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ABSTRACT

In this paper we discuss about the threats and opportunities of democratic education in the context of globalization. Globalization is a dynamic phenomenon which is affected by neo-liberalism policy (e.g. commercialization, deregulation and privatization), but on the other hand it is influenced by development of technology and communication, and promotion of transnational social networks too. While neo-liberal thinkers like Hayek (1944) are promoting democracy in the context of freedom in order to economic competitiveness (in the negative sense) regardless of social justice concerns, an environment is created based on cultural dialogue by expansion of communication and subsequently increasing global awareness which attempt to achieve de-monopolization and social democracy with social justice concerns. Neo-liberal governments try to spread propaganda a particular kind of social and cultural values under laissez-faire and non-interference policy which make stableness the foundation of their political and social domination. Educational thinkers which criticize liberalism, replace the neo-liberal democracy with social democracy based on equal community participation. To deal with the policies of neo-liberalism, an environment should be prepared by education filled up with critical thinking, participation, dialogue and voices which on the one hand, legitimate the culture and Indigenous experiences of students, and the formal knowledge promoting neo-liberalism is problematic, on the other hand. Expansion of global communication and reduction of government control in some social arenas such as culture, by creating social movements that support social justice, provide an opportunity for various groups around the world to take steps in coordinated manner either in theory or practice for fighting against neo-liberalism and achievement of real democratic education.
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1. Introduction

Globalization in the years leading up to 2000 was one of the most discussed topics in various fields, and several studies dealt with it. Today, after more than a decade of this phenomenon, researches have been conducted in different areas look at globalization as a complicated event which is a result of both intentional and unintentional factors (Olssen, 2004; Olssen & Peters, 2005; Torres, 2009; Edwards and Usher, 2008). Globalization, especially after 1970s and 1980s has been accompanied by variety of interpretations and has been significant results on the different realm humanity too. In regarding to globalization, events of recent years have been valuable experiences in a variety of science; dusty atmosphere of the final decades of the first millennium has been settled and the accuracy of studying different science in surveying the globalization has been increased. Judgment about globalization is according to lived experiences, not based on analyses of a priori. The human of decade 2020, on the one hand, feels with all the miserable results of neo-liberalism’s domination on the world’s politics and economy, increasing anti-capitalist movements and global communication too, have a promising democratic future, on the other hand. Educating and Democracy have
become the major concerns for humanity in the modern world. Various scholars believe that education is one of the most effective ways to deal with threats such as terrorism, tyranny of economic enterprises, increasing inequality and promoting consumerism. Today, education is important for achieving a social and dynamic democracy, and thinkers with different attitudes believe that the foundation of real democracy should be strengthened by education (Giroux, 2004; Olssen, 2004; Apple, 2001; McEwan, 2005; McCowan, 2009; O'Cadiz, Wong and Torres, 1998).

This paper will examine the opportunities and threats of democratic education in the context of globalization. For this purpose, first will turn to an analysis of globalization and its relation to neoliberalism, and then we are going to study about opportunities and challenges for democratic education in the age of globalization, and at the end, we will offer suggestions to strengthen the dynamic and democratic education for class.

2. Neo-liberalism

Neo-liberalism is a complicated ideology which has appeared with an appeal to some principles of classical liberalism. Mainly, economy of capitalist country – from 1945 till 1970s – was based on Keynes theories. In spite of liberalism, Keynes believed that financial market is not able to self-regulation, so government should regulate the financial markets to supply social support for low-income (Turner, 2008). But the economic decline in this period caused plenty of critics of Keynes’s theories. Palley (2005) believed that Keynesianism had weaknesses which appeared in economic decline in 1970s, these internal defects caused the division of Keynesianism. Hereinafter inside Keynesianism emerged two trends: American Keynesianism (neo-Keynesianism) and European Keynesianism. Neo-Keynesianism appeared in American Keynesianism and European Keynesianism emerged in the Scandinavian welfare state model. The main discrepancy of these trends was about Income Distribution and unemployment problem. While European Keynesianism believed that the government intervention is necessary to regulate income distribution and controlling unemployment, but in neo-liberalism’s beliefs, free markets regardless of government intervention are able to regulate income distribution and elimination of unemployment.

In the 1970s, the traditional model replaced by new economic theories arose from Neo-Keynesianism which in economy is known as neo-classic economy, and in the other realms known as neo-liberalism. Milton Friedman and F.A Hayek can be noted the world's leading neo-classical economy (Turner, 2008). Proponents of neo-classical economics support laissez-faire policy and despite the Keynes believed that government should never regulate the market. Hayek believed that economic conditions and economic institutions are subdominant of spontaneous order not intentional acts. The most important principle that should spread freely in economic markets is competition to supply individual interests; because principle of competition said: "It is better way of guiding individual efforts than any other." (Hayek, 1944:37)

Although neo-classical economics had been promoting by Hayek and Friedman of 1940s, but with the arrival of Margaret Thatcher in Britain and Reagan in America from 1970s and 1980s, political and economic neo-liberalism carried out with all the powers (Harvey, 2005). Neo-liberalism ventured the privatization, deregulation, reduction of social responsibilities of state, promoting untold competition in the global free markets and changing in governance methods (Apple, 2001). Neo-liberalism went further than an economic theory and presented a redefinition of politics, society, education and democracy; and tried to spread these policies by strong ideological tools. Giroux (2006) argued that the climax of neo-liberal policies appeared in the George W. Bush administration, especially after the 9/11. Extensive privatization, dominance of great economic companies on macro-policies, promoting free markets in the world under the pretext of fighting terrorism, and militarism in America and abroad were the results of neo-liberal dominant policies in this period.
Neo-liberalism deals with commercialization of politics, society and education under free markets. Apple (2001) believes that commercialization in neo-liberal system is a metaphor for de-politicization which says economic laws are natural and neutral; so in this way, neo-liberalism is going to crack down the ideological of movements which support social justice. Following Hayek (1944), neo-liberals believe that economic inequalities not only are not a result of division of targeted injustice but also are a natural result of competition in financial markets. Planning and reform of economic and social conditions in society are unfounded and pointless; only make disruption of financial market’s natural process.

Neo-liberalism seeks to promote a political conservatism which is based on Hayek’s economic and political theory. Peters (1999) argued that neo-liberalism with laissez-faire policy does not undermine the state; but also in replacement financial market rather than state, or in the better words, it changes in the form of governmentality not replacing it with social institutions or even private entities. McCowan believed that "Neo-liberalism requires a strong state that can ensure the primacy of private property, preserve the dominance of markets over social control, and thus limit the operation of democratic power. Also, neoliberalism often requires a strong state, sometimes a dictatorial state, for its implementation" (McCowan, 2005: 172).

Neo-liberalism policies promotes an individualism which Chomsky (1999) called it Possessive Individualism or Individual Atomism. People in neo-liberal system enter the competition with others according to their individual interests and compete with them for achieving profits; this leads to a kind of atomism policy which ideologically cracks down the anti-capitalist protests. Turner said that Keynes was a propagator of pluralism inside liberalism but the heads of neo-liberalism such as Hayek and Friedman:

Identified Nazism, fascism, Soviet communism, New Deal social reform and Keynesianism as part of a larger collectivist impulse, which was threatening to devour the philosophy of individual freedom (Turner, 2008: 63)

3. Globalization

Anthony Giddens, one of the most famous social theorists, explained globalization in this way: "Intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa" (Giddens, 1996: 64). Held and McGraw (2000) believed that globalization is more than relationships and social activities beyond the geographic boundaries, but means: "Growing magnitude or intensity of global flows such that states and societies become increasingly enmeshed in worldwide systems and networks of interaction" (Held and McGraw, 2000: 3). Of course, it does not mean that national and local space is replaced by global living space, “Rather, the point is that the local becomes embedded within more expansive sets of interregional relations and networks of power” (Ibid: 3).

The interpretation of globalization has been emerged by three major trends: skeptical to globalization, globalist, and Transformalist (Keily, 2005). According to Held and McGraw (2000), skeptical trend, replaces Internationalization with the term Globalization. Internationalization refers to the expansion of relationship between communities, and separated national economies or regionalization. Skeptics from the realists, who believe in contradiction between governments to social democrats and some widespread Marxist tendencies, know globalization as a legend that carries out by politicians to adjust people with free markets. This trend believes that globalization is not a new concept but also there were evidence of relationship's expansion in this style in the past societies (Keily, 2005). Tabulawa and et al(2013) call this trends "state centric approach" that believe
that local state never gone away in during globalization, but also the global arena is as well as "state-writ-large" (Tabulawa, 2013: 111). Therefore globalization does not have any qualitative transformation for local states, but also the arena of their activity just expands from local communities to global communities.

On the other hand, globalization’s followers, according to Torres “Globalization from above” (Torres, 2009: 14), believe that globalization process makes great changes in global public life, and reduces the power of national governments to market regulation. National governments in globalization age are not able to protect their boundaries against national private decisions (Olssen, 2004). Neoliberalism supports globalization tendency, and is going to create a space without national boundaries against free markets, in that case, state replaced by free markets. Neoliberalism believes that economic markets is more effective than local states, for this reason tries to promote globalization by different policies such as promoting economic competition, privatization, small state, etc. Radical tendencies also know globalization as a great change that reduces governments’ power, but on the contrary, these people show disagreement with promoting it; in fact, globalization is a new way to make different countries around the world as colonialism, and this is not a pleasant thing. From this perspective, globalization leads to deterritoialisation. A world full of flaws based on free markets and fund transfer caused government weakness, and it means that some people remember it as the end of geography or the end of history (Tabulawa et al, 2013).

The third tendency in the interpretation of globalization is owned by transformationalists. While two previous tendencies mainly evaluate globalization based on quantitative criteria, but the third believes that globalization is both quantitative and qualitative evolution (Keily, 2005). According to Held and McGrew(2000), the followers of this tendency although believe that premier western ideologies have many roles in globalization process, but we cannot limits it just in this aspect. Globalization is a multidimensional phenomenon which has economic, cultural, and political aspects, and limits it just into economic aspect is illusive. Globalization according to this phrase: “is driven by a confluence of forces and embodies dynamic tensions” (Held and McGrew, 2000: 7). It cannot be reduced merely to project of capitalism or rapid growth of technology. Neoliberal has a huge impact in globalization process and by the promotion of free enterprise through international institutions such as money World Bank and IMF, is trying to enforce its economic and cultural policies. But on the other hand, the globalization undergoes with some changes that neoliberalism cannot be attributed solely to it. Emerge of phenomena like regionalization or regional alliances such as globalization makes relationship with local governments complicated (Olssen, 2004).

With regard to the relationship of globalization, third case is more complicated; in the second trend, the relationship between dialectical and both regionalism and regional decentralization is established, it can be named “continuous ‘dying’ and ‘rebirth’ of territoriality” (Tabulawa and et al, 2013: 113).Both of previous trades have an one-dimension look at the phenomenon of globalization and its relationship to state. But the perspective of a third tendency, the government in the global process is not stable and is not being completely undermined but evolves. The state government tests new ways, for example through the development of semi-market institutions, the government is trying to make Independence Community from government. In other words, the government changes its way from "government to governance"(ibid: 114). Jayasuriya (2001) also believed that the globalization process of government changes but does not dye.
Olssen believed:

States have a diminished capacity to protect their borders against private international decision-making, but this is so only in some arenas, and only on some issues. This is as much because certain issues (environmental issues, trade issues, health issues) have become global issues of concern, as it is that states have been diverted from control... if at the level of governance, globalization is complex and fragmented; at the cultural level we can also agree that globalization is having a marked effect. (Olssen, 2004:239)

Thus, the globalization does not mean dying of state and we can discuss about the state and globalization. According to Hirst "We still have a world of states. The change is that we now have many other agencies too"(Cited in Olssen, 2004; 240). In some aspects, such as cultural aspect, expanding of world communication makes complex environment which the geographic boundaries lose their meaning. Virtual communities are created which in it both identities and cultural values is not function of national and local values, for example, we can note celebrate Valentine as a globalization event in previous years. But in a political aspect, by using of modern methods of indirect controls, without direct involvement, the government governs the community and in this aspect the government not only is not weak but also it becomes strong.

3.1 Globalization and the Challenges of Democracy

In the process of globalization, democracy is faced with different challenges and opportunities. Challenges to Democracy are mostly dominated by neoliberalism. Neoliberalism offers a modern treatment to democracy that according to some, undermines foundations of a society and democratic education( Giroux, 2004 & 2013; Torres, 2013; McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2010; McEwan, 2005). Neoliberalism gives new definition of government, freedom and community which their Results causes undermine in democracy of community involvement. Hayek (2011) knew freedom as an absence of an external coercion (negative freedom). Plant explained Hayek view of Freedom in this way:

For Hayek, freedom is essentially negative; it is freedom from the intentional coercion of another...the fact that, for example, I lack the resources to do something that I would otherwise have done is not coercive unless my resources have been removed by the intentional acts of another. Hence, the poor person who is in this position is not coerced by his or her lack of resources, unless, as I have said, these have been intentionally removed from that person... So the first conclusion from this is that an individual is not constrained or coerced by a lack of resources, and this means that the nature of free exchange in a market economy is only limited by such intentional coercion. Where such coercion does not occur, the outcomes of such free exchange are not unjust (Plant, 1994; 172).

Thus, Hayek concludes that freedom, on the contrary to some fans of social democracy, is not meaning equalizing access to resources and Redistribution of Resources in fact it is incompatible with freedom. Activities of welfare state for providing social protection for the poor and low income people, will lead to arbitrary actions (Hayek, 2011). As social Darwinists, Hayek believed that social and economic conditions (which may include social inequality and poverty) is result of spontaneous and natural order that they are based on individual interests and not imposing of a particular social class. In Hayek’s view, social conditions are not predictable, and plannable and controllable: "Those philosophers like Marx and Auguste Comte who have contended that our studies can lead to laws of evolution enabling the prediction of inevitable future developments are mistaken"(Hayek, 1988; 26). Poverty and economic inequality, like natural disaster or illness, are results of natural and uncontrollable laws, thus not considered injustice and the government has no obligation to support
the poor. This is one of the natural laws of competition; social evolution like biological evolution is based on Darwin’s principle of natural selection:

In social evolution, the decisive factor is not the selection of the physical and inheritable properties of the individuals but the selection by imitation of successful institutions and habits (Hayek, 2011; 118).

Financial markets control and guide people through competition acts and the government should not interfere in markets. According to Hayek "The successful use of competition as the principle of social organization precludes certain types of coercive interference with economic life" (Hayek, 1944; 38). Hayek was opposed to any form of social democracy based on social planning and believes that governments based on a social plan or so-called welfare states, for their social projects, resort to authoritarian methods and "If capitalism means here a competitive system based on free disposal over private property, it is far more important to realize that only within this system is democracy possible. When it becomes dominated by a collectivist creed, democracy will inevitably destroy itself" (Hayek, 1944: 73). So in Hayek’s neoliberal perspective, democracy is separated from social justice, and forms in individualist measures aimed at the preservation of freedom of people (in the negative sense) for economic competitiveness.

The neoliberal states release itself from the issues of morality and social responsibility with the motto of privatization and de-regulation and not accept any responsibility for social justice and reduce inequalities. The only requirement of this state is to provide the benefits against its costs (Giroux, 2013). In such a system of governance, social democracy is undermined day by day, Community participation to achieve a dynamic democracy, replaced by competition based on individual interests and critical citizens is replaced by unique orientation individuals.

Contrary to common opinion, the neo-liberal government is not under the shadow of market but it uses the market as a means to control and governing in new method (Tabulawa, 2013). According to McEwan:

"In fact, when neoliberals advocate deregulation, in practice they are advocating a different kind of regulation. Instead of regulation whereby government limits the operation of markets, neoliberalism imposes regulation that assures the separation of markets from social control" (McEwan, 2005: 173).

Olssen and Peters (2005) believed that compared to the state in terms of traditional liberalism and neoliberalism, While, traditional liberalism seeks to foster free and independent people, the goal of neoliberalism is to educate investors who are in competition with each other or to say better it is Manipulated Man which tries to ensure free markets. Contrary to the claims of neoliberal government not to intervene in the market, it controls the society through indirect policies. Increase of the standard evaluation, particularly in the field of education, is one of the most important tools for increasing control with no direct involvement. Ambrosio (2013) following the endorsement of thought, argues that neoliberal government artificial impression is to facilitate a culture based on free market.

Implementation of neoliberal policies may become possible in the shadow of a kind of military and economic power (Harvey, 2005; McEwan, 2005). Neoliberalism tries in other countries, particularly in post-colonial countries, to promote its policies through military intervention or economic institutions. An example would be the implement of neoliberal policies in Chile by Pinochet’s dictatorial policies or implement of their policies in those African countries taking advantage of economic power of the World Bank and the IMF. Applying of military and economic power is a threat to democracy, because under the motto of economic market promotes a kind of auctoritarianism and the relation of unequal power. Military budgets of neoliberal countries in recent years has been
steadily increasing and especially during the presidency of George W. Bush, and after the incident of September the 11th institutions allocate account for the massive military budget.

Social government under the Privatization replaces to a measuring government. In this state of things is measured by criteria of economic profitability and market logic. Evaluation of success criteria is in accordance with the standards.

Many thinkers believe that neoliberalism has given a new logic to assess the accountability, and this is a tool for indirect social control (Ambrosio, 2013; Giroux, 2006; Apple, 2001; Davies & Bansel, 2007; Baltodano, 2012; Torres, 2009). Standard for this accountability, even in culture and education field, is to be economically effective; Degree of success for educational and cultural institutions is dependent on their economical efficiency, and their performance in national standard evaluations.

Expanding the accountability system based on economic efficiency in education is accompanied with commercialization, and expanding choice and competition’s literature as an important common concept in education, is a result of this issue. As Angus argues:

"The hands-free, market-oriented, chooser-dependent mechanisms for controlling education explicitly tolerate inequality. Such policy assumptions tolerate the hierarchical sorting of learners, schools and communities, and have the effect of maintaining existing social segregation and reinforcing privilege". (Angus, 2013: 11)

Neo-liberalism commercializes the culture through disseminating market terms in the society, or as to Giroux (2009) with Corporative Culture, and as to this fades m criticism and social participation, and on the other hand reproduces existing inequalities and unequal power relations. Dissemination of Corporative Culture is a threat to real democracy, because this culture attacks institutions like higher education that are important base for a democratic society, and through privatization, destroys social environments which are based on participation and replaces mistrust, disappointment, individualism, monopolism, intolerance and consumerism. This ideologically challenges a real democracy.

Another aspect of neoliberalism was revealed during George W. Bush administration and after September 11 attacks, which represented hatred towards democracy and any negative opinion (Giroux, 2009). Result of this era was violence, fear and militarization inside and outside of America in the name of fighting against terrorism, wide privatization of governmental responsibilities, increasing economic and social inequalities, and dominance of large multinational companies on politics and economy. Moreover, during last few years neo-liberals politics and their neo-conservative allies has increased violence against minorities, excessive patriotism, opposition immigrants, and marginal groups and also increase in a culture of fear and thread. This has weakened critical thinking basis, social participation and real democracy in capitalist systems (Giroux, 2008).

Chomsky discusses the result of the U.S. dominance over last 30 years, as to him:

“The massive increase in social and economic inequality, a marked increase in severe deprivation for poorest nation and people of the world, the disaster of global environment, unstable global economy and unprecedented bonanza for the wealthy” (Chomsky, 1999: 8)
3.2 Globalization and opportunities for democracy

As it discussed before, globalization has different aspects and dimensions, consequently alongside the threats that globalization has to democracy there lies opportunities too. Many thinkers (Torres 2009; Giroux, 2009; Apple, 2001; McLaren and Farahmandpur, 2001) have ignored this issue, on the contrary some others (e.g. Olssen, 2004; Adams, 2013; Edwards and usher, 2008; Keily, 2005; Olsson and Peters, 2005) paid a special attention to opportunities of democracy in the time of globalization. Social communication with internet and social networks, during globalization, are spread all over the planet. Particularly cultural borders have disappeared and so many qualitative and quantitative transitions have been occurred. As Edwards and usher argued that:

Developments made possible by the use of ICTs in education – developments captured with the notion and actuality of cyberspace – work in ways that call these spaces of enclosure into question. There is a questioning of underlying assumptions about the fixity and stability of the word, the linear text and the teacher as authoritative bearer of meaning. This opens up possibilities for learning to be more diverse, purpose driven, self-imposed and self-monitored than that normally found in current mainstream educational practices...Hence, this is a possible situation where learners do not simply interpret meanings but actively collaborate in creating meanings, and thus are more able to determine their own paths of learning. (Edwards & Usher, 2008: 54)

Developing cyberspaces, cyber communications and even cyber societies that have happened through globalization can be accounted as a potential to oppose neo-liberal hegemony. One of the important strategies of neo-liberalism is to legitimate itself by controlling the production and presenting and official knowledge (Apple, 2003). Neo-liberalism tries to change its political, cultural and economic values to a common sense and through this preserve them from questioning and criticism. As to this, the motto TINA (There Is No Alternative) is an important politics of neo-liberalism (Olssen, 2004: 232). But inside cybernetic environment there is no full control over sources of knowledge, and with the help of this environment, different cultures can have a dialogue on equal terms and experiences in pop-culture (against elite culture) can be transformed. This environment introduces alternatives to neo-liberalism and provides a good environment for a dynamic democracy based on participation and dialogue.

As we mentioned before, through globalization in cultural and social domains, alongside with the government, other agents have influence on power relations, this can be accounted as threat to democracy because this can provide opportunities for multinational companies’ dominance, but on the other hand acts of other international institutions preserving human rights, environmental conservation institutions and other anti-capitalist movements can provide an opportunity to revive the democracy. In recent year different thinkers have criticized democracy to educate democratic neo-liberalism and presented a model for that. Referring to Michelle Foucault’s ideas Jayasuriya, Mark Olssen and Peters, tried to replace social democracy based on cosmopolitanism instead of neo-liberal democracy. (Jayasuriya 2001; Olssen, 2004; Olssen & colleagues, 2004; Olssen and Peters, 2005). Laclau and Mouffe replaced radical democracy instead of neo-liberal democracy (Mouffe, 1992; Laclau and Mouffe, 1985) and other thinker which may have neo-Marxist attitudes defend social democracy (O’C sidewalks, Wang and Torres, 1998; McCowan 2009; Giroux 2004 & 2013; Torres, 2009). Olssen (2004) argued that the development of supranational institutions in the globalization process has been necessitated the requirement to a cosmopolitan democracy. In his view, the Comprehensive democracy has five key features :‘( 1) Safety and security; (2) freedom and autonomy; (3) inclusion; (4) fairness and justice; and (5) equality of resources and capabilities”. (Olssen, 2004: 250)
Olssen’s critique of liberal democracy and neo-liberal, propose a model in which the government has the power to regulate financial markets, but on the other hand the government is evaluated and controlled by a dynamic civil society which is composed of public institutions and NGOs. Growth of organizations and popular movements and widespread public participation in the monitoring process on the government make more possibilities on the achievement of the goal of equalizing power relations. In addition, the imposition of cosmopolitan democracy also creates limitations on the powerful government, because in spite of the neoliberal model, government’s relations stabilized based on morality and democracy and the government is not allowed to interfere in authority. International human rights organizations and international movements such as the women’s movement and the protection environment’s movement, somehow contribute to the implementation of cosmopolitan democracy. Dynamic social democracy based on people’s participation and social institutions and associations is considered as a dynamic model against neoliberal democracy. Social democracy dedicates itself to social justice and ethics, freedom from this perspective simply cannot be summarized in a negative freedom, but also freedom is absence of release from domination and establish equal relations of power. This kind of freedom is obtained in social participation, and one of the duties of government is to effort on providing this type of freedom by the Rule of Law. Attempts to revive the social democratic welfare state is one of the important issues, however, there are differences in social democracy and the Keynesian view of welfare state. The welfare state is to considering social democracy based on decentralization and reduction of social institutions and trade unions, while Keynes was not much inclined to this dimension. (Olssen, 2004; Giroux, 2004). The following table shows the comparison of social democracy and neoliberalism policies in education in the perspectives of Olssen and the others (2004):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The primary purpose of social</th>
<th>Profit-orientation of neoliberal</th>
<th>Social Justice as Fairness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is distributing?</td>
<td>Education as a preferred item</td>
<td>Education as a fundamental social good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(negotiable item)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria of Distribution</td>
<td>Benefit (Optimal average profit for all – Even if the difference is large)</td>
<td>Justice (Only when people are more inequality, low productivity, profitability Remember)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main criteria for the allocation of resources</td>
<td>Effectiveness (investment To increase in gains)</td>
<td>Requirement (To increase opportunities for low-interest investment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most important educational outcomes</td>
<td>Increase in efficiency of Education</td>
<td>Equitable distribution of the benefits of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main social impact</td>
<td>Imbalance in resource acquisition in favor of efficient people</td>
<td>Redistribute profits by restricting Selection (Prosperity for All)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mouffe has more different stance, he argued that leftist and anti-capitalist tendencies, should spend more on strengths and shortcomings of liberal democracy and must not spend on its refusal. He wanted “radicalization of the modern democratic tradition” (Mouffe, 1992: 1). Mouffe believed that the only hope of the left parties is to make liberal democracy as a commitment to its ideals. In contrary to Olssen and some other neo- Marxist thinkers, He is committed to some of the heritage of liberal democracy such as natural right and the division of powers to achieving equality. In fact Liberal democracy is part of the democratization process and achievement and equality in social democracy’s follower’s consideration, is just based on radicalizing liberal democracy. One of the most important principles radical democracy is revival of the concept of citizenship, fostering active citizenship and is a Multi-Orientation which in the era of neoliberal domination is neglected.
expansion of mass communication and consequently, the "global consensus” (Keily, 2005: 7), and on the other hand increase in adverse outcomes of neo-liberal dominance on global markets with strengthening institutions and anti-capitalist movements and creating space based on Multi-Orientation, has led to much criticism against the emergence of neoliberal democracy and the strengthening of social movements and democracy in recent years. The rise of social networking in recent years has led to reflection widespread humanitarian issues around the world and virtual teams struggled greatly to the general impulse to have to deal with them. Adams (2013) Believes that social networks encourage social interaction and increase the so-called relational creativity. This type of communication creativity has led to multi-orientation and criticism space. And problems arising from neoliberalism (such as inequality and poverty) is placed at the center of human affairs. Nowadays creation of this dynamic and full of moral civilization atmosphere is become one of the major potential mass movement against capitalism, For example, we can point to the role of communication in the student movement against neoliberal creativity in Quebec, Canada, and OWS movement (Giroux,2013). On the other hand, the cyberspace provides the opportunity for equal participation that challenges social stratification and provides the possibility of the emergence of marginal groups.

4. Conclusion

Teaching democracy is one of major challenge of the modern education, On the other hand, education is necessary for a vibrant democracy. Several educational thinkers addressed this issue. Dewey (1916) one of the first people who studied the relationship between democracy and education, presented concerning the proposed that are used by Education Thinkers and teachers. From the perspective of Dewey "A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience ("Dewey 91:1916).

By increasing common interests among community members and create free interaction possibility across the social groups, education will deal to strengthen social democracy. Dewey believes that "since a democratic society repudiates the principle of external authority, it must find a substitute in voluntary disposition and interest; these can be created only by education "(Ibid: 91).

At present, it can be raised by correcting Dewey's democratic education weaknesses raised against of Neoliberalism education.

Dewey observed the School as public place and small patterns to his democracy practice. Using of Dewey’s democratic education can be aimed to education of responsible citizens and created rich civil society for realization of sustainable democracy based on participation of all groups of citizens. Training of critic and Reflective citizens who are constantly exposed to the test their experience and knowledge by new evidence and also is engaged participate actively, it can be provided the foundations of a democratic dynamic society. Olssen (2004) admits also the importance of education for democracy, by deriving from Petit believed that the education "Stark choice between the invisible hand and the iron hand: between the strategy of marketing and a strategy of management'. Education is the ‘third estate’ between the free market and the autocratic hand of regulation and management.” (Olssen, 2004:263)

Olssen also believed that the education is an institution which is interfacing other social institutions like family and state and it has a fundamental role in the direction of social democracy. After the crimination of neo-liberal democracy model, he represented that Deliberation and Contestation are two main processes of democratic education. These two
processes made a democratic society where decisions are based on participation and the rights of individuals to recognize opposition.

Such a society is always open to criticism on opposing views and based on democratic Deliberation and interactions contribute to democracy. Critical Pedagogy is the One of the trends that its intellectuals have great attention to democratic role of education (Giroux, 2008; Torres, 2009; Apple, 2001; McLaren and Farahmandpur, 2001; Farahmandpur, 2010). At present Henry Giroux, as one of the greatest speakers of this trend, inducts many critiques of liberalism and democracy and Following of Commit of education to ethics democracy based on social(Giroux,2004, and 2008). In view of Giroux education should be liberation and its purpose to be education of critical and democratic citizenship "Teachers as transformative intellectuals." Teachers as transformative intellectuals are manifestation of education as a public sphere. Democracy and vibrant social participation is among different social groups education should be enhanced teachers political awareness and they equipped with critical tools it can be analyzed correctly the relationship between power and knowledge, and on the other hand create their classroom an space, in order to the all students engages together from different cultures to interaction and with different cultures of voice can be ability to a conversation with each other. Voice Pedagogy and Border Pedagogy is the Giroux's pure interpretation (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1997).

He believes that education should be break boundaries that marginalize minority and aim to individuals in primarily to look critical view to their own culture and others. The next step is to help them till outside of Exclusions section boundaries, engages constructively interaction with others. According to Giroux fosters civic courage, Language of Possibility, and the hope of the purposes is the critical education important goals. Thereby" pedagogy merges politics and ethics with revitalized forms of civic education that provide the knowledge, skills, and experiences enabling individual freedom and social agency. Making the pedagogical more political demands that educators become more attentive to the ways in which institutional forces and cultural power are tangled up with everyday experience"(Giroux, 2003:158). Social democracy committed to social justice and morality that are founded based on the individuals common interests of individuals and creates a dynamic spaces social equal interactions, On the other hand, critical education connects the classroom to daily life communication and in this way will learn is meaningful, increase their control over their learning, this one lead to the strengthening of social agency. In this way within the curriculum are significant culture and experiences of native students, on the other hand the produce of knowledge of hegemony of neo-liberalism comes out and people are free to engage in a critique of rehabilitation science curriculum ,Not being able to accept it as absolute fact. Supported education of critical thinkers is the kind of education praxis-oriented "bridges the gap between critical knowledge and social practice. This involves bringing theory into the streets. It includes organizing and mobilizing students, parents, and teachers at the community level, and linking their struggles to larger national and international struggles"(Farahmandpur, 2010: 66). Therefore, the purpose of critical pedagogy is creation of social movement to realize to social democracy which accrue through community political awareness increase and different people empowerment.
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