GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP AND CULTURAL IDENTITIES

KEIKO SEKI

Consider the process by which people with different cultures live together without mutual understanding and empathy and then come to develop such feelings clearly, this is as an issue of human development over one’s lifetime, from birth to old age.

I

Ryunosuke Akutagawa was quite right when he stated human beings constantly resign ourselves to the possible rather than the desirable (Akutaga, 25). This observation does not apply equally to everyone, however. Some individuals are able to have their world as they want it relatively easily, others must compromise their goals and content themselves with the possibilities at hand. The former are able to come close to their desired world without compromise, provided they act in accordance with their own outlook and ideas. The latter group must content themselves with what is possible and resign themselves to what is out of reach. In pursuing subsistence activities that allow them to express themselves within the larger social milieu or in striving to become a success in the conventional sense, individuals in this latter group find themselves under constant pressure to abandon their judgments, internalize required modes of behavior, and emulate others for whom such behavior comes naturally. These pressured individuals constitute a minority for the social majority defined the accepted lifestyle.

Erik Erikson described compromise as that which follows from joint existence in a shared world image, “not only an acceptance of the dominant ideal, but also an unconscious agreement with the judgement of inferiority” (Erikson, 1974, 117-118). An individual who compromises must simultaneously endure the humiliation of being informed of his or her inferiority and also endeavor to overcome that inferiority. Consider the position of an individual who, for survival purposes, has to master a foreign language. That individual compromise, endeavor, and endurance prove that he or she belongs to a minority, and underscores the hard realities behind coexistence as an otherwise romantic ideal.

Blacks, the young, and females, Erikson continues, share in common the experience at having been others, whereas adult white males have been “it.” An “intrinsic,” “in-built psychological unfreedom” can be found inheres in all groups “characterized by stigmata which mark an irreversible difference from a dominant type, an unfreedom not resolved by the mere promise of political and economic equality-although, of course, impossible without it.” (Erikson, 1974, 114). He complemented this observation by noting that “the dominant male type in all societies (and here I include all modern states) is offered special chances and privileges in order to make him define his own identity in the narrow and uniform terms
demanded by the system.” (Erikson, 1974, 115). By contrast, minorities, “characterized by stigmata” and excluded from the mainstream, must strive to shape their own identities within a setting of deprivation and disadvantage.

How can the liability of minority group membership be resolved? If not entirely resolvable, can that disadvantage at least be mitigated? Can ethnic minorities and people in other disadvantaged groups, e.g., women, the physically handicapped, the elderly, or the socially deprived coexist in symbiosis with the majority who have defined the accepted lifestyle? In addressing these questions, I define “symbiosis” as “a state of mutualism whereby one or both of two species benefit by living together, with no harm to either” (Onizuka, 8).

II

Needless to say, identity formation is not a task faced by minorities alone. The formation of identity is an issue that affects the process of shaping the next generation. “A sense of identity means a sense of being at one with oneself as one grows and develops; and it means, at the same time, a sense of affinity with a community’s sense of being at one with its future as well as its history -or mythology” (Erikson, 1974, 27-28). Erikson related the establishment of personal identity to life-cycle theory, and particularly as a developmental issue for individuals in the adolescent stage of life. However, it should be noted that some people are unusually tense about the issue of identity formation. The reason is primarily because they want to have an identity that substantiates their value as individuals. There are times when it also becomes a major issue for people living in multi-cultural and multi-ethnic societies. Such a time is when one group of people sets up a category to establish its dominant position. This category is intended to justify that group’s dominant position, but the grounds for their dominance, considered to be self-evident, are not subject to proof. When one category is promulgated over others in this way, tension arise in some people with regard to formation of identity. This yearning for proof or justification, as it were, stems from the perception that categorical stereotyping threatens to deprive them of their personal value. In other words, people who bear the stigma of being different tend to be all the more discriminating about their own identity. Minorities with this identity problem could be taken to include ethnic minorities, women, homosexuals, the physically handicapped, the mentally ill, and members of any other group that is “considered to be outside the mainstream either in terms of its character or accepted norms of function or conduct” (Ishikawa, 196).

Consider the question of ethnic identity, for example. “People belonging to an ethnic majority have few opportunities to be consciously concerned about the issue of ethnic identity” (Ishikawa, 20). That is to say, “being in an ethnic minority is another way of labeling an individual in a situation that does not allow him or her to be unconcerned about the issue of ‘ethnicity.’ The stronger the belief in and the greater the dependence of a society on these norms and competence, the more such a society will produce people (minorities) who are labeled “different” and stigmatized. In Japanese society, for example, the Ainu have been created as a minority. The method employed to position the Ainu people as a minority has also been used to produce other minorities.

In so far as the making of categories determines the relationships between people, minorities will continue to be produced. Unless the categories that control relationships
between human beings diminish and lose strength, creating new reciprocal relationships will not be possible.

Likewise, an ethnic majority describes a class of individuals who are capable of leading lives oblivious to the social function of ethnicity" (Ishikawa, 20). However, this majority imposes the categorization that provides yardsticks for discrimination, thus producing the deprived groups (minorities) that have to live with categorization as such. As one who has followed and studied the problems of minorities in culturally diverse societies, this is essentially the reason why I have chosen to devote attention to the issue of identity.

I would, however, like to draw attention to another point: namely, the fact that identity formation is no longer an issue exclusively for individuals in their adolescence. The prolonged social “moratorium” on adolescence itself is now a widely known phenomenon. Not only that, but largely due to social trends and population shifts, it is now possible for personal identities established within one social context to be threatened or undermined in other social contexts, or to be re-established with certain types of assistance or opportunities (Nakano, 181). Such examples are in the process of becoming commonplace. Emigration and the collapse of nation-states, as in the case of the now-defunct Soviet Union, have shaken, established, or threatened the identities of numerous individuals regardless of their age. Nonetheless, “little if any serious attention to date has been devoted to the socialization of adulthood or to identity crises extending over prolonged periods” (Nakano, 188). “Identity crises sometimes begin with the sense of desperation that may follow when one engages in serious introspection, reflection, and at times rejection of one’s former self. In some cases, the individual may feel adrift, unable to understand what he is actually searching for” (Nakano, 170).

What forms of support can help a minority individual overcome an identity crisis? The task of achieving coexistence and symbiosis between majority and minority groups will not be possible unless this question is answered.

On this point, let us delve somewhat further into the issue of identity formation. According to Erikson, identity serves to bind the past and future for members of the same group. One may add that the identity “I’ includes everything that is perceived to distinguish an individual from others: e.g., physical features, age, personality, educational background, professional credentials or career, world view, values, aesthetic sensitivities, ethnicity, mother tongue, day-to-day role, and binding relationships with other individuals” (Ishikawa, 14). A gender-based perspective is also essential, together with an analysis of dimensions of competence. In effect, the notion “I’ may be termed the collective totality of all the features composing one’s identity” (Ishikawa, 14). In other words it is possible to say that “the ‘self’ is a collective, a bundling of identities” (Ishikawa, 14). Among the factors comprising this bundling of the identities called the “self” are national identity, regional and local identity etc.

Conversely, an identity crisis can involve factors that upset the harmony of one’s personal identity package. Overcoming this crisis may be described as an effort to focus on selected components of one’s identity and striving to regain a measure of balance. Examples of a shift in that focus are worth our attention here. Although native tongue is an important element of personal identity, an individual may face the necessity of adopting another language. Individuals sometimes abandon their ethnic identity “in favor of a national identity that they believe will serve as better proof of their existence” (Ishikawa, 75-76). As this example illustrates, individuals can shift the focus of importance ascribed to different elements of their identity.
As indicated earlier, a minority is created when certain individuals are categorized by their level of predominance within a given social context. At that instant, each individual in the new minority is accordingly confronted with the pressing task of readjusting the totality of his or her personal identity. The following scenario, however, can affect individuals belonging to either a majority or a minority. "It is possible that, given a certain biographical context, signs or symptoms will be produced by the individual himself" (Berger and Luckmann, 199). It is important to consider, "the imprint of societal identity types upon the individual subjective reality of the ordinary people with common sense" (Berger and Luckmann, 199). Indeed, some individuals are capable of casting the spell of their own identity and living it out in real life.

III

Establishing a personal identity is today an important challenge that spans the full cycle of an individual's life -- from birth through adulthood to old age and eventual death. It is not only a challenge in terms of pursuing and living one's chosen lifestyle, but also a challenge that bears on the formation of personal character. As such, it amounts to a common challenge for the entire spectrum of human existence; further, in finding solutions to this challenge, all humans are on equal terms.

More precisely defined, the formation of personal character is, in Erikson's vocabulary, a process of "generativity" (Erikson, 1965, 258): that is, a manifestation of "the concern in establishing and guiding the next generation" (Erikson, 1965, 258). This manifestation, so to speak, is powered by certain modes of behavior and notions of independence and self-reliance that can vary depending on the group to which the individual belongs. For example, they may vary by ethnic group, community, or generation.

The way of shaping the next generation and the views and conduct regarding the way in which the next generation achieves independence are called culture of human development. Culture of human development find expression as lifestyles to be actualized over the life cycles of their participants. Erikson in this context (1982, 96) uses the term "life-historical" as a synonym for "developmental," with an emphasis on development as a living process rather than a matter of extent or static degree.

The concepts and modalities of independence which include self-reliance, provide the foundations for culture of human development. So too do the relations between individuals in pursuit of their independence and the benefactors who assist them (Seki, 1998, 282-285).

As used here, independence is not a notion that applies only to actors on the stages of Western or contemporary civilization. More to the point, it is not an idea that by definition excludes any individual or group. Rather, if we invoke the phrase "social independence," it can be construed as having a broad-based or comprehensive scope. In this respect, then, the concept is understood to imply autonomous decision-making power regardless of skill, age, or other attributes; this is "the position that individuals are capable of making their own decisions, be they elderly and bedridden or senile, or whatever their condition" (Hagiwara, 8-9).

Historically, the process of becoming independent in the general sense was influenced by a variety of factors, including social status or class, geographic location, and gender. In
modern times, though, schools have assumed an increasingly important role, accompanied by a decline in admiration for the cultures that fostered independence long prior to the advent of contemporary society (Sachs, 8). Take imperial Russia, for example. Members of the Russian aristocracy were then in the practice of calling in private teachers to tutor their children in French language and other subjects that would guarantee the perpetuation of aristocratic culture, and indeed, considered this to be a major step toward independence. By contrast, members of the peasant class had devised their own strategies for independence. In particular, peasants assisted the next generation in achieving self-reliance by preparing boys to assume the work roles performed by their fathers and preparing girls to assume the work roles fulfilled by their mothers. In this fashion, each social class gained pride and confidence in the form of self-reliance that it practiced.

Nonetheless, the notion of independence itself gradually changed as systems of schooling developed. Throughout history, the developmental process by which the next generation is formed has varied according to social strata and class, region, gender, and ethnicity. However, since the beginning of the modern age and public education, schools have come to exercise an exclusive position in this process. When one culture of human development holds sway over schools, in a school-oriented society that culture becomes the majority.

Under the traditional schooling systems of education, workers, farmers, women, powerless ethnic groups, and citizens in rural or outlying districts were all considered to be conspicuous minorities. However, with the realization of equality as one of the principles of urban society, these putative minority groups also were gradually integrated into the schooling system. Although social movements made steady progress toward winning assurances of the right to an education, going through the formal education system itself in the meantime took on value as the orthodox path to independence.

What were the implications of this change? One, of course, was that an individual's level of formal education came to be interpreted as a measure of independence or self-reliance. Schools defined society's world view, with no other interpretations accepted. To put it another way, people who saw the formal schooling system as the path to independence became the dominant culture of human development. As a consequence, most people nowadays share the view that a good education is the way to ensure that an individual is a successful member of modern society. In effect, people who placed schools at the core of their culture of human development earned a position of dominance (became the majority) within the contemporary societal dimension of human resources development. That is to say, when the foundations for formal schooling began falling into place, culture of human development shared by males, Caucasians, ethnic groups in a position of control, the healthy, the bourgeoisie, and the middle class began applying the filters of race, social class, gender, and ethnicity to the rest of society. These filters also found acceptance among, and enclosed, the people who fell through them.

"Dropout" is one of the conventional labels applied to people nowadays who struggle to free themselves from the hypnotic spell of school-imposed values. In fact, it is almost as if they were being treated as social deviants merely because they have chosen an approach to independence that is different from the path accepted as the norm. Indeed, it would appear that "Schools produced knowledge of a particular kind, then, at the same time as they recreated categories of deviance that stratified students" (Apple, 20). To the point, schools create deviants.

In a schooled society, people so labeled clearly represent a minority. Conversely, people
with the time and space to live as they desire (Sachs, 21) and affirm their own existence with the lifestyle of their choice are undeniably members of the true majority.

IV

Consider next the structural elements of the culture of human development in more detail. Considerations of international comparative research on multi-cultural and multi-ethnic societies conducted thus far, enable us to identify elements comprising culture of human development as indices for comparative study. Five structural elements (A~E) of the culture of human development can be enumerated.

For (A-1), curricular content serves as a messaging system for the knowledge or ideas to be transmitted and acquired, and for (A-2), the languages that can be used for these purposes. For (A-3), languages that are taught as a foreign language. For (A-4), books and teaching aids. A-4 means education primarily through spoken and written language, or not limited to the above (i.e. preparation coincides with the sensibilities and abilities of children).

(B). The structural principles on which the curriculum depends as a messaging system. The principles shaping interpersonal relationships between individuals involved in the educational processes of knowledge transmission and acquisition. These have to do with someone control the curricular content and the methods and speed of transmission: i.e., teachers, students, and the relationships between them.

More particularly, B embraces (a) efficient and systematic instruction and study in each of clearly distinguished subject areas and (b) comprehensive study type that raises topics, includes fact-finding activities, and develops self-awareness.

(C). The relationship between teachers and students is often hierarchical absolute or reciprocal. Bernstein’s theory provides the basis for B and C. Bernstein explains the basic structure of curriculum as a messaging system in terms of a concept of classification utilized to demonstrate the level of integrity in dividing the lines between curricular or subject content. He focuses on the interpersonal relationships involved in such transmission and acquisition of knowledge, and explores school-based education in terms of who has control over course content, educational methods, timing, or pace (framing). Whenever the classifications and framing are strong, the schooling code is labeled “collection code.” In Bernstein’s interpretation, “principles of power and social control are realized through educational knowledge codes” (Bernstein, 94). Collection codes feature strong curricular boundaries that are underpinned by the integration of students into a hierarchical social order of power relationships. “the stronger the classification and the framing, the more the educational relationship tends to be hierarchical and ritualized” (Bernstein, 98). Students are treated as un-learned and have no rights or status. Teachers conversely have exclusive powers of control and supervision. Students receive their education, accumulate knowledge, and “children and pupils are early socialized into this concept of knowledge as private property” (Bernstein, 97). “One nearly always know the social significance of where one is and, in particular, who one is with each advance in the educational career” (Bernstein, 95). Students and institutional staff who specialize in a particular subject will pursue their studies with devotion and acquire their own special identity.
An "integrated code" denotes forms of schooling based on relaxed classifications. "Integrated codes may well provide the conditions for strong horizontal relationships and allegiances in students and pupils, based upon a common work task (the receiving and offering of knowledge)." (Bernstein, 104). In such settings, learning is organized on the basis of a set of comprehensive ideals that accord more emphasis to having a choice of subjects to study than the inculcation of specialty expertise, per se. Whenever integrated codes prevail, boundaries between different subjects are less distinct, and the educational emphasis is not on the nature or details of knowledge itself, but on ways of creating knowledge, in other words, "how knowledge is created" (Bernstein, 102). Furthermore, students are on equal terms and enjoy a collaborative relationship with their teachers. Stress is placed on a variety of cognitive methods, and the formats for learning can be group or self-regulated (Bernstein, 102).

In terms of B and C as described above, it is important that an effort be made to clarify power relationships and realities of control, and to identify the types of socialization taking place.

"Where knowledge is regulated by collection codes, social order arises out of the hierarchical nature of the authority relationships, out of the systematic ordering of the differentiated knowledge in time and space, out of an explicit, usually predictable, examining procedure." (Bernstein, 106). Students in this setting will study science subjects in the conventional, segmented manner and be socialized to the existing order as it relates to knowledge and humans.

The multiplicity and connectivity (D) of the setting for the transmission and acquisition of knowledge comprise an additional structural element of culture of human development. The issues here are whether the student striving for independence has a variety of different places for learning, and the ways in which these places relate to one another. Assuming a plurality of educational settings, the question will be whether they have been arranged into a hierarchical structure, or exist as student-oriented networks (the organization of which the student is capable of choosing independently). These factors are concerned with the atmosphere for learning and living with a monotone (mono-cultural) or plural values.

If a plurality of communities are available for the learning process, the transmission and learning codes are characterized by a collection code. A hierarchy is in place, the student will be strongly socialized to the existing order and equipped with a strengthened identity. If an integrated code is in effect, the student will encounter a conflicting mixture of cognitive instructional methods in each community and have the opportunity to build his or her own identity without the prospect of being wholly assimilated into the group or having his or her pre-existing identity further reinforced. However, if the student has access to a plurality of communities marked by collection and integrated codes, he or she may experience a weakened sense of identity (or the identity crisis). The fewer communities available, the weaker the above-noted experiences will be.

Collection and integrated codes also result in different levels of student accomplishment. For example, in educational environments dominated by the collection code, students will be socialized into the existing order and expected to steadily build on their mastery of a predefined set of knowledge. "The collection code is capable of working when staffed by mediocre teachers, whereas integrated codes call for much greater powers of synthesis, analogy and for more ability to both tolerate and enjoy ambiguity at the level of knowledge and social relationships" (Bernstein, 108).
An understanding of element D with attention to B and C will allow one to decide whether the educational setting favors coexistence or symbiosis between different cultures, i.e., is conducive to the development of new cognitive methods through dialogue by members of different cultures. Ongoing dialogue with others through participation in a variety of different communities has the potential of fostering personalities with unique sets of knowledge, albeit provided the integrated code prevails in those communities to start with. It will also be possible to cultivate unique individuals through group collaboration. It is very important to find the place (group) in which to act.

“Most importantly, there could be concrete actions and struggles, though sometimes not conscious ones, by real groups of human actors that existed and which might be both mediating and transforming existing structures and meanings in significant ways” (Apple, 22).

The final element for consideration here is (E) the background setting or environment as a mechanism for message transmission: that is, the backdrop setting for culture of human development. Certain environments are conducive to the educational process and capable of generating imagery of tranquility. As such, they have a healing effect in that they allow individuals to experience and internalize a soothing sense of being accepted for what they are.

It is important to focus on community networking. This community means the place (or human relationship) where a child or a man (woman) is accepted as he or she is.

In effect, many minorities are seriously concerned that peoples of different cultures have been deprived of “the opportunity to define the forms of their social life” (Sachs, 9). One causal agent of their distress is the bloated nature of the schooling system as a channel for the realization of personal or social independence. Another is the monocultural nature of the average school institution. From the beginning of our modern era, minorities have been people who could enter the mainstream of society only by adapting and altering their own culture of human development.

What can be done to help minorities recover their autonomous ways of living (Sachs, 21)? They must regain their traditional culture of human development or strive to build new such cultures from scratch. Otherwise, they face the risk of being assimilated by another culture and branded as underachievers. Recapturing their own definitions of independence will be key. To this end, it will be crucial to contemplate the value or significance of transmitted knowledge from a minority standpoint and identify the essentials for minority-defined independence or self-reliance. The bonds and communities of the people who support this speculative enterprise will also be of critical importance. The places (communities) that embrace and share in this exploratory quest, and that accept minority individuals for what they are, will be of the utmost value. One word of caution: minorities should not allow themselves to be sidetracked by the advice or guidance of specialists or authoritative experts who have not shown any willingness to review or revise their own notions about strategies for the achievement of independence.

By participation in the above-noted places (communities), I mean participation that is free of foregone conclusions and that allows everyone an active voice, i.e., is not dominated by Promethean experts. Indeed, communities that let anyone join in the dialogues and discuss whatever they like (Freire, 101). The point is that dialogue will follow if the parties concerned
collaborate in devising methods and concepts for their own independence. An open environment conducive to a heightened sense of participation in group life is the only atmosphere in which true dialogue can take root (Freire, 56). Among parties engaged in shared questions, dialogue is a foundation for equality as well as mutual, constructive criticism (Freire, 98-99).

Minorities will find it of value to ask several questions: e.g., what is it they are pursuing in their collaboration with others; how to establish an atmosphere of dialogue between students and teachers and ensure that everyone acquires a proper attitude for contemplation (Freire, 197); what significance scientific discoveries and ideas may have; the historical value of significant knowledge and in what ways knowledge has been utilized, among other attributes (Freire, 195). Dialogue will allow for a creative reconstitution of the basic forms of social interaction (Sachs, 20), as well as a rearrangement of the relationships between humans and material things, between humans themselves, and between humans and their natural surroundings.

As used above in relation to minorities, the term “community” carries two connotations. One is as a refuge from the colonization of the global living environment. “How will we live together as a group? What is it that gives us our values? What do we believe? How should we interpret life as we live it day by day? It is imperative that each of us be able to independently answer questions like these” (Tomlinson, 336). These places of refuge have been given form by individuals who are trying “to resist the colonization of our global living environment;” e.g., peace activists, members of the environmental movement, the women’s movement, and people engaged in campaigns for the liberation and welfare of minority ethnic groups (Tomlinson, 333). The other connotation of community is that of a place for “a new way of relating to each other, of activating and invigorating each other in the service of common goals” (Erikson, 1974, 33). Dialogue in these settings will open “a new vista in which relative standpoints are ‘reconciled’ to each other in fundamental invariance” (Erikson, 1982, 96-97).

Dialogue between people with different backgrounds or viewpoints may lead to something entirely new. If based on fundamental consensus, collaboration in finding solutions to shared issues (e.g., concerning the environment or peace) can have major consequences, be that undertaking inside or outside the school setting.

In this context, community is to be thought of as an arena for citizen-led movements or as a center for social activities. However, it would be inadequate to describe it solely as a location for citizen activism. Citizen movements that allow for the common use of spaces that guarantee certain basic forms of participation and dialogue are consistently “oriented toward the goals of decentralization, activism, and restructuring” (Shoji, 288).

However, it would not be a good idea to confine oneself to any single community. The reason is that if being different is construed as “being something special or having a special identity, that individual may be confronted with artificial limits or led astray” (Trinh, 153). Granted these drawbacks, it would seem more sensible to help create and participate in a variety of communities and learn to enjoy the mutual contrasts and consolidation with others who are different. Identify formation through participation in multiple communities will be conducive to a broad-based identity and an ability to achieve quick compromise. If minorities take part in a variety of communities, the majority will be unable to fully control or stifle them. In this process, the majority will also lose any justification for stifling minority groups through categorization or stereotyping. The atmosphere of polar confrontation will conceivably come to an end, thus setting the stage for majority and minority groups to intermingle and forge new
innovations in their relations.

In other words, the point is to become a proponent and mediator of networked communities. In doing so, one may help give rise to a uniquely new culture of human development. Individuals can be expected to follow lifestyles as active agents of information and knowledge while striving to assimilate the knowledge they need for their own purposes, yet without being sidetracked by the currently dominant system of knowledge (or its experts). This process will be facilitated by participating in a variety of communities, striving to forge consensus, managing shared space, and engaging in autonomous efforts to network the communities surrounding oneself.

Struggles in culture of human development are played out between the majority and minorities, with the results leading to education reform. If, as Trinh T. Minh-ha says, hegemony is a situation in which one side wields power over another and "this power derives from a difference of position or gender," it is possible to see educational reform as a hegemonic struggle over culture of human development. For example, in Tatarstan in the Russian Federation, there is a growing move toward Tatarization by requiring both Russian and Tatar as the languages of instruction. From one perspective, this merely appears to be a shift from Russian nationalism to Tatar nationalism, and this aspect is strong. However, among those who have experienced these reforms, including young people, there are some in the process of creating dual cultures and dual ethnic identities and others who are forming a third separate identity. In addition to learning opportunities that offer diverse values and are not hierarchical (D), the atmosphere of places where children are raised (E) encourages the formation of such people. While the city of Kazan in Tatarstan appears to have a strong Islamic influence, there is an atmosphere of diverse culture. The mixed landscape of two religions (Islam and Russian Orthodox) seems to have encouraged this.

Global identity develops and the process of becoming a global citizen starts when an identity begins to take shape not held captive by any particular ethnic, local, regional or national identity. If various learning opportunities are available offering diverse values (D), it becomes possible to network among them in one's own fashion. Such people will be not subsumed by one identity or group. This means participation and dialogue will be guaranteed. People will view themselves as special and will not be limited in their choices. Rather than consist of controlled views or foregone conclusions, participation must realize a type of dialogue which makes it possible to exchange views without fear. It is important that no one denies others the right to choices or force his or her choice on others. According to P. Freire, this results in people who exercise radical choices. When there are various locations of young people capable of making radical choices, the formation of global citizenship will progress.

The revolution in education is really a battle for dominance over culture of human development. The deep strata of this revolution may be understood in terms of the structural elements A through E described earlier. Further, as already indicated, individuals who have experienced emigration or the collapse of their country will face an identity crisis whether they have already passed through adolescence or not. One may wonder how such individuals feel about that crisis, or what they should do to rebuild their identity to fit their new societal context? What forms of support or conditions will be of value in helping such individuals recover their identities? The above considerations, if rooted in culture of human development, will be a major first step in the quest to find answers to these questions.
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