Éducation comparée / nouvelle série, n°10, pp 209 -241

Learning from Southern environmental education models: Borrowing ecopedagogy through processes of globalization from below

Greg William Misiaszek
Université de Bejing
R.P. de Chine

The Earth's wellbeing is becoming increasingly less prioritized when not directly related with economic gain and specifically, economic profiting inline with power structures. It was found in the research described in this chapter that many current environmental education (EE) models, especially in the West, sustain this unfortunate trend rather than counter it. Critical, dialectic, democratic, and transformative pedagogies framed within environmental and social justice models were viewed as needed more now than ever before. Examples of such EE models needed are *ecopedagogies* that emerged from South America. Ecopedagogies read and reread the complex to decode neoliberal influences of the acts of environmental devastation and the education of these acts[1]. Examined in this chapter is how EE in the West would benefit from contextually borrowing these ecopedagogies within critical, contextual comparative education methods.

Ecopedagogy emerged from popular education movements in South America that have been greatly influenced by the Brazilian

[1] Education is defined here at all levels: formal, non-formal, and informal.

educational scholar and philosopher Paulo Freire (Gadotti, 2008b, 2009; Gadotti & Torres, 2009). Although there are many definitions of ecopedagogy, with defining specifics largely determined by an educator's focus on the environment; the foundation are pedagogies that are democratic, critical, and dialogical to teach transformation with within current social system and radically outside of them but within social and environmental justice models. In this research, ecopedagogy was defined as focusing on the connections between social conflict and environmental devastation (socio-environmental issues). In is essential that ecopedagogues encourage the dialogical learning and teaching horizontally from both student(s) and teacher(s) to deconstruct the politics of socio-environmental issues in which participants most often contribute to oppressive neoliberal influences that are purposely hidden to benefit a few "in power" toward constructing possible solutions. One other essential element of ecopedagogy to note is that ecopedagogues must help students understand that solutions are possible and thus opposing neoliberal ideologies in which possibilities are impossible and even unnatural. In other words, ecopedagogy must counter the fatalistic ideologies of neoliberal EE models.

This chapter will draws from comparative education research conducted in Argentina, Brazil, and the Appalachian region of the United States of expert ecopedagogues. There were many goals of the research but the umbrella research question was the following: How do people learn, don't learn, and/or mis-learn the connections between environmental devastation and social conflict, and what are the influencing politics? The grounded research was deconstructed and reconstructed through many theoretical lenses including globalizations (processes of globalization *from below* and *from above* (i.e., neoliberal globalization)), theories of colonialism (anti-, neo-, post-), critical race theories, feminism, critical media theories,

liberation theologies, and theories of sustainable development, among many others (G.W. Misiaszek, 2012). What emerged as a reoccurring theme was a need for a transfer of ecopedagogical methods from South America to the West as an essential element of citizenship education (G.W. Misiaszek, 2011, in press). The participants' framed their concerns with the pressures and normalization of neoliberalism upon EE, as well as and sometimes more disconcerting, neoliberal ideologies' spread through processes of globalization. However, they also expressed the socio-environmental justice possibilities from globalization from below.

The need expressed for a South American to the West transfer of ecopedagogical models to environmental education was opposite of the more frequent North-South acquisition of knowledges and cultures through mostly globalization from above. The lending and borrowing of ecopedagogies to the global North's EE field is seen as a process of globalization from below. Globalizations are a contested terrain that are either empowering or disempowering (Kellner, 1999, 2002; Torres, 2009). Processes of globalization from above are not only often seen as neoliberal influences, but also a larger cultural assimilation to a Western norm, whereas globalization from below help amplify voices of those marginalized. Within EE models, globalizations from above discourage transformative teaching and learning that construct radical changes as possibilities. Rendering systematic transformation as impossible, globalization from above is fatalistic by constructing neoliberal systems as natural and all other possibilities unnatural. Participants stress a need for reinventing EE models as ecopedagogical model that focus on transformation through the possibilities of radical change towards constructions of socio-environmental utopias. Paulo Freire discussed the need for love and hope to recreate the word by having the ability to dream of possible

utopias and construct praxis to continually "reach" for utopia without ever being able to obtain utopia (Torres, 2007a).

This chapter will first describe the research participants' views on the effects of neoliberalism on EE models in widening the knowledge gap of the connections between environmental devastation and social conflict. Described will be their views on globalizations that promote neoliberal but can also empower the local within social-environmental issues. Next will be the participants' descriptions of the need for South American ecopedagogies through the processes of globalization from below. In this section, the history and influences of ecopedagogies in South America will be compared and contrasted to those in the West. The selection and structuring of these comparisons are dictated by some of the most prominent themes expressed by the participants. Details of South American ecopedagogies will center on the popular education movements' influence especially detailing the influences of Freirean Pedagogies with specific focus on needing to end fatalistic EE models. Descriptions of the West's EE models will center on the participants concentration on a deficit of critical pedagogies, especially in EE, which accounts for the widening ignorance of socio-environmental oppressions due to neoliberalism globalization. The discussion will incorporate the themes of the chapter to discuss how action through reflection, or praxis, is the essential outcome of EE with the contextual transfer of ecopedagogical methods as essential for transformative socio-environmental learning, the construction of possible solutions, and that such solutions are possible.

Neoliberalism, Hegemony and Environmental Education

The defining of neoliberalism is essential to better understand how ecopedagogical methods can deconstruct its doctrines. The essence of neoliberalism is that all decision-making should be determined within the market for economic progress of endless (and boundless) economic growth. This is a simplistic defining of the term that must be unpacked within ecopedagogical teaching and research. This unpacking must deconstruct the power relationships of such "economically-benefiting" actions. Neoliberalism originates from economic liberalism in which a State's economic welfare system cease in classical liberalism system and a bit more existent in modern liberalism systems, with individuals becoming solely responsible for themselves and their self-defined responsibilities that encourage free and self-regulating markets (Gray, 1995). With this definition the environment becomes minimally important unless there is an observed direct relationship by an individual between economic and environmental wellbeing; however economic grow remains paramount to determine wellbeing. Although some scholars, such as Harvey quoted below, discussed how environmental protection is part of the state, the overbearing factor is freedom of activity for economic market gain with the distancing of the State.

> …if markets do not exist (in areas such as land, water, education, health care, social security, or environmental pollution) then they must be created, by state action if necessary. But beyond these tasks the state should not venture. State interventions in markets (once created) must be kept to a bare minimum because, according to the theory, the state cannot possibly possess enough information to second-guess market signals (prices) and because powerful interest groups will inevitably distort and bias state interventions (particularly in democracies) for their own benefit. (2005, p. 2)

Although Harvey stressed that neoliberalism steers economic political practices rather than political ones (2005), the hierarchy of stressing economic prosperity overshadows social well-being. Neoliberal influences upon EE models disconnect the links between

social conflicts and environmental devastation so needing to determine the difficult question of what is most important simply does not exist. Due to this and other factors, the popular West defining of *sustainability development* place economic concerns as much as or more prominent than others.

All human acts of environmental devastation are done for the profit of groups of individuals; however neoliberal influenced EE pedagogies hide who is benefiting and who is negatively affected. Important to understand, but often politically hidden, is that those who are marginalized are almost always the populations who suffer the most from environmental devastation. What makes this neoliberal defining of sustainable development even more problematic is that the economics of all (i.e. the masses) is not considered as much as the sustaining and strengthening the existing socio-economic hierarchies with a few becoming increasingly powerful. Although the doctrines of economic liberalism state that everyone has the same opportunities for economic prosperity, neoliberal actions sustain and strengthen hegemony rather than the masses encountering economic prosperity. Framed within a classic Marxism perspective, neoliberal EE are ideological tools from hegemonic entities in which the best way to control their actions towards the environment it to have them understand the actions that negatively affects them rather positively affects them (Chomsky, 1999). Even within the economic framing of environmentally beneficial actions, strengthening and sustaining of the current hegemony is the hidden objective. However, through creating false economic prosperity frameworks, many EE models either consciously or unconsciously falsely teach that actions that most devastate the masses benefit them the most. If the processes of learning sustainable development were to be purely framed within economic frameworks, it would be much different from many of the models existing todays with a few being positively affected and many

more negatively effective. The key to sustain hegemony through EE is to hide this disparity of positive and negative aspects.

Ignoring the fundamental problematic questions of the inherent elitist structure of capitalism in which it is impossible for the masses to have economic prosperity, neoliberal EE models frame environmental decision-making in which the masses gain economically from "necessary" environmental devastation while hiding who to actually benefiting from the devastation. As essential in all critical pedagogies, ecopedagogues must teach towards understanding determining who is benefiting from knowledges given and accompanying actions.

Power and selectivity of power are essential discussions when determining neoliberalism and EE. Shallow EE models are tools for which power structures are sustained, constructing what Norm Chomsky would define to construct an unquestionable "an instructive body thought [that] has been developed to justify elite resistance to democracy" (1999, p. 33). Democracy is threatened with such shallow EE models because democratic decisions are determined by false knowledges in which the effects of environmental devastation are unknown and alternatives absent. Such false democratic structures were discussed by many of the participants, as well as placing the need for ecopedagogy to be an element of citizenship education authentic civil democratic participation to exist (G.W. Misiaszek, in press). It is important to emphasize that the need to unpack the hegemonic characteristics of neoliberal influences on EE is essential to see who is benefiting within an economic framework, who is not, and what is being taught.

Distances and Hegemony

The political significance of the conceptualization distances between environmental devastation and human populations to understand socio-environmental issues emerged from the research conducted. To lessen the oppressor responsibilities of those benefitting from environmental devastation, the interconnections between humans and all that is nature excluding humans (i.e., all non-human ecology) are systematically ignored in many EE models. Participants expressed that such distancing occurs in terms of location, polity, time and hegemony to disassociate direct and indirect connections. The false non-socio-environmental teaching models that utilize various frameworks of distances between environmental devastative actions and those who were most affected was discussed largely as hegemonic tools.

Globalization from above helps distance such actions as opposed to processes of globalization from below which helps shortened these distances. Spread by the processes of globalization from above, neoliberalism places environmental priorities as low as other non-income generating interests. Environmental concerns as a low priority is explained below by Joseph Stiglitz, 2001 recipient of the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences and former senior vice president and chief economist of the World Bank:

> Caring about the environment, making sure the poor have a say in decisions that affect them, promoting democracy and fir trade are necessary if the potential benefits of globalization are to be achieved. The problem is that the institutions have come to reflect the mind-sets of those to whom they are accountable. The typical central bank governor begins his day worrying about inflation statistics, not poverty statistics: the trade minister worries about export numbers not pollution indices. (Stiglitz, 2003, p. 216)

Globalization complicates the power structures globally to further complicate the understandings of who benefits.

Take for example a large group of peasants protesting against their government when they are not able to receive medical treatment for lung cancer they do not know are suffering from, since it still remains to be diagnosed. Imagine that in this case, increases in the occurrences of lung cancer were caused by a source of air pollution from industries upwind from this conflict (location-distant), across a geo-political border (polity-distant), in a nation with eased pollution standards over a period of more than 20 years (time-distant). By pouring great amounts of money into their local economies, these industries assist friendly politicians in getting re-elected. Increasing pollution standards to improve health would lead to massive local unemployment in these industries; to allow controls to be applied; and to pay for compliant equipment. Due to these reasons, as well as due to additional bribing of local officials, these polluting actions are not challenged (hegemony-distant.)

Comparing Environmental Education Models in the West and South America

The histories and structures of EE in the West and South America is complex and is by no means uniform. This chapter, or any single piece of writing, does not provide the space to explore all of the similarities and differences within these regions. There are many examples of such democratic, critical EE models in the West, as well as neoliberal models within South America. This fact is unfortunately increasingly true because of globalization from above. As well, there are many critical educators within the West throughout history that stemmed from critical pedagogies constructed by educational scholars and philosophers such as Myles Horton, John Dewey, and many others. It is important to note that the Appalachian research sites were

chosen because they exemplified ecopedagogy models rather than the more common Western EE models. What is emphasized is the need for ecopedagogical models, determined as reoccurring characteristics necessary for successful ecopedagogy by the participants, that is lacking most in the West.

A key term from the previous paragraph is reinvention. Reinvention of Freire's work is a key tenet to how learning must be problem posing and constructed and reconstructed through reflective framing - *praxis*. The importance of praxis will be further discussed later in this chapter. Deep comparative education analysis that focuses on the Local's context is essential rather a simple lending and barrowing of pedagogies. Coding and recoding theory is essential for theory to be relevant. Freire uses his own influence of Marx to enforce the need for reinvention by stating, "Without claiming, by a long shot, to compare myself to Marx (not because now, from time to time, it is said that he is a "has-been," but on the contrary, precisely because, to me, he continues to be, needing only to be reseen" (Freire, 1992, p. 74). The concepts of Freire's work on transformative education is often misunderstood as change rather than reinvention by many EE scholars by viewing his work as altering culture rather than empowering population of a culture(s). In the same way that one educational system cannot be merely switched to a more "successful" or "effective" one from the global North to the global South, nor can it from the global South to the global North.

It is important to note that the naming of EE model as ecopedagogy or someone as an ecopedagogue, but rather the pedagogical characteristics of the socio-environmental teaching and learning taking place. It is important to note this both for critical environmental educators who could also be categorized as ecopedagogues and self-prescribed ecopedagogues whose pedagogical practice resembles

more banking education rather than critical models. This is important within the research conducted because the naming of ecopedagogy (ecopedagogia) rarely occurs in the West, as compared to South America, because the term is not widely known but is gaining slow recognition among educational scholars.

In this comparative education research, it is essential to understand the contextual foundations EE models have been constructed from. Through social, theoretical, and historical comparisons, I argue that the need for an increased South-North borrowing of ecopedagogical methods in the West's EE field for better understanding the actions toward better socio-environmental well-being holistically.

It is not only the need to transform current non-ecopedagogical EE models, but that current EE pedagogies are negatively affecting the environment by sustaining and increasing propaganda to consent to environmental ill actions. Noam Chomsky wrote on Frances Hutchenson conceptualization of propaganda for governance in that "the principle of 'consent of the governed' is not violated when the rulers impose plans that are rejected by the public, if later on the 'stupid' and 'prejudices' masses 'will heartily consent' to what we have done in their name" (1999, p. 34). The current neoliberal approaches of banking EE models are sustaining and even increasing environmental destructive actions by reinforcing neoliberal arguments to justify environmentally harmful actions. In other words, non-critical approaches to EE help socio-environmental ills to occur by the suppressing the questioning of needing alternatives outside of neoliberal frameworks. In addition, non-critical pedagogies avoid such questioning entirely because within neoliberal framing of such issues there is no problem needing to be solved. Within a neoliberal mindset, there is the environmental devastation occurring; however it is not problematized and the social aspects are ignored or better yet

non-existent. In this way, environmental devastation is an unfortunate outcome of "development" and "progress," rather than a factor of social conflict.

In the same way as the pedagogical methods of EE is essential, the defining of *sustainable development* education to deconstruct and reconstruct what is "development" and what is "sustainable" is essential. In addition to critically analyzing the two words, it is essential to question how the two define each other as a term in both theory and practice, as well as understanding the politics of how it is being utilized and by whom? In the discussions on sustainable development during the research in Argentina and Brazil, many participants discussed how there are over 70 definitions of "sustainable development" in their countries; however in the West we overwhelmingly define the term within an economic framework. More in-depth ecopedagogical discussions of questioning if social "progress" can only be defined as economic "growth" are examples of critical discussion seen as largely missing in Western EE models by the participants.

Economics is important to livelihood however it is not the sole factor; however many participants found that an overwhelming presence in much of educations different levels (formal, informal, non-formal) that there was an emphasis of an inverse relationship between livelihood and environmental wellbeing. The relationship was seen as economics as the primary, and sometimes sole, measure of livelihood. Because of this, environmental priorities are often much lower than that of economics even though who is benefiting economically are often not the masses and the connections to social conflict are largely untaught.

South America's Environmental Education Models

This section will delve into some of the histories of critical pedagogies that were constructed in South America that defines the region's EE models. As stated previously, it is essential to deconstruct histories because they construct present and future- in a non-fatalistic manner with contextual transformation as the construction's essential element (Chomsky, 1999). Such understandings are essential to not only compare and contrast EE models in South America and the west, but also what is the context of borrowing EE pedagogies from the larger global South to the global North. Reading and rereading of oppressions through sociological learning towards transformation is a key element of popular education in which ecopedagogy emerged as opposed to the West in which it emerged from the distancing of the social aspects to the hard sciences.

Ecopedagogies are rooted in the popular education movements of South America. It is widely held that term ecopedagogy was first termed in Francisco Gutiérrez and Cruz Prado's book *Ecopedagogia e Cidadania Planetária* (1989). Although the term first appeared in this book, there are a number of writings previously, from both the global South and North that teach in many of the constructs of ecopedagogies without stating the term "ecopedagogy." By those who only have read Freire's earliest writings including his most famous *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), Freire might seem anti-environmental. There are many aspects to this opinion but some may focus on his comparisons between humans with animals by which he seems to devaluing animals. However, such arguments are misunderstanding in that his intent was fundamentally environmental rather than the opposite. In these comparisons he frames humans are transformative beings that are able to better the world in which we live with the World and animals live in the World. Within socio-

environmental context, we humans are the species that have the ability to change the environment either negatively or positively in that humans are the one unbalancing nature for their gain[2]. In other words, humans are the ones affecting nature's balance but have the ability to socio-environmentally better the world. Freire's last book he was writing until his death was focused on ecopedagogy (Gadotti, 2008a), in which some of the completed writings are in his book *Pedagogy of Indignation* (2004) posthumously. The idea of understanding the need and possibly of socio-environmental transformation discussed directly and indirectly throughout his writings.

It must also be stated here that some EE scholars believe that Freire's work is anti-environmental with probably the most notable as C.A. Bowers who "argued that his [Freire's] pedagogy was based on assumptions about change, individualism, anthropocentrism" (2007, p. 112). However I argue that Freire stressed the need for progressive learning (progressive changes) through critical dialogue by students and teachers to embrace, analyze, and respect one's own and each other's culture, history, and traditions. Freire's goal was not for a person to abandon their tradition, but for individuals to use "critical reflection to continually rename the world. This does not imply the abandoning of mentoring relationships, direct observation and embodied learning provided by the traditional community" (McLaren, 2007, p. 102). Inevitably, individuals remake the world within the context of their own cultural traditions. Freire was concerned with raising consciousness that the normative oppressive forces laid upon the masses were anything but natural.

---

2 "Positive" is framed within the laws of nature for the betterment of all of Earth and not solely humans. "Gain" can either be seen as positive or negatively considering social and/or environmental aspects.

Freire and South American Ecopedagogical Movements

Some of the influences of Freire that helped shape the popular education movements in South America to gather a deeper understanding of how the foundation is essential for ecopedagogy will be discussed. It is important to note that this section that only briefly details a portion of those who influenced Freire, gives a better foundational understanding of the sociological and philosophical elements that construct ecopedagogies in the South[3].

Before going into the Freire's theory of *conscientização*, which aids in leading to liberation and empowerment, there will be an analysis of the importance of history for Freire. Importance of history originates from Hegel's theory that a person's consciousness is developed according to their history of self-other interactions (Morrow & Torres, 2002). Freire used Hegel's concept of *Master-Slave* dialect for determining hegemony, by reading and re-reading the world (hermeneutics); as well by using Christian personalism, which focuses on love and mutuality (Morrow & Torres, 2002).

Hegel believed that the slave is the only one that can understand "true" freedom; but he also believed that learning is needed for the slave to become conscious of this fact through *revolutionary praxis.* In the same aspect, the basis of Freirean *conscientização*, preferring, "… rebelliousness because it affirms my status as a person who has never given in to the manipulations and strategies designed to reduce the

3 In his book Pedagogy of Hope, Freire wrote a list of thinkers that "…enlighten the vivid memory that was forming me; Marx, Lukacs, Fromm, Gramsci, Fanon, Memmi, Sartre, Kosik, Agnes Heller, M. Ponty, Simon Weil, Arendt, Marcuse, and so many others" (1997, p. 12). Freirean scholars have expanded the "so many other" category that Freire wrote about to include: Gramsci, Hegel, Mannheim, Dewey, French existentialism, Christian personalism, liberation theory, Habermas, Vygotsky, and, of course, others who are not listed here (Macedo, 2005; Mayo, 1999; Morrow & Torres, 2002).

human person to nothing" (Freire, 1998, p. 103). This favored rebellious needs transformation beyond the status of *Subjects* of dominant ideology stating, "…the objective of any true revolution-requires that the people act, as well as reflect, upon the reality to be transformed…" (Freire, 2005, p. 130). Freire discussed how radical transformation of strongly held ideologies are difficult because ideologies are an individual's reality rather than just a thought process within reality (G. W. Misiaszek & Torres, 2010).

Utopic environmental education models rather than fatalistic models

Participants viewed one ecopedagogues' central goal is to have students first recognize and then deconstruct the negative effects of environmental devastation by asking critical questions such as: Who is benefiting from the destruction? Every person has his/her own *thematic universe* as their frame of reference in which they view their self within society. Freire stressed need for people to expand their own *thematic universe*, by critically questioning the ideologies they have been taught to them by "reading the World" through coding and recoding (or reading and rereading) societal processes such as globalizations and neoliberalism. Reading and rereading socio-environmental issues question the ideologies that allow for governance according to the market by critically questioning why not governance through socio-environmental justice concerns - *life-centered* rather than purely anthropocentric. Participants stressed that education should not be the transfer of objective "truths" but rather understandings are fluid and alternative actions emerging through reflecting on these changing understandings are possible.

Freire focused upon how history develops normalized, oppressive ideologies which stress that we live in inert society with "the recently

proclaimed death of history, which symbolizes the death of utopia, of our right to dream, reinforces without doubt…" (1998, p. 103). Freire expressed how all beings are unfinished being continuously transforming, with the World developing as we develop it [4]. Participants discussed how ecopedagogues needing to stress that we are able to develop our own world, and must reject the fatalistic notion that the current state of it is unchangeable. Freire stated that this is from continued "… ponder[ing] Marx's observation about the necessary radicality that enables me to be permanently aware of everything that has to do with the defense of human interests, which are superior to those of particular groups or classes of people" (1998, p. 92). This learning ideology of fatalism is essential for a few people can govern oppressions of the masses (Chomsky, 1999; Fanon, 2004; Memmi, 1991; Sefa Dei & Kempf, 2006).

History was viewed by Freire as being "…filled with possibility and not inexorably determine[d]…" (Freire, 1998, p. 26)- without the possibility of adaptation, its death leads to fatalism. Marx believed that not only do we construct history, but that history also makes humans (Freire, 2005). History has developed the ideology that environmental ills are necessary within a neoliberal world, an idea that has been normalized through a globalization that promotes Westernization. Freire wrote how Marx and Engels "cried out in favor of the unity of the working classes of the world against their exploitation…." and that, at the current time, this cry needed to be against neoliberalism or as Freire described it as, "the ferocity of the ethics of the marketplace" (1998, p. 115). Trends of global neoliberalism allow more economically developed nations to purchase natural resources at excessively low prices, without regard for the current and long terms ills caused by producing or removing these

4 Development here is transforming our realities (social, political, and economic systems) and not transforming nature.

natural resources from under developed nations. Critical, horizontal dialogue full of hope (e.g., full of utopian possibilities) was considered most important to determine the links between hegemony, ideology, and environmental devastation that lead to true fatalism- destruction of the earth and the resources we need for survival on a biological level. Freire stated that this thought was part of the "death of history" theory that promotes a "…reductionist mentality that talks only of training skills strengthens the authoritarian manner of speaking from the top down… "(1998, p. 103).

The concept of hope was expressed by participants as an essential element for successful ecopedagogy in order to dream of possible utopias to able to construct praxis to continually reach for utopia even with continuing not to obtain utopia- metaphorically a horizon (Torres, 2007b).

> [A]s an educator, a politician, and a man who constantly re-thinks his educational praxis I remain profoundly hopeful. I reject immobilization, apathy, and silence…I am not merely hopeful out of capriciousness, but because hope is an imperative of human nature. It is not possible to live in plentitude without hope. Conserve the hope. (Freire, 1996)

Hope is necessary for dreaming and for developing praxis for actions that reach for utopia, even though it cannot be achieved fully, since reaching one level of utopia will only bring about dreaming about the next level of utopia. Loss of hope brings ends to dreaming about utopia, resulting in loss of "…faith in the human capacities for regeneration and to imagine a better future" (Boff, 2008, p. 5). Leonardo Boff stressed that hope brings about care which is "…more than a mere act; it is rather an attitude… attitude of activity, of concern, or responsibility and of an affective involvement with the other" (2008, p. 14)[5]. For ecopedagogy to bring about change, learning

[5] Leonardo Boff is Emeritus Professor of Ethics, Religion, Philosophy, and Ecology at The State University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

must promote praxis where knowledge, dialogue, and self-reflection determine action in hope of a future where the earth and all life are not oppressed by systems that sustain hegemony.

Colonialisms and fatalism

The complex and difficult deconstruction of the processes of globalizations is essential. Processes of globalization construct oppressive systems of neocolonialism that focuses "on production without any preoccupation about what we are producing, who it benefits, or who it hurts" (Freire & Macedo, 1996, p. 84; Mayo, 2004). These two questions are essential for ecopedagogues to construct horizontal discussions within learning spaces. For developed countries to sustain their current global hegemony, they must have access to a large amount of diverse resources that their own lands, due to environmental constraints, cannot provide. In the past, one important reason that imperialistic nations such as England, Spain, France, and Japan controlled colonies was to gather natural resources that were unavailable or low in quantity on their own lands. In the postcolonial world, developed nations create a global society that provides these resources to them within a global capitalist market. This market favors selling these resources at prices that maximize profit for hegemonic nations by selling at the lowest price possible. This practice allows developed nations to purchase natural resources at excessively low prices, without regard for current and long terms ills caused by producing or removing these natural resources from "less-developed" nations.

The phrase "decolonizing of the mind" refers to empowerment of intellectual agency by bringing forth and critically analyzing false knowledge from a colonized education (Dei, 2006). Ecopedagogues must encourage critical thought on how production and its polity promote colonization through production and trade in both global

and local aspects. Anti-colonial EE models strengthen intellectual agency. It empowers not only individual agency, but also local agency by teaching that a nation's indigenous knowledge is powerful enough to break previous colonial, dominative knowledge (Dei, 2006). The next section will explain how the different sphere of oppression between in South America as compared to regions in the West have strong historical constructions of ecopedagogies that are anti-colonial.

The West's Environmental Education Models

Throughout the participants' dialogue there was a great deal of critical analysis of Western EE framed through many theoretical lenses by many of the South American participants and more pragmatic-framed discussions from Appalachian ones. The lack of facilitating critical dialogical depth of many Western EE models, especially outside of current social, political, and economic systems was a reoccurring theme. Many participants viewed this absence as promoting positivistic models of environmental teaching and learning leading to prescribed, objective outcomes for shallow problem solving. Without a transformative, radical nature EE models situate environmental problem solving within severely narrowed neoliberal frameworks and systems in which economic profits for a few and sustaining power structures are paramount. The promotion of the natural-ness of neoliberalism allow non-critical, non-radical EE models to flourish because problem-solving outside of a neoliberal framework is taught as "unnatural" – a tenet of neoliberalism expressed by many critical pedagogues (Apple, 1999; Chomsky, 1999; Sandlin & McLaren, 2010; Torres, in press). What is stressed within such neoliberal EE models are not the complex power relationships between who economically benefits and who do not but rather within false, simplified understandings in which everyone benefits from

"necessary" acts of environmental devastation. This section briefly describes how models EE models evolved from well-meaning environmental movements to education models that are highly influenced by neoliberal ideologies.

The following three aspects on the differences between EE in the West and South America will be briefly described that participants viewed as strong foundational reasons for two very different pedagogies to emerge: histories of the environmental movement and the education that emerged, the depth of sociological and philosophical foundations; and the spheres of socio-environmental oppression shaped by globalizations. These are only a few examples that emerged from the research, but these were some of the most emphasized most from South American participants as well as, but to a lesser extent, from Appalachian participants.

History of Western Environmental Education Models

In the United States the environmental movement and its educational models evolved out of conservation movements within mostly middle to higher socio-economic White populations (Zehle, 2002). This is consistent with many nations in the West. Although the origins and reasoning for EE in each region and individually vary; the strong foundation of South American environmental movements emerging from social movements is lacking. Rachel Carson's book *Silent Spring* (1962), which was first contested by many, is seen by many as the start of the environmental movement in the U.S. that led to the banning of the pesticide DDT and initiating the "dawn of industry's fight against the dissemination of scientific discoveries critical of industrial practices" (Saylan & Blumstein, 2011, p. 27). Although Carson's book had much more depth than proving the need to conserve certain bird populations, many dismissed it as such. The

West's socio-environmental movement largely emerged from the alternative social movements from the mid to late 60's intertwined with the anti-war and civil rights movements; however many of the important environmental movements largely dissolved in the early to mid 70s. This era's environmentalists became othered as radical "tree huggers" associated with the counter culture (Saylan & Blumstein, 2011, p. 27) as materialism became increasingly popular. By the early 1980s, such movements were even more othered by a U.S. President that publically vilified the counter-culture of the late 60s numerous times and dissembled solar energy panels on the White House in which the previous president installed. Reaganism and Thatcherism was the beginning of the modern neoliberal and globalization from above movements that was a combined set of forces to dilute the environmental movement and reconstructed its education to fit its neoliberal agenda.

Lack of sociological, historical depth

Almost all of the research participants express how many in the West do not categorize themselves as "environmentalists" but do so because of ignorance of socio-environmental issues. They stressed that if the oppressive influences of neoliberalism were known that a large majority of the population would name themselves socio-environmentalists. Ecopedagogues interviewed believed that deeper socio-environmental understandings require interdisciplinary EE models as essential to problem solving in which radical changes are understood as possibilities. Descriptions of self-defined "successful" ecopedagogies that emerged from the research are complex but there are two key elements that I would like to elaborate upon which are foundationally different from many Western EE models. First is the lack of sociological depth that most participants spoke about and second is how EE programs are placed mostly in the "hard" Western

Sciences rather than the social sciences, humanities and indigenous sciences.

First, participants frequently discussed how the complex politics of socio-environmental injustices are largely ignored in Western EE models because the models lack thorough sociological theorizing for understanding socio-environmental issues and problem solving in which radicalness is not shunned. With the complexity of social issues as a key for neoliberal curricula to be best hidden (Apple, 2004; Giroux, 2001), socio-environmental issues are best hidden when educational systems do not teach how to evening begin to understand the complex links. Without pedagogies that critically assist in understanding the sources of oppressions by linking social and environmental issues, these pedagogies hide the need to understand them. In other words, the benefactors of neoliberalism gain immensely from shallow pedagogies. This overall lack of theoretical and interdisciplinary teaching was seen by participants as much more common in the West compared to South America where EE models largely emerged from popular education models.

The second theme is the predominant positioning of EE programs in the hard Sciences in the West and devaluing EE programs situated in the disciplines of social sciences and humanities. Many Western EE models were viewed as distancing Sciences from society by situating scientific reactions to be "objectively" detached from the subjective society and that S/science is only "good" if it is Western (noted as Science with a capital "S" as all non-Western and/or indigenous sciences with a lowercase "s" (Harding, 1998)). In addition, participants thought that when EE models are situated in social sciences departments, teaching discourages problem solving that involves radical changes of social systems to better socio-environmental wellbeing. Because of this, Western EE were seen as

becoming more and more passive transfers of dominant knowledge (e.g. banking education) rather than critical, transformative teaching and learning. Such passive EE models were seen as hegemonic tools in which socio-environmental harmful actions are not only hidden but are taught as beneficial actions to those who they most harm.

Spheres of oppression: Comparing the Global South to the Global North

The differences and similarities of framing oppressions between the global South and the West are very important for ecopedagogues to analyze in teaching, as in all critical pedagogical models. In all EE models, the constructions of oppressions determine how socio-environmental issues are learned. With Freire's concept that everyone is oppressed as well as an oppressor (Freire, 2005), how individuals conceptualize themselves and their societies within these opposing identities is contextually essential to how they construct socio-environmental oppressions especially in the framing globalizations. It is also important that within the contexts of the West and South America, the global South was seen as neo-colony for the global North to benefit from their oppression.

> In Latin America, Washington expected to be able to implement the Monroe Doctrine, but again in a special sense. President Wilson, famous for his idealism and high moral principles, agreed in secret that "in its advocacy of the Monroe Doctrine the U.S. considers its own interests." The interests of Latin Americans are merely "incidental," not our concern. He recognized that "this may seem based on selfishness alone," but held that the Doctrine "had no higher or more generous motive. The U.S. sought to displace its traditional rivals, England and France, and establish a regional alliance under its control that was to stand apart from the world system, in which such arrangements were not to be permitted. (Chomsky, 1999, p. 17)

There are many oppressions emerging from such global power structures with environmental exploitation as an important one to deconstruct.

The Appalachian and South American participants discussed their regions' oppressions within different spheres of domination. Appalachian oppressions were constructed within the dominant forces *within* the U.S.; whereas the oppressions in Brazil and Argentina were expressed as oppressions within the global sphere with the U.S. as the most dominate (or largest oppressor). All of the participants discussed oppressive processes of globalization directly or indirectly, but within this context, the South Americans viewed global oppression by the Western world with the United States as a/the leader. In addition, Appalachia has the fallback of the United States to help them out of socio-environmental devastation.

The regions researched within Brazil and Argentina have the support of the respective nation-states; however their oppressions were constructed as more multi-leveled within the global sphere. South American participants expressed that the global South also has some support of the hard-to-define international community but in most circumstances this community acts within frameworks of neoliberalism for their decision-making. The recognition of such global oppression was shown as not as well hidden for those in the South because the recognition of oppression is not directly related to negatively affecting their power. In other words, participants expressed that there is little negative impact for those who profit by being defined as an oppressor; however the recognition of oppressing regions within the nation-state will have a negative impact on the entity causing the oppression. Because national citizenship is well defined at the national level in the U.S., the evidence and widespread knowledge of oppression of one of its regions would be politically devastating. Within the global scope, the same oppression would be

bad politically, but the loosely defined and recognized global citizenship allows for oppression that is more open.

Discussion

> The insistence that the oppressed engage in reflection on their concrete situation is *not a call to armchair revolution. On the contrary, reflection – true reflection -- leads to action*. On the other hand, when the situation calls for action, that action will constitute an authentic praxis only if its consequences become the object of critical reflection. (Freire, 2005, p. 66)

The purpose for EE is to better the world by countering socio-environmental oppressions for the Earth in both anthropocentric and biocentric spheres. This chapter delves into how pedagogies can either empower or oppress through either stimulate critical understanding of socio-environmental connections or to further lengthen the "distances" between acts of environmental devastation and social conflict. Reading and rereading the influences of neoliberalism is essential in both how it systematically suppresses the socio-environmental learning, as well as analyzing the restrictions it places on problem solving by inciting the senses of fatalism that the ideologies promote. South American ecopedagogical models were focused upon the foundation of many critical pedagogies, especially within EE models, have originated and widely practiced in this region (Gadotti & Torres, 2009; Saylan & Blumstein, 2011). This is not to state that there are not many other critical pedagogical models outside of this region that should be borrowed towards countering EE models shaped by neoliberal ideologies. This chapter has focused upon the need for constructing critical socio-environmental pedagogies in the globally dominant West; however, what is more essential are actions done, constructed through individuals' reflection of learned understandings from such pedagogies.

As written throughout this chapter, learning that radical alternatives are possible is the first step. This is often a difficult step many times because fatalistic neoliberal ideologies are so deeply ingrained when thinking on any topic that the naturalness of it seems inherent. Freire stressed that oppressive pedagogies discourage change; it is undeniable that "however, knowing change to be difficult but possible is far superior to the fatalist immobility of believing it unthinkable, or to think that change is a sin against god" (2004, p. 82). The concept of god here is used to signify that many pedagogies stress that current systems are "natural" and change is "unnatural," or going against the concept of god who created the nature of oppressive systems.

Freire constructed praxis as essential to critical pedagogies such as the following examples: conceptualizing praxis as fights that "constitute an act of love" (2005, p. 45); the concept of dominant praxis as "deny[ing] praxis to the oppressed thereby invalidate their own praxis" (2005, p. 126); and the need for human curiosity "because *ingenuous curiosity does not automatically become critical that one of the essential tasks of progressive educational praxis is the promotion of a curiosity that is critical, bold, and adventurous*" (1998, p. 38). I would like to select to unpack the following passage from *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* in which many might point to as proving Freire to be anti-environmental and/or exclusively anthropocentric.

> …humankind, as beings of the praxis, differ from animals, which are beings of pure activity. Animals do not consider the world; they are immersed in it. In contrast, human beings emerge from the world, objectify it, and in so doing can understand it and transform it with their labor. (2005, p. 125)

Friere is not promoting oppression due to a hierarchal structure of humans on top but rather we, as humans, construct and reconstruct our own realities. Those with the most powerful and manipulative neoliberal interests want the masses to become unnaturally non-

human by seeing our society static and ourselves as "finished" with transformation as impossible. With many EE models teaching student how to be *immersed* in the world without the ability to change for possible solutions to exist or the critical ability to identify socio-environmental problems, we fulfill Ivan Illich's prophecy of becoming "the plaything of scientists, engineers, and planners" (1983, p. 78). With increased neoliberal influences, the powerful individuals playing are those who controls scientists, engineers, and planners – controls the knowledges that most seem as abstract and unattainable to understand. What this chapter has tried to accomplish is set broad pedagogical guidelines and possible borrowing of South America's ecopedagogies so that these players do not control the education of socio-environmental issues needed to have them to stop playing.

References

Apple, Michael W. (1999). Between neoliberalism and neoconservatism: Education and conservatism in a global context. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 376 p.). New York: Routledge.

Apple, Michael W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Boff, Leonardo. (2008). *Essential Care: An Ethics of Human Nature*. Waco, Texas: Baylor University.

Bowers, C.A. (2007). A Response to McLaren's revisionist interpretation of Freire. *Capitalism, Nature, and Socialism, 18*(1), 109-118.

Carson, Rachel. (1962). *Silent spring*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Chomsky, Noam. (1999). *Profit over people : neoliberalism and global order* (Seven Stories Press 1st ed.). New York: Seven Stories Press.

Dei, George J. Sefa. (2006). Introduction: Mapping the Terrain - Towards a New Politics of Resistance. In G. J. S. Dei & A. Kempf (Eds.), *Anti-colonialism and Education: The Politics of Resistance* (pp. 313). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Fanon, Frantz. (2004). *The wretched of the earth* (R. Philcox, Trans. 1st ed.). New York: Grove Press : Distributed by Publishers Group West.

Freire, Paulo. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo. (1992). *Pedagogy of Hope*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo. (1996). *El grito manso, Paulo Freire en la Universidad de San Luis*. Universidad de San Luis. San Luis, Buenos Aires.

Freire, Paulo. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.

Freire, Paulo. (2004). *Pedagogy of indignation*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Freire, Paulo. (2005). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo, & Freire, Ana Maria Araâujo. (1997). *Pedagogy of the heart*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo, & Macedo, Donaldo P. (1996). *Letters to Cristina : reflections on my life and work*. New York: Routledge.

Gadotti, Moacir. (2008a). *Education for sustainable development: What we need to learn to save the planet*. São Paulo: Instituto Paulo Freire.

Gadotti, Moacir. (2008b). What we need to learn to save the planet. *Journal of Education for Sustainable Development, 2*(1), 21-30.

Gadotti, Moacir. (2009). *Education for sustainability: A contribution to the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development*. Saõ Paulo: Editora e Livraria Instituto Paulo Freire.

Gadotti, Moacir, & Torres, Carlos Alberto. (2009). Paulo Freire: Education for Development. *Development and Change, 40*(6), 1255-1267. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7660.2009.01606.x

Giroux, Henry A. (2001). *Theory and resistance in education: Towards a pedagogy for the opposition* (Rev. and expanded ed.). Westport, Conn.: Bergin & Garvey.

Gray, John. (1995). *Liberalism* (2nd ed.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gutiérrez, Francisco, & Prado, Cruz. (1989). *Ecopedagogia e cidadania planetária. (Ecopedagogy and planetarian citizenship)*. São Paulo: Cortez.

Harding, Sandra G. (1998). *Is science multicultural?: Postcolonialisms, feminisms, and epistemologies*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Harvey, David. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Illich, Ivan. (1983). *Deschooling society* (1st Harper Colophon ed.). New York: Harper Colophon.

Kellner, Douglas. (1999). Globalization from below?: Toward a radical democratic technopolitics. *Angelaki, 4*(2), 101-113.

Kellner, Douglas. (2002). Theorizing Globalization. *Sociological Theory, 20*(3), 285-305.

Macedo, Donaldo. (2005). Introduction to the Anniversary Edition. In P. Freire (Ed.), *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (pp. 183). New York, NY: Continuum.

Mayo, Peter. (1999). *Gramsci, Freire and adult education: Possibilities for transformative action*. New York: Zed Books.

Mayo, Peter. (2004). *Liberating praxis : Paulo Freire's legacy for radical education and politics*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishers.

McLaren, Peter. (2007). Conservation, class struggle, or both: A response to C.A. Bowers. *Capitalism, Nature, and Socialism, 18*(1), 99-108.

Memmi, Albert. (1991). *The colonizer and the colonized* (Expanded ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Misiaszek, G. W., & Torres, Carlos Alberto. (2010). Ideologia. In D. R. Streck, E. Redin & J. José (Eds.), *Dicionário Paulo Freire* (2nd ed.). Belo Horizonte, Brazil: Autêntica.

Misiaszek, G.W. (2011). *Ecopedagogy in the Age of Globalization: Educators' Perspectives of Environmental Education Programs in the Americas Which Incorporate Social Justice Models.* ProQuest LLC. 789 East Eisenhower Parkway, P.O. Box 1346, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. Tel: 800-521-0600; Web site: http://www.proquest.com/en-US/products/dissertations/individuals.shtml. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED533850

Misiaszek, G.W. (2012). Transformative environmental education within social justice models: Lessons from comparing adult ecopedagogy within North and South America. In D. N. Aspin, J. Chapman, K. Evans & R. Bagnall (Eds.), *Second International Handbook of Lifelong Learning* (Vol. 26, pp. 423-440). London: Springer.

Misiaszek, G.W. (in press). La esencialidad de la ecopedaogia (re-inventada por la Pedagogía Freireana) en la educación para la ciudadanía: hacia una comprensión crítica de los derechos ambientales esenciales para la participación en la ciudadanía (Ecopedagogy (reinvented thru Freirean Pedagogy) as essential for

citizenship education: Critically understanding environmental rights essential for citizenship participation). *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social (International Journal of Education for Social Justice), (official publication of the Red Iberoamericana de Investigación sobre Cambio y Eficacia Escolar, Facultad de Formación de Profesorado y Educación, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España), 1*(2: Special edition: El Rizoma de Paulo Freire (The Rhizome of Paulo Freire)).

Morrow, Raymond A., & Torres, Carlos Alberto. (2002). *Reading Freire and Habermas*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sandlin, Jennifer A., & McLaren, Peter. (2010). *Critical pedagogies of consumption: Living and learning in the shadow of the "shopocalypse"*. New York: Routledge.

Saylan, Charles, & Blumstein, Daniel T. (2011). *The failure of environmental education (and how we can fix it)*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sefa Dei, George J., & Kempf, Arlo (2006). *Anti-colonialism and education: The politics of resistance*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Stiglitz, Joseph E. (2003). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Torres, Carlos Alberto. (2007a). Paulo Freire, education, and transformation social justice learning. In C. A. Torres & A. Teodoro (Eds.), *Critique and utopia: New developments in the sociology of education in the twenty-first century* (pp. viii, 184 p.). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Torres, Carlos Alberto. (2007b). Paulo Freire, Education, and Transformation Social Justice Learning. In C. A. Torres & A. Teodoro (Eds.), *Critique and utopia : new developments in the sociology of education in the twenty-first century* (pp. viii, 184 p.). Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.

Torres, Carlos Alberto. (2009). *Globalizations and education: Collected essays on class, race, gender, and the state*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Torres, Carlos Alberto. (in press). *Education and neoliberalism: Essays of oppression*. New York: Routledge.

Zehle, Soenke. (2002). Notes on Cross-Border Environmental Justice Education. In J. Adamson, M. M. Evans & R. Stein (Eds.), *The environmental justice reader : politics, poetics, & pedagogy* (pp. 331-349). Tucson, Arz.: University of Arizona Press.