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The internationalisation of higher education aims to produce ‘citizens that feel at home in the world’ but the process is driven by both economic and educational motivations. Today, the international community aspires to promote Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) and Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC), together planetary citizenship, and with them emphases on personal and ethical responsibilities to the environment and future that contrast with current competitive individualism. Driven by rising numbers of international students, curricula are already shifting toward more global assessments of society and environment. However, progress is being impeded by management systems that take commerce as their model. While instructors strive to ensure that learners consider their responsibilities through ESD and EDC, their message is being contradicted by their context. Since learners learn from their total environment, not just in classrooms, changes are required. Granting greater attention to sustainability issues and the empowerment of learners and teachers would allow a better constructive alignment between educational and economic imperatives.
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Introduction

Internationalisation is examined as part of a larger struggle for the soul of higher education, which ranges the social ideals of citizenship against the lore of the market (Bloom 2002). In theory, internationalisation is a process for the education of planetary citizens. Internationalised curricula aim to prepare learners to cope in a world that is multicultural, environmentally vulnerable and interdependent (OECD 2004). Its graduates are cosmopolitan, tolerant of pluralism, understand the world’s economic, political, social, cultural, technological and environmental processes, identify with the whole planet as much as any subset, accept ethical responsibility for their actions and recognise their obligations to the future (Oxfam 1997, 2; Gunesh 2004). This ‘education for planetary citizenship’ is like ‘education for sustainable development’ (ESD) but emphasises ethics, attitudes and behaviour more than economics (Gadotti 2000). Rabindranath Tagore, a pioneer, envisaged an education in ‘touch with our complete life, economic, intellectual, aesthetic, social and spiritual… connected… by the living bonds of cooperation’ (Tagore 1961, 202; O’Connell 2003).

In practice, internationalisation is about income generation for cash-strapped higher education institutes (HEIs) (Haigh 2002). The ‘massification’ of HEIs in Western nations has been accompanied by a decline in State support for local learners (Bok 2003). International students pay high fees. They come, mainly, from less wealthy developing nations, especially China, India and Korea, but most migrate to the wealthy nations of
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the West, where their fees help subsidise the education of local students. Expanding this income stream also encourages Western HEIs to invest heavily in marketing and recruitment, rather more than in meeting these students’ educational needs. For international students, the consequences may be unsatisfactory experiences and high failure rates (Ultsch and Rust 2001). Hence, in HEIs, education for planetary citizenship provides the dream for internationalisation; economic globalisation dictates practice (Parker et al. 1999).

In recent years, the author’s duties have included developing recommendations for internationalisation, then ESD and, finally, with helping the Professoriate win a voice in policy making at his HEI (Haigh 2002, 2004). These activities proved to be facets of a single issue, the management’s relative commitment to educational and financial targets (Bond et al. 2003). This paper evaluates the obstacles opposing implementation of an internationalised curriculum and ESD and the preconditions for establishing real ‘education for planetary citizenship’.

**Planetary citizenship vs globalisation**

Planetary citizenship was founding ideal of the United Nations and recent developments (‘global warming’, the ‘war on terror’) keep it high on international agendas. UNESCO’s constitution dedicates it to ‘the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace’ and calls for ‘equal opportunities… the free exchange of ideas and knowledge … for … mutual understanding … sacred duties’ for all nations (Daniel 2002, 1).

UNESCO conceives globalisation as the ‘set of economic, social, technological, political and cultural structures… that comprise the base of the international political economy’ (UNESCO 2003, 1). This complex has four chief, evolving, interdependent aspects (Beerkens 2003). Deterritorialisation, the ‘death of geography’, is an ‘intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities’ such that physical location and state boundaries become less important in everyday life (Giddens 1990, 64). Cosmopolitanism is ‘world citizenship in terms of individual engagement with cultural diversity’ (Gunesh 2004, 268). Homogenisation is a transformation of cultures ‘from mosaic to melange’ (Beerkens 2003). Finally, there is economic interdependency at the global scale (Adams and Carfagna 2006).

UNESCO sees globalisation in positive terms. Elsewhere, it is demonised for: declining national sovereignty; creating a ‘knowledge economy’ divide between rich and poor; international trade cartels; polluting ‘pure cultures’ with alien ideas; enforcement of a global hegemony – the ‘hamburger’ culture; problems associated with the expansion of international travel; the emergence of amoral transnational media (internet, satellite television); the reaction it breeds through alienated, chauvinistic and fundamentalist resistance; and for rampaging multinational corporations (Scholte, 2000). A hard economic line divides the social ideals of planetary citizenship from the business of globalisation (Adams and Carfagna 2006).

**Higher Education Inc.**

In the USA, ‘Higher Ed, Inc. is a $250 to $270 billion business – bigger than religion, much bigger than art’ (Twitchell 2004, 47). Higher education services are a significant aspect of international trade. In 2001, the OECD nations’ 1.6 million student migrations had a market value of $30 billion (OECD 2004). By 2025, international student
numbers may reach 7.2 million (HEFCE 2004). Against fierce competition, the UK expects ‘to maximise export earnings by selling education services to paying customers’, so increasing its ‘market share’ from 16% to 25% (van der Wende 2003). In 2000, education generated about 4% of the service sector income for both the USA and the UK (Elliot 1998, 32).

The internet is a driving force of globalisation and its expanding educational offshoot is ‘e-learning’. The USA’s HEIs doubled distance-learning enrolments between 1998 and 2001. In 2001, 11% of the UK’s HEI’s international enrolment (Australia: 9%; New Zealand: 33%) involved e-learning (Hatakenaka 2004). Meanwhile, the global e-learning market for higher education grows at 12% p. a. (Media Inc. 2004).

Higher education is ‘big business’ so many HEIs model their management on multinational corporations. Today’s HEI leader is a Chief Executive Officer (CEO). The director of finance is often the most valued employee; not the ‘best researcher’ and never the ‘best teacher’. In 2003, Harvard University’s five top money managers were paid $105 million (Peters 2004). By contrast, increasing percentages of instructors and researchers are hired as casual labour on a few dollars each hour. Almost half of UK academics are on short-term contracts and many more are hired for occasional hours (AUT 2003). In the USA, almost 450,000 instructors hold casual ‘adjunct’ appointments (Adjunct Advocate 2005).

‘Trade creep’ in the thinking of HEIs, echoed here for dramatic effect, is inevitable (Knight 2003). The whole ‘experience of higher education, all the accessories, the amenities, the aura, has been commercialized…’ (Twitchell 2004, 47). To many HEIs, students and their employers are ‘customers’ for ‘educational products’. In Australia ‘…public universities now operate according to a commercial imperative … international education has been shaped largely by university leader-managers – particularly entrepreneurial presidents and marketing units – rather than by faculty… [while]… some universities have developed new programs almost overnight without much regard for … the curriculum’ (Marginson 2002, 2).

Hence, ‘customer relations’ is a rising concern (Haigh 2002). In America, many HEIs ‘spent the better part of the 80s and 90s treating users as expendable: students, alumni … faculty and staff. […] but lately…’ They have realized that people on the other end of marketing exchanges are critical to their success. Many are making every effort to solidify relationships, to find ways to appreciate “customers”, build loyalties…’ (Torpor 1998, 1).

Conceiving students as ‘consumers in a buyer-driven market’, Higher Education Inc. uses business-style methods to attract them. Promotional offers include ‘Olympic-quality gyms, Broadway-style theaters for plays, special trainers, and glitzy student unions with movie theaters …’ (Peters 2004, 1). Equally, many HEIs invest major sums in refining their ‘brand’ image believing this will enhance ‘the marketability of their products’. Inevitably, the ‘product’ being ‘marketed’ is an image signified by a ‘branded’ certificate. ‘Credentialism’ is the idea that a diploma is the sign of educational merit and its value is determined by its ‘brand’ (Furedi 2005). This notion drives student migration. Hence, when Deressa and Beavers (1988) surveyed international students, fewer than 30% thought that their new learning would prove useful on their return, while most thought their international degree certificate would help secure good future opportunities (Hatakenaka 2004). As Brian Martin (1998, 11.1) notes, ‘academic credentials are part of the overall system which allocates people to occupations in a way which seems to be based on merit but actually legitimates unnecessary inequality’. A nicely ‘branded’ diploma may not correlate with future performance but, as a screening device, it is useful for the intergenerational preservation of social elites (Collins 1979).
Ironically, the international agencies that now promote planetary citizenship also encouraged credentialism (Bloom 2003). Previously, there was reluctance to invest in HEIs in developing nations, which were seen to serve local elites. Higher education is not mentioned by the Declaration of the World Conference on Sustainable Development or the UN Millennium Development Goals (WSSD 2002; UN 2005). Preserving the underdevelopment of HEIs in the developing world both motivates international student migration and fuels a ‘brain drain’ that supports the hegemony of the West; they can cherry-pick their HEIs’ products and send the rest home (TiHE 2000).

It also fosters the hegemony of the Western academy (Gore 2005). Velta Clarke’s (2004) survey of USA college students found that 85% from the White majority thought the USA’s culture superior to all others; most from minority groups disagreed. Ravinder Sidhu (2004) argues that even the cultural hybridity permitted within an internationalised HEI is scripted by the neoliberal presumption that Western norms should prevail. Jonas Stier’s (2004) critique of internationalisation ideologies begins with ‘cultural idealism’ – interpreted as ‘they should learn from us’ and share the vision of a future shaped by technology, the market, and the exclusion of ‘Others’ – ‘women, non-Western cultures and Nature’ (Milojevic 2005, 12). Stiers also discusses ‘instrumentalism’, which includes educational homogenisation through quality control systems, and the creation of a common world educational structure that supports the current hegemony (Dale 2000; Olssen 2004). Europe’s Bologna process, which uses an Anglo-American model to standardise courses across many nations, is a good illustration.

The emergence of a fully globalised HE system is heralded by a blossoming of large-scale multinational university consortia, multinational universities and ‘international universities’ (Hatakenaka 2004). As commercial pressures do their work, Simon Marginson anticipates the ‘Steepening of university hierarchies, the formation of a ‘winner-take-all’ world market in elite and mostly American university education, a tighter fit between social hierarchy and educational hierarchy at the national level, and global patterns of domination/subordination…” (Marginson 2004a, 175). The ‘Global University’ will be dominated by a small number of brands, each targeting particular levels of the market from ‘bespoke’ to ‘bargain basement’. Those smaller HEIs that survive will have found new specialised niches, often involving dissent and probably service to a particular culture, language, polity or religious community (Altbach 2003). Thus, Crossley notes ‘Globalization not only pulls upwards, it pushes downwards, creating new pressures for local autonomy’ (Crossley 2002, 82); as larger HEIs become more globalised, so more communities will be more inclined to foster local institutions that meet their individual needs.

In sum, HEI internationalisation is the offspring of economic globalisation, the neglect of HEIs in the developing world and the cultural and economic hegemony of the West. The vehicle it has created, ‘Higher Education Inc’, seeks financial gains from international students. From this emerges a ‘Global University’ disbursing a culturally loaded, standardised education through the internet and a casualised local labour force, to train employees for a globalised corporate economy. Of course, it is possible to conceive an educational system far better suited to creating a sustainable and secure future (Berry 1999).

Towards planetary citizenship
Planetary citizenship education seeks a future sustainable in environmental, social and ethical terms. The idealistic counterweight to ‘Higher Ed. Inc’, it assigns learners new responsibilities. Instead of being concerned only for their individual welfare, each is cast as
a world-worker, a ‘visvakarma’ (Tagore 1930, 42), who accepts responsibility to act for the welfare of all, who demonstrates the ‘union of education and life’ (Tagore 1961, 43), who lives ‘as though the future mattered’ (Devall 1988).

Current campaigns for planetary citizenship emerge from those supranational organisations that increasingly act as a global conscience. They reflect new concerns about social conflict and the planet-wide impacts of our present ways of life (Berry 1999). Among recent manifestations, the United Nations’ Decade of Education for Sustainable Development, 2005–2014, proposes that education tackles the causes of environmental degradation (Haigh 2005; UNESCO 2004). It urges every educational institution to help learners achieve ecoliteracy and realise that personal lifestyle decisions have global impacts (Martin and Jucker 2005). Another is the ‘European Year of Citizenship through Education’, which anticipated ‘long-term investment to promote the democratic values of human rights, tolerance and cultural pluralism’ (Council of Europe 2005, 1). Education for democratic citizenship (EDC) aims to raise awareness of social inequalities, empower progressive social change and enable contextualisation of the self (Stromquist 2006). It tries to help learners to play an effective role in society, becoming informed, thoughtful and responsible citizens, aware of their rights and conscious of their duties (Institute for Citizenship 2004).

Of course, the term ‘citizenship’ encompasses many concepts. It may be seen as an institution, a practice, democratic participation in governance, and/or a collective identity, culture, tradition or ancestry (Giesen and Klaus 2001). Broad themes include: communitarian citizenship emphasising cultural affinities, civic republicanism emphasising organised public participation, and deliberative democracy emphasising communal decision making (Delanty 2000). However, the rise of citizenship education reflects global concern about the growth of self-centred individualism. Hence, it always involves the inculcation of a sense of belonging, building ‘social capital’ within communities, and expanded definitions of citizenship inclusivity (Preece and Mosweunyane 2006).

Planetary citizenship is where the UN campaigns for environment and citizenship merge. The ESD view of citizenship recognises the dependence of humans on the integrity of our finite global life support system (Harding 2006). Of course, Tagore acknowledged that: ‘The same stream of life that runs through my veins … runs through the world…’ (Tagore 1913, 69). He considered this world in kinship terms and called establishing environmental consciousness the first goal for education (Tagore 1930, 99). Factually, humans cannot survive without help from millions of organisms, many microscopic. This is recognised and developed by the philosophy of ‘Deep Ecology’, whose discourses subtext much environmental thinking (Devall 1988; Drengson and Inoue 1995). Constructed upon the intuition that the personal self is an active component in the global life-support system, the world of Nature, Deep Ecology pedagogy encourages learners to recognise this interdependence and transform their perception from ‘ego to eco’, from chauvinistic anthropocentrism to egalitarian biocentrism (Naess 1987; Haigh 2006). Their pedagogy of ecological self-realisation aims to help learners see themselves in all creatures and all creatures in themselves (Tagore 1924, iii), perhaps as members of a ‘Council of all Beings’ that share a planetary superorganism, ‘Gaia’ (Seed et al. 1988; Harding 2006).

Such notions remain anathema to many. Long ago, Naess differentiated his biocentric ‘Deep Ecology’ from ‘Shallow Ecology’, which favours the human species (Naess 1987). This second view still dominates. However, ‘Greens’ are not alone in prioritising planet-level commitments; so too, in different ways, do many feminists, scientists, and those cyber-citizens who call the Internet home (Appadurai 1996). Also, numerous non-governmental organisations (NGOs), working for environmental and social uplift, operate
internationally. Adams and Carfagna (2006) believe that their activities signal the beginnings of a global civil society that may, ultimately, influence governments, shape markets and determine global labour and environmental standards. Of course, a planet-wide society requires an active and responsible citizenry. Hence, both EDC and ESD are promoted as something every learner should understand (cf. Surian 1996; Nieuwenhuis and Mokoena 2005).

In the classroom

The classroom is where the dream of planetary citizenship and realities of Higher Education Inc. meet. Here, ESD and EDC, sustainability and citizenship education, are driven mainly by exhortation while economic imperatives overshadow every activity and the finance-driven influx of international students affects many programmes. Today, 17% of Swiss HEI students are international (UK: 14% overall, 8% undergraduate, 38% postgraduate) (UKOSA 2004). Some HEIs host still larger concentrations: London School of Economics (62%), University of the Arts, London (34%) and Imperial College (32%). International students cluster in career-related subjects: engineering (UK 28%), business (UK 24%), law, psychology, IT, health sciences and engineering (UKOSA 2004). Since the cultural divides between international students may exceed those between them and their hosts, they form significant and diverse constituencies in many classes (Hofstede 1993).

Inevitably, internationalisation drives curriculum change. Monash University ‘recognised early that a curriculum with an Australian focus did not constitute a competitive export product’ (Back et al. 1996). However, many continue to treat international students ‘as sites of English language deficiencies or “empty vessels” to be filled up with Euro-American knowledge’ (Ninnes and Helstén 2005, 10). Even Britain’s most inclusive HEI, the Open University, worries that its ‘curriculum is widely perceived as predominantly white and Eurocentric’ and fails even ‘to represent the diversity of cultures … in modern Britain’ (OUCPG 2000, 8). Most Western HEIs build from a knowledge base of national tradition, history, culture and literature (Crossley and Watson 2003). Commonly, there remain implicit assumptions of local knowledge, conventions of learning, teaching and language that disadvantage international migrants. Western HEIs even struggle to cater for local students with ‘non-traditional’ backgrounds (Maguire 2001). Inevitably, internationalisation creates a problem that requires a rethinking of course structure, course content, mode of delivery as well as the language used (Back et al. 1996). The author believes that the best approach is to build from the assumption that most students are ‘international’ (Haigh 2002).

Unfortunately, most teachers experience internationalisation unprepared and untrained. International students are dumped into systems designed only to meet national needs. In a survey of 150 Canadian teachers, most found internationalisation enriching but 50% said there was insufficient time (66% insufficient resources) for preparation (Bond et al. 2003). Delivering an education for planetary citizens demands major investment in staff training and curriculum design. However, at many HEIs, staff time is allocated by the University Finance Officer – not educational best practice. Hence, the most fundamental problem in modern HEIs is that educational good practice is routinely subordinated to economic priorities.

Meanwhile, the greater irony is that investments in preparing staff for internationalisation often address the wrong audience (Haigh 2002). Normally, the ‘international student’ is not the issue. Graduates of an internationalised curriculum should be ‘able to adapt to an unfamiliar culture and operate in a socially and culturally diverse
environment; appreciate differences in gender, culture and customs; and be able to work effectively and sensitively...’ (QUT 1997, 1.3). In these terms, most international students are already advanced learners, while many ‘stay-at-home’ students remain novices. Indeed, by remaining ‘local’, some ‘stay-at-home’ students may signal either ignorance or antipathy to ‘Otherness’, but to date, such serious educational issues remain largely neglected (Rosandic 2000). A good internationalised curriculum is transformative. Mahatma Gandhi called those who returned ‘square pegs’. Nevertheless, he wanted ‘the cultures of all lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible’ (Gandhi 1921, 33, cited in Rajput 1998). Already, some nations import international students and teachers specifically to bring the world to their own people (e.g. Huang 2006).

Meanwhile, an internationalised HEI remains ethically bound to allow all students equal opportunities to learn. This means creating curricula that do not rely on local prior knowledge or prejudice the ways of knowing of particular groups, but provide an inclusive learning environment that grants all equal opportunities to comprehend their personal responsibilities as planetary citizens (Haigh 2002).

Several writers tackle the challenge of curriculum design (Ryan 2000). Black (2004) emphasises the use of international ideas, materials and student experience. Haigh (2002) critiques five current strategies, which are styled: ‘Bringing the Foreigners up to Speed’, ‘Education about Cultural Pluralism’, ‘Benevolent Multicultural Segregation’, ‘Bicultural Education’ and ‘Multicultural Education’ before commending the last two and a five-step approach (Table 1).

This framework may meet Bennett’s six internationalised curriculum objectives: appreciating the self-identity discourses of social groups, development of intercultural competences, combating chauvinism, building global environmental awareness – ecoliteracy, and developing social action skills (Bennett 1995). However, if a further step were needed, this should be the integration of ethics and action through service.

Nelly Stromquist (2006, 93) explains: ‘Before we can recognize the “Other”, we have to know ourselves... This requires ... ethics, not just being bystanders’. ‘Knowing ourselves’ requires a deep understanding of human unity, a critical self-awareness of one’s own worldview; and an ability see the world through the eyes of others, namely to empathise (Nussbaum 2005). ‘We may become powerful by knowledge, but we attain fullness by sympathy’ (Tagore 1917, 116). Of course, ‘Re-connecting with the natural world and the true place of humans ... is the best route ... to sustainable societies and economies’ (Harding 2006, 1). Tagore agrees: ‘The highest education is that which ... makes our life in harmony with all existence’ (Tagore 1917, 116).

| Step 1. Protection by labelling. If a course targets ‘stay-at-home’ students and local concerns - every student needs to know. |
| Step 2. Review the teaching processes (see Ryan 2000). Flexible styles of student-constructed, student-centred learning allow greater scope for pluralism than conventional didactic instruction. |
| Step 3. Teach in language that all students can understand. An HEI’s language entry requirement and the language used in instruction must be aligned. This may mean teaching all students in international English. |
| Step 4. Design a fair curriculum. Parochialism in content, sources and expectations of prior learning must be expunged to allow all students equal opportunities for success. |
| Step 5. Educate the ‘stay-at-home’ students. An international curriculum should provide ‘stay-at-home’ students with training in cross-cultural communication and an appreciation of, at least, one alien tradition. |
Our world ‘… needs people who live well in their places … it needs people of moral courage willing … to make the world habitable and humane’ (Orr 1994, 53). This process involves action and service learning. ‘I … dreamt that life was joy. I awoke and saw that life was service. I acted, and behold, service was joy’ (Tagore 1932, cited in Sykes 1975, 1).

The contrary campus

The author’s work to promote internationalisation, ESD and collectively planetary citizenship uncovered an unexpected obstacle – the HEI itself. Learners learn from their total environment, absorbing more ideas and values from the world they inhabit than from classroom experience. This is why, for his school, Santiniketan, Tagore sought a place of open horizons, freedom of mind, engaged in community service, with classes held in the shade of trees, where learners ‘and nature enter into an immediate harmonious relationship’ (Roy 2006, 1). By contrast, many modern HEI campuses are paved, crowded with poorly insulated, overheated, artificially lit buildings that scorn all notions of sustainability. As for freedom of mind, HEI managements, like their top-down corporate models, pay only lip service to notions of democracy, accountability and community. Teachers are ‘employees’, students are ‘customers’, the university a ‘brand image’ and no-one is its citizen.

Orr writes:

Students hear about global responsibility while being educated in institutions that often invest … in … irresponsible things. The lessons being taught are those of hypocrisy … [and] … that they are helpless to overcome the frightening gap between ideals and reality. What is desperately needed are faculty and administrators who provide role models of integrity … and institutions that are capable of embodying ideals wholly and completely. (Orr 1991, 57)

Mahatma Gandhi advised ‘my life is my message’, which is both a truth and an ideal (Bahuguna 1987).

Orr proposes a four-part test for each HEI. First, does the education encourage graduates to contribute to global sustainability? Second, does the HEI minimise its ‘ecological footprint’ (Worldmapper 2007)? Third, are its actions ethical, honest and democratic? Finally, are its graduates ‘ecoliterate’ and do they comprehend their role in the global environment (Orr 1991, 1994)? Since, very few HEIs pass this test, teaching planetary citizenship creates tension between the classroom message and reality outside. Some instructors circumvent this apparent hypocrisy by using campus practices for problem-based learning (e.g. Miller, in Haigh 2004).

Less easily tackled is democratic reform. Modern HEIs are ‘… quintessentially “industrial era” organizations … top-down structures … [with] teachers and students at the bottom … marginalized, disempowered “foot soldiers”’ (Slaughter 2000, 1). Currently, disempowerment creates an unhelpful ‘culture of compliance’. A ‘box-ticking’ survival strategy greets each latest externally imposed change, good or bad. Teachers ‘go through the motions’ aware that they are unable to influence the process (Vidovich 2004).

The challenge is to steer HEIs towards a more cooperative, community model where learners and instructors regain some democratic influence over their finance-oriented management. A renewal of democratic values is needed at all levels (Henry et al. 1999). Of course, reconstructing HEIs as ‘communities of learning’ demands significant change in governance and managerial ethos, not easily achieved through grassroots action alone (Srikanthan and Dalrymple 2005). Nevertheless, to be credible, HEIs must demonstrate what their teachers preach and highlighting this discrepancy may be a way ahead.
Discussion

Internationalisation motivates education for planetary citizenship but current practice is dominated more by the desire for income than better education. ‘Global educational strategy is a trading game in which the world is nothing more than a map of opportunities for self-enrichment’, advisesMarginson (2004b, 3). There would be fewer international students if HEIs obtained no financial gain.

Tagore’s tale The Devotee (1916), where the protagonist leaves to study holy scripture but returns as a washing-machine salesman, chimes in with the recent history of higher education (Tagore 1965). So too the message of The Artist (1929), where the child is delivered with the words ‘keep him from the worship of money’ (Tagore 1965, 201). Reflection upon such fables from a pioneer of education for a sustainable future helps highlight how far HEIs have moved from their educational vocation (Sharma 2002). Controlled by a balance-sheet psychology, managerial autocracies and a desire to become trainers for the globalised economy, today’s HEIs are overtly not ‘fit for purpose’ where it comes to education for planetary citizenship (Orr 1994). A more cut-throat, expansive corporate economy, delivering short-term material benefits to wealthy elites is not what this overloaded planet needs, nor are HEIs producing graduates with these same values (Olssen 2004).

So, the main challenge facing internationalisation and effective education for planetary citizenship is the HEI. This must change. While the mission of education runs second to that of money-making, while the views of those who teach and learn are subordinated to those who manage the accounts, the future for education and everything in life that comes from education is bleak. As Orr (1994, 126) writes, this is: ‘a crisis of values, ideas, perspectives and knowledge, which makes it a crisis of education, not in education’.

It is fashionable to talk of ‘tipping points’. As Ervin Laszlo writes, ‘the world needs changing. It is not sustainable and sooner or later it will change. Predicting which way it will change is not the challenge … The challenge is for us to create a positive future’ (Laszlo 2002, 15). Here, internationalisation’s idealistic aspect, education for planetary citizenship, carries the torch of hope. EDC incorporates the idea that learners absorb democratic values (Council of Europe 2005, 1). ESD proposes that learners should work for the benefit of the future. EDC encourages democratic inclusivity. ESD encourages ethical living. Already, these affect the way that courses are delivered and campus life conducted. Presently, the modern campus speaks more of short-termism and waste than sustainability, its management more of autocracy than democracy. The challenge is to help HEIs embody the messages they would teach and the values that will allow our society a future. This demands cultural change driven from both inside HEIs by educationists and outside by policy makers.

Conclusion

Internationalisation of the curriculum is a key site for the exchanges and conflicts induced by globalisation (Ninnes and Hellstén 2005). This paper explores two worldviews and the two motivations for internationalisation, the finance-driven corporate ethos of ‘Higher Education Inc’ and the communal aspirations of planetary citizenship, especially ESD and EDC. Its conclusion is that the main obstacle to education for planetary citizenship is the culture of the modern HEI, which does not reflect either the values or knowledge base needed by the citizens of a sustainable future.

The problem remains to integrate concepts of citizenship, social justice, ethics and sustainable development within an educational system oriented to financial goals and in HEIs whose campus and management contradict classroom teachings about sustainability and democracy. As Slaughter (2000, 1) reflects, ‘prevailing “system imperatives” are not
necessarily about human beings, society or, indeed, the future. They are … power, control, 
economy and efficiency’. However, pedagogy is cultural politics. Learning is linked to 
social change. It is a moral and political practice (Giroux 2004). In this case, pedagogy can 
help reinvent the HEI as a community rather than a business and begin building the moral 
pressures that must, finally, achieve the cultural change that HEIs need. The challenge is 
to reclaim HEIs for learning and teaching and reinvent them as relevant and positive 
influences in a sustainable future.

Meanwhile, those engaged in internationalisation can assist by designing courses that 
promote responsible global citizenship, targeting especially the ‘stay-at-home’ students 
(Haigh 2002; Crossley and Watson 2003). As Tagore also recognised, while each culture 
has inherent value, this must be contextualised because ultimately, despite our capacity for 
fight and faction, there is only one human history (Rizvi 2004). The insights of Tagore, 
Mahatma Gandhi, Kofi Annan and the many others who have seen this truth may seem 
‘unsettling even subversive for policy makers … [but] … These thinkers have … provided a 
vision of how education … can be a tool in the creation of a more socially just society’ 
(Crossley and Tikly 2005, 150).

Of course, the threat remains that both the EDC and ESD agendas will be hijacked 
into support for today’s self-destructive ways of life. However, presently, they support that 
educational alternative sought by Tagore: ‘ever-increasing harmony with the life of nature’ 
(Hjärne 1913, 2) and joy in service to the world and through shared endeavour (Delors 
1996).

In sum, internationalisation, conceived as education for planetary citizenship, ESD 
and EDC, can be a counterweight to the commercial forces that drive HEIs to abet future-
destructive practices. It can help bring about needed change in the way that higher 
education is conceived, designed and delivered. In 1992, Nelson Mandela reminded South 
Africa’s University of the North that: ‘We should never forget that education is our first 
reason for existence as a university. Students, in particular, should always keep this in 
mind’. However, the people he should have reminded were HEI leaders and policy-makers 
who have so much to do to achieve constructive alignment between their educational 
mission, financial goals and management structures. Meanwhile, educators can help 
promote change by teaching the messages that will help transform HEIs into sustainable 
learning communities that support the learning needs of a future planetary citizenry.
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