilitate the international communication among educational classrooms or groups minded to uniting nations. No discussion on Global Citizenship or Global Democracy is possible if nations remain so distant as they are today.

To resume, it is arguable that the political problem of Global Democracy cannot be treated adequately *without a support from education*. One century ago, Dewey acknowledged the importance of education to building democracy *day per day*. One hundred years later, such importance, if possible, is even grown, even if it has not received the recognition that it deserves, in neither the realm of human and social sciences in general, nor in the stricter realm of philosophy and science of politics. Obviously, a correct understanding of *which kind* of education is needy is important, since an education that be traditional, bigot, and conservative, even if humanistic, is futile. In the same vein, also an education “modern and innovative” like that promoted by the OECD, is also a bias, since the mind of that approach is above all that to construct competent (and consentient) citizens-consumers and producers. Rather than that, the Intercultural and International Education research should focus on *how* facilitating the *Dialogue among Civilizations* as a daily educational practice and on *how* discovering and empowering *Intercultural Intelligence* in the students as well as in the teachers as the capacity of the mind to overwhelm the difficulties to communicating that are of cultural nature.

As an educator and educationalist in the rich part of the Planet, the author can testify that the student-type of this part of the Planet, when confronted with the terrible situation of social disparity and economic inequality in the current world, just wishes him or herself to remain living in the rich part of the Planet, simply. Very often, he or she does not feel any moral obligation in front of poverty, be it thin or thick. That it is why a need exists that educational institutions respond to a *political* theory that asserts the centrality of Intercultural and International Education. If *Intercultural Intelligence* grows in the students as well as in the teachers, making sense of the ideal of the *Dialogue among Civilizations*, also Cosmopolitanism, *including the material aid*, will consequently refresh. If that is true, then, there is hope that Global Democracy step-by-step becomes less a utopia and more a concrete matter of the daily life all over the world.



## CONCLUSION

In the present article, the author describes his own trajectory to understanding the importance of Intercultural and International Education with the aim to open a concrete way to Global Democracy. While giving a summary information about his whole *Theory of Global Democracy*, Pampanini points to refresh Cosmopolitanism as a still useful philosophical and political tradition. Of course, Cosmopolitanism needs to be criticized and integrated with very concrete notions of mutual aid and understanding, as Nussbaum suggests. Nevertheless, it remains a useful conceptual framework for educators willing to contribute to implement the globalization of democracy. In fact, the article highlights the need of a *political* theory of the educational institution, since, given its importance, Intercultural and International Education cannot be left to the hazard or to the good willingness of this or that single teacher or educator. In that sense, Cosmopolitanism, adjusted, corrected, and integrated with the notion of material aid, as suggested by Nussbaum, remains a useful overarching political understanding for education uniting nations. Finally, the article gives some details about *how* schooling and educating could function in a way to favour that trend.

## REFERENCES

- Achcar, G. (2013). *Marxism, Orientalism, Cosmopolitanism*. Haymarket.
- Appiah, K.A. (2007). *Cosmopolitismo. L'etica in un mondo di estranei*. Laterza.
- Archibugi, D. (2008). *Cittadini del mondo. Verso una democrazia cosmopolitica*. Il Saggiatore.
- Beardsworth, R. (2011). *Cosmopolitanism and International Relations Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Benhabib, S. (2008). *Cittadini globali. Cosmopolitismo e democrazia*. Il Mulino.
- Cassese, S. (2012). *Chi governa il mondo?* Il Mulino.
- Cristaldi, M. (2015). The Global Teacher. A professional figure emerging from activism and research in Education. In G. Pampanini (Ed.), *Right to Education and Globalization* (pp. 101-105). CUECM.
- Cristaldi, M. (2017). Competenze globali, global teacher e global student. Riflessioni sulla Campagna educativa «Etna vulcano della pace. Preghiera interculturale delle scuole di Catania contro la guerra». *Educazione interculturale*, (15), 1, 68-86.  
<https://rivistedigitali.erickson.it/educazione-interculturale/it/visualizza/pdf/128>
- Cristaldi, M., Majhanovic, S., & Pampanini, G. (Eds.). (2019). *The Orbital Classroom. Global Teachers committed to Global Democracy*. Nahj al-Balaghah International Research Institute.
- Cristaldi, M. & Pampanini, G. (2016). Research and activism about girls education for global democracy: The case of the campaign «Etna, Volcano of Peace», Catania, Italy. *Policy Futures in Education*, (14), 5, 578-589.  
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1478210316631376>
- Habermas, J. (1996). *Fatti e norme*. Guerini.
- Habermas, J. (1998). *L'inclusione dell'altro*. Feltrinelli.
- Küng, H. (2005). *Scontro di civiltà ed etica globale. Globalizzazione, religioni, valori universali, pace*. Datanews.
- Lê Thành, K. (1991). *Education. Cultures et sociétés*. Publications de la Sorbonne.
- Lê Thành, K. (1995). *Education et civilisations. Sociétés d'hier*. UNESCO.
- Lê Thành, K. (2001). *Education et civilisations. Le monde contemporain*. UNESCO.
- Moyn, S. (2018). *Not Enough. Human Rights in an Unequal World*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2002). *Giustizia sociale e dignità umana, da individui a persone*. Il Mulino.
- Nussbaum, M. (2006). *Frontiers of Justice. Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2008). *Giustizia e aiuto materiale*. Il Mulino.

- Nussbaum, M. (2012). *Creare capacità. Liberarsi dalla dittatura del Pil*. Il Mulino.
- Nussbaum, M. (2003). *Coltivare l'umanità. I classici, il multiculturalismo, l'educazione contemporanea*. Carocci.
- Nussbaum, M. (2019). *The Cosmopolitan Tradition. A Noble but Flawed Ideal*. Cambridge MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Pampanini, G. (1990). La "pedagogia interculturale": una nuova frontiera degli anni '90. *Annali della Pubblica Istruzione*, XXXVI, 5-6, 617-626.
- Pampanini, G. (Ed.). (1992). *Introduzione all'educazione interculturale*. Prefazione di Aldo Visalberghi. CUECM.
- Pampanini, G. (Ed.). (1993). *Prospettive euro-arabe di educazione nel Mediterraneo*. CUECM.
- Pampanini, G. (1996). *Nuove conversazioni in Sicilia*. Prefazione di Ettore Gelpi. Latessa.
- Pampanini, G. (Ed.). (1997). *L'educazione degli adulti nel confronto mediterraneo*. Latessa.
- Pampanini, G. (Ed.). (2000). *Un mare di opportunità. Educazione e cultura nel Mediterraneo del III millennio*. Armando.
- Pampanini, G. (2004). The Mediterranean Society of Comparative Education. *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies*, (9) 2, 109-118.
- Pampanini, G. (2005). *L'éducation dans la Méditerranée*. Préface de Lê Thành Khôi. CUECM.
- Pampanini, G. (2008a). *New Directions in Comparative Education*. CUECM.
- Pampanini, G. (2008b). *Iluminismo pedagógico*. Altamira.
- Pampanini, G. (Ed.). (2010). *Interculturalism, Society and Education*. Sense.
- Pampanini, G. (2011). *Intercultural Intelligence*. CUECM.
- Pampanini, G. (2015). *Right to Education and Global Democracy*. The National School of Law in India University.
- Pampanini, G. (Ed.). (2017). *Talking about Global Democracy.*: A&G-CUECM.
- Pampanini, G. (2019). *Uniting Nations. A Theory of Global Democracy*. L'Harmattan.
- Pampanini, G. (in press). *La Multiversità degli studi. Idee per una scuola nuova*. Lunaria.
- Pogge, T. (2010). *Povertà mondiale e diritti umani. Responsabilità e riforme cosmopolite*. Laterza.
- Rawls, J. (1995). *Liberalismo politico*. Comunità
- Rawls, J. (2001). *Il diritto dei popoli*. Comunità.
- Risse, M. (2012). *On Global Justice*. Princeton University Press.
- Roy, A. (2015). *Il dio delle piccole cose*. Guanda.
- Sandel, M. (2010). *Giustizia. Il nostro bene comune*. Feltrinelli.
- Singer, P. (2003). *One World. L'etica della globalizzazione*. Einaudi.

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

### *Giovanni Pampanini*

A militant of Inclusive Education and Global Democracy, Giovanni Pampanini delivered roughly one hundred University courses, seminars, lectures, and conferences on both the matters from 1980 to 2016 in a number of countries including Argentine, Bolivia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Russia, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, Turkey, UK, and USA.

The 2005-2007 vice president of the World Council of Comparative Education Societies, he is the recipient of the 2008 Honorary Citizenship of Bahia Blanca, Argentine for his cultural merits and the 2014/2015 Asolapo/UNESCO Prize for Peace Education.

Among his publications: *'Un mare di opportunità'. Cultura e educazione nel Mediterraneo del III millennio* (as editor, Rome: Armando, 2000), *Illuminismo pedagogico* (Buenos Aires: Altamira, 2008), *Interculturalism, Society and Education* (as main editor, Rotterdam: Sense, 2010), *The Orbital Classroom. Global Teachers committed to Global Democracy* (as one of the editors, Tehran: Nahj al-Balaghah International Research Institute, 2017), and *Uniting Nations. A Theory of Global Democracy* (Dakar-Paris: L'Harmattan, 2019).

Since 2020, Pampanini is the coordinator of the “*Lê Thành Khôi*” *Atelier for the Dialogue among Civilizations and International Relations*.

**Contact information:** Giovanni Pampanini, via Vezzosi, 26 - Catania, Italy, 0039.3335396797, [pampanini.wixsite.com/globaldemocracy](http://pampanini.wixsite.com/globaldemocracy), [pampanini@hotmail.it](mailto:pampanini@hotmail.it)