

# Theodore Brameld's Thought Infused in Higher Education Global Studies Curriculum

Stephen R. White<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of North Carolina System, Vilas, North Carolina, USA

Correspondence: Stephen R. White, University of North Carolina System, 1496 Baird's Creek Rd., Vilas, North Carolina, 28692, USA. Tel: 1-828-963-7092. E-mail: whitesr@boone.net

Received: February 28, 2016

Accepted: April 28, 2016

Online Published: June 28, 2016

doi:10.5539/jel.v5n3p278

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jel.v5n3p278>

## Abstract

The assertion here is that Theodore Brameld's Social Reconstructionist thought can provide us in American higher education the philosophical foundation for a relevant 21st century curriculum global studies agenda. It is a curriculum that merges self-awareness with global societal evolution. Through the interjection of Brameldian social reconstructionism into the forum of global studies into that of the Arts and Letters for American higher education, learners gain an infusion of emerging collective consciousness that weaves together new ways of knowing through the formation of the curriculum that informs rational thought and empirical action of global social behavior the ultimately cultivates a new normal for humankind. "*The consciousness of each of us is evolution looking at itself and reflection upon itself...the whole future of the Earth seems to me to depend on the awakening of our faith in the future*" Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955). "*We shall require a substantially new manner of thinking if mankind is to survive*" (Albert Einstein, 1875-1955).

## 1. Introduction

This study is a theoretical narrative regarding two major areas American society in an increasingly globalized world and higher education who is seeking to educate for the future of peaceful cooperation. What is the new and novel scholarly contribution here is that it makes to the field of American higher education philosophy as an interdisciplinary synthesis: (1) The evolution of our increasingly globalized life-world, (2) the development of the curriculum in higher education to inform learners for the 21st Century through global studies, and to suggest a restoration of Social Reconstructionism through an examination of philosopher Theodore Brameld's thought within the context of global education.

Brameldian thought argues that education's cultural role was to reconstruct society, specifically toward greater global unity and planetary cohesion for humankind. Today we are seeing a globalized society through a process driven by technology that does not lessen Brameld's vision of an educated society. Thus we have solid reasons to revisit his thought within the context of curriculum development in American higher education.

## 2. Our Age of Globalization and Global Studies

Globalization is defined as the social compression of the on an interconnected international social, political, cultural and humanitarian scale. The depth of this human phenomenon demands a change in the way humankind thinks about and sees themselves within this emerging integrative global system.

Present day international political and socioeconomic developments will most likely forever change human relations. These new global political and socioeconomic transformations will have a deep impact on our society's collective consciousness as we become increasingly aware that our social-life world is inherently interdependent. This new social phenomenon is termed globalization (Berger & Hunnington, 2002; Bhagwati, 2004; Bloom, 2000; Lal, 2004; Pertrilli, 2006).

Some scholars explore the economic complexity and dichotomy of globalization. They marvel at the great success of some nations through ever changing technology. Yet, simultaneously, much of the Third World are holding onto an old life-world views and what have traditionally mattered to them with their antiquated world view.

Their concern is that very few really understand what exactly globalization means. For many scholars globalization is simply about American hegemony and the Americanization of the world. However the reality is

that the issue is much more complex because it involves evolving international relations, emerging global markets, expanding technology, and the rise of the power of independent entrepreneurs and multi-national corporations who hold power relative to that of nationalistic power.

Politicians and economists argue that organizations such as the World Bank, World Trade Organization and international financial interests fund control of the economic development of globalization and that it is a force of good for the poor and disenfranchised. As such the reality is that globalization is improving the living of millions around the world.

Others hold a humanist disposition about it—put on a human face—that will make it more agreeable to acceptable for all persons. This is necessary because they believe that antiglobalization movements have overstated the claims that globalization has created oppressive conditions of Third World countries that is even worse than the recent past.

In respect to India, Edward Luce (2007) writes of the nation as becoming a 21st century economic and geopolitical giant. He examines the growth of India within the context of globalization by exploring the impact it is having on individuals as they attempt to deal with the new global culture emerging within the old Hindu culture of self-reliance and religious mores. He documents the stress on societies and people caused by the transition into the new age of globalization but sees the end point of the process as progressive and positive. Their assessment represents what many nations argue is the case in regards to globalization. Thus they ask will globalization lead to a new higher order of social reality, an authentic transformation, or will it accelerate humankind into destruction (Luce, 2007; Kamdar, 2007)?

Many in American higher education have called for a vision of the profession that promotes activism and consciousness of globalization. American higher education is rapidly becoming a process of global education. The realization is that higher education is strategically positioned to not only participate in the globalization process but advance it.

Some scholars have taken a critical assessment of American higher education. They ask why the once-vaunted US system of public higher education has slipped being relative to much of the world. Once accepted as gospel was the premise that strong research universities are central to higher education and the development of individuals and societies. They do not call for expanded spending on higher education for the public good but better use of current funds, policies and shift in thinking regarding the overall purpose (Dulas, King, & Feller, 2009).

Guruz and Zinpler (2011) have examined higher education around the globe within the context of what challenges of increasing globalization are having on other institutions. They seek to uncover emerging patterns of strategy and practice in the internationalizing of higher education. They ask how is globalization within the context of higher education can be understood by those who lead these universities, globally. What leadership thought will be needed in the future that can transform today's institutions?

Theoretically, Guruz and Zinpler make a clear distinction between forms of globalization and internationalization, and the relationship to leadership challenges such as ethical issues and cultural tensions created by a global economic demands and organizational responsibilities of higher education beyond national boundaries in higher education's administrative efforts to respond to the challenges of globalization.

King, Marglinson, and Naidou (2011) argue that higher education today has entered center-stage in regards to the knowledge economy and has been deployed in the search for economic competitiveness and social development. Convergences and divergences in national higher education systems are resulting from increased global co-operation and competition. They suggest governance mechanisms by international organizations, national governments and by higher education institutions themselves that analyze local responses to dominant global templates of higher education and the consequences for knowledge generation, social equity, economic development and the public good.

Katherine and James (2012) have focused their research on the history globalization had had on American higher education. The American-style university are an intervention into current discussions concerning the role of the post-modern American-style university in a global context and explore various ways that American models of higher level learning have become instituted around the world that develops, and how these levels of control methods of education, knowledge, power, and culture.

Their conclusion is that globalization is impacting the future of higher education, the politics of teaching and its cultural impact are changing nature of universities themselves. Thus a rigorous analysis about some of the most

pressing issues concerning the future of what used to be known as conventional liberal education, a hallmark of American higher education, are now under the banner of global studies (Keypas & McDougall, 2012).

Many assert that we are all becoming global citizens which begs questions such as what are our new civic responsibilities. For him, American higher education has responded to this question by making the socialization of “global citizens” into globalization part of their core mission, primarily through studies abroad. Nevertheless, theoretical and research based pressing questions remain a challenge for the academy: how does one acquire global citizenship, social skills and global competence? What are the philosophical, pedagogical and practical challenges facing American higher education as they endeavor to prepare global citizens? How is study abroad and the cultivation of global citizenship compatible with the traditional role of American higher education (Lewin, 2009; Maringe & Nick, 2010; Odin & Manicas, 2004)?

Suarez-Orozco and Qin-Hilliard (2004) examine not higher education but the impact globalization has on the education and development of tomorrow’s higher education learners in the construction of a new global culture. They merge perspectives from anthropology, history and economics to offer us unique insights. They look on globalization’s impact on the neglected but crucial topic of culture and education. They define a new domain of basic scholarship which engages the complex relationships between globalization, culture and the education of global citizens. The fate and future of the planet rests on the ability of education to meet those challenges while also developing future global citizens.

Weber and Duderstedt (2008) have also explored what role do universities play in the process of globalization? They argue that the globalization of higher education is reflective of how the shrinking of the world is affecting universities and how we, as a society, chose to respond.

Ben Wildavsky (2010) has studied how international competition for the brightest minds is transforming higher education. Every year, three million international students study outside of their home countries. Newly created or expanded universities such as in China, India, and Saudi Arabia are competing with the likes of Harvard and Oxford for faculty, students, and research preeminence. He argues that as international universities strive to become world-class, the new global education marketplace is providing more opportunities to a greater number of people than ever before in history.

This literature review shows that the focus of global higher education (global education) is much different from that of comparative international studies. The overriding goal for all these educational theorists is to conceptualize educational programs as a forum for knowledge acquisition and the exchanging ideas that promote collective cooperation globally. The role of the educator is to facilitate social change and transform the consciousness of learners. Thus global education is an educational agenda to raise the consciousness of learners who desire to participate in social action advancing collective global cooperation (Merriam & Brockett, 1997).

The world is indeed at a threshold where old international sociological realities are being shattered and new global realities formed. This phenomenon requires a shift in attitudes and behaviors that are conducive to international interdependence and cooperation among all peoples and tribes. Getting this social shift logically communicated, to learners who were socialized into and have lived in a world contrary to the new emerging reality, is daunting task.

There is much to reorient society toward the rising reality of globalization. This is especially true of American society that is grounded in a culture structured around autonomous individualism, competition, and staunch sovereignty. I proclaim that global education, theoretically, is the socialization into globalization. It is the educative process of acquiring the social literacy necessary to function as rational citizens in the new global order. Social literacy is the intellectual competence to interact with others in addressing issues and problems, rationally. In this evolving historical epoch of intensified globalization, rational and reflective social literacy skills are essential tools to advance social evolution over global desolation.

Therefore, how the actors in higher education contextualize global education programs is particularly significant. The task here is to explore how to conceptualize our thoughts as being a process of “social reconstructionism” as the contextual foundation for an American global higher education programs.

### **3. Social Reconstructionism Revisited**

Globalization’s movement toward global cooperation and the potential for the establishment of a new world order hold paramount interest for educational philosophers of the Social Reconstructionism tradition. Since the 1960s and the formation of the Society for Educational Reconstruction (SER), reconstructionist have been visionaries of the coming new world we now face in higher education for over the past century (Riley, 2006).

Social Reconstructionist hold that modern society is facing a grave crisis of international political conflicts, economic instability, changes in social stability, environmental and ecological destruction that threaten the very survival of humankind. These issues demand that all levels of education advance social activism. Activism should take place within the domain of education because it holds a strategic social position in these crisis areas by providing the intellectual and social foundation for musings that will lead to positive global changes and cooperation.

Reconstructionist argues that education is the proper social institution for social change because it's potential to bring about real change is more comprehensive and widespread than any other. Before political, social, and economic reform people must first become educated for change. Social Reconstructionist argues that today's educational content is tomorrow's socioeconomic and public policy. Making the college educator aware that the "act of teaching" holds equal importance with narrowly focused "specialized research" is no small or trivial contribution of Reconstructionist. An important contribution of Reconstructionist is the promotion of interdisciplinary study. Colleges and universities over time have become fragmented and segregated by an over-emphasis on compartmentalized research and specialization. The renewed emphasis on teaching has resulted in the recognition by many in the collegiate ranks of the validity of interdisciplinary study and academic generalization.

As has been demonstrated in the previous section, globalization is having varied impacts on higher education in the United States. The socialization process of higher education learning into globalization is the process of learning through what is termed here as "global education (studies)". What is occurring through various global higher education curricula is already the reconstruction of American society, the construction of a new global culture and the construction of collective consciousness. How leadership in higher education visualizes humankind globally prescribes how they prepare the consciousness of learners to interact globally to their life-world within themselves. The basic assumptions regarding the human phenomenon and social reality influences social relationships on a global scale. Most often these basic assumptions are so ingrained in thought patterns that educational leaders of the past rarely have they entertained alternative perspectives even though they are fundamental to the way perceive the world and higher education's place in it.

It is not enough to say for instance in a social reconstructionist curricular agenda, that a collective system of harmonious individual psyches would be sufficient for evolving a more ideal global culture; rather, both the individual and the society could only achieve its perfection through purposeful collective action on a global scale and at the end of its evolutionary process. Instead of higher education blindly submitting us to the destructive capacities of exclusive or utopian subjective inquiry, objective societal action, or totalizing systems for global unity (Stanley, 1992).

The assertion here is that we in higher education look again and anew at the Principles of Social Reconstructionism to see their golden threads so that we might better continue to weave in our service of harvesting human consciousness into the evolving collective global consciousness as part and parcel of an unfolding tapestry of 21st century higher education mission (Roberts & Bussler, 1997).

The thought of Social Reconstructionist Theodore Brameld reveals foundational motifs to contemplate for those of us in the midst of postmodern globalization and higher education. Thus what follows is an overview Brameld and his vision of society reconstructed through education within the context of an evolving global milieu.

#### **4. Theodore Brameld's Global Thought**

Theodore Brameld (1904-1987) was an education theorist who cultivated Reconstructionism into a more polished global philosophy of education. He did not possess the dogmatic harshness of a radical revolutionary of educational praxis but was more a Utopian idealist and futurist. His Reconstructionist philosophy emphasized the human need for large macro visions of humankind's progression that inspired compelling goals for a social frontier. These future frontiers could galvanize and unify educational dispositions and efforts to construct new societies and cultures. Higher education is a forum for the cultivation of individuals cognitive and consciousness progression toward a cooperative and collective action and mind (Roberts & Bussler, 1997; Riley, 2006; Stone, 2003).

Brameld was grounded in Hegelian philosophy of the dialectical evolution of consciousness. Hegel argued that the dialectic process of ideas through thesis, antithesis, and synthesis always led to something better than what existed previously. Therefore, Hegel saw history, society, and political systems as progressive with each new emerging era improved over the last. Likewise, Brameld argued that social reconstruction would occur through the dialectical process of ideas promoted through education. Through the process of education social progression

is occurring historically, socially, and politically. Education is the forum for the dialectic of ideas and the pushing of society to new realities improved over the previous reality with as a new global (Ozman, 2011; Stanley, 1992).

Similarly, Brameld argued that social reconstruction would occur through the dialectical process of ideas promoted through education. Through the process of education social progression is occurring historically, socially, and politically. Education is the forum for the dialectic of ideas and the pushing of society to new realities improved over the previous reality with as a new global order as the final idealistic endpoint (Brameld, 1971).

He held that Reconstructionism is a crisis philosophy of both education and society. Humankind is at a critical point in history-one road leads to destruction while the other leads to salvation only if humankind will make the effort. Thus, he states, Reconstructionism is a philosophy of values, ends, and purposes. Though Brameld was absolutely certain what path humankind should take, he was not sure and was troubled by which path humankind would actually take (Brameld, 1965, 1976).

Brameld's utopian vision of social progress is inspirational but not an objective realistic assessment. He does not provide a blueprint about what kind of political system should be promoted through education, the questions of political power and how to devise a system of equitable and acceptable economic distribution globally are not specifically addressed. He only proposes that it should be democratic. Brameld often laps into pure speculative idealism of "what ought to be" without addressing "how" education and a global government can overcome these monumental problems (Brameld, 1950, 1957; Stone, 2003).

Simply stated, in Brameldian sense, to change society we must first change the individual and education is the most effective social institutions to accomplish this task. Brameld's brand of social reconstructionist has flowered into a strong arm of the movement. Other educators following Brameld's lead have contributed to the "futurist" thinking and orientation of Reconstructionism about society and education (Brameld, 1965, 1976, 2000).

Brameld, who represented the more advanced aspects of the modern social Reconstructionist movement, understood something deeply essential in this dialogue of developing self through societal action when he conceived of a curriculum of explosive ideas that helped students actualize themselves through collective social action. This view is closely consistent with French philosopher Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's theory and vision of planetization (Meynard, 2006).

In this curricular sequence, societal problems are apprehended collectively through an awareness and empathy with those struggling with poverty, violence, ignorance, and other inequities. From this vantage point, students are able to postulate a teleological goal (vision for collectively-achievable positive change) versus a materialistic one of fateful passive acceptance. They came to understand through practice that a harmonized solution is achievable through a contentious process of debate and dispenses culminating in consensual action. Moreover Brameld's curriculum posed important philosophical questions within the ideas of culture, class, and evolution that helped prepare students to ask important questions concerning truth and the ideal (Brameld, 1965, 1971; Stanley, 1992; Stone, 2003).

He believed that through this experience students develop a natural desire and capacity to transcend their collective tensions through projected synthesis of collaborative contribution, culminating in purposeful and meaningful action (praxis). Learners gain facility with harmonizing ideas in action and within the context of larger questions that suggest global implications for competing philosophies, beyond national interests (Guttek, 2003).

Brameld's work influenced and directed Reconstructionism toward becoming a more abstract philosophical vision and global ideology. Brameld's philosophy of education is future oriented and optimistic and a major contribution to the development of global education. He held that the underlying forces of a social struggle, both in the Marxian class struggle of materialism and in the Hegelian sense of consciousness, are both propelling humankind to a higher evolutionary social endpoint. Since Brameld, a major tenet of reconstructionism is that the future "can be" better "if" people adopt an attitude to work to make it better (Ozman & Carver, 2011; Stone, 2003).

In his assessment, social moral contradictions (e.g., social equality vs. Profiteering) and economic mass confusion (i.e., competition vs. cooperation) has stricken contemporary society. To avoid ultimate destruction, society must establish focused goals for survival, particularly the goal of promoting a transnational global social order over that of the current state of nationalism. He believed that humankind must embrace a "one world

government” and establish a “united global society”. This global society must be one in which people of all races, all nations, all colors, and all creeds join in the common purpose of a peaceful world, united under the banner of international order. The task of education in the movement toward a global society is to probe the meanings of the different ideas, concepts, and purpose of a global order (Brameld, 1950, 1965; Daun, 2002; Roberts & Bussler, 1997).

For Brameld, humankind needs to design a political system of democracy on a global scale in which “man believes in himself, in his capacity to direct himself and govern himself in relations to his fellows”. The establishment of a world government where there is majority rule in policy making and, yet, provisions for minority opinions are allowed. According to Brameld, the fundamental means by which such an ambitious goal can be achieved is only possible through the education of the world’s citizens toward a global democratic system (Bramled, 1950, 1976).

He understood and expressed that we could direct ourselves better in society by harnessing technology, and a pluralism of disciplines, cultures, and approaches that direct the harmonization of tensions through reflection and action aimed at a collective goal of a better global organization. Through a flexible commitment to dialectical insight and dialogical action we can help evolve our collective consciousness through moral ends and means in a social reconstructionist agenda for higher education. An agenda for higher education that furthers our understanding and literacy in the plurality of knowing others in a sense of harmony with objective action (Riley, 2006; Roberts & Bussler, 1997).

The idea of a merged, collective, and plural dialectical and dialogical nature emerging from an evolving collective consciousness that helps us imagine and embrace the higher aspect of the evolved global society. Thus a unified and transcendent system of cultures that sees the care of self as ultimately inseparable from the whole, thus producing a more holistic way of respecting plurality and the process of synthesis with other cultures. In this example of social Reconstructionist curricula, society can learn to evolve in an ever-changing process of consensual action through cooperative collaboration ethics of global awareness and action (Brameld, 1957, 2000, 1976; Stanley, 1992).

Critics such as Gutek (2003), Ozman (2011) argue that his proposal was more “visceral” than provable. Ozman states:

...he was opposed to absolute goal setting as he was to absolutes in anything else. He was a dreamer as well as a worker... he had certain presuppositions about the continued perfectibility of individuals and society. Brameld was active in advancing proposals for consideration and implementation, and he saw the utopian concept as a technique for establishing useful goals and orienting people toward an acceptance of change itself.

As a social Reconstructionist, Brameld approached global social problems holistically because he held humankind and societies to be globally interconnected and interrelated. He maintained that due to this holistic nature that the solution of one problem may very well create a new problem. If people are challenged to see social problems in a broader interrelated perspective then the chances of eliminating the problems are greatly enhanced (Brameld, 1976; Stanley, 1992).

Brameld believed that humankind has the power to direct its destiny and that we are not subject to deterministic historical laws. Though he argues that history does exert influence on human action but that human’s progress into what they are because of the context of the historical epoch in which we live. Each historical epoch merges out of the proceeding one as such is influenced by earlier periods of history. For him, history has no “ingrained purpose” or “preordained goal”. The goals achieved and the effects of these goals are due to human choices (Brameld, 1971, p. 372). Thus in Brameldian thought, the hypothesis is that humankind can shape history and human progression, such musing is only logical and rational as well as being a rational educational agenda.

He argued that humankind is at a critical point in history-one road leads to destruction while the other leads to salvation only if humankind will make the effort. Thus, he states, reconstructionism is a philosophy of values, ends, and purposes. Though he was absolutely certain what path humankind should take, he was not sure and was troubled by which path humankind would actually take.

In his assessment, social moral contradictions (e.g., social equality vs. Profiteering) and economic mass confusion (i.e., competition vs. cooperation) has stricken contemporary society. To avoid ultimate destruction, society must establish focused goals for survival, particularly the goal of promoting a transnational global social order over that of the current state of nationalism. Brameld argued that humankind must embrace a “united global society”. He stated that this global society must be of a new culture “in which people of all races, all

nations, all colors, and all creeds join in the common purpose of a peaceful world, united under the banner of international order” (Brameld, 1950, 1965).

The task of higher education in the movement toward a global society is to probe the meanings of the different ideas, concepts, and purpose of a global order. For Brameld, humankind needs to design a political system of democracy on a global scale in which “man believes in himself, in his capacity to direct himself and govern himself in relations to his fellows”. The establishment of a global order where there is majority rule in policy making and, yet, provisions for minority opinions are allowed. According to Brameld, the fundamental means by which such an ambitious goal can be achieved is only possible through the education of the world’s citizens toward a global democratic system (James, 1995; Riley, 2006; Stanley, 1997).

Most significant to this study, is Brameld’s (1971) notion of *culturology*. *Culturology* is his thinking that humankind exerts profound influence on the members of society lives and culture. He viewed this as an anthropological philosophy in which “culture is regarded as the fulcrum of an effort to interpret human meaning, existence and actions” (p. 14). The task for educators as social reconstructionist is to examine our culture and to explore the ways in which social institutions, such as higher education, are unequal to our current crisis situation so that we may become conscious of the changes of action and thought to achieve a social cultural transformation.

Cultural transformation asserts that a culture holds deeply ingrained patterns of belief that place persistent influence on social events and human disposition; any careful examination of beliefs about reality will reveal a cultural context (Brameld, 1971, p. 360). Thus the conflicts amongst groups require Reconstructionists is to understand the role of society and it’s cultural to be the influence of the psych of intervals. In our society, groups within society can corrupt the thinking and conciseness of the masses in regards to humankind as a whole.

Brameld’s work influenced and directed social reconstructionism toward becoming a more philosophical vision and global ideology. Brameld’s philosophy of education is future oriented and optimistic and a major contribution to the development of global education. He held that the underlying forces of a social struggle, both in the Marxian class struggle of materialism and in the Hegelian sense of consciousness, are both propelling humankind to a higher evolutionary social endpoint. Since Brameld, a major tenet of Reconstructionism is that the future “can be” better “if” people adopt an attitude to work to make it better (Roberts & Bussler, 1997; James, 1995; Stone, 2003).

Brameld’s utopian vision of social progress is inspirational but not an objective realistic assessment. He does not provide a blueprint about what kind of political system should be promoted through education, the questions of political power and how to devise a system of equitable and acceptable economic distribution globally are not specifically addressed. He only proposes that it should be democratic. Brameld often laps into pure speculative idealism of “what ought to be” without addressing “how” education and a global government can overcome these monumental problems (Brameld, 1971; Slattery, 2006).

Simply stated, in Brameldian sense, to change society we must first change the individual and education is the most effective social institutions to accomplish this task. Brameld’s brand of social reconstructionism has flowered into a strong arm of the movement. Other educators following Brameld’s lead have contributed to the “futurist” thinking and orientation of Reconstructionism about society and higher education.

Again, educational theorists Howard Ozman (2011) states:

Concern for social values, humane justice, the human community, world peace, economic justice, equality of opportunities, freedom and democracy are all significant goals for Reconstructionism, things in which the world is sadly lacking. If it is true that Reconstructionists are impatient and precipitous in their desire to eliminate social evils, it is understandable in a world still filled with hate, greed, bigotry, and war.

Thus, what is universal to the human phenomenon is true universally. To visualize the inherent commonalities assist in understanding the construction of the organization of a global life-world. This can potentially empower educational leadership to see and understand social relationships that are not typically identified through conventional theoretical musing. Such visualization is a radical departure from the scientific positivist perception of an organization as a mechanistic fragmented compartmentalized association of disconnected individuals that are groping to come together today.

## 5. Summary

For Brameld and others, the evolution of us, our societies, and a global world culture requires conscious and directed acts involving harmonization of tensions—of the self through dialectical insight, of society through dialogical action and dynamic reflection and aspiration. As Brameld reminds us, there is little chance of this goal of a global world-order being reached unless it is grounded in profoundly common attributes, in which the value of love serves as the pervading ethic that is deeper than any custom. Indeed to acculturate a global citizenry into similar habits of mind, action, and practice will require a plurality of disciplines and processes liberating the value of all individuals within all cultures.

Brameldian thought for subjective reflection and for harmonious development of the individual through the liberation of ideas can be a center piece for those of us in higher education in our age of globalization. In order to evolve our collective thinking to its higher aspect, we must also set the conditions for the tool of technology, in the form of the internet and other communication networks, helps us articulate and embrace a global proliferation of moral ends. Transcendent messages of global action, efficiently and effectively transmitted through an increasingly complex network, allow us to internalize a larger harmony that is respectful of the role of diversity. In the resurgence of social Reconstructionist scholarship, we begin to understand there may be a building threshold for a collective evolution that embraces a social Reconstructionist role for higher education curricula.

This vision of an evolved society as an organic can be seen to move beyond modern society's concerns for bridging inequities to postmodern needs for illuminating a synthesis of cultures. A new muse that is resolved in consensual moral action that contains an overarching vision of global oneness. In this new paradigm, we see ourselves as "collectively-authoring a peaceful global society and ourselves, our society as an evolving new world culture".

I propose that we in American higher education focus again on the theoretically intangible, yet extremely meaningful characteristics of higher education process. Thus it should not be shackled by the constraints of conventional analysis but be allowed as a progressive alternative interpretation of the reconstruction of society in a global context and the socialization of global citizens into the new culture forming as the means and end of higher education today.

## References

- Baylis, J., & Smith, S. (Eds.). (2001). *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beck, R. (1999). *What is globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Berflo, U. (2006). *Is your world flat: Experiencing emotional awareness in upwards moving cycle*. Lincoln, NE: iUniverse, Inc.
- Berger, P. L., & Huntington, S. P. (Eds.). (2002). *Many globalizations: Cultural diversity in the contemporary world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/0195151461.001.0001>
- Bhagwati, J. (2004). *In defense of globalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bigelow, B., & Peterson, B. (Eds.). (2002). *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools Press.
- Bloom, H. (2000). *Global brain: The evolution of mass mind from the big bang to the 21st century*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Brameld, T. (1950). *Education for the emerging age*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Brameld, T. (1957). *Cultural foundations of education*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.
- Brameld, T. (1965). *The use of explosive ideas in education*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Brameld, T. (1971). *Patterns of educational philosophy*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Brameld, T. (1976). *The teacher as world citizen*. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.
- Brameld, T. (2000). *Education as power*. San Francisco, CA: Caddo Gap Press.
- Burbules, N., & Torres, C. A. (Eds.). (2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

- Daun, H. (Ed.). (2002). *Educational restructuring in the context of globalization and national policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Douglas, J. A. (2009). *Globalization muse: Universities and higher education systems in a changing world*. Institute of Governmental Studies.
- Foer, F. (2004). *How soccer explains the world: An unlikely theory of globalization*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Freidman, T. L. (2000). *The Lexus and the olive tree: Understanding globalization*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Friedman, T. L. (2004). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Guruz, K., & Zinpler, N. L. (2011). *Higher education and internationalization: Student mobility in the global knowledge economy*. SUNY.
- Guttek, G. L. (2003). *Ideological and Philosophical Perspectives on Education*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. (2002). *Globalism and anti-globalism*. Washington, D.C.: Polity Press.
- Holger, D. (2001). *Educational restructuring in the Context of Globalization and National Policy*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- James, M. (Ed.). (1995). *Social reconstruction through education*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- Kamdar, M. (2007). *Planet India: How the fastest growing democracy is transforming America and the world*. Rosenberg, OR: Scribner.
- King, R., Marglnson, S., & Naidou, R. (2011). *Handbook on globalization and higher education*. Edward Elgar Pub. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4337/9780857936233>
- Kleypas, K. L., & McDougall. (2012). *The American style university at large: Transplant, outpost, and the globalization of higher education*. Livingston Books.
- Lal, D. (2004). *In praise of empires: Globalization and order*. New York: Palgrave.
- Levin, J. S. (2001). *Globalizing the community college: Strategies for change in the 21st century*. New York: Palgrave Books. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780312292836>
- Lewin, R. (2009). *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship*. Routledge.
- Luce, E. (2007). *In spite of the Gods: The strange rise of modern India*. New York: Doubleday Books.
- Maringa, F., & Bosket, N. (2010). *Globalization and Internationalization in higher education: Theoretical, strategic and management perspectives*. Continuum.
- Meynard, T. (Ed.). (2006). *Teilhard and the future of humanity*. New York: Fordham University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5422/fso/9780823226900.001.0001>
- Odin, J. K., & Manicas, P. (2004). *Globalization of higher education*. University of Hawaii Press.
- Ozman, H. A., & Craver, S. M. (2011). *Philosophical Foundations of Education* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Peterson, R. D., Wunder, D. F., & Mueller, H. L. (1999). *Social problems: Globalization in the twenty-first century*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Petrilli, M. J. (2006). *If the world is flat: Why does American education go in circles (Book review)*. Education Next, The Hoover Institute, Palo Alta, CA: University of Stanford.
- Riley, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Social reconstruction: People, politics, perspectives*. Greenwich, CT: IAP.
- Roberts, S., & Bussler, D. (1997). *Introducing educational reconstruction: The philosophy and practice of transforming society through education*. San Francisco, CA: Caddo Gap Press.
- Slattery, P. (2006). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Stanley, W. (1992). *Curriculum for utopia: Social Reconstructionism and critical pedagogy in the postmodern era*. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY.
- Steger, M. B. (2001). *Globalism: The new market ideology*. New York: Rowan & Littlefield.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

- Stone, F. A. (2003). *Theodore Brameld's educational reconstructionism: An intellectual biography*. San Francisco, CA: Caddo Gap Press.
- Stromquist, N. P. (2002). *Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Stromquist, N. P., & Monkman, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Suarez-Orozco, M., & Qin-Hilliard, D. B. (2004). *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium*.
- Weber, L. E., & Duderstedt, J. J. (2008). *The globalization of higher education*. Economic.
- Wilson, A. (2010). *Knowledge power: Interdisciplinary education for a complex world*. Oxom, U.K.: Routledge.

### **Copyrights**

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).