Surian, Alessio

Challenges for Global Education in the Mediterranean Region

ZEP : Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik 27 (2004) 2, S. 22-28

in Kooperation mit / in cooperation with:

ZEP Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung
und Entwicklungspädagogik

"Gesellschaft für interkulturelle Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik e.V."

http://www.uni-bamberg.de/allgpaed/zep-zeitschrift-fuer-internationale-bildungsforschung-und-entwicklungspaedagogik/profil

Kontakt / Contact:

Digitalisiert

Mitglied der

Leibniz
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

ZEP

Mit: Mitteilungen der DGfE-Kommission "Bildungsforschung mit der Dritten Welt"

Globales Lernen in Europa

North-South
Centre

European Centre
for Global Interdependence and Solidarity

Aus dem Inhalt:

- Globales Lernen und Millennium Development Goals
- Förderstrukturen der Entwicklungspädagogik
- Qualitätssicherung und Evaluation
- Globales Lernen in verschiedenen Regionen

Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik

| 27. Jahrgang | Juni | **2** | 2004 | ISSN 1434-4688D |

Alessio Surian

Challenges for Global Education in the Mediterranean Region

Abstract: This paper reviews some of the present challenges facing learning in the 21. century and the concern for "glo-cal" issues in the Mediterranean region. It stresses that global education can be translated into various focal themes such as development, environment, human rights, intercultural relations, peace. However, such a translation should retain a common "broad" methodological approach centred on conflict transformation. A sociology of "translation" is needed for enhanced co-operation among practitioners in the region.

"If you wish to understand something, try changing it. "
(K. Lewin)

Introduction: towards a broad focus

Once upon a time there lived a federation of twelve ethnic groups. They belonged to five main linguistic families and cultural traditions. They lived together maintaining their languages as well as their own political and economic structures. At the same time they shared a common structure, an economic agreement and a number of cultural institutions, enhancing the feeling of belonging to a common framework...

Hmmm... sounds familiar? Whatever you have been thinking of, it is Darcy Ribeiro's short description of the indigenous people from the Xingu river in Brazil. What will happen to our mental associations when we refer the first few lines of this paper to the European Union or to Amazonia or to a region such as the Mediterranean?

Today, education concerned with world issues is faced with a difficult dilemma: how is it possible to deal with injustices and differences among peoples without reinforcing negative stereotypes? How to address inequalities at the global level while stimulating respect and curiosity for other cultures and eventually a better understanding of one's own culture? This challenge seems particularly relevant for global educators.

The many links between education and globalisation do not address just a better learning concerning an increasingly globalised economy and the alarming level of conflicts among human beings and between human beings and the environment. Scholars such as Bateson (1972; 1979), Maturana/Varela

(1980) and Morin (2001) have repeatedly encouraged educators to reflect upon the type of knowledge, learning and ethical attitude needed by the citizens of the XXI century. Their investigations point at some of the bottlenecks and paradoxes of Western positivism such as individualism turning into fragmentation, egocentricity and the disintegration of solidarity. Another ambiguous and controversial product of modernity is its approach to technology. While trying to free mankind from its various expenditures of energy by transferring the burden to machines it progressively subordinates society to the quantitative logic of its machines. A world dominated by a technological, economic and scientific logic sees its mark in the deterioration in quality over quantity. According to Morin "when a given system finds itself saturated with problems it can no longer resolve, it has two possibilities: either general regression or a change of system". He sees examples of both human responses in world history, with crucial episodes rooted in the Mediterranean region: "The example of regression is illustrated by the Roman Empire. As we know today, it was not the invading hordes that caused the downfall of the Roman Empire but the fact that Rome proved incapable of changing and of resolving its economic problems. By contrast, the emergence of historic societies in the Middle East some ten thousand years ago, when small nomadic tribes progressed from hunting and picking to agriculture and settling in village communities, is a successful example of how an overly categorised or dispersed organisational system was overcome to solve the problems posed by a large concentration of populations" (Morin 2001).

Morin's message is that an awareness of our global destiny as a community is the prerequisite for change that would allow us to understand the dynamics of co-evolution (the environmental-human and human-human links) and act as co-pilot for the planet, whose problems have become inextricably intertwined. Similarly, we need a thought system that enables us to see and create links, as Bateson and Pascal stress, since „all things aid and are aided, cause and are caused [...] and everything being linked by an invisible link that binds the parts most distant from one another, I hold it to be impossible to know the parts without knowing the whole just as it is impossible to know the whole without knowing the parts" (Morin 2001). Unfortunately the dominating thought system

in formal education from primary schools to universities is a system that breaks down reality and prevents our minds from linking up the knowledge we are made to fragment and to pigeonhole into discrete disciplines. This hyper-specialisation of knowledge, the carving out of a single aspect from reality can also lead to neglecting the social and human dimension, contributing to dispossess citizens of the right to take political decisions and transferring this privilege to experts. As the Delors Report (1996) puts it the challenge is no longer to promote social cohesion but to re-motivate democratic participation. This is closely linked to adopting a broad (teaching *through* and *for*) rather than a narrow (teaching *about)* focus in dealing with global education issues. In other words and just as one example how to deal with issues of development, study courses and topics can be organised within a narrow focus like:

1. Presenting problems of developing countries (Teaching *about* development)
2. Promoting an implicit acceptance of a Western view of development.
3. Emphasising „aid" as a solution to „under-development".
4. Encouraging student involvement in terms of fundraising through charitable collections etc.

Alternatively, a broad focus would emphasise:
1. World development/interdependencies
2. Non-Western as well as one's own perspectives
3. Solutions lie in reforming economic and socio-political arrangements within and between countries
4. Encouraging students to develop knowledge, attitudes and competences for participation in decision-making processes (Teaching/or development)

This second approach is close to creating educational opportunities for discussing and searching for critical Utopias, a process that requires what the Portuguese sociologist Boaventura de Sousa Santos calls "no global social justice without global cognitive justice" (Santos 2003, p.5).

Dealing with absences

The dominating school culture actively produces absences through a logic of monocultures. Just think of the combination between the monoculture of a linear understanding of time and the monoculture of rigor of knowledge. According to this thought system modern science and high culture represent the sole criteria of truth and aesthetic quality, respectively. Both claim to be, each in its own field, exclusive canons of production of knowledge or artistic creation. As a result, anything that is not legitimated by the canon is declared as non-existent or lacking culture. Similarly, the monoculture of linear time claims that history has a meaning and direction - taking the shape of progress, revolution, modernisation, development, globalisation. Santos stresses that common to all these formulations is the idea that time is linear and that ahead of time there proceed the core countries of the world system and, along with them, the dominant knowledge, institutions and forms of sociability. This logic produces nonexistence by

describing as backward whatever is asymmetrical vis-à-vis whatever is declared as forward.

Such thought system tends to polarise and frame everything into first or third world and to neglect alternatives. This is particularly problematic in the Mediterranean region where similarities and differences cut across this simplistic view. The challenge for global educators is to focus on the practice and knowledge that unites them, rather than on what divides them. It is a matter of developing competences in "translation": the ability to enlarge reciprocal intelligibility without destroying the identity of what is translated. The recent Development Education Summer School (Peniche, Portugal, 2003) enabled practitioners from this region to explore how host-difference can replace fortress-in-difference. Through translation work, diversity is celebrated as a factor of sharing and solidarity (Santos 2003).

In the Mediterranean region the term global education seems to be more widespread across European countries although it is often translated into one or more specific fields such as democratic citizenship, development, environmental, human rights, intercultural, peace education. Of these fields, environmental education is probably better known across various Mediterranean countries.

Within the formal education sector in particular, the limitations of an often rigid curriculum combined with a lack of opportunities for in-service training for most teachers have resulted in global education and its related fields becoming in most cases the subject for experimental projects. Even when there is some kind of formal recognition, they are entering schools through the back door.

An intercultural education approach appears to be essential in emphasising a broad focus concerning not only development education, but also the teaching of any single aspect of global education. It may even mean to question the very concept of development in the region and world-wide. The issue of conflict seems a crucial focus for global education in a region where tensions are rising to alarming levels. Before addressing a global and intercultural education perspective concerning conflict transformation, it is worth paying attention to a school subject that plays a fundamental role in de-constructing cultural prejudices and conflicts.

Learning history from a global education perspective

As I am writing these lines I have just finished browsing through a remarkable book by the Peace Research in the Middle East (PRIME) centre.[1]

The book is the outcome of a project based on the awareness that in periods of conflict, nations tend to develop their own narratives as if each narrative was the only true narrative. School textbooks can be viewed as formal representations of a society's ideology and ethos as they convey the values, goals, and myths that the society would like the new generation to acquire (Apple 1979; Bourdieu 1973; Luke 1988). Research on Palestinian and Israeli school textbooks shows how

each side, Palestinian as well as Israeli, presents its own narrative.

Adwan/Firer (1999) present a comprehensive analysis of narratives of the conflict/relation in Palestinian and Israeli history and civic education. Their analysis illustrates how the texts reflect a culture of enmity. The terminology used in the texts have acquired different meanings according to the context where it is being used. What is positive on the one side becomes negative when used by the other side. The heroes of one side are the monsters of the other while the maps in the texts eliminate the cities and towns of the other side. There is also no recognition of each other's sufferings.

124 Israeli school books published between 1975 and 1995 were analysed by Daniel Bar-Tal (1995). He concludes that when two sides face acute conflict each side develops beliefs about the justness of its own goals, beliefs about security, about delegitimising the opponents, of a positive self image, beliefs about patriotism, about unity and about peace. These beliefs constitute a kind of ethos that supports the continuation of the conflict. The study demonstrates that beliefs about security are emphasised in the Israeli textbooks. Most of the contents stereotype Arabs in a negative way.

A heated debate in Israeli society concerning how to teach history was sparked by Nave/Yogev (2002). They claim that the task of history textbooks is to tell the story of the past. At the same time the content and the messages convey the ways in which the normative identity and its collective memory is constructed.

PRIME is trying to deal with these research findings: the way Palestinian and Israeli texts present their historical narratives affects the views of the students reading them. Such historical narratives need to be questioned and framed differently if we want to offer pupils opportunities to change their views and attitudes towards the Other, beginning with the way the Other is being portrayed. PRIME'S basic assumption is that children should learn and respect the Other's narratives. One way of doing so is to confront them with the way narratives are presented from the Other's perspective.

This has resulted in an innovative school book: "Shared History Booklet". It is based on two narratives: the Israeli narrative and the Palestinian narrative. Both are dealing with the same dates and turning points in recent history. The team that produced the book was formed by six Palestinian history and geography teachers, six Jewish Israeli history teachers and six international delegates, as well as one Jewish Israeli observer. While several of the Israeli teachers, who teach in the central and northern parts of Israel, participated in previous encounters with Palestinians, the Palestinian never participated in dialogue encounters with Israelis. They are from Hebron, Bethlehem and East Jerusalem. Teachers and observers were able to meet four times. Each time they met for three days.

PRIME recalls that "as the political and the military situations were very fragile, it was unclear until the last minute whether the Palestinian teachers would get permits to enter Jerusalem, or if they would be able to reach the places where the permits were issued. The workshops were called off several times, but each time we found ways and the energy to call them on again and finally we succeeded to make them happen,

mostly with full participation. As the project operated within the reality of the conflict, it is critical to note the contexts from which the participants came. First, while the situation on both sides was bleak, difference and asymmetry existed with respect to the intensity of the general realities on the ground. For Palestinians, the reality has an unrelenting effect on day-to-day life with experiences of occupation and living under the thumb of the Israeli army. This translates into restricted freedom of movement, curfews, borders checkpoints and a lot of fear of shootings, killings and house demolitions. Most have suffered serious losses and have had their own home or that of relatives damaged. Meanwhile, for Israelis, because of Palestinian suicide attacks, the every day reality reflects itself mostly in fear. This involves fear of riding buses, and of going downtown or anywhere with crowds. Many on both sides even fear sending their kids to school. Rather unsurprisingly, given the situation, faith and hope have been difficult for both sides to hold on to - hence our sheer amazement at the fact that the seminars had such high participation and commitment. One of the Israeli teachers mentioned during the fourth seminar: 'This work over the last year was my only source of hope in the current desperate situation'."

Teachers' influence on pupils goes well beyond the mere written texts in forming children's understandings and value systems (Nave/Yogev 2002; Angvik/von Borris 1997). Consequently, PRIME'S project focused on the role of teachers in the process of using shared history texts in the classroom. The teachers developed the narratives and tried them out with their ninth and tenth graders, after the booklet had been translated into Arabic and Hebrew. The booklet included an empty space between the narratives for the pupils and teachers to add their own responses.

By the time of the fourth workshop in January 2003, the booklet was not yet ready, but the texts were on paper and most of the teachers had at least tried them out in one of their classes. This enabled participants to devote time to listen to their evaluations of these initial experience and then to decide about three additional dates to be the basis for developing new narratives. A conference is scheduled at PRIME in June 2004 to review the first experimental phase and use of the booklet.

From Regional to World History

The PRIME project is an encouraging experience in rethinking the role and the methodological approach in history teaching. Let us explore this issue further with the help of research from a different region, North America. Ross Dunn is an interesting author for scholars of Mediterranean history as he has penned "The Adventures of Ibn Battuta, a Muslim Traveller of the Fourteenth Century" and co-authored with Gary B. Nash and Charlotte Crabtree "History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past". Dunn (2000) identifies four broad models concerning the teaching of world history in American schools.

Model number one is the *Western Heritage* model. It holds that the central mission of history education is to convey a

shared heritage of values, institutions, and great ideas derived mainly from peoples of Europe and the ancient Mediterranean. Such a model particularly values the traditional "Western Civilisation" course, which spread across the nation after World War I. This was considered useful in the United States to teach newly arriving immigrants that Europeans and native-born Americans shared a proud, unitary cultural heritage and based upon the values of democracy, freedom, and a shared system of cultural communication. According to Dunn, this model assumes an essentialist point of view, contending that Western civilisation generated out of its own cultural ingredients exceptional traits and that it continues to possess innate attributes, which may from time to time be obscured, though temporarily.

Pattern number two is the *Different Cultures* Model, based on a critique of Eurocentrism although it does not challenge much the model's fundamental assumptions in the Western Heritage. The multicultural perspective does not dispute the idea that civilisations possess inherent attributes, while its insists that world history courses should amply represent other civilisations and cultural categories besides the West, mainly for essentialist reasons.

The third model is kindred to the Different Cultures model in its general commitments to internationalism and is called the *Contemporary Studies* model. It is more popular in professional social studies circles and among advocates of international education. It pays more attention to present global issues such as economic globalisation, international migrations, conflicts, warfare, peace studies, environmental change, and world-scale institutions such as the United Nations and Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs). Within this model history is seen as a well from which to draw the explanation of the "background" of recent transformations.

The fourth approach is identified as the *Patterns of Change* model. It is close to the Different Cultures and Contemporary Studies models in promoting a socially and culturally inclusive curriculum although it seems more rooted in the discipline of history. It draws extensively on the social sciences for analytical constructs and vocabulary. Unlike the Western Heritage model, it avoids the search for cultural "origins" and to use a causal chain linking paleolithic East Africa to Mesopotamia, Mesopotamia to Greece, and Greece to modern Europe. This model shares with the Contemporary Studies model an awareness of the globalisation dynamics and of the complex relationship between *Homo sapiens sapiens* and the biosphere. It is concerned with issues of cultural borderlands, deterritorialisation, and how human groups have represented and made sense of one another. It encourages an awareness that social and spatial fields of historical inquiry should be open and fluid, not predetermined by fixed cultural or geographical categories. As a result, the world history curriculum should not be so much a matter of deciding how to line up the study of various autonomously-conceived cultures but of framing substantive, engaging historical questions that students might be invited to ask unconstrained by predetermined border lines of civilisations, nations, or continents. Within this model students should look for explanations of *change*: "not to describe "how things were" in Culture A,

"what they had" in Culture B, or the "interesting things they achieved" in Culture C - says Dunn - That is, the Patterns of Change Model requires that the organising of textbooks and curriculum guides start not with selection of places to study but with problems to investigate in both the remote and recent past" (Dunn 2000).

A professor of History at San Diego State University and the Director of the World History Projects at the National Centre for History in the Schools at University of California Los Angeles (UCLA), Dunn is an advocate of the Patterns of Change Model, the one that is most closely associated with the intellectual and pedagogical aims of the World History Association. After reviewing state standards documents, professional journals, and textbooks Dunn concludes that the most influential pattern in American schools is a "somewhat awkward, unstable blending of Different Cultures and Western Heritage history. This inconsistent mix is partly a reflection of politics: boards of education, publishers, and curriculum officers constantly grope for a safe road through mine fields laid on one side by multicultural or ethno-racial interest groups and on the other by organisations dedicated to advancing "Western values." The result is a general pattern of curriculum that reflects a fairly murky ideological position combining cultural inclusivism with a rather absent-minded acceptance of the notion that after 1500 and up to 1945 Europe and the world were the same. This amalgamation of Western Heritage and Different Cultures history is evident in almost all the leading world history textbooks and in the more content-rich state standards documents" (Dunn 2000).

Usually the first half of the text or standards guide deals with a series of major civilisations (each covered as a unit encompassing several hundred to several thousand years). This accounts for "diversity and internationalism" and then the focus of the second part can shift to Europe, its internal history and the activities of Europeans abroad. Dunn concludes that in most history textbooks the idea of the West as a cultural entity, whose "rise" may be ascribed almost entirely to internal mechanisms and foundational traits, remains largely unchallenged. Only for periods after 1945 significant attention is paid to globalisation.

This attitude is not only American. Clear challenges for global educators lie in addressing this dominant attitude in history textbooks and in creating the conditions for exchanging and comparing shared narratives. This is a key issue in addressing attitudes of competition and co-operation and therefore views on interpersonal, local and global conflicts in education as well as conflicts in various parts of the region and in the region as a whole concerning two crucial axes. One concerns the growing propaganda opposing Christianity, Islam and Judaism. A second one concerns global conflicts such as the recent invasions of Serbia, Iraq and Afghanistan and the war/humanitarian propaganda that goes with it.

Six reflections on global education from an intercultural perspective

The end of British colonisation in India, of the Shah' rule in Iran, of Marcos' in the Philippines, Solidarnosc in Poland, the Velvet Revolution in Chechoslovakia, the end of the Cold War and the fall of the Berlin Wall, the end of the Pinochet regime in Chile, of Milosevic's rule in Serbia and more recently the bloodless change of Shevardnadze as Georgia's head of State: nonviolence can change the world for the better, it offers stories of hope. Unfortunately, not very often historians pay attention to the facts and the participatory dynamics that made these changes possible. To consider just the Mediterranean region it is clear that both Rugova's nonviolent efforts in Kosovo and Serbia's nonviolent opposition to Milosevic's rule did not receive much attention nor support from neighbour countries nor from mainstream media.

Nonetheless, such stories of hope have inspired individuals and groups in practising nonviolence and conflict transformation according to principles based on empathy, empowerment and active listening.

To come back to the Transcend example, world religions provided inspiration for the following conflict transformation principles:
1. Map the conflict formation: all parties, all goals, all issues.
2. Bring in forgotten parties with important stakes in the conflict.
3. Have highly empathetic, individual dialogues with all parties.
4. Each conflict worker may specialise on one conflict party.
5. In these dialogues, identify goals acceptable to all parties.
6. Bring in forgotten goals that may open new perspectives.
7. Arrive at overarching goals acceptable to all parties.
8. Arrive at a short, evocative, goal-formulation.
9. Help define tasks for all parties with this goal in mind:
- disembedding the conflict from where it was;
- embedding it elsewhere;
- bringing in forgotten parties and goals.
10. Verify how realising this goal would realise parties' goals.
11. Help parties meet „at the table" for self-sustaining process.
12. Withdraw from the conflict, go on to the next, stay on call.

An awareness of such processes in terms of conflict transformation at the macro-level seems important to challenge individualism, competition and war culture at the local and interpersonal level as well. It helps identifying the ground for stories of hope, as we will see later. While environmental and development education have received some attention in the Mediterranean in the past years, global education seems still weak on the peace and intercultural education fronts and these are essential maps to orient mankind through the Mediterranean labyrinth.

To address again the previous terminology, the concept of "global education" is gradually moving from a synonymous of "world studies" to a "glocal" approach to civic education bringing together at least five key areas: development, environment, human rights, interculture and peace.

An integrated framework

A key reference is the Declaration of the 44th session of the International Conference on Education, held in Geneva in 1994 with the active participation of representatives from all Mediterranean members, and its follow-up document approved in Paris (1995), the Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy. It is worth reflecting on two core educational objectives included in the Framework:
- Education must develop the ability to recognise and accept the values which exist in the diversity of individuals, genders, peoples and cultures and develop the ability to communicate, share and co-operate with others. The citizens of a pluralist society and multicultural world should be able to accept that their interpretation of situations and problems is rooted in their personal lives, in the history of their society and in their cultural traditions; that, consequently, no individual or group holds the only answer to problems; and that for each problem there may be more than one solution. Therefore, people should understand and respect each other and negotiate on an equal footing, with a view to seeking common ground. Thus education must reinforce personal identity and should encourage the convergence of ideas and solutions which strengthen peace, friendship and solidarity between individuals and people.
- Education must develop the ability of non-violent conflict-resolution. It should therefore promote also the development of inner peace in the minds of students so that they can establish more firmly the qualities of tolerance, compassion, sharing and caring.

This is particularly relevant if we are concerned with the roots and interdependence of present globalisation phenomena.

Various projects have attempted to integrate a set of key contents within the general search for a specific global education methodology.

A positive approach to global education, educating for and *through* global issues (such as peace), rather than *about* global issues needs to approach peace, sustainability and human rights (and democracy) as three interrelated key topics. Of the three fields, human rights has benefited from a strong support by both the United Nations and the Council of Europe.

As already mentioned, various authors (Hicks/Steiner 1989; Pike/Selby 1988) advocate the need to shift from a *narrow* to a *broad* focus concerning the contents of the major field of global education (development, environment, human rights, peace). Abroad focus suggests that from the point of view of the contents a proper understanding of each of these fields requires to identify the roots of conflicts and to adopt an intercultural perspective.

The economic international relations have been gradually integrated into the global education picture. By 1979, the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association had integrated the concept of social justice within the reflection about peace.

Addressing structural issues (and ultimately the issue of sustainability) becomes crucial to place local and international conflicts within their wider context. Addressing the issues

of justice, exploitation, local and global poverty enables global education to go beyond the academic debate and to promote a vision of peace rooted in the everyday concerns of the communities where it operates.

Empowerment as common global education methodology

Teaching *for and through* rather than *about* these issues requires to reflect upon attitudes and behaviours. Research in the field of education and solidarity (Bartelds 1984; Nolting 1981) shows that effective methodology is usually based on active listening and co-operation rather than on a normative approach.

The central question is what are the psychological and pedagogical conditions which favour solidarity attitudes. The results show that only autonomous altruism (as opposed to normative altruism) can be a reliable basis for attitudes and behaviours of solidarity. A positive self-image, a knowledge of the other's situation, and various skills which enable empathy and personal responsibility are the key factors which favour solidarity.

This is particularly relevant for global educators because the above conditions strongly refer to a nonviolent and intercultural approach in education. Such approach also establishes a relation between global education and various philosophies of education centred around the civic responsibility of the individual and his/her community and the liberation function of education. From Gandhi, to Freire, the past decades have witnessed strong contributions based on non-European perspectives in education, advocating empowerment as a central responsibility for any educational process. For example the concept of Zenzele is at the basis of the work the Organisation of Rural Associations for Progress (ORAP) in Zimbabwe and has facilitated strong partnerships at the local, national, and international level. It is based on the African saying (Kempadoo/ORAP 1991, p.7).

Hicks (in Hicks/Slaughter 1998) has also argued that in order to empower people, education needs to become more future-oriented and that the future is often a missing dimension in global education. One of the most relevant studies carried out in this field (Ornauer et al. 1976) compared views of the future in ten different countries.

The results are not very encouraging, with pessimistic visions of the future prevailing over optimistic ones. The ability to think about and to visualise the future was found to be not particularly developed. Similar and more recent studies and young people's views of the future (Hicks/Holden 1995) show similar patterns of response. In this context, the conclusions made by Galtung to the 1976 study seem particularly relevant:

"For the nations in our sample the future seems somehow to be synonymous with technological future. The future is seen in technical terms, not in terms of culture, human enrichment, social equity, social justice, or in terms of international affairs [...] People may also think in terms of social future but regard it as unchangeable.

But it seems more probable that they have only been trained to think technologically and have no other type of thoughts

as a response to the stimulus 'future'; or at least have not been trained to express any other thoughts. And this will then become self-reinforcing since no one will be stimulated by others to think about social futures" (Galtung 1976).

"Prettifying reality" or "learned optimism" are not necessarily features of peace education. Yet, how is it possible to facilitate assertiveness and empathy in the social relations without encouraging an active reflection about probable and preferred futures? Elisabeth Boulding reminds us that "conventional adult wisdom at present confirms a rather violent, inequitable and increasingly polluted world. Admitting children to co-participation in social thinking, dreaming and planning while they are still free to draw on their experiential knowledge of the world will help make the adult social order more malleable, and more open to new and more humane developments" (in Boulding/Boulding 1995).

Frank Hutchinson (in Hicks/Slaughter 1998) suggests a frame of reference (and a useful indicator of the relation between visions of the future and of social attitudes) to further explore this issue:

Anticipations about the 21st century and related motivational states
- Hopelessness: Low self-esteem; feelings of worthlessness; impoverished creative imagination about social alternatives; flight; violence turned against self or others
- Passive hope: Bland optimism; technological cargo-cultism; reductionist literacies for accommodation to 'future shock'
- Active hope: Foresight; pro-social skills; appropriate assertiveness; enriched social imagination; optimal literacies for facilitating integration of the personal, the political and the planetary
(Hutchinson 1998)

In the footsteps of Paulo Freire ("The liberation of individuals only acquires a profound meaning when it turns into social transformation. The dream becomes a necessity, a need", Freire 1992, p. 100), David Hicks (in Hicks/Slaughter 1998) identifies nine main sources of hope: The natural world; Other people's lives; Collective struggles; Visionaries; Faith and belief; A sense of self; Human creativity; Mentors and colleagues; Relationships. While active listening, assertiveness, co-operation, conflict mediation have been often at the core of global education activities inspired by a nonviolent approach, the intercultural and the futures perspectives still constitute challenges to be explored also in order to define the place of peace education within the global education agenda taking into account the interrelations with development, environment, human rights and interculture.

What are the concrete pedagogical implications of promoting concepts such as peace, ecological balance and justice through educational activities and especially through the school system?

Beside the attention to key contents related to the various global education fields, it seems crucial to develop an active listening and reflexive attitude to enable human beings to face conflicts as learning opportunities. Going back to Gregory Bateson (1972), he suggests that learning can be conceived as a process of moving from a territory to a map, from level 0

to level 3 learning. In other words he suggests that:

Level 0: Behaviour corresponds to turn one doorknob
Learning about one event in one context.
Level 1: Behaviour corresponds to turn all doorknobs
Learning as generalisation, learn unconsciously what makes up a set across contexts and be able to operate based on that learning
Level 2: Behaviour corresponds to turn doorknobs, push swing doors; create new kinds of doorknobs
Learning as Discrimination, learn the characteristics of one set versus another; be able to articulate the rules of a set and generate new examples;
Level 3: Behaviour corresponds to teach people how to distinguish between doorknobs and swinging doors; create new methods for getting people through doors

Learning as consciously describe discrimination; generate a new set based on Level 2 rules. Level 2 and 3 (*deutero learning*) appear to be crucial to Global Education.

One can think of each level as a „territory" of skills and the level above as a „map" of the skill set below. Therefore, as one moves up to the next level, (s)he has conscious access to the level below and unconscious access to a new set of skills. It is a matter of becoming aware of our present frames of mind to be able to imagine new frames.

Annotations

1 www.webartery.com/PRIME/
2 www.transcend.org

References

Adwan, S./Firer, R.: The narrative of Palestinian Refugees During the War of 1948 in Israeli and Palestinian History and Civic Education Textbooks. Paris: UNESCO 1997.

Adwan, S./Firer, R.: The Narrative of the 1967 war in the Israeli and Palestinian History and Civics Textbooks and Curricula Statement. Braunschweig: Eckert Institute 1999.

Al-Ashmawi, F.: The Image of the Other as Presented in History Booklet. In: International Textbooks Research, 18 (2): p. 221-229. Braunschweig 1996.

Al-Rubay A./Ray, D./Sabie T.: Global Education: A Brief Assessment of the Literature. In: Bulletin of Peace Proposals. Vol. 15, No. 2, 1984.

Angvik, M./von Borries, B. (Eds): Youth and history: A comparative European survey on historical consciousness and political attitudes among adolescents. Hamburg: Koerber Foundation 1997.

Apple, M.W.: Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1979.

Bar-Tal, D.: The rocky road toward peace: Societal beliefs in times of intractable conflict, the Israeli case. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, School of Education o.J. (in Hebrew).

Bateson, G.: Steps to an Ecology of Mind. San Francisco: Chandler 1972.

Bateson, G: Mind and Nature - A Necessary Unity. New York: Dutton 1979.

Bartelds C.: Peace Education and Solidarity, in Gandhi Marg, Journal of the Gandhi Peace Foundation, Vol. VI, Number 4 and 5, p. 308-312, New Delhi: N.Vasudevan 1984.

Boulding, E./Boulding K.: The Future: Images and Processes. Sage, London 1995.

Bourdieu, P.: Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In: Brown, R. (Ed.): Knowledge, education and cultural change. London: Tavistock, 1973, p. 71 - 112.

Braudel F.: Les mémoires de la Mèditerranée. Paris: France Loisirs/ Editions de Fallois 1998.

Delors, J. (ed.): Learning, the Treasure Within. Paris: Unesco 1996.

Drum, J./Hughes, S./Otero, G.: Global Winners - 74 Learning Activities for Inside and Outside the Classroom. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press Inc. 1994.

Dufty, D. & H. (ed.): Thinking Whole. The Quest for a New Educational Paradigm. Sidney: Social Education Association of Australia 1988.

Dunn, R. E., (ed.): The New World History. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's 2000.

Freire P.: Pedagogia da Eperanca. Um reencontro com a Pedagogia do Oprimido. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra 1992.

Galtung, J.: The Form of Peace Education. In: Bulletin of Peace Proposals, Vol. 3, p. 212, 1974.

Galtung, J.: The future: a forgotten dimension. In Ornauer, H. et al.: Images of the World in the Year 2000. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press 1976.

Galtung, J./Carl, G./Jacobsen, C.G./Brand-Jacobsen, K. F.: Searching for Peace: The Road to TRANSCEND. Sydney: Pluto 2002.

Hicks, D./Steiner, M. (Eds.): Making Global Connections: A World Studies Workbook. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1989.

Hicks, D.: Exploring Alternative Futures: A Teacher's Interim Guide. Global Futures Project. London: Institute of Education, University of London 1991.

Hicks, D. /Slaughter, R. (eds.): Futures Education. World Yearbook of Education 1998. London: Kogan Page 1998

Huckle, J.: What We Consume: the Teachers Handbook. Richmond: WWF UK/Richmond Publishing Company 1988.

Kempadoo P./ORAP: Zenzele The ORAP Way. Bulawayo: RCP 1991

G.S.Kirk G.S./ Raven J.E./Schofield M.: The Presocratic Philosophers. A Critical History with a selection of texts. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1995

Luke, A.: Literacy, booklet, and ideology. London: Falmer Press 1998.

Maturana, H. R./Varela, F. J.: Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living. Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science [Cohen, R. S./Marx W. Wartofsky (Eds.)], Vol. 42, D. Dordrecht: Reidel Publishing Co 1980.

Morin, E.: Seven Complex Lessons in Education for the Future. Education on the Move. Paris: UNESCO 2001.

Nave, E./Yogev, E.: Histories: Towards a dialogue with yesterday. Danon, D. (Ed.). Bavel, Tel-Aviv 2002. (In Hebrew).

Nolting H.-P.: Lernschitte zur Gewaltlosigkeit. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag 1981

Ornauer H./Wiberg H./Sicinski A./**Galtung J.:** Images of the World in the Year 2000: A Comparative Ten Nation Study. Atlantic Highlands NJ: Humanities Press 1976

Pike, G/Selby, D.: Global Teacher, Global Learner. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988.

PRIME: Shared History Booklet. Beit Jallah 2003.

Sterling, S.: Sustainable Education - Re-visioning Learning and Change. Schumacher Briefings 6, Green Books. Devon 2001.

Santos de Sousa, B.: The world social forum: toward a counter-hegemonic globalization. Paper presented at the XXIV International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association, 27 - 27 March, Dallas 2003.

Alessio Surian, born 1964, is conducting research about intercultural competencies and participation methodologies at the University of Padova. He co-ordinates the training courses of the Centro Educazione Mondialità/ Global Education Centre (CEM., Brescia, Italy). He is a member of the DEEEP (Development Education Exchange in Europe Project) Training Working Group and of the Council of Europe Pool of trainers. He is co-author of "Compass. Human Rights Education with Young People". Strasbourg, 2002.