

Problematizing GCE's Humanism in Countering the Anthropocene: Posthumanism, Post-critical, and Ecopedagogical Questions and Possibilities

How do we teach the beyond-humans essence of environmental pedagogies in critical models of global citizenship education (GCE) and Freirean, critical theories-grounded ecopedagogy rooted in humanization? Coinciding with other ecopedagogical scholars, I have argued that inherent, inseparable connections exist between humans' acts of environmental violence and social violence. It has been argued the essence of inseparable connections between GCE and ecopedagogy for either to be successful (Misiaszek, 2015; including within GCR - Misiaszek, 2017). This paper's overall question is how overfocusing on humanization can entrench anthropocentrism, which leads to falsely justifying anti-environmental, unsustainable actions. The argument is the essentialness of unpacking the anthropocentric nuances of humanization that are often not questioned. To such ends, the goal is to strengthen the inherent connections between GCE and planetary sustainability, as well as to further disrupt perverted, mislabeled GCE models that are dehumanizing and unsustainable.

Problematizing Humanism in GCE

First, I must emphasize that humanization is essential in all forms of GCE and ecopedagogy.

However, the nuances of this essentialness lead to four questions below, which are crucial to unpacking how humanization is taught and theoretically grounded in GCE.

- (1) How does humanization prioritization delegitimize the rest of Nature?
- (2) How can this widen the ideological separation between us, as humans, from the rest of Nature (i.e., *world-Earth distancing* (see Misiaszek, 2018)) rather than being *part* of Nature?
- (3) How does narrowing GCE within only Northern epistemologies lead to over-prioritizing the anthroposphere?; and
- (4) How can all these aspects affecting citizenship education, including GCE, decrease caring for the rest of Nature?

The following sections discuss just some of the nuances of the humanization foundations of GCE and critical environmental pedagogies that are frequently overlooked by viewing the foundations as an unquestionable good in all its forms. I use the term “nuance(s)” to signify that humanization is essential for GCE and ecopedagogy; however, it is the subtle, but sometimes systematically hidden, misteaching of humanization that can justify anti-environmental actions against the rest of Nature and, perversely, dehumanizing actions against one another. The questions above are not answered in this paper but serve to problematize our GCE and ecopedagogical work.

Nuances Beyond Disrupting Neoliberal GC: Perversion of (Critical) GCE
Problematizing humanization in GCE begins with actively disrupting GCE models and aspects that are dehumanizing - inherently deprioritizing justice, peace, and sustainability. In other words, posthumanism through ecopedagogical lenses includes humanism and planetary sustainability – “‘sustainability’ includes environmentalism outside humans' interests, recognizing that planetary unsustainability is due to our anti-environmental activities” (Misiaszek, 2023, p. 3).

Various categorizations of GCE form contested terrains. For example, Lynette Shultz (2007) categorizes global citizenship as either neoliberal, radical, or transformationalist. In this paper, I problematize the intersectionalities between these three GCE models beyond the more apparent groupings of the latter falling under a “critical GCE” umbrella and the first, neoliberal GC, as being directly countered by this criticality umbrella. Neoliberal models and influence on GCE are dehumanizing and deplanetarizing. Neoliberal (GC) education “serves a human capital function (Andreotti, 2014) that is tied to the wider knowledge society where expertise is exchanged as a means to further (individual and national) economic development (Stein, 2015)”

(Pashby et al., 2020, p. 150). This coincides with the neoliberal tenet that profiteering within one's private sphere trumps all else, and the well-being of public spheres is ignored unless it affects our private sphere.

Citizenships, plural to indicate local-to-global-to-planetary citizenship spheres, are viewed as valueless unless it is the latter case, and the rest of Nature is deprioritized to nil unless the non-anthropocentric ill affects the self's private sphere (Misiaszek, 2015). Such GCE models must not be ignored; instead, GCE *with* ecopedagogy must actively disrupt neoliberal models and other dehumanizing forms of GCE with (anti-)environmentalism (Misiaszek, 2018). A key argument of ecopedagogy's inseparability from GCE aligns with its goals of actively disrupting dehumanization, including neoliberalism, and being non-anthropocentric. Meaningfully adapting GCE and ecopedagogy to local cultures through bottom-up approaches is both humanizing and essential for the success of sustainability, but neoliberal globalization disregards this as worthless. This is further discussed in the last epistemologies section.

Karen Pashby, Marta da Casta, Sharon Stein, and Vanessa Andreotti's (2020) meta-review of GCE interrogated the following intersectional orientations between models: neoliberal-liberal and liberal-critical interfaces of neoconservative-neoliberal-liberal, critical-liberal-neoliberal, and critical-post critical models. Without going into the details of the intersectionalities in this paper, they found that neoliberalism is frequently tied to liberal (citing Schattle, 2008) and critical GCE. The other key aspect that coincides with this paper's topic is its common Northern/Western/Eurocentric epistemological grounds, which will be further discussed in the last section of the paper.

- Andreotti, V. d. O. (2014). Critical and Transnational Literacies in International Development and Global Citizenship Education. *Sisyphus*, 2(3).
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25749/sis.6544>
- Misiaszek, G. W. (2015). Ecopedagogy and citizenship in the age of globalisation: Connections between environmental and global citizenship education to save the planet. *European Journal of Education*, 50(3), 280-292. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12138>
- Misiaszek, G. W. (2017, Feb 8, 2017). Ecopedagogy's essential role in teaching global citizenship and sustainable development. *Global Commons Review: Magazine of the UNESCO-UCLA Chair in Global Learning and Global Citizenship Education*, (0), 56-60.
- Misiaszek, G. W. (2018). *Educating the global environmental citizen: Understanding ecopedagogy in local and global contexts*. Routledge.
<https://www.routledge.com/Educating-the-Global-Environmental-Citizen-Understanding-Ecopedagogy-in/Misiaszek/p/book/9781138700895>
- Misiaszek, G. W. (2023). *Freire and Environmentalism : Ecopedagogy*. Bloomsbury Academic.
<https://www.bloomsbury.com/us/freire-and-environmentalism-9781350292116/>
- Pashby, K., da Costa, M., Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. (2020). A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education. *Comparative Education*, 56(2), 144-164.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2020.1723352>
- Schattle, H. (2008). Education for global citizenship: Illustrations of ideological pluralism and adaptation. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 13(1), 73-94.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310701822263>
- Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 53(3), 248-258.
<https://doi.org/10.11575/ajer.v53i3.55291>
- Stein, S. (2015). Mapping Global Citizenship. *Journal of College and Character*, 16(4), 242-252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2194587X.2015.1091361>