

De-colonizing Pedagogy : Teaching English in the Age of Globalization

Chaepyong Song
(Wayne State University)

Song, Chaepyong. 2001. De-colonizing, Multicultural Pedagogy: Teaching English in the Age of Globalization. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 9(1), 167-183. This article argues that English education can contribute to producing critical world citizens who are urgently needed in this age of globalization. After critically analyzing a Korean educational climate in which English is decontextualized and fetishized, this article recommends that a renovated curriculum of English education include literary works in order to help students expand their imaginative horizons, which is critical to the fostering of globally sensitive Koreans. It further argues that English education conceived as such can contribute to cultivating morally crucial abilities of imagination, without which both intra-cultural and inter-cultural relations are impoverished.
(Wayne State University)

1. A Story Thus Far

In the year 2001, English education in South Korea has been revamped. Many applied linguists and other dedicated English teachers have renovated pedagogical methods, attempting to seek for alternatives to the previous grammar-translation methods. Thus, contemporary English education emphasizes communicative skills. Moreover, increasing number of native English educators are helping the students improve their conversation skills. Every semester thousands of Korean college students, in spite of a recent IMF shock, swamp English language institutes in the universities in US, Canada, UK, and Australia, to familiarize themselves with English language. These fortunate students

are far better situated than the previous generations in experiencing English language in real-life contexts. Moreover, the advanced information technology has made it possible for the students to access such English channels as CNN, BBC, and Cartoon Network, as well as numerous English Internet Web sites. These opportunities, aided by pedagogical renovations, overseas language training, and ubiquitous English media, may have helped students a great deal in terms of their communicative skills. Thus, contemporary college students in Korea may be more competent in English conversation skills than those students of a university *Time* magazine-reading club in my generation who might have struggled when you asked them the way to the station.

Yet, in another respect, English education does not appear to have changed much. In the 1980s, for highly competitive exams for jobs, college students had to 'conquer' popular TOEFL or vocabulary texts, just as high school students strove to memorize their textbooks to enter colleges. In such an educational environment, English education was what was in popular texts and what might be in the exams. For many of us, English, before it was a real language used by flesh-and-blood people living in a real world, became a serious study object, whose mastery might move us upwardly.

After two decades, English language in Korea is still a de-cultured study object. As high school students still study English to enter colleges, most college students still attempt to master English to get better scores for their future jobs. Our students often think of English language as 'English knowledge power,' which may well reflect what we have long identified English language acquisition with: a social power one can wield. A 'powerful' command of English is a vital means of establishing one's social power base. Failure to master English, however, means a serious slide down the social ladder. A good command of English language, often evaluated by one's scores on various tests, is directly related to one's 'powerful' command of life in the country, and quite distanced from English language as an integral part of its varied cultures the world over.

Even the above-mentioned, popular overseas English training for college students—an experience that is very much desired by corporate systems in Korea—seems to have been reduced to another task that one must complete to embellish one's resume. Under such a social climate where English becomes translated into a test score, our students have been discouraged from experiencing the enjoyment of learning a foreign language. Or more strongly put, Korean English teachers have taken away from our students the basic enjoyment that any foreign language learners may experience. English as a global language can be an effective medium through which we could vividly imagine other people and their culture and thus in turn re-imagine ourselves. Yet English as a study object reduced to another form of cultural capital, results in de-coupling English language from its lively contexts. English has been alienated from its users and their cultures; especially, English education twisted into a service of college entrance or job exams has intensified this process of reification. Thus, English language, denuded of its varied contexts under which it is used, the very materiality of which students should be constantly reminded, has been turned into another hot commodity. Such commodification is an alarming issue if one thinks of one critical avenue that any foreign language education is entitled to opening: the expansion of our students' imagination toward other people.

While some critics fault nationally-approved English textbooks for their grammatically incorrect sentences or obsolete usages, I want to propose a more radical pedagogical change by calling attention to the rich implications the use of literary works written in English can present to English educators; such a change is required to foster among our students the curiosity and enjoyment of learning English. And moreover, our new world order, often called the age of globalization, demands that we rethink the ways in which we have defined ourselves, and that we heighten our ethical imagination in preparation for increased interactions (in reality or virtual reality) with people from other cultures. Any change in English education needs to be conceived of in such a global responsibility.

The discourse of globalization, of course, figures centrally in English education in Korea. In fact, the logic of economic globalization, or 'the latest stage of imperialism' has permeated deep into the everyday life of Koreans (Sivanandan, 1999, p. 5). Thus, while such transnational economy is the very force that stimulates the restructuring of English education into a more efficient one aligned with its logic of capitalism, it is also the force that speeds up the commodification of knowledge in every sector of life. In this respect, critical educators need to question if English educators, through the increased instrumentalizing of English language in Korea, have participated in the brutalities of economic globalization, the globalism that is, according to Geeta Kapur, inseparable from "an ideology of the market, dictated by the IMF, the World Bank and the G-7 executive, crowned by Gatt" (Kapur, 1998, p. 192).

While the economic crisis of the late 1990s has undoubtedly sped up the process of globalization within Korea, English language, as one of the alluring metropolitan goods, has been increasingly commodified. Undoubtedly, English is a highly desired commodity in Korea, a commodity that can increase one's profitability. In such a climate, for thousands of students, before it is a foreign language, English is rather a battle students believe they must wage in order to compete for jobs or promotions in the jobs they already hold. They know that when they have better English 'power' they have a distinct advantage over less 'powerful' colleagues. A high English score in high school means entry into a prestigious university; high TOEIC scores signify acquisition of a competitive edge in a company. Viewed in this climate of English as commodity fetish that one desires in the face of a fear of emasculation, it is not difficult to realize how much our students have been estranged from what English language is: a real language of English-speaking people. These flesh-and-blood speakers of English language all over the world have been obscured by our students more immediate need for a profitable commodity. Either multiple varieties of English have been simplified into a standardized, thus more manipulative, stiff form, or, for

some, they have been reduced to the level of limited grammatical rules, obscure vocabularies, and clichéd common (useful) expressions. In de-coupling English from its living contexts, English speakers (of all kinds of varieties) become abstracted or disembodied.

For me, this impersonal abstraction works against the basic principle of language; language is an unfixable living entity in a constant flux that should be conceived of in its relations to human beings. To point to such inseparable connectedness between language and human beings, Martin Heidegger said that language is the home of Being. Walter Mignolo supports this, by stating that "language is not an object, something that human beings have, but an ongoing process that only exists in languaging" (Mignolo, 1996, p. 123). By the term 'languaging,' Mignolo foregrounds living interactions among individuals that condition the possibility of language. Without interacting human beings, language may be relegated to a de-cultured object. This is what has happened to English language in Korea. In this process of objectification, its foreignness, the very source of curiosity for EFL learners, has become abstracted as a disembodied object. To restore the materiality of English language or to re-embody it, we must change our educational climate that has been reinterpellating our students from learners to accumulators of wealth, from active, knowledgeable citizens to myopic profiteers.

2. Teaching Otherwise

Korea's ever-increasing 'English fever' has recently been intensified by the rise of economic globalism. This fever is so high that some students miss their college classes—English classes included—to strengthen their English at the private English language institutes outside the college campuses. What an irony! Is there any malignant side effect of such fanatical 'English fever'? Unquestionably, such renewed fever has awakened some conservative educators to a dire need for renovating university curriculum so as to reflect students' demand. However, some critics suggest that it has reached an unhealthy level of

frenzy. One hopes that this 'English frenzy' can lead to students' better taming of a wild foreign tongue and in turn to a better quality of life. Yet, in the meantime, any critical English educator needs to rethink whether this conception of English education, an education that has addressed or has connived to address English study as a way of accumulating more capital, misses out on a significant function that it can serve in helping students become critical global citizens. To producing such global citizens, citizens as much urgently needed as fluent English speakers, English education can contribute, only with a pedagogical re-orientation that returns to the original purpose of foreign language learning: to increase one's understanding of other people and their culture via their language.

As such, this re-orientation, first of all, requires the democratization of English language, along with the de-colonization of our minds (to borrow the popular phrase of Nigerian writer Ngugi wa Thiong'o). By now English has become a global, multicultural phenomenon. Thus, such re-structuring should be made with an extended view of English as the de facto international language used the world over, whether in Ireland, India, Nigeria, South Africa, or Jamaica, as well as in England, USA, Canada, or Australia. In addition, such re-focusing should entail a democratic pedagogy that Queen's English or American Standard English—the English we have long considered as a 'standard,' thus valued English due to its appeal in its association with money and success—is, as countless scholars have pointed out, only a dialect of many Englishes. The other subalternized Englishes such as Jamaican English or English in India, are no better or no worse than Standard English. In short, this critical English pedagogy conceives of English language as a multicultural phenomenon, and thus distinct from its earlier colonized version that attempted to mimic an imperial, 'white' English as a norm; it looks into the epistemic violence lurking behind this colonized consciousness that divides the world into black and white, and valorizes the world of whites above and beyond that of blacks. Viewed as such, English education, especially through the imaginative,

multicultural literatures written in English, can enrich our students' understanding of the others and expand their horizons of international imaginings. If this multicultural imagination of other people is strongly needed for anybody in the world in this age of globalization, it is even more necessary in a homogeneously-constructed nation like Korea. For it takes rather a radical re-imagining to look beyond our deep-rooted nationalistic worldviews and see other values and beliefs, other sense of reality. English education can meet this need, only if properly oriented. Yet, it has many obstacles to face, because of the specific, post-colonial Korean cultural milieu.

With the post-colonial Korea's need to consolidate its base as a modern nation-state, it has emphasized its intra-cultural sameness, thus relegating differences that, contrary to constructed common beliefs, evidently exist, whether in the form of region, class, gender, or even race. Our centralized national education system has been so successful in the production and dissemination of such ideologically-charged notion of cultural homogeneity. Koreans seem to have internalized this notion of cultural purity. The idea of a pure Korean cultural identity imagined as a way of restoring degraded integrity of the nation especially under the Japanese colonial rule, has been established as opposed to the other national cultures' impurity. This inwardly constructed notion, if unchecked, could translate into undesirable human relations with people from other cultures, relations commonly built on some underlying assumptions that we, the pure, are better than them, the impure. The violent episteme underlying behind such national identity-building project could burst into a form of racism under stressed circumstances.

Mass education in the 20th century, along with mass media, has enabled the integration and homogenization of the Korean population (Lie, 1998, p. 176). Especially in the post-Liberation period, the Korean education system, as an Althusserian Ideological State Apparatus, has played a central role in the construction of a homogeneous national culture. It is by now a cliché to say that ours is not a culture in which diversity is seen as a value or an ideal. We find pride in unity: one

people, one 'white-clothed' race, one mind. Complicitous with national hegemonies, the education system has reinforced this idea. Yet, even though the globalized Korean society has materialized in phenomena that challenge the image of the unchanging homogeneity, this idea of a pure national culture has been consolidated at the expense of repressing or excluding the uncontainable within that idea. For instance, in the present there are many Chinese and other 'foreign' workers in Korea who suffer from basic human rights abuses and other discriminatory policies, even though some of them were born in Korea. Along with other mixed-blood Koreans, they only exist on the periphery of the national imagination. This is not an insignificant matter, for an exaggerated sense of national identity on the one hand or lack of recognizing of others on the other becomes frequently the basis of racial prejudice and discrimination. One can even say that cultural racism lurks behind such exclusionary forms of national identity.

To exemplify this discriminatory nature, let me draw attention to a recent disturbing incident in Korea, as reported in *Joong-Ang Daily News* on June 28, 2000. A 20-year-old Chinese student applied to Seoul National University and Yonsei University, but these universities turned down his applications, not because of his scholastic achievement scores, but because of his alien status in Korea. The fact that he was born in Korea and speaks Korean as fluently as Chinese was not sufficient enough to be accepted. This Chinese student is a victim of the conservative Korean citizenship law, which has been animated by the exclusive form of national identity. This student has been offered a scholarship by a university in USA, and when asked where he would work after his graduation, he said, "Of course, I will go to China, and I will not come back to Korea." Who can argue with this disheartened student's painful determination not to come back to Korea, the country that traumatically bothered him?

Complicit in the production of the official narrative of Korean national culture, English education, a part of the institutionalized education system, has also ended up fostering a certain form of cultural racism. It

has done so, as I suggested earlier, by having overtly or covertly participated in attributing value or normativity to 'white' English, thus white people, and devaluing, stereotyping, and labeling English people of color as 'other.' Thus these people became subalternized, rendered invisible. Such educational ideology—a colonial ideology pragmatically justified by the fact that this 'white' English is a prestigious one—has, in my mind, has perpetuated among our EFL learners the colonized consciousness, a mindset that any critical global citizen should decolonize.

In fact, one often encounters among overseas Koreans those who seem to enact such colonized consciousness in a form of cultural racism. (One's personal or cultural unconscious tends to become more visible in one's interactions with other peoples in international settings.) These culturally insensitive Koreans quickly rehearse all offensive clichés about people from other cultures and limit their human relations according to pre-established stereotypical images of them. "The Chinese never take a shower, and you can tell by 'bird's nests' on their head" (a reference to their seemingly untidy hair); "Never trust Jews, and you don't know when they turn around and bite you"; "Blacks are lazy and ignorant"; "Mexicans are impulsive"; and "Asian Indians are smelly." These are only a few samplings that I remember hearing from other fellow Koreans both in Texas and Michigan, USA. Many of these Koreans are highly educated. In fact, these racial generalizations are not literal translations, for most of the Koreans who related such stereotypes tended to use derogatory, racist terms in reference to all other nationalities (except to Koreans), such as 'Jjang-ge' for the Chinese, 'Kkamdoong-yi' for Blacks, and 'Yang-nom' for white Americans. One may think of many informed ways to account for this wide-spread undesirable, racist mentality. Here, I want to attribute it to the lack of the ability to imagine other people as concrete individuals due to a lack of proper, educational stimulation. Far too long we have promoted or even exaggerated our sense of individual and national self-identity at the expense of others, which I argue underlies much of

our lack of recognition of others. While recognizing, legitimating, and institutionalizing a certain ideological, pedagogical orientation, English education in Korea might have ended up subalternizing certain less prestigious cultures, even though they are a part of global cultures of English language. If this is the case, English educators are responsible to help our students become culturally literate in those cultures that have been hitherto invisible so that they can assume a global responsibility.

3. Literary Imagination into English Education

If English education has participated in the commodification of English in the process of industrializing modern Korean nation-state, now it is time that it should turn to what is urgently required in this rapidly globalizing world: critical global citizens. These citizens are the ones critical of a narrowly-conceived, exclusionary national identity and the ones who act multiculturally, though located in his or her own culture yet at once sensitive of others' cultural integrity. By fostering the playfulness as well as materiality of English as a foreign language and also by incorporating literary works into current curriculum, English education can contribute to the production of critical world citizens. It can do so, because English is the global language. I advocate the use of literature in EFL classrooms (both in colleges and secondary schools), because literary works of some depth can foster a multicultural sensitivity.

Faced with the rapid restructuring of the world order and also the renewed nationalisms, many philosophers and cultural critics attempt to search for a more inclusive form of cultural identity. In such effort, philosopher Martha Nussbaum turns to literary texts to show their significance for moral philosophy; she reads realist social novels like those of Charles Dickens for moral values, seeing those novels as giving 'a particular set of answers to the question "How should one live?"' (Nussbaum, 1990, p. 36). In 'Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism,' she

also draws our attention to Rabindranath Tagore's novel, *The Home and the World*, for "the very old ideal of the cosmopolitan, the person whose allegiance is to the worldwide community of human beings" (Nussbaum, 1996, p. 4). Supported by Tagore's novel, she calls for 'cosmopolitan education.' Of course, one can wonder if any complex literary work is easily subject to such a rational philosophizing. Moreover, her idea of cosmopolitanism sounds too utopian, transcendental, often obscure, and disembodied. Yet, her insight on the need to cultivate the world citizen who can live sympathetically in our world of what Richard Falk calls 'capital-driven and ethically neutral' economic globalization is of value to our education system (English education included), an education system that has been (far too long) twisted and pressed into the service of the economic development of the nation (Falk, 1996, p. 58). Nussbaum resists the public conception that though illuminating their private life literary imagination is 'idle and unhelpful' when it comes to the issues such as classes and nations; rather, she showcases literature as a vital part of both personal and public ethical deliberations (Nussbaum, 1998, p. 225). It is because the metaphorical imagination in literature enables one to see "one thing as another, to see one thing in another" (Nussbaum, 1998, p. 235). This imagination encourages one to look beyond the immediate things to see other things; it vividly evokes the things beyond the pale, things that are not easily appropriated into our formulaic, pure sameness. To cultivate such imagination is not peripheral, but essential, if a critical educator believes that without such metaphorical ability both personal and social relationships with other people are greatly impoverished. Especially, one needs to listen to her argument that the experience of literature reading can yield a strong commitment to regard each life as individual and separate from other lives, and that when one extends the literary attitude of sympathetic imagining to the other, the dehumanizing, stereotypical representation is hard to sustain, at least, for a while.

Surely, imagination is not enough in our public life, partly because

imagining others is so difficult that one can be in the presence of another person who is in trouble and not know that the person is in trouble. And it is so easy to remain ignorant of another person's pain. However well imagined, the imagined object lacks the vitality and vivacity of the perceived object. To remind us of the difficulty of imagining others, Elaine Scarry turns our attention to Jean-Paul Sartre's study of the imagination, which Scarry argues powerfully underscores its limits (Scarry, 1999, pp. 283-4). Sartre asks us to try the specific experiment of comparing an imagined object with a perceived one, in which we actually close our eyes, concentrate on the imagined face of a friend, then open our eyes and compare its attributes to whatever meets us when we return to the sensory world. In this experiment, in comparison with an actually present face, the imagined face, even if it is our beloved friends, will be, as Sartre says, 'thin,' 'dry,' 'two-dimensional,' and 'inert' (qtd. in Scarry, 1999. p. 283). In his efforts to imagine the face of his friend Pierre while Pierre is not present, Sartre complains that the image is "like the silhouettes drawn by children"; "It is something like a rough draft." While it is so difficult to imagine a single friend, it is more difficult, Scarry argues, to exercise "the imaginative labor of knowing the other" (qtd. in Scarry, 1999. p. 284). For it requires us to imagine not a close friend, but someone remotely connected to us; not a single person, but perhaps millions of others. Due to such limits or difficulties of imagining others, I agree with Scarry that spontaneous imagining toward others alone cannot guarantee the prevention of discrimination against the other, and that laws—especially constitutional designs—are also needed so that they can provide the frame in which generous imaginings can take place.

While illuminating the problems that await us when we attempt to rely on the imagination as a guarantor of justice, Elaine Scarry also differentiates the poverty of mental imagining or daydreaming from the enrichment of literature where images do acquire the vivacity of perceptual objects, a distinction she made more fully in her article entitled "On Vivacity: The Difference between Daydreaming and

Imagining-Under-Authorial-Instruction." Because of our poor ability to imagine, our daydreams are gray and ghostly, flat and two-dimensional. Yet, there is a place—that is, the place of great literature—where the ability to imagine others is very strong, for literary imagination displaces "the ordinary attribute of imagining—its faintness, two-dimensionality, fleetingness, and dependence on volitional labor—with the vivacity, solidity, persistence, and givenness of the perceptible world" (Scarry, 1995, p. 22). For instance, E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* presents our mind with a cross-cultural encounter, as represented by Englishman Fielding and Indian Aziz, with far more fullness and vivacity than the two-dimensional images of our own daydreams; Kazuo Ishiguro, in *The Remains of the Day*, vividly depicts (or verbally enacts) the high price the main character Stevens has to pay in order to maintain his professional English identity: his exorbitant suppression of emotion; most readers of Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* may intensely remember its vivid evocation of Igbo society, as embodied in the protagonist Okonkwo, in the early twentieth century, at the time of the first major incursions of British colonialism; Toni Morrison's *The Bluest Eye* painfully reminds us of Pecola's loss of self due to a lack of cultural recognition of the other. When properly understood, such works can challenge our previous narrow understandings of Indians, Africans, and African-Americans, the people who are often marginalized by the West and also by our limited imaginings aligned with the West; they can help us re-imagine them as concrete individuals and even identify with their characters' anguishes, anguishes that often derive from their colonial or repressed histories.

This vivid literary imagination can present stimuli to constitutional arrangements so as to institutionalize the equal value among people. Yet these laws will prove unstable to the extent that people become insensitive. Therefore, we need to cultivate critical global citizens in our hearts and minds as well as our codes of law. As both Nussbaum and more importantly Scarry suggest, works of imaginative literature play a pivotal role in such cultivation. Many literary works dedicated to the

labor of imagining others, with their vivid images of others, represent underexposed people not only to elicit a reader's empathetic response but also to spur the reader's recognition of the need to change current conditions and attitudes. If, as Elaine Scarry rightly contends, "the way we act toward 'others' is shaped by the way we imagine them" (Scarry, 1999, p. 277), it is our responsibility as critical educators to facilitate our students and the public with enriched, not impoverished, images of the other so that they can interact with or respond to the other with a sense of justice. If we keep in mind that our racial prejudice and discrimination toward the other are very often based on our failure to imagine the other as concrete individuals, our task is an important part of political praxis that seeks alternative, ethical ways of interacting with people different from ourselves. It is more so if we consider the fact that we, often too busy exercising self-reflection and self-identification within a post-colonial Korea's particular condition, have not had much room for reflection on and identification with people from different cultural backgrounds, and that this cultural inwardness is not conducive to the production of sensitive global citizens who are urgently needed in this age of globalization.

Within its limits, English education in Korea is positioned to empower our students to enter into the life-worlds of people who live in different cultures and societies and to appreciate their lives and cultures. This critical task can be accomplished only by reconnecting the de-cultured thus commodified English language in Korea with the intricate nexus the world over in which it is used. In other words, when we critical educators teach English language as an organic part of diverse international cultures, not as a form of detached, reified commodity as currently manifested in Korea, we can contribute to the production of critical world citizens. For these citizens, cultural differences in the other are viewed as a positive force of creating diversity, tolerance, and an enhanced and strengthened society, and not intolerance, division, and violence. I argue that literary works can play a vital force in cultivating such citizens with the help of the imaginary density, immediacy, weight,

and solidity. Such works incite in our imagination the vividness and concreteness of other people, which can work as antidote against violent stereotyping of the other. In this respect, any language pedagogy that detaches learners from the specific situations of other human beings is detrimental to the enhancement of critical multiculturalism, for such non-engaging pedagogy ends up desensitizing them toward the cultural wealth of contemporary global societies.

This challenging task of sensitizing students and the public to an enhanced sense of responsibility for the other requires interdisciplinary collaborations, especially between English language educators and literary critics in Korea. Admittedly, up until now most Korean English literary critics have distanced themselves from the business of teaching English as a foreign language. Yet rapidly changing educational and social climates demand that these critics re-evaluate English literature education. In fact, recently I have seen some serious critical reflections, especially in *In/Outside: English Studies in Korea*, on how to teach English literature in Korean college classrooms. Yet such reflective efforts are not enough. Literary critics need to be more willing to seek pedagogically practical supports from language educators so as to reflect EFL concerns in their classrooms, while the latter also needs more supports from the former on the matters of selecting appropriate, multicultural literary texts. More importantly, such collaborative efforts should lead to extensive curricular renovation, especially in secondary schools and college liberal arts education, so as to incorporate literary texts as well as other various discourses. This renovation can be achieved by teams composed specialists in both disciplines.

This team work is faced with many hurdles on the way, mainly because of the differences between the two modes of disciplines. These differences can be compared in terms of English educations penchant for tidiness or systematicity (as a part of social sciences) against literature's more disorderly, spontaneous 'messy' character. English education, we might say, loves what is trim, strictly relevant, and goal-directed. It values clear distinctions and clean categories. Literature,

conversely, loves the mysterious un-nailable fluidity of experience. Yet, in order for the mutual contacts to bear fruits, it is important for one party not to overvalue its goods. While English literary critics in Korea should consider their (often dismissed) responsibility as practical educators of English as a foreign language, English educators need to remember that their disciplinary thinking can suffer from being conducted in overly tidy categories or regulatory systems that simplify by denying the reality and force of whatever does not fit the prescribed pedagogical pigeonholes. We know that overly-regulated linguistic environments, which are admittedly endemic to English textbooks in Korea, inhibit the liveliness of a living language. Considering the distinctive orientations of the two, I don't want to indulge in an overly utopian notion of their coming-together in a marriage of happy complementarity. Rather, what is more beneficial is to maintain possible tensions between the two, which can keep one party from being self-contained within its shell. Through such tension, it may be possible for the two disciplines to check one another to see if each party is focussing on the 'third' yet most important party: students, faced with global challenges. It is high time that we should turn our attention toward the students, restructuring education as a way of delivering a service for the students who is in dire need of a healthy multiculturalism in preparation for this globalized era. Rather than attempting to protect one's pre-established disciplinary territories, we need to keep in mind that multicultural global societies are the context of English education in the contemporary moment, in which new forms of cultural awareness are needed that appreciate difference, multiplicity, and diversity.

References

Achebe, C. (1958). *Things Fall Apart*. London: Heinemann.

- Falk, R. (1996). Revisioning Cosmopolitanism. In Joshua Cohen (Ed.). *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. 53-60. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Forster, E. M. (1924). *A Passage to India*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.
- Ishiguro, K. (1989). *The Remains of the Day*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Kapur, G. (1998). Globalization and Culture. In Fredric & Masao Miyoshi (Eds.). *The Cultures of Globalization*. 191-217. London: Duke University Press.
- Lie, J. (1998). *Han Unbound: The Political Economy of South Korea*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Mignolo, W. (1996). Bi-Languaging Love: National Identifications and Cultures of Scholarship in a Transnational World. In Laura Garcia-Moreno & Peter Pfeiffer (Eds.). *Text and Nation: Cross-Disciplinary Essays on Cultural and National Identities*. 123-141. Columbia: Camden House.
- Morrison, T. (1993 [1970]). *The Bluest Eye*. New York: Knopf.
- Nussbaum, M. (1990). *Loves Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (1996). Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism. In Joshua Cohen (Ed.). *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. 3-17. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (1998). The Literary Imagination in Public Life. In Jane Adamson, Richard Freadman, & David Parker (Eds.). *Renegotiating Ethics in Literature, Philosophy, and Theory*. 222-246. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scarry, E. (1995). On Vivacity: The Difference between Daydreaming and imagining -Under- Authorial-Instruction. *Representations*, 52, 1-26.
- Scarry, E. (1999). The Difficulty of Imagining Other Persons. In Carla Hesse & Robert Post (Eds.). *Human Rights in Political Transitions: Gettysburg to Bosnia*. 277-309. New York: Zone Books.
- Sivanandan, A. (1999). Globalism and the Left. *Race and Class*, 40(3), 5-19.

Chaepyong Song
Department of English
College of Liberal Arts
Wayne State University
Detroit, MI 48202, U.S.A.
Phone: (313) 927-1435
Email: c.song@wayne.edu