

Asian Lifelong Learning in the Context of a Global Knowledge Economy: A Task Re-Visited

Soonghee Han

Seoul National University
Korea

This article revisits and reinterprets my previous paper. It is a snapshot of the lifelong learning system building in selected Asian countries, reflected in the mirror of the Asian Financial Crisis in the 1997s and the aftermath of that event. I reconsidered the arguments (1) the economic recession had delivered a global dimension of lifelong learning to the re-shaping of the local education system beyond local attributes; (2) and that the divergent tradition of adult education in this context was to meet the global market standards. Additionally, (3) I tried to further the discussion about the relationship between global forces and the lifelong learning system in the context of a knowledge economy, but with a number of different approaches. I argued that the lifelong learning system under the global forces of capitalism, as per the Asian experience in the 2000s, can be a *part* of a knowledge economy itself, not a tool of it, and in this sense, a knowledge economy sets the conditions of a lifelong learning system as an embryo of its attributes.

Key words: lifelong learning, nonformal education, adult education, East and Southeast Asia, global knowledge economy, Asian financial crisis

Introduction

Six years ago I had published a paper in this very Journal, the Asia Pacific Education Review, an article entitled 'Creating systems for lifelong learning in Asia' (Han, 2001). In that article, I investigated the lifelong learning support systems which had suddenly emerged in six Asian countries including Korea, Japan, Singapore, Hong Kong(SAR), Thailand, and the Philippines. My conclusion at that time was that the lifelong learning systems of each of these countries were influentially pushed forward by the economic instability of the 1997 Asian

Financial Crisis, and were geared to function as a stabilizer, if in part, for the massive structural adjustment at the Post-Crisis.

Of course, the phenomenon of economic turmoil pushing forward new education systems is not rare, but can in fact be often seen by reference to several previous experiences. From 1988, Japan fell into a 'long term depression' or a 'lost ten years', a down turn of the "bubble economy" which lasted from the middle of the 1980s until 2002. Significant reformations of lifelong learning happened in that period of time. During that decade, the Japanese lifetime employment system was undermined and the tradition of in-house training for employees lost ground, occupational skills development to be left outside the company. Since then, the social responsibility of continuing education and training was emphasized, and the concept of lifelong learning (*Shoukai Kakushou*) began taking a leading role while the previous system of community education

Soonghee Han, Department of Education, Seoul National University, Korea.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Soonghee Han, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea. e-mail: learn@snu.ac.kr

(*Shakai Kyoiku*) was restricted to adult liberal education. The Social Education Bureau underwent a change of name to the Lifelong Learning Bureau in 1988, and the Lifelong Learning Promotion Law was established in 1990.

In Europe also, the Exchange Rate Mechanism(ERM) Crisis of 1992 gave the U.K the worst recession since the end of World War II, with unemployment rates in excess of 10%. The same year in 1992, coincidentally or not, the Further and Higher Education Act of 1992 was enacted, and redirected the Conservative Government's weak policies in major education training to "move slowly but steadily from state-led regulation towards marketized" regulation, while stimulating greater participation in lifelong learning (Hodgson, 2000, p. 10). Although these are hardly causes and effects, it is still apparent that these lifelong learning policies could not have been positioned on board as government major policy if not these critical situation.

I am curious at this point. In principle, private individuals as well as corporate investors tend to cut back on investment into human capital when hit by crisis. Not only the increase of child labor and school dropouts, but also serious cut backs of adult and professional training programs tend to, in consequence, cause a serious degradation of human capital fundamentals. Ironically, however, the lifelong learning discourse and its implementation into real policies seems to take its shape from such chaotic contexts. How could it be possible and by what theoretical framework can it be explained? What do the lifelong learning policies mean to the mechanism of global capitalism?

Ten years after the Crisis, I would like to raise these questions again and look back at the situation more closely. This article revisits the loosely proposed connection of the global economic challenge with the establishment of lifelong learning and hopes to make this connection more visible.

Lifelong Learning in the Post-Crisis Asia

Lessons Revisited

In retrospect, the Asian Financial Crisis was the result of two combined global forces: it began with the attack of global financial capital against the state's vulnerable

economic fundamentals; it enabled the bloodless triumphal entry of the neo-liberal structural adjustment program(SAP) of the International Monetary Fund or its equivalent into the old fortress of Asian social fabric. As a consequence, millions of people fell below the poverty line in 1997-1998, and the per capita incomes in most of the ASEAN countries significantly declined while the rest of the world per capita income in the same period of time actually rose (Yellen, 2007). The structural adjustment program drastically forced Asian governments to draw resources away from public expenditure, especially from education. Without doubt, the education sector and other social welfare domain became the first group of victims from the consequence.

My previous article of 2001 had attempted to show the direct link between the economic instability with the advent of the neo-liberal version of a lifelong learning and learning society. With the urgency of coping with the global financial attack, the countries invented a number of 'magic wands' to stabilize the skyrocketing numbers of lay-offs and rising unemployment, which goes beyond the level of traditional handling of the labor market. What the Asian countries actually adapted was 'restructuring the education system' instead of its 'simple shrinkage' to link economic needs to the education sector, under a different name and different system: Lifelong learning instead of school education; competence instead of a subject-based curriculum; qualifications instead of diplomas; recurrent and ever continuing models instead of front-end models. Without doubt these lifelong learning policies did not only have a positive impact upon the economic circumstances; they also created new rules of the game in the whole educational ecology that might have had a harmful impact upon the traditional public education system. In the previous 2001 article, I raised five critical issues observed in the Post-Crisis period as follows, which can be simplified into two issues (Han, 2001).

First, I argued that the characteristics of the global knowledge economy had heavily influenced the shaping of the local lifelong learning system beyond local attributes. The selected Asian countries had proclaimed similar notions of lifelong learning and turned these ideas into reality through legislation and institutionalization. Now, Asian education is no longer insulated from global influence and other vulnerabilities. Education policies are being moved rapidly from the realm of national politics to global

economic and business management. Lifelong learning, as a global model for educational reform, suddenly became an important initiative of national education strategies.

Second, I contended that adult education was losing authenticity in this process of experiencing the strong labor market orientation in the adult education field. The responsibilities of lifelong learning had been shifting from the providers to the learners. The job-related career orientation of adult learning had become generally dominant in most Asian cases, at the expense of liberal adult education. There was less emphasis on 'liberal' or 'free' adult education. Lifelong learning had been emphasizing the role of post-secondary education. In most countries HRD was relying on the active participation of universities, which drastically increased the number of tertiary education enrolments. With regards to this, knowledge assessment and skill validation had become more important issues but the reference standards for validation still remained in the realm of post-secondary formal degrees and certificates. Certainly, this neo-liberal structural adjustment program fundamentally changed the way in which education and the business sector were put together. The former pattern of 'developmentalism' in school discourse or the human capital approach was revived and accelerated to the area of human resource development, with a fully marketized version, which became a symbol for lifelong learning in most Asian countries.

Lifelong Learning and the System

It is now time to look into the realities of what happened in the Post-Crisis period, using the case of Korea. Certainly, it was not until the 1997 financial crisis that lifelong learning and national human resource development were seen in government policy documents. The crisis, however, pushed the Korean government to do something urgent to cope with the social instability. The Lifelong Education Law was enacted in 1999 and a new Bureau of Lifelong Learning Promotion was set in the Ministry. In the same year, the Ministry of Education also changed its name to the Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development (MOEHRD). These new developments, however, were not the solution but the beginning of new confusion, because most civil servants in the Ministry failed to recognize the meaning and importance of what they had

just accomplished.

If Korea was not the worst case, Malaysia and Thailand were the other two that had suffered the severest impacts. Interestingly, in the Malaysian case, the Seventh Malaysia Plan (1996-2000), which has been set before the Crisis, had still bound in the old paradigm of skill development and training programs. Some new ideas on education and training are highlighted from the next plan. The Thai government enacted the revision of the National Education Act in 1999 when the Korean government passed the Lifelong Education Law, that encompassed the idea of education reform lifewide as well as lifelong.

In 1999 the Thai Government passed The National Education Act under which "education" was defined as the learning process for personal and social development, through imparting of knowledge, practice, training, transmission of culture, enhancement of academic progress, and building a body of knowledge by creating a learning environment and society with available factors conducive to continuous lifelong learning (Somtrakool, 2002, p. 113).

The crisis's impact on Singapore was not minor. Despite the fact that Singapore was well known to be the role model for vocational training and recurrent education nationwide, the country cannot be seen as exceptional in making more concrete the movement toward the direction seen in most of the Asian countries. In 1998, in the same way as other Asian countries, Singapore changed the name of her Ministry of Labor to Ministry of Manpower, and, in the next year, the well-known lifelong learning policy known as 'Manpower 21' was proclaimed. As Kumar relates;

Singapore's approach to lifelong learning is pragmatic and rational. It is one of the economic drivers used by policy makers to enhance Singapore's competitiveness and is viewed as an antidote against unemployment. With the emergence of a more integrated and interdependent global economy, the premium placed on ideas and continuous learning becomes critical to an individual, organization and the country (Kumar, 2004, p. 559).

The case of Hong Kong was rather controversial. Even the year 1997 was a nightmare. Hong Kong had to suffer

economic recession as soon as being handed over to Mainland China. According to Kennedy (2004), the handover government handled the shock badly and this led to a hard landing. The purpose of lifelong learning proclaimed in this context was mostly to mitigate the pressing political disputes against the government. Thus;

However, to view recent Hong Kong education policy just in terms of an apparent convergence with global trends would be to neglect the ways in which the discourse of lifelong learning has been tactically deployed to serve local political agendas. . . . an executive-led administration to demonstrate 'performance legitimacy' - through major policy reforms - in the absence of (democratic) political legitimacy. It is against this political background that the strategic deployment of a 'lifelong learning' discourse needs to be seen (Kennedy, 2004, p. 589).

China, although, relatively less affected by the direct Asian shock, also had to experience an equivalent crisis, if not more a more severe one, since China then was pushed to slow down her overheating GDP growth rate and ensure a 'soft landing' for the economy. From 14% in 1992, the GDP growth rate decreased to 7.1% in 1999, which was simply a huge problem. It was the right time for China to make a structural adjustment in education, and the notion of lifelong learning was pushed forward in this respect. Immediately after the Asian financial crisis, the Chinese Ministry of Education issued the paper 'Education Promoting Action Towards the 21st Century' in 1999 that brought forward the slogan "constructing a lifelong learning system in a knowledge-based society", or "China will establish a lifelong learning system by 2010" to train a workforce qualified for the National Knowledge Creation Project and for the modernization of the country (Wang, Song, & Kang, 2006).

The Transformed Learning Ecosystem

Broadly speaking, whole area of education was 'non-formal' until the notion of 'formal' was invented and claimed the dominant position within the whole learning ecosystem. If nonformal and adult education evolved locally and had local authenticity, formal education is the result of the global transplantation and adaptation of a universal code of typical schooling, including an academic credit award

system and an equivalent learning outcome recognition system (Boli, Ramirez, & Meyer, 1985). Metaphorically, if nonformal education is akin to a local wild flower, formal education is something akin to imported roses. From this perspective, and this is still the case, the nonformal education field has a long and strong historical context based on community education. This was the battle ground of ideological contestations mostly driven by social activism, in which the political democratization movements and labor union movements in Korea, Japan, Thailand, the Philippines fertilized the soil of the indigenous learning ecosystem.

Conceptually, education beyond school in Asia has various streams; it has authentic backgrounds and is comprised of unique, if not purely local contexts. The First Group of the East Asian countries, such as Korea, Japan, and China have shared a very longstanding common cultural heritage, and have adapted a common terminology of *social education*. This means that they share a background of community education that has embedded within it a common grassroots emancipatory and collective approach. This common heritage, however, diverged when the modern China employed new concepts under the Mao's communist regime (Makino, 2001). The Second Group of countries had a British colonial heritage, such as Hong Kong, Singapore, and Malaysia. These countries had usually employed the term *adult education*, which referred to adult basic education, technical training, and beyond, all the way up to higher education. Differing from the British tradition, adult education in this region has placed more focus on vocational education than liberal education. The Third group of South Eastern countries such as Thailand, The Philippines, Vietnam, etc used the term of *non-formal education* under the heavy influence of UNESCO's Education for All (EFA) project. The diverse terminologies used meant that not only the history of adult and continuing education in the region but also the fertile environment upon which the education beyond schools have evolved authentically.

Along with the expansion of a lifelong learning framework as a part of a national education delivery and handling system, the authentic space for nonformal education has been shrinking. Non-formal education was more and more closely related with formal education in various ways and reflected the shadow cast by it (Brennan, 1997). Intentionally or otherwise, lifelong learning expanded the realm of the learning market where the

learning outcomes were recognized and exchanged with qualifications for the labor market. Creating certain correspondences between formal and non-formal education in terms of the recognition of learning outcomes were necessary in this regard. The new trend of alternative credential systems in the 2000s, such as the Recognition of Experiential Learning Outcomes (Thailand) and the Academic Credit Bank system (Korea) or the National Qualification Frameworks (Malaysia), etc. accelerated the supplementation of regular formal education credentials.

In this process, the uniqueness of the Asian tradition of social, non-formal, adult education has been losing ground. Ideological orientations has been blurred, community-based context lost its central position, and the social linkages among the old members eroded. The challenge to the economic fundamentals and its impact on the learning ecosystem were severe. Additionally, the rapid increase in private sector educational provision became apparent. First, the way that universities had to meet the learning demand became a key issue. In Korea more than 80 per cent of colleges and universities are private. The surplus universities in Korea and Japan are undergoing structural adjustment to accept more continuing adult learners. Singapore and China keep to a strictly elitist hierarchy in educational stratification, with different reasons, which is now turning to the other direction by making more use of the private higher education system. China is one of the most rapidly growing countries (3% in 1991 to 20% in 2005) in terms of the higher education sector since the user-fee policy was adopted. In Hong Kong and Singapore, the contrast between the elitist academic track and the mass non-formal vocational track can characterize the major feature of the lifelong learning system's architecture. Polytechnics and ITEs are targeting the population who are trying to obtain a post-secondary diploma in vocational areas, securing for themselves some social upward mobility in the process.

The increasing role of private education was also obvious to the nonformal education sector. If NGOs and NPOs were the major partners for previous non-formal education practice, working with the government literacy campaigns and self-help learning centers, these new circumstances brought the private education business sector into the role of being an important partner for lifelong learning or human resource development. Private education

institutions, which, in many cases, apply distance-learning as a major means of knowledge delivery have become more common and have acquired a slightly more dominant position in Hong Kong, Korea, Singapore, and Japan. In particular, new private higher education institutions, with or without accreditation, began to play key roles in increasing higher education enrolments everywhere, especially in China, Thailand, Philippines, and Korea.

Under these new conditions, 'education' was no more an appropriation of the Ministry of Education, but a part of 'trade' and 'work competencies'. The sole control of the Ministry of Education was shared with the labor market policy, in which inter-Ministerial cooperation was observed to broaden the focus from formal education to encompassing non-formal education and its relationship with labor related ministries in Japan, Singapore, and Hong Kong. Thailand, Hong Kong, Singapore, Japan, and Korea explicitly adapted new policies to deal with the need for efficient and effective human resource development and its management. With the Lifelong Learning Promotion Law, the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science began to work with the Ministry of Trade and Industry. Singapore and Hong Kong have already established partnerships between the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Manpower (in Singapore), and Education Department and Labor Department (in Hong Kong). In Korea, although not directly connected with the Ministry of Labor, the Ministry of Education itself was transformed into the Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development to cope with new demands.

Alternative Consideration: Learning Capitalism?

As seen in the previous sections, Asian countries were driven strongly by global forces to participate in the game of lifelong learning. The first point to consider here is that the global economy is working with the hierarchical multi-layered modes of economies, like a 'food chain' in an economic ecosystem, on top of which the knowledge economy resides as the ultimate predator. Secondly, most national economies seek to move up to the top layer, as long as they are players in this game. Thirdly, the global financial crisis eventually functioned to force the 'closed but

vulnerable' national economies of Asia 'surrender' to the global economy. Finally, the idea of lifelong learning was implanted and practiced as a global strategy, unfortunately without any previous experience or understanding of what it was and will be.

Indeed, the circumstances of the Post-Crisis period was one which was in fact full of mysteries, an unknown future and empty experiences about the new knowledge economy as well as the new lifelong learning system. Although the knowledge economy came to the surface as a desperate face of the new national educational vision, the economy was not ready to actually create it. Indeed, the reality was that, most Asian countries, except for a few, were not ready for a knowledge economy. The primary role of lifelong learning policies was simply to transfer the unemployed who had previously worked at the labor-intensive agricultural or manufacturing sectors to the somewhat labor-efficient, if not more knowledge-intensive, service sector. For what reason then, does the bandwagon of lifelong learning actually play for?

To understand the whole picture as described above correctly, I believe it is necessary to expand our discussion broader. Several terms and mega concepts follow the discourse of lifelong learning, among which I agree with a common cliché, that lifelong learning was primarily for the knowledge economy, but inform a slightly different position. The simplistic and linear mode of dealing with this concept presupposes that the relationship between lifelong learning and the knowledge economy is instrumental, so that we can easily interpret lifelong learning as a vehicle leading us, with the knowledge economy as a destination. However, if we turn this approach around slightly, we can assume a somewhat different theoretical setting: (1) lifelong learning is a *part* of the knowledge economy, not a tool of it, so that the knowledge economy lies and grows *in* the system of lifelong learning; (2) in this sense, the knowledge economy sets the conditions of the lifelong learning system as an embryo of its attributes, to reproduce the "learning economy".

Lifelong Learning as a part of the Knowledge Economy

Lifelong learning exists in two different worlds: lifelong learning in the 'lifeworld' and in the 'system', if Habermasian concepts are applied. On the one hand,

lifelong learning in the lifeworld has existed for a very long time throughout history. Learning by nature is a way of living, private and personal, and takes care of the living spirit and inner-self. Lifelong learning discourse in the lifeworld deals with various kinds of education and learning that produce meaning in life and social discourses as well as providing the spirit to the whole career of a human being (Usher & Edwards, 1994; Welton, 1995; Williams, 1989). Lifelong learning in the world of systems has the implication that the 'incarnated' idea of lifelong learning is placed into legal and institutional form. Originating from the school system, it expands the territory of the exchange value of learning into the form of global capitalism and its changing labor market system.

In the same way as the school system, lifelong learning as a 'system' is a global phenomenon (Holford, Jarvis, & Griffin, 1998; Jarvis, 2007; Walters, 1997). Systems by their nature set a global and universal standard which the local phenomena are forced to meet. It is 'global' in a sense that global world standards have significant influences on local initiatives and help thus in defining the shape of educational systems. The learning economy that 'knowledge capitalism' has created thus becomes the most important instrument with a particular mode of production and reproduction (Burton-Jones, 1999), which turned on the structural transition from capital-based economy to knowledge-based economy. Asian economies, in this context, have just moved toward the same direction, and the policies and practices are showing clearly the systemic layers of the global discourse of lifelong learning, a part of 'learning capitalism.' In this sense, lifelong learning today becomes a commodity that is bought and sold in the learning market. The milieu of the global economy places most commodities, including knowledge and learning communities, into the global market, that which can be traded and exchanged under global standards. In this sense, "lifelong learning has become quite central to contemporary globalised capitalist society" (Jarvis, 2007, p. 76).

Moreover, lifelong learning discourse incessantly invents new codes for the education system which can be used to challenge the old educational order of schools and universities in Asia as well as in other regions. As Rinne has noted, 'the principle of lifelong learning challenges many of the principles of the older school system' (Rinne, 1998). It changes the ways in which borders of education are placed,

learning activities are selected and organized, and the learning outcomes are produced and exchanged in the labour market. This is especially true of the newly emerging learning economy producing a particular model of a learning society or a new platform of lifelong learning practices. As Schuetze nicely puts it, lifelong learning changes its focus from a somewhat idealist reform model to a human capital based model, and this shift from welfare state to market rule is a main plank of the dominant neo-liberal agenda (Schuetze, 2006). In so doing, the foundation of public education that had been founded on the notion of welfarism, is seriously undermined. The rule of traditional schools as a form of academic fortress, including education providers, learning resources, definition of qualifications, etc. are becoming re-formulated to maximize the degree of exchange and accumulation to fit into capitalist forms.

While education in the lifeworld is non-formal by nature, or to put it differently, education by origin is without formality, education as part of a 'system' has been established with a formal code that has continuously amalgamated the non-formal elements into the area of formality. Education and learning as a part of a social system tries to adapt the dominant code of social reproduction and expand the territory in the same way as living creatures in the wilderness. So, too, does schooling, expanding into new territories in two dimensions: its 'lifelong' dimension expands the parts of initial education into the area of adult continuing education and integrates them into a continuous learning sequence, while its 'lifewide' dimension extends the realm of the education system beyond the formal, and colonizes the non-formal and informal areas into an integrated space of a socially manageable learning system. In short, lifelong learning practice stands for not only the opportunities of learning in lifelong and lifewide senses, but it does so by expanding the system's formality as a part of the global market. Increasingly, learning, which had been previously free from formality is becoming a part of a new system *with* renewed formality, which makes learning something to be individualized, preserved in credit, and exchanged with something beyond in the global market.

What are the Ultimate Consequences of Lifelong Learning?

New phenomena brought in the area of knowledge

capitalism within the lifelong learning discourse can be summarized as follows:

- The knowledge economy and the newly established employment contract rituals require new modes of education and labor market training systems, in which the entrepreneurs find fault with the traditional schools and urge them to reform.
- The terminology of 'lifelong learning' is becoming more popular among the business sector first, which gradually supersedes the old way of educational classifications and systematic conceptualization.
- On a state level, the legal foundations and administrative government structure are invented to support the rationality of the practice. The notion of human resource development takes the central position of any lifelong learning system.
- Over the course of a life, educational demands result in rapid increases in higher education, both formal and non-formal or as a part of initial or of continuing education. Most of the increase is related to private universities that are sensitively interconnected with the professional labor market.
- In terms of lifewide, formal and non-formal initial education are interlocking and overlapping and thus share influences with each other, to create new credit recognition and qualification systems like NQF.
- In turn, schools face serious challenges to transform, e.g. OECD's scenarios for the future of schooling (OECD, 2004) by the boomerang of the expansion and fusion. The subject-based school curriculum and qualification systems are under fierce criticism from the competence-based approach.
- All these processes are advanced under the banner of global knowledge capitalism that requires neo-liberal market policies to take the core principle of lifelong learning and adult continuing education. While states contribute to the legal foundation and administrative bodies, the role of employers and individuals are growing under the global learning market rules in terms of decision making and financing.
- The prior labor market policies that were a part of the public sector are deconstructed and restructured under neo-liberal lifelong learning policies.

Additionally, adult education provision increasingly is seen as a strategic investment. In this context, private education providers begin to play a key role in most countries.

In this discourse, the key element is the 'competencies' which claim the spotlight either in terms of knowledge capitalism or the lifelong learning system as a part of it. Capital requires services and goods to be re-formulated to maximize the degree of exchange and accumulation to fit into the capitalist forms. In this regard, like material capital and finance capital in the past, all forms of services and goods such as knowledge capital, cultural capital, human resources, and social capital that we can invest into the production process can develop management systems and ultimately become wealth. The current system of knowledge capitalism which can be seen now, makes the obtaining of knowledge akin to capital. As a result, education plays a role, which school used to play, in strengthening the productivity of knowledge capital beyond the function of the early stage which is the simple reproduction of capitalistic production relations.

The new educational matrix that combines the global knowledge capitalism with lifelong learning expands its influential sphere of competencies. In this way, 'competence-based lifelong learning' will change the fundamentals of school curricula of primary, secondary, and higher education. It will set a key standard of achievement in the educational game, and all the processes and products of lifelong learning will be re-adjusted to the signal of competencies. Academic qualifications will also be compliant to these signals. Overall, a lifelong learning system that is inclusive, from cradle to grave, will be established to produce human competencies, and in turn, the system itself will be the largest part of the knowledge economy. Lifelong learning is not for the knowledge economy. It *is* the knowledge economy, upon which it elaborates toward a more evolved status.

Conclusion

In this article, I revisited a snapshot of the development of the lifelong learning systems in selected Asian countries against the backdrop of the Asian Financial Crisis in 1997

and its responses to that crisis. I reconsidered the arguments that I'd raised in the previous article of 2001 in that the characteristics of the global knowledge economy had heavily influenced the shaping of the local lifelong learning system beyond simple local attributes; and adult education was losing its authenticity and was being re-shaped to meet global market standards. I tried to re-interpret the findings in the context of the knowledge economy, but from a different approach. I argued that the lifelong learning system under the global forces of capitalism, as with the Asian experience in the 2000s, can be a part of the knowledge economy itself, not a tool of it, and in this sense, the knowledge economy sets the conditions of the lifelong learning system as an embryo of its attributes. In this respect, I believe, the global financial crisis deconstructed and reconstructed the old mode of schooling and adult education system, in so doing giving birth to a new form of learning capitalism.

References

- Boli, J., Ramirez, F. O., & Meyer, J. W. (1985). Explaining the origins and expansion of mass education. *Comparative Education Review*, 29(2), 145-170.
- Brennan, B. (1997). Reconceptualizing non-formal education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 16(3), 185-200.
- Burton-Jones, A. (1999). *Knowledge capitalism: Business, work, and learning in the new economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Han, S. (2001). Creating systems: Lifelong learning in Asia. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 2(2).
- Hodgson, A. (Ed.). (2000). *An international and historical context for recent policy approaches to lifelong learning in the UK*. London: Kogan Page.
- Holford, J., Jarvis, P., & Griffin, C. (Eds.). (1998). *International perspective on lifelong learning*. London: Kogan Page.
- Jarvis, P. (2007). *Globalization, lifelong learning and the learning society: Sociological perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Kennedy, P. (2004). The politics of 'lifelong learning' in post-1997 Hong Kong. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 23(6), 589-624.

- Kumar, P. (2004). Lifelong learning in Singapore: Where are we now? *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 23(6), 559-568.
- Makino, A. (2001). Trends in and objectives of adult higher education in China. In D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M. Hatton & Y. Sawano (Eds.), *International handbook of lifelong learning*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- OECD. (2004). *International schooling for tomorrow forum: Background OECD papers*, The Schooling Senarios. International Schooling for Tomorrow Forum, June 6-8th 2004, Toronto, Canada.
- Rinne, R. (1998). From labour to learn: The limits of labour society and the possibilities of learning society. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 17(2), 108-120.
- Schuetze, H. G. (2006). International concepts and agendas of lifelong learning. *Compare*, 36(3), 289-306.
- Somtrakool, K. (2002). Lifelong learning for a modern learning society. In C. Medel-Anonuevo (Ed.), *Integrating lifelong learning perspectives*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Usher, R., & Edwards, R. (1994). *Postmodernism and Education*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Walters, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Globalization, adult education and training*. London and New York: Zed Books.
- Wang, A., Song, G., & Kang, F. (2006). Promoting a lifelong learning society in China: the Attempts by Tsinghua University. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 18(2), 1-16.
- Welton, M. (1995). In Defense of the lifeworld: Critical perspectives on adult learning. In M. Welton (Ed.), *In defense of the lifeworld: Critical perspectives on adult learning*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Williams, R. (Ed.). (1989). Adult education and social change. *In what I came to say*. London: Hutchinson Radius.
- Yellen, J. (2007). The Asian financial crisis ten years later: assessing the past and looking to the future. Retrived from <http://www.frbsf.org/news/speeches/2007/0206.html>.

Received September 11, 2007

Revision received December 9, 2007

Accepted December 12, 2007