



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization



UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 20-22 March 2006

# Expert Meeting on Intercultural Education

# **Expert Meeting on Intercultural Education**

**UNESCO HQ, Paris, 20-22 March 2006**

Section of Education for Peace and Human Rights

**UNESCO**

**Section of Education for Peace and Human Rights**

**Division for the Promotion of Quality Education**

**Education Sector**

Section for Human Rights Education  
Education Sector

UNESCO  
7, place de Fontenoy  
75352 Paris 07 SP  
France

Printed at UNESCO in Paris  
(ED-2006/WS/39) - CLD 28574

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Background and Introduction – p. 5

II. Opening Statement – p. 7

III. The Panels – p. 9

**Panel I: Language and culture – are they mutually exclusive? – p. 10**

● Presentations – p. 10

● Debate – p. 11

● Synthesis – p. 13

**Panel II: Changing scenarios for intercultural education – p. 14**

● Presentations – p. 14

● Debate – p. 22

● Synthesis – p. 24

**Panel III: Are interfaith education issues part of intercultural education? – p. 26**

● Presentations – p. 26

● Debate – p. 30

● Synthesis – p. 32

IV. ‘UNESCO Guidelines on Intercultural Education’  
– Discussion of draft document – p. 35

V. UNESCO Database on Intercultural Education - Discussion – p. 39

VI. Presentation of the UNESCO World Report on Cultural Diversity – p. 41

Annexes:

Annex 1: List of Participants

Annex 2: Agenda



# I. Background and Introduction

The Section of Education for Peace and Human Rights of the Division for the Promotion of Quality Education held an expert meeting on Intercultural Education from March 20-22, 2006 at UNESCO Headquarters, bringing together international experts from Australia, Bolivia, Egypt, Finland, Hungary, Korea, Lebanon, Mexico, Nigeria, South Africa and the United Kingdom, including UNESCO Chairs and academics, as well as representatives of NGO's, National Commissions and UNESCO staff from various sectors (see attached list of participants).

The meeting was organized as part of the Section's activities on intercultural education, which are placed more broadly within the framework of UNESCO's activities on the Dialogue among Civilizations, the Rabat Commitment and the concerns of document 33 C/5, which requests the Director-General to continue to "strengthen initiative in the development of materials for education and intercultural and interfaith understanding". Further context was provided by the World Programme for Human Rights Education, the second World Decade of Indigenous Peoples and the UNESCO World Report on Cultural Diversity.

Presentations and discussions included the relationship between language and culture, changing scenarios for intercultural education, and the linkages between interfaith education and intercultural education. A main aim of the meeting was to receive input from the invited experts for the draft document "UNESCO Guidelines on Intercultural Education" as well as for a database on Intercultural Education, both of which are being developed by the Section. Another point presented for feedback was the UNESCO World Report on Cultural Diversity 2007.

This report will give for each panel a summary of the presentation, the ensuing debates and a synthesis. The discussions of the draft UNESCO Guidelines and of the database on Intercultural Education, including the results and next steps to be taken are also presented. In addition, the report provides a summary of the debate around the presentation of the UNESCO World Report on Cultural Diversity.



## II. Opening Statement

The Director of the Division for the Promotion of Quality Education, of which the Section on Education for Peace and Human Rights forms part, opened the meeting. She described the context of the Section's activities within the Division and its other activities, and explained the interrelatedness of intercultural education with the other topics of the Division, including education in relation to HIV/AIDS, the Associated Schools network and the assessment of learning outcomes, as well as its relevance to the Education sector's priority of Education for All.

She stressed the importance of the meeting for the work of UNESCO in addressing today's challenges of globalization and cultural diversity, as well as in the context of the increasing demands from member states for information on the role of education in building dynamic and versatile societies that are respectful of cultural differences.

In closing she commended the work of UNESCO Chairs and experts on intercultural education and anticipated that the results from the meeting would provide input not only for the further development of the 'UNESCO Guidelines on Intercultural Education' and the Section's database on the topic, but also towards the "Universal Forum of Cultures Monterrey 2007".



# III. The Panels

## Panel I: Language and culture – are they mutually exclusive? – p. 10

● Presentations – p. 10

1. **Sylvia Schmelkes:** *Language, Power and Cultural Identity* – p.10

2. **J. F. Ade-Ajayi:** *Language as the Vehicle for Cultural Expression* – p.11

● Debate – p. 11

● Synthesis – p. 13

## Panel II: Changing scenarios for intercultural education – p. 14

● Presentations – p. 14

1. **Luis Enrique Lopez:** *Intercultural Education in Latin America* – p.14

2. **Alexandre Marc:** *Intercultural Education and the Situation of the Roma* – p.16

3. **Crain Soudien:** *“Skating on the Surface of Multiculturalism” – A Perspective on Intercultural Education in South Africa* – p.17

4. **Johanna Lasonen:** *Intercultural Education in the Context of Internationalization, Localization and Globalization* – p.19

5. **Christiane Jeitani:** *The Role of School in Promoting Intercultural Dialogue and Intercultural Learning: The Associated Schools Network Experience in Lebanon* – p.22

● Debate – p. 22

● Synthesis – p. 24

## Panel III: Are interfaith education issues part of intercultural education? – p. 26

● Presentations – p. 26

1. **Liam Gearon:** *The Role of Religion in Civic, Citizenship and Human Rights Education and the United Nations* – p.26

2. **Ali Omar El Kashef:** *Towards a Future Model of Education* – p.27

3. **Gary Bouma:** *“To Try to Ignore Religion is to Stick Your Head in the Sand” – The Place of Religion in Intercultural Education* – p.28

4. **Dai-Geun Kang:** *A Reflection on Interfaith Education* – p.29

5. **Jagdish Gundara:** *Religion and the Secular State* – p.30

● Debate – p. 30

● Synthesis – p. 32

# Panel I

## Language and culture are they mutually exclusive?

### PRESENTATIONS

#### 1. **Sylvia Schmelkes:** **Language, Power and Cultural Identity**

Sylvia Schmelkes' presentation addressed the relationship between language and culture, language and power and educational policy, giving the example of an intercultural bilingual education model in Mexico.

A basic element of educational policy development was the strong relationship between language and culture. She defined language as "a fundamental part of culture" and the means of cultural expression and preservation.

A second fundamental element for consideration was the relation of language to power, as a "means of conquest, domination, conviction, conversion". As such it de-

termined the relationship between "the dominant and the dominated" in a given society, leading to the continuous enrichment of the language of the dominant and consequently to the impoverishment of that of the dominated. Citing the Mexican Constitution (1992), which defines the country as multicultural, Schmelkes advanced the impossibility of a truly multilingual, and hence multicultural, country without it being intercultural. "The quest for multiculturalism is also the quest for multilingualism", she proposed.

Educational policy should, she argued, aim for "additive bilingualism" as a strategy, and "balanced bilingualism" as an objective. Based on the above, intercultural education worked towards three objectives: "knowledge of cultural and linguistic diversity"; "respect for cultural and linguistic differences", and "appreciation of the culturally different". The latter would help towards the eradication



of racism, which she maintained was one of the principle obstacles to intercultural exchange.

Schmelkes illustrated her presentation with the example of a bilingual intercultural education model in secondary schools based on the recently adopted law on linguistic rights (“Diario Oficial de la Federación, 2003”). The law stipulates that “all indigenous languages are national languages” and that everyone has the right to basic education in their own language. Her model contained a subject entitled “Language and culture” taught three hours per week. It taught indigenous language and culture to indigenous and non-indigenous students through cultural exploration.

Schmelkes concluded that “language trends can be transformed”, and education, with an intercultural approach, has an essential role in this process towards the goal of a “truly multilingual and intercultural country”.

## 2. J. F. Ade-Ajayi:

### Language as the Vehicle for Cultural Expression

Prof. Ade-Ajayi discussed the link between culture and language as illustrated by the example of religion and its culturally and linguistically specific expressions and implications.

He based his remarks on the fundamental assumption that culture and language are so closely related that sometimes they are indistinguishable. Our perception of reality is, he maintained, a reflection of culture, expressed through language.

Prof. Ade-Ajayi exemplified the link between culture and language, citing examples in Christianity and Islam in Africa in general and in Nigeria in particular. He addressed the process of ‘indigenization’ of “universal religions” that results from the translation of religious texts into different African languages. He gave the example of the translation of the concept of “God”, and described some of the linguistic and cultural factors, in particular culturally specific translations, that can have “powerful cultural implications”. These included the incorporation and mixture of traditional religious-cultural elements into a variety of possible interpretations.

## DEBATE

In the ensuing debate, issues ranging from language and terminology in education policy development and assurance of ‘multicultural equality’, to the role of language in interpretations of religion and the various forms of extremism were raised.

Participants discussed, in some detail, the need for clarity in the

use of terminology around the concepts of multiculturalism, interculturality and intercultural education, as well as for the development of policy and legal frameworks. There was a proposal to use 'multiculturalism' as a descriptive term, rather than a policy term. 'Interculturality' was proposed as a more normative term which should become part of the legal and policy language. The need for the deconstruction of language and the introduction of "intercultural education as a new paradigm" were proposed.

With regard to policy development, participants mentioned the following issues to be taken into consideration: the issue of language and power, i.e. the national language policy being that of the 'dominant' group ("languages [as] bearers of political history"); "subtractive bilingualism", which implies the first language of instruction not being the mother tongue and its implications and the "the cosmology of the second language"; the question of "what happens when minorities are actually majorities?"; as well as questions of "quality and equal-

ity" and "equality with dignity" as, for example, in the Latin American context.

The question "How does education policy engage with practices and institutions?" was raised and gave rise to a discussion around issues such as "second class empowerment"; different systems and "bodies of knowledge", including the concept of "centric knowledge"; and the need for a "critical engagement" as the role of the schools for intercultural education.

"The cost of being indigenous" was a concern, raised in reference to a World Bank study on the economic implications of intercultural bilingual education in Latin America. Participants agreed on the need for legal frameworks and further analysis of public and local education policies to respond to "local global complexities".

Further points discussed included language, religion and belief, as well as the role of arts education as a part of intercultural education.

## Synthesis and Commentary of Panel I:

*Language and culture – are they mutually exclusive?*

*By Liam Gearon (rapporteur)*

The panel had only two presentations which allowed the group to cover a wide range of topics during the discussion. Concerning the two main issues of religion and intercultural identity, I will present 10 points:

- 1) **A systematic review**
  - Of practice and research done in this field to avoid duplication
  - Including curriculum models and issues of finance and methodology
- 2) **The concept of culture:**
  - To be seen as a source of harmony and unity, but also as a source of conflict
  - Cannot be separated from the power structure
  - Is also related to the ideology of language
- 3) **Cultural homogeneity vs. heterogeneity**
  - And how this dichotomy is played out in educational system
- 4) **Minority vs. majority:**
  - How does their relationship play out in educational settings; how does it affect the curriculum?
- 5) **Unitary issues**
  - What is the role of culture in either building social cohesion or fragmenting identity
  - Building a national identity vs. multiple identities
- 6) **Quality and equality in education**
- 7) **The role of the individual in relation to these collective considerations**
- 8) **The need to engage in policy and practice**
  - What does this engagement mean beyond theoretical considerations of schools and teacher training?
- 9) **The concept(s) of knowledge**
  - The epistemological question of knowledge
  - The relationship(s) of culture/power/knowledge
  - Hierarchies of knowledge – the prioritization of certain kinds of knowledge, and what is legitimate knowledge
  - The economic dimension of knowledge, on the local and global levels
- 10) **Centric knowledge**
  - The question of ethnocentricity and who decides on the definition of culture and knowledge and its implications
  - The role of governments and IGOs concerning curriculum and teacher training
  - Implied historical considerations on colonial and post-colonial knowledge systems

# Panel II

## Changing scenarios for intercultural education

### PRESENTATIONS

#### 1. **Luis Enrique Lopez:** **Intercultural Education in Latin America**

Luis Enrique Lopez introduced his presentation on the situation and issues around intercultural education in Latin America by describing the regional context vis a vis cultural and linguistic diversity, and current programmes of intercultural education. He stated that afro-descendents were not included in the general discussions on intercultural education, since the issue of 'interculturalism' from its inception was closely linked to indigenous issues. Therefore, the afro-descendents issue represents a separate challenge.

He began by giving a statistical overview of the Latin American indigenous situation, explaining that

the indigenous population comprises 40-50 million, with 400 separate groups constituting 10% of the overall population of the continent, and numbers varying from country to country. He stated that there has been an increase in indigenous political participation and in demands for bilingual education and indigenous knowledge in schools. Indeed, one of the results of the increased indigenous participation has been the recognition of indigenous languages as legally official.

The main issues addressed by Lopez were the history and current situation of Intercultural Bilingual Education (IBE), the relationship between what he termed 'interculturalism' and education and the status of Intercultural Education (IE). He described the development of Intercultural Bilingual Education, beginning in the 1930s as a "long period of trial and error", initially rooted in "governmental schemes which sought

to assimilate with the aim of creating a homogenous nation state". It was only in the late 1970s and early 80s that the current definition of Intercultural Bilingual Education emerged. Today this is one of the main political demands of the indigenous population, and forms part of most national education systems even though it is principally at primary school level. To date only 11-22% of the indigenous communities are reached. A positive achievement is the inclusion of Intercultural Bilingual Education in national EFA plans throughout the region, with an active indigenous participation in school management, an adoption of alternative historical perspectives of learning and increasing number of indigenous educators. Today it has strong support from the indigenous leadership, but nevertheless includes demands for more radical approaches, making the challenges both political and epistemological. An example of on-going work at the policy level is the "Latin American Congresses of Intercultural Bilingual Education" held every two years.

In addressing the relationship between 'interculturalism' and education, Lopez first defined 'interculturalism' as describing 'intercultural relations in society', and explained that unlike 'multiculturalist positions', 'interculturalism' challenges "the notion of the homogenous nation state towards multiethnic societies and plurina-

tional states". He described constitutional reforms beginning to take place, with the concomitant acknowledgment of realities of 'multiethnicity', 'multiculturalism' and 'multilingualism'.

Intercultural Education, he stated, is perceived as the "appropriate response to the new need derived from the "return to the Indian" movements of the early 80s. It is a useful entry point to discussions on citizenship in multiethnic societies, contributing to social and legal policy changes, such as educational laws and curriculum reforms. As opposed to Intercultural Bilingual Education, Intercultural Education is only in its initial stage, the main challenges including the stereotype that Intercultural Education is "for indigenous people only", the afro-descendent issue and the operationalization of Intercultural Education. Lopez underlined the need for exchange of experiences with experts of other regions on this and related topics. Finally, he stressed the importance of the "recuperation of political inspiration of both Intercultural Education and Bilingual Intercultural Education in the struggle against racism and discrimination in Latin America".

In concluding, Lopez listed a number of issues for reflection in relation to intercultural education: racism as not only existent in minds, but hidden in legislation; class and economic issues; the

issue of power relations, international trends in educational testing, issues of cultural identity/ies; and relevant to the Latin American context in particular: changing self-perceptions of Latin American countries, the “unexpected perverse effect of decentralization for intercultural education”, i.e. diverging political interest on national and local levels.

## 2. Alexandre Marc: Intercultural Education and the Situation of the Roma

Alexandre Marc opened his presentation by making a link to the previous presentation, pointing out that the political and economic challenges of Roma in East Europe have parallels with those of the indigenous people in Latin America, confirming and reiterating the need for exchange.

He then presented some historical background on the Roma, explaining that the term Roma with regard to the self-identification of these communities is a complex issue. He described the Roma as one of the oldest cultural communities of Europe, going back to the 10-13th century, with different historical versions of their origins; and as having diverse dialects and customs. They were marginalized and persecuted during the Holocaust. Today their number is estimated at 6 million in Europe and 10 million around the

world, with the exact numbers being difficult to determine. He explained that 50% of the Roma people are under the age of 20, with little or no access to education. He listed “distance [as] a cultural feature of the Roma”. The diversity of the communities and the issues around self-identification pose challenges, he argued, with regard to census taking, resulting in the lack of precise data. There was also an ensuing lack of political organization for the identification of needs and possible solutions, including improvement of access to education and policy development. “The Roma are the real losers of economic liberalization” argued Marc, as they “become even more vulnerable in an increasingly economically oriented competitive environment”, and, in the context of the rise of nationalism in Eastern Europe, without any improvement in either access or levels of education.

Marc pointed to the poor state of the education system in the countries of the region and the urgent need for reform. Decentralization processes added to the challenges, since political decentralization was not necessarily followed by a fiscal one, resulting in low political willingness for change at the local level. Barriers to access to schooling for Roma children were the collapse of preschool education, one of the means of exposing Roma children to the majority language, enabling a successful entry into the school system; the lack of support

to cover transportation, food and learning materials; and a wide use of psychological testing to determine intellectual abilities in children, resulting in a discriminatory barrier. These tests, he maintained, are culturally and linguistically biased, leading to 80% of Roma children being sent to special schools for the mentally handicapped. He also cited the issue of culturally biased curricula and the difficulty of mother language teaching due to the diversity of dialects, as well as a lack of Roma mother tongue qualified teachers, as being further barriers.

In the context of the increasing number of Eastern European countries gaining membership of European Union, Marc described the efforts of European level policies, which pressure government to address these issues. Implementation is slow. Major challenges are insufficient funding, a lack of political support due to the non-existent political organization of the Roma communities, and the lack of implementation of the legislation that has been passed.

Marc concluded by suggesting that in regard to the question of intercultural education for Roma, the level of awareness and understanding concerning concepts of multi-ethnicity, multilingualism and multiculturalism is extremely rudimentary. He spoke of the need for substantial improvement in the functioning of education systems.

### **3. Crain Soudien:** **“Skating on the Surface of Multiculturalism” – A Perspective on Intercultural Education in South Africa**

In his presentation on the question of intercultural education in South Africa, Crain Soudien described the development of the education system since the end of Apartheid, looking at how far it had advanced in embracing intercultural, multi-ethnic and multilingual concepts, as well as the values of equality in terms of race, gender and sex.

He provided an overview of the changes and developments at a general policy level, as well as educational policies and their implementation.

The new era following the end of apartheid in 1994, he argued, had inherited a “profoundly discriminatory educational system” with youth considered “not only as white and black but critically as distinct ethnic groups”. Indeed, ironically, “apartheid was a form of multiculturalism. Tolerance and respect for difference ... were not its aims. It was a multiculturalism inspired by white supremacy”.

As examples for changes in the new system, Soudien presented the South African Schools Act, which “abolished race in education” and gave children the “right of access to schools of their choice”, as well

as the “Curriculum 2005”, which was adopted in 1997 by the Ministry of Education and addressed the new values of inclusion, equality and respect for diversity. Both were developed through a participatory process, assisted by international curriculum development experts, and both were revised following public criticism.

Further instruments for the introduction of these new values in the curriculum were the National Curriculum Statements (NCS), which refer to the new South African Constitution, and its commitment to “issues of diversity such as poverty, inequality, race, gender, language, age, disability...”. Furthermore, the new curriculum in theory recognized the importance of indigenous knowledge systems. Following these changes, Soudien asked what had been achieved “10 years into this bright new world”. He acknowledged a process whereby South Africa had to “come to terms with reality” after having practiced “models of niceness” with the “sacrifice of models of realness”, indicating the results as being “less than auspicious”.

With regard to integration, he quoted the Minister of Education as admitting that “the stark answer to these questions is that children in our schools are not integrating”. Among the categories of formerly “white”, “Indian”, “coloured” and “African” schools, Crain described the greatest movement to

have been that of “Indian” and coloured” children towards formerly “white” schools. There was also a large exodus from formerly “African” schools, mostly towards formerly “coloured” and “Indian” schools, as a one way movement, while all schools retained the racial profile of their teachers.

As the second indicator for the implementation of the new policies he listed the curriculum and teaching reality. The new curriculum had been successful, he maintained, in addressing the main forms of exclusion, such as race, gender, language and class, as well as awareness-raising on “how racism works”, but does not succeed in “engaging with the everyday world of Africa”. Of particular interest in the context of intercultural education, he mentioned the failure to implement cultural and linguistic elements, namely the inclusion of “indigenous knowledge systems” and teaching in other mother tongues. Due to a lack of teachers able or willing to teach in indigenous languages, as well as a lack of assistance in how to practice the teaching of “indigenous knowledge”, most teachers choose not to do so.

Soudien concluded this question with the statement that “African children ... are thus required to do all the cultural and racial work” finding their way “across the divides of the dominant white school culture and the everyday culture



of their homes”, which in his eyes left South Africa “in a dangerous place”. He described this danger as two-fold: firstly, formal integration has only taken place in privileged schools; and secondly, learning has become an essentially middle-class and white attribute.

He described as a consequence “children from non-dominant cultures ... forever having to play ‘catch-up’”; with the additional linguistic challenge of the language of instruction being their second or third. The result is that such children are unable to perform as well as their ‘white’ peers, who do not have to deal with crossing cultures and “cultural decoding” in their everyday life. This, according to Soudien, leads to patterns and routines that “reproduce their own psychological and social syndromes”.

Soudien named this “the deep and often unspoken cultural tragedy of South Africa”. He called for more attention to be paid to these questions in the form of discussion in schools around the linkages between culture and learning, and the impact of particular cultural approaches. Another proposal, more complex in nature, would be the facilitation of policy discussions on “habits, customs, and practices” affect learning.

He concluded by maintaining that there is a kind of “end point” on “how to enter into the zone of the

Other”, and mentioned Allport’s contact hypothesis and concept of “contact management”. Concerning multicultural relations and intercultural education, he stated that “the difficulty ... [for] a multicultural policy is that the basic framework of learning is ... framed by ‘middle-class presumptions’”. Soudien finished with the question: “can these presumptions be neutralised and/or assimilated into diverse settings without these settings giving up values that a group or individual might hold dear?”

#### 4. Johanna Lasonen: Intercultural Education in the Context of Internationalization, Localization and Globalization

Johanna Lasonen presented approaches to Intercultural Education from a Finnish perspective, including related issues of minorities, the integration of immigrants and language policies. Her presentation introduced the relationship of (and the gap between) intercultural education and international education, with a particular focus on the mobility and internationality of the Finnish work force, as implications of the development of intercultural competencies and a successful approach towards intercultural education.

She opened her presentation by pointing to the timeliness and significance of this meeting. In the

context of increasing “internationalization, localization and globalization” the need for intercultural dialogue and intercultural education was, she maintained, today greater than ever.

A list of questions set the outline for her development of an approach for intercultural education, including: What is possible/desirable for education? What is the status of Intercultural Education – what is being implemented, what is missing? What kind of Intercultural Education do we desire for the future?

Lasonen began to describe her definition of Intercultural Education in the context of language policies in Finland and their relevance to the successful integration of immigrants, and then developed a concept of cultural competences leading to a proposed approach to intercultural education. She defined Intercultural Education in four dimensions, of a practical, legal and philosophical nature: “a way of thinking and a value orientation”, “a framework for decision-making criteria”, “covering issues involved in curriculum, instruction, learning, administration and learning environments”, and “an alternative way of thinking about how to provide quality education”.

One of the challenges for intercultural education is the integration of minorities and immigrants into Finnish society and its workforce. Finnish Language policies

represent an important element in this process. They recognize Finnish and Swedish as official languages (as well as recognizing some 30 minority languages, that are immigrants’ mother tongues, as teaching languages), and, in addition, grants children the right to have the lessons of their mother tongue at least in primary education. However, Finnish legislation requires immigrants to speak Finnish. The majority of the Finns are learning several foreign languages in school.

“What kinds of teaching approaches are needed for intercultural education?” With this question, Lasonen introduced another element in regard to intercultural education, calling for a reassessment of teaching methods, materials and teacher education, for all levels of education, from primary to tertiary, and including formal and non-formal education, vocational education and teacher training. This review, she argued, should include the development of intercultural competences as the basis for intercultural education. Lasonen then advanced the importance of interculturality and cultural competences beyond national educational and institutional settings, referring to the implications of intercultural competences for increased international mobility of students and workers at the national and European level.

Returning to the question of intercultural education, she proposed

five “arrangements of learning environments for intercultural education”, namely physical, social, technical, pedagogical and empowering learning environments.

She concluded her presentation by elaborating on the clarification and definition of terms within the context of Intercultural Education, beginning with Intercultural Education itself.

She defined Intercultural Education as “a reform movement that emphasizes revising the structural, procedural, substantive, and evaluative components of education and training to reflect the social, cultural, ethnic, racial, and linguistic pluralism”, and “a process of institutionalizing the philosophy of interculturality within education and training systems”. She went on to argue that the terms of multicultural education and intercultural education have often been used to refer to the same thing; however their meanings differ. Multicultural and intercultural education both aim at adopting the structures and contents of education in multicultural societies. However, multicultural education refers to improving the education of immigrant youth and other minority groups. The term ‘intercultural’ is used when referring to education and training, and the term ‘multicultural’ when referring to a culturally diverse society.

She made the following distinctions:

- **Multicultural education** is often used in the context of adjusting immigrant groups to new home countries by preparing them to live and work on a daily basis in multicultural communities and societies.
- **Intercultural education** prepares the learners to act as interpreters and mediators between different cultures. This concept is often used in the context of international and intercultural cooperation promoting understanding and diversity.
- **Multicultural competence** refers to the ability to develop ethical policies, strategies and decisions that concern minority groups.
- **Intercultural competence** refers to the ability to work in international and multicultural working environments, to contribute to learning between different cultures and to collaborate.

In her view, the role of intercultural education is to provide an optimal environment for intercultural learning through intercultural communication and dialogue. It aims at intercultural understanding and competence, and prepares students to adapt to, live, and work in multicultural work communities and multicultural societies. It can be implemented at all levels of formal education, in the contexts of non-formal education and in work places.

She closed with the question of whether “intercultural competences” are a separate subject or whether it might be an essential component of overall education. In an internationalized world, she argued, intercultural competence should be considered an internal element of every type of education and training and of domain-specific expertise. From the perspective of professional education, broadly understood competence covers personal characteristics as well as core competence and skills such as language skills and knowledge and understanding of cultures, civilizations and their history.

## 5. Christiane Jeitani:

### The Role of School in Promoting Intercultural Dialogue and Intercultural Learning: The Associated Schools Network Experience in Lebanon

As an example of intercultural education in practice, Christiane Jeitani presented the intercultural activities of the Associated Schools Network (ASPnet) in Lebanon. She gave a brief background of ASPnet Lebanon, coordinated by the Lebanese National Commission of Lebanon for UNESCO, describing its establishment in 1994 with 10 schools to the situation today with 45 schools, both public and private and ranging from primary through to secondary level institutions. They included Christian, Muslim and secular schools.

She then presented some examples of intercultural activities at national, international and interregional levels. They included a film contest under the title “Lebanon – the civilization and the human being” among Lebanese ASP schools promoting the diversity of cultural heritage within Lebanon. They also included a number of student exchange projects, with ASP schools in Japan, Germany and Denmark, aiming at intercultural exchange and cooperation on intercultural projects, as well as the participation of Lebanese ASP schools in the Euro-Mediterranean schools network. These activities were coordinated by the Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation in the context of its “Euro-Arab Dialogue” activities.

## DEBATE

Based on the presentations and the concepts, ideas and proposals advanced by the presenters, the debate centred on the so-called socially and individually “hidden hatreds”, including politically motivated and collectively inherited agendas of discrimination, legislative policies and curricula. They also addressed the need for an “understanding not just of education, but of the subconscious and unconscious divides of our society”, and ways of eliminating them, through an examination of the concept of

justice, the “exposure of the hidden in order to attack it”, and “a shift in paradigm” for approaches to intercultural education. In this context, the importance of the intercultural training of teachers’ educators was stressed.

The discussion of concrete examples in Finland and the ASP schools in Lebanon confirmed the existence of systemic barriers throughout educational settings. Participants agreed that from the presentations a number of parallels emerged, concerning challenges faced by minorities and vulnerable social groups, most evidently between the Roma of Eastern Europe and the indigenous peoples of Latin America. Common difficulties included class issues as well as economic exclusion resulting from the non-recognition of indigenous and minority languages; questions of self-perception and identification; the weakening of the culture of certain groups; and the need for an inclusive process of nation building.

The need for exchange and dialogue across countries and regions was expressed as “building mirrors”.

The issue of “tolerance” was discussed. Some experts felt it was too weak and ill-defined a concept, and that discourse needed to move beyond passive issues of tolerance towards constructive mutual respect.

## Synthesis and Commentary of Panel II:

*Changing scenarios for intercultural education*

*By Sylvia Schmelkes (rapporteur)*

The panel consisted of five presentations dealing with changing scenarios for intercultural education. It provided a very broad view of the problems facing intercultural education in different and changing scenarios in the world:

### **Latin America: The situation of bilingual and intercultural education in Latin America**

- Intercultural education is an indigenous demand, mostly part of educational policy
- Multiculturality now mostly recognized, as well as the relationship between intercultural education and citizenship
- Main challenge is the application of principles in school and society

### **Eastern Europe: A description and analysis of the situation of the Roma people in Eastern Europe today**

- The Roma are losing languages, traditions and culture leading to a deterioration in self-identification, and further exclusion, socially, economically and in the face of the rise of nationalist tendencies
- Exclusion extends to education, with a lack of political will for assistance

### **South Africa: A critical analysis of the state of educational integration in South Africa since the end of Apartheid**

- Integration in education did not develop as imagined
- Burden of integration on black Africans who have to adapt to new languages and schools
- Cause: changes take longer than expected, possible need for policy revision
- Hidden curriculum of dominant middle-class white culture and a strong relationship between culture and learning

### **Finland: Language policies and the situation of intercultural education of minorities and immigrants in Finland**

- Need for open long term policy for intercultural education for both minorities and the majority
- Advanced language policy on recognized minority languages as well as on the right to mother language instruction in primary education
- The role of higher education and importance of further teaching and research on intercultural education

### **Lebanon: A description of the activities of the UNESCO Associated Schools Programme in Lebanon**

- Associated Schools Project in Lebanon as a good example of active school involvement in intercultural and interfaith education, nationally and internationally

### **Commonalities between these scenarios of intercultural education:**

- All are dynamic and problematic
- Transformations seem to take longer than expected, or “take the wrong turn”
- Policy and legislation help, but are insufficient

### **For the advancement of intercultural education:**

- Education should start with the education of teachers; more is to be done in teacher training and research
- Policy should be auto-critical concerning ethnocentrism and the predominance of a homogenous view of nations and cultures, in order to achieve a certain degree of coherence allowing moving ahead.

Hidden hatreds perpetuate discrimination despite existing discourse. These paradoxes and contradictions face educators in their daily work. Education is an important platform for facing cultural asymmetries and injustices, but is insufficient vis-à-vis discrimination imbedded in legislative and institutional structures and everyday intercultural relationships. Synergies have to be sought through intersectoral cooperation and policies.

Class issues and the colonial heritage still represent an obstacle in the achievement of intercultural education.

In an increasingly global and international world intercultural education is more than ever needed, as well as its promotion and strengthening and the establishment of a consistent farsighted policy for each national, regional and local context.

# Panel III

## Are interfaith education issues part of intercultural education?

### PRESENTATIONS

#### 1. Liam Gearon: **The Role of Religion in Civic, Citizenship and Human Rights Education and the United Nations**

Liam Gearon's presentation addressed the two main issues of 'religious and secular culture' and the tension or dichotomy of religion versus Human Rights, or, as he presented it "cultural conflict – where religion and Human Rights might clash".

He began his presentation by stating three main theses:

- i. "The role of religion has been underplayed in national and international policies but it is clear that religion is a key player in both private and public life
- ii. The role of religion in civic-citizenship/HR education should

be accepted as such  
iii. Religion has also traditionally been divorced from historical/political contexts and this must be resolved

His comments referred to the situation of the United Kingdom, where religious education is addressed in interfaith and citizenship classes. In his view, areas of potential religious and cultural conflict are mirrored in education policies.

He illustrated these issues in four critical contexts: religion and global governance, religion and the United Nations, religion in citizenship and human rights education, and citizenship/human rights education in religious education. Each of these contexts was presented with theses and anti-theses as follows:

#### ***Critical Context 1: Religion and Global Governance***

Thesis: The role of religion in public and political life has been historically underplayed since



the European Enlightenment  
Antithesis: Increasing evidence of the importance of religion in post-Cold War public and political life, centring on issues of Human Rights, including freedom of religion or belief

### ***Critical context 2: Religion and the United Nations***

Thesis: The UN system has incorporated and defined freedom of religion or belief since the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but the early history of the UN tended to downplay religious and ideological diversity

Anti-thesis: From the late 1970s and with the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief (1981) the UN system began to recognize the international significance of religion for a stable world order

### ***Critical context 3: Religion in Citizenship and Human Rights Education***

Thesis: The role of religion in civic education, citizenship and human rights education has been underplayed

Anti-thesis: Broader global trends show increasing recognition of the importance of religion in citizenship and HR education, though the recognition of teaching about religion remains less strong in civic education than in religious education

### ***Critical context 4: Citizenship / HR Education in Religious Education***

Thesis: The political (e.g. citizenship/HR) has been underplayed in religious education, and the historical context has been side-stepped.

Anti-thesis: The exponential growth of civic/citizenship education globally has forced religious education to consider the political and historical, this growth forced upon education by manifold changes in the world in which we live.

## **2. Ali Omar El Kashef: Towards a Future Model of Education**

In his presentation, Ali Omar El Kashef outlined what a model of intercultural education for the future could look like, giving the main lines of this model, as well as describing his proposals for future educational philosophy.

He called for “education and culture ... [as] a global programme”, and stressed the importance of “access to future intercultural education”, as well as the democratization of education, which, he maintained, should become “a lifestyle”, evoking the need for learning to live together on an everyday basis. Furthermore, he stated that issues of equity and justice are prerequisites for the development of his model of education, which should include a moral dimension. He called for a “scien-

tific curriculum” to teach students rigour and objectivity.

He then described some elements of a possible future educational philosophy, comprising the improvement of a “global education”, the development of a culture of “‘intercultural’ sharing of educational challenges” and the “development of [an] educational planning ideology or spirit” which included reflections on changes in different faiths as well as in interaction and communication.

Concerning suggested directions for the future model of education, El Kashef stressed the need for guidelines on the various challenges to education posed by conflictual religious and/or cultural relations, and for related research.

### **3. Gary Bouma:** **“To Try to Ignore Religion is to Stick Your Head in the Sand”** **– The Place of Religion in Intercultural Education**

Gary Bouma opened his presentation by providing a general context for the role of religion in society. He noted the increase in religiously motivated violent conflict since the end of the Cold War, and “increased religious conflict over social policy”. He then addressed the question of the place of religion in public space, including in schools and other public educational settings, which, according to his experience, provoked

differing opinions. Some argue that secularity offers a neutral and objective position from which to consider the historical role of religion. This view denies a legitimate role for religion in public affairs and fails to understand that secularism is itself a committed value position and not neutral, he maintained.

He reflected on the meaning of related terms, e.g. “Religion/Faith”, “Belief” and “Spirituality”, stressing the cultural bias of words and terms used, and that many are “informed by Western Christian organizational concepts, not all of which apply to other societies and cultures”.

Prof. Bouma suggested four reasons why religion should indeed be part of intercultural education, in spite of the fact that, “many teachers don’t know how to teach religion”. As a first point, he evoked the social context stating that “due to increased contact and conflict both between and within religious groups, a misunderstanding of “how religion works”, is one result of a lack of interfaith education, and leads to “inaccurately conceived social policy, including educational policy”. His second point addressed the role of religion in public space, since, he argued “it is not possible to keep religion out of public space”, as images of what is good are informed by religions and based on collective religious history. He described this by saying that to ignore “...the chain of memory that religious practice constitutes and reproduces” is “to be wilfully ignorant

of a factor shaping people's thinking and nations' social policy".

Prof. Bouma argued that a further issue to address was that of secularity, which, according to him "... should be taught about and examined as a committed value and belief position, no less orienting than religious ones and no more 'scientific'. Clear boundaries between religious perspectives and the conduct of science are essential to do each well." Finally, as most classrooms are now multi-faith spaces, he spoke of the need to understand each religion in general and of religious groups in particular, so that "the other may understand who you are", thus affirming the significance of religions and education about religion for the development of one's identity and the implications for multifaith education.

He concluded his presentation by describing the lack of interreligious and interfaith teaching as a failure to provide essential intercultural education, for: "to deprive children of knowledge about the religions of the world is to fail to educate them to know about themselves and the world and how to live together".

#### **4. Dai-Geun Kang:** **A Reflection on Interfaith Education**

Dai-Geun Kang described interfaith education as a logical extension and essential element of

intercultural education and in the context of current social and cultural diversity.

He began by discussing cultural diversity "as a new universal ethic in the cause for peace and development", informed by a variety of sources, including UNESCO's Constitution, a presentation at the "UNESCO Round Table on Cultural and Intellectual Cooperation and the New International Economic Order" (Paris, 1976) and Neil Postman's "law of diversity". He stated the importance of language, referring to the need for terminological clarification of the terms used in the debate on intercultural education, and demonstrated his point citing Lao Tsu concerning the naming of things and the simultaneous impossibility to name.

He discussed the need for intercultural education as a "critical pedagogy" to address social and political challenges and the increase of cultural and religious tensions, stressing the role of interfaith education as part of intercultural education to counter the religious dimension of "bias, discrimination and hate crimes". He described it as an "alternative pedagogy as well as a means to overcome present religious conflicts" and referred to its contribution to a culture of peace.

He concluded with a call for engagement in further discussion "to identify what constitutes interfaith

education”, and closed with the following quote by Mahatma Gandhi: “An eye for an eye just makes the whole world blind”.

### 3. Jagdish Gundara: Religion and the Secular State

Prof. Gundara presented a reflection on religion and the secular state. His main thesis was that in a secular state religion can be free and the state can provide protection to all religions and religious groups, if a coherent educational and social policy is formed based on the commonalities between all groups and peoples and the principles of Human Rights. However, at the moment, economic changes in the polity are guiding changes in educational and social policy.

He began his presentation by stating the need to develop concepts and notions of the sacred and the secular in their different phases of knowledge. The first phase, he explained, did not establish the real unification of humanity. The second phase of the Enlightenment moved the discussion ahead significantly, but has not been achieved. In making this argument he asserted the need for the development of a protective space. In thinking along these lines it is important to recognize the need, not for the recognition of difference, but rather of similarity.

He discussed some related issues in detail, including the link between the level of education and the level of devotion in a social context, pointing to the fact that there is no easy uncausal correlation between low levels of education and high levels of devotion since many people with high levels of education are also deeply religious.

Another issue he raised was the distinction between individual rights and group rights and the increasing possibility of the viability of the idea of universal rights. He also discussed the “post-colonial challenge” of older forms of religious institutions, and their role in the strengthening of the nation state. In a post-colonial context he addressed the teaching of history in schools and the need for history to teach intercultural understanding. He linked this to his previous point on intercultural or multicultural identities and the need to recognise that identities are not singular.

#### DEBATE

The debate following Panel III covered a wide range of related issues, ranging from the incorporation of local practices into the national context, the positioning and role of atheism in the debate on interfaith education, the dichotomy of the secular versus the sacred, the religious in the public and private domain, and the practice of interfaith and inter-religious education.

The discussion focused on the incorporation of local practice in the context of global and national change. Participants noted the erosion and marginalization of local cultures and faiths and debated the protection of religious groups by the state, and the risk of confusing religion and political power. They also discussed the related issue of using religious or interfaith conflict to conceal political interests. The example of Nigeria was given as a secular state, which, despite constitutional and legislative moves towards secularism, would in fact not approve of a non-believer as president.

The discussion on atheism, religion and the “end of secularism” gave rise to a comparison of communism vs. religion from a historical perspective and atheism vs. religion today. The point was made that “atheism and secularism are dying”, as illustrated by the example of Australia, where 15% confess to no religion, but only 0.02% identify as atheists.

The separation of state and church was a further item for discussion, including the question of the protection of religious groups in a secular state versus a religious one, based on tolerance, hospitality or patronization. Another point mentioned was the reflection of the separation of state and church in education, which often implies a lack of religious education that is replaced by civic education, giving emphasis to “common values” of a national nature. Further issues discussed concerned a call for the

exploration of the “grey area between the private and public domain” with regard to religious practices, the distinction between lay vs. secular states and the wearing of religious symbols in public.

A number of concrete examples in regard to the practice of religious education were presented. They included the teaching methodology for religions in the UK and the problem of rigid conceptualizations of religions, as well as the challenge of implementing interfaith education in Korea where most private schools are religious and teach only about their own religion. The example of a UNESCO project in Lebanon to develop a textbook of different religions supporting interreligious learning among religious communities gave rise to the possibility of persisting “negative imaginations”, which can prevent true inter-religious learning despite the provision of materials. The example given of visits between religious communities illustrated the position that religious learning takes place not only as a “scholarly transfer of knowledge”, but also effectively in “multicultural, inter-religious being with” the other, and getting to know the surrounding contexts.

## Synthesis and Commentary of Panel III: *Are interfaith education issues part of intercultural education?* By Crain Soudien (rapporteur)

### The cultural puzzle of sameness and difference

The answer was, yes interfaith issues are very much part of the cultural puzzle of sameness and difference, but clearly now have to be read through the social dynamics of the current social, political and economic conjuncture. The nature of the world, especially the movement of the world away from the binary structure yielded by the Cold War, has released new understandings of Self and Other. It has brought the world to a point where we see new ways in which Self and Other can be configured. Its is critical, however, to make the point that as in previous conjunctures, this structural configuration contains a complex of different forms of marginalization and that these are often subsumed underneath one or other dominant forms or are articulated and expressed anew as a result of the conjuncture.

### SUMMARY OF THE PRESENTATIONS:

#### Liam Gearon

- Gave a short introduction on the context in the UK where religion is taught in a number of different configurations
- Made the point that conflicts in culture and religion are finding expression in religious education
- Drew attention to four critical contexts

for understanding the place of religion and multifaith education

- Suggested that we ought to be paying more attention to the conflict between the religious and the secular

#### Ali Omar El Kashef

- Argued that more studies are needed in interfaith conflicts to give direction to solving problems
- Presented some guidelines for intercultural education
- Emphasized the need for better and more research

#### Gary Bouma

- Stated that the end of the Cold War had brought a religious resurgence around the world and an increase in religiously motivated social conflict
- Drew attention to the use of terms, explaining the problem of terms used in a Western context
- Addressed the issue of the “imagined Other”, especially between Christianity and Islam – this ‘other’ did not exist but had come to provide the basis for poor policy-making, and the reality was that religion was back on the agenda
- Presented four reasons why religious education should be part of education

#### Dai-Geun Kang

- “Cultural diversity a critical ethic for the 21st century”: ignoring each other’s ways

was the problem of the 20th century

- Question of the confusion of use of terms in the context of the importance of language – the ‘mother of all things’
- Suggestion: values of intercultural education to encourage critical thinking and creative imagination

### Jagdish Gundara

- Need to develop notions of the sacred and the secular in their different phases of knowledge: first phase did not establish the real unification of humanity; second phase of the enlightenment moved the discussion ahead significantly but has not been achieved
- Need for the development of a protective space. In thinking along these lines it is important to recognise the need not for the recognition of difference but of similarity
- At present time no easy equation between low levels of education and high levels of devoutness
- Post-colonial challenges of older forms of religious institutions have led to the strengthening of the nation state
- Distinction between individual rights and group rights
- Issue of history teaching to students and the need to teach intercultural understanding

## DISCUSSION

### Issues that arose in discussion:

- Local traditions being disrupted by larger religions
- Should religions be treated as frozen entities and should the powers of the

state be used to protect these?

- A great deal of interfaith conflict is not about religion
- Atheism is not being discussed today
- Significance of the end of the Cold War and Communism holding atheism together, with the exception of China

### Major discussion

- The role of the state and the notion of protection as opposed to hospitality
- Indigenous groups recovering older, seemingly buried practices
- Danger in even First World is retreat of identity into singularity
- Issue of separation of private and public sphere

### Core Issues

- The limitations of our discourses at the present time. Suggestion by rapporteur: two discourses of the contact hypothesis: 1. the intellectual heir to our Enlightenment heritage – summed up in the belief that through ‘knowing’ we will be able to get beyond ignorance which is the “mother of distrust”; 2. the multicultural alternative which is essentially about accepting the Other through different ways of knowing
- The role of the state – where should the state sit in relation to core issues in different parts of the world. Is the role of the state the same in these different places?
- Youth identity and youth socialization
- The question of learning and how learning might take place

# IV. Discussion of the draft 'UNESCO Guidelines on Intercultural Education'

## SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS

One of the main purposes of the expert group meeting was to draft received inputs on “UNESCO Guidelines on Intercultural Education”, currently being developed by the Section in the context of its activities on Intercultural Education. In the presentation of the document by Linda King, the nature and purpose of the document was explained as a normative framework based on already existent declarations and conventions. Two questions were posed to the experts for discussion:

1. Do we need UNESCO Guidelines on Intercultural Education?
2. If we do, how can these guidelines be improved?

## DEBATE

The discussion of the draft guidelines ranged from general comments to concrete suggestions for the modification of the document.

It included the examination of issues such as the implementation of the guidelines in practice and policy developments; the future development and position of intercultural education in society, practice and theory; reflections of related issues and concepts, including the ‘intercultural education’ of stakeholders; context specificity; methods of testing and assessment; “intercultural education and governability”; and linguistic, cultural and historical perspectives of minorities and ‘dominated majorities’.

Concerning the first question, participants confirmed the need for such guidelines, describing the document as a “very important document, for the present context of intercultural education” as well as an “absolute necessity” considering “the way the world works...” and a “currently valid and useful synthesis of the existing legal framework”. However, they also expressed some concerns regarding their generality and the question of successful implementation. The need for practical guidance through examples was raised (this issue was addressed in more detail later in the discussion, as described below), as well as a



caution from the Latin American participants for a context specific applicability with regards to terminology. General consensus was expressed on the need to render the document more lively and interesting to stakeholders, mentioning the risk of it being turned into a set of 'regulations', rather than a 'teaching and learning tool'.

Some debate evolved around the applicability of the principles in concrete settings, expressing a need for a practical perspective including concrete examples and guidance for their implementation. This gave rise to the idea of two separate documents, one as a normative framework such as the present draft, and a second one to provide more concrete guidance on the implementation of policies and principles.

## Presentation of “Tensions”

With regards to the second question, i.e. input from the experts on modifications for the improvement of the document, a number of fundamental and important points were made, that resulted in a consensus for its further development. One issue referred to the use of terminology, and the need to define for the purpose of the document terms such as “multicultural vs. intercultural vs. international education”, and “multiculturalism vs. interculturality”. The main debate on the

improvement of the document centred on what was termed the presentation of “tensions”. There was a proposal for the introduction of the document to focus on the tensions around intercultural education, in order to “keep the struggle in (the guidelines)” as one participant put it, and to provide a debate on the existing challenges rather than attempting to give final solutions.

Issues which emerged included context specificity vs. universality of UNESCO documents as well as their normative vs. descriptive nature. Other “tensions” concerned the role of language in intercultural education, majority vs. minority populations (including the “direction of intercultural education”, either from the majority to the minority or vice versa) as well as the question of “dominated majorities” and intercultural education. Further suggestions concerned the need for the document to recognize multiculturalism and its existence “in different places”, to be reflected in policies and social realities and the ensuing allowance for difference. Other topics included the issue of culturally biased methods of testing and assessment in educational settings, and the need for the development of culturally sensitive methodologies – or as expressed by another participant – the need for a theoretical reorientation away from the existing “deficit-oriented theories” towards those inclusive of difference. This was acknowledged to

be a challenge due to the political sensitivity of such shifts. The inclusion of interfaith education as an important component of intercultural education is, according to participants, of high importance, as a form of “confronting reality”.

## Other comments and suggestions

Participants were of the view that a discussion on the future development of “intercultural education for all” should be included as a “critical approach”, which includes the necessity of a “historical perspective of societal cultural diversity”; the recognition that “intercultural education is not a subject matter, but an approach to learning” encompassing “different systems of knowledge”; and the perspective of seeing “multicultural education as a starting point from which to move into intercultural education”. Participants suggested the revised document “attack all levels” of stakeholders, institutions and universities, as well as decision makers concerning social, public and cultural policy. On the level of implementation, the presentation of the importance of “awareness and attitudes to knowledge and skills” was deemed important as elements to be taught and learned through intercultural education”.

With regard to the instruments presented in the documents, further conventions and declarations were suggested for inclusion, namely the

1965 UN Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples and the 1966 UNESCO Declaration of the Principles of International Cultural Cooperation.

The World Report on Cultural Diversity was mentioned as possibly providing incentives to the Guidelines, particularly on the examination of concepts of culture, and in order to “obligate players in educational policy to recognize cultural diversity”. A proposal for follow-up was the consultation of university networks, e.g. through the International University Association, which had recently completed a survey on the implementation of intercultural education at universities.

## Follow-up

In concluding the debate Linda King emphasized UNESCO’s unique leadership role as international standard setter, and convenor of diverse multicultural perspectives. As a next step it was agreed that UNESCO would rework parts of the draft document, based on the experts’ discussion and input.

# V. Presentation and Discussion of the Database on Intercultural Education

## INTRODUCTION

The database was briefly presented by Melanie Seto, including information on its purpose, structure, challenges and limitations. Two questions were then posed for discussion by the experts:

### Structure:

- a) Are the existing categories and areas of expertise representative of the work currently conducted in the field of intercultural education?

### Research methods:

- b) How can the language limitation be overcome? Are there central sources of information accessible in English, French or Spanish that can inform on references?
- c) How can the search for references be extended beyond the internet, or can internet resources be identified to inform on references?

## DISCUSSION

The existing categories seemed to find overall approval, it was suggested to expand the category 'organizations' to 'organizations/networks'; further suggestions were to add databases and journals, to which it was replied that a comprehensive compilation of bibliographical references would be a different kind of database.

With regard to the list of areas of expertise, participants suggested adding citizenship as an area, transforming the item 'Human Rights' to 'Human Rights/Citizenship'. Another suggestion concerned the modification of the item 'Diversity' to become 'Cultural and Linguistic Diversity'. The inclusion of Arts Education was discussed, but finally disregarded since it would be too broad an area and not necessarily relevant to intercultural education.

Further suggestions of areas of expertise included: "intercultural work place learning" and "public space education".

Concerning research methods and resources beyond the internet, it was suggested to include in the database 'linkages' to relevant sources/networks, as well as to provide links to non-English web sites, and a number of references were provided by the participants.

It was agreed that the paper form for additional references that had been distributed would be modified for wider distribution by the participants to their 'networks' and sent to them electronically.

# VI. Presentation of the work on the World Report on Cultural Diversity 2007

Mr. Frederic Sampson (UNESCO, Culture Sector)

Frederic Sampson presented the proposal for the World Report on Cultural Diversity 2007, currently being developed. He explained its purpose to serve as a tool to address a wide range of issues concerning cultural diversity, including a chapter on intercultural education.

He requested that the participants provide input in the form of comments, questions or written papers, which would greatly contribute to the report.

“role of media [in] negating cultural diversity”, and its new forms being “private and erosive of cultural diversity”. Two points in that context concerned learning. The first point was that, partly due to media culture, there is less inter-generational and more peer learning today. The second point addressed the observation that youth learn from media, but do not learn to “read [them] critically”, which led to a discussion on the possibility of “good” and “bad” cultural diversity and the question of the “legitimately cultural”.

## EXPERTS' COMMENTS

Debates emerged around the issues of the definition of culture and cultural diversity and the role of the media. Concerns were raised on the usefulness of obtaining results from a survey among National Commissions, with the regards to “the powerful defining of what cultural diversity is for all”. With regards to media and cultural diversity, experts mentioned the

Experts enquired about the inclusion of a variety of relevant issues in the report, including issues of language, equity, religion, leisure and sport, as well as cultural heritage projects undertaken by UNESCO Associated Schools. The presenter replied that language as well as leisure and sport would be addressed in the report, but that the topic of religion was difficult to address. Another suggestion was to include a literature review of the relevant publications.

# Annex 1: List of Participants

## I. INVITED EXPERTS:

### Jacob Ade-Ajayi

Professor Emeritus of History  
University of Ibadan  
1, Ojobadan Avenue  
Bodija Estate, Ibadan  
P.O. Box 1461  
Ibadan - Nigeria  
Tel: +234 2 8101588  
jadeas.Trust@lagosmail.sprint.com

### Gary Bouma

Chair  
UNESCO Interreligious and Intercultural  
Relations, Asia Pacific  
Monash University - Faculty of Arts  
Building 11  
School of Political and Social Inquiry,  
Room W1109  
38000 Victoria  
Australia  
Tel: +61 3 9905 2982  
Gary.Bouma@arts.monash.edu.au

### Ali Omar El Kashef

Dean  
Faculty of Education  
El-Azhar University  
88 Alzahra St.  
Dokki - Cairo  
Egypt  
Tel. +20 233 731 78

### Liam Gearon

Chair  
Association of University Lecturers  
in Religion and Education Centre for  
Research in Human Rights – Faculty of  
Education  
University of Roehampton  
Digby Stuart College  
SW155PH London  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 208 392 3661  
L.Gearon@roehampton.ac.uk

### Jagdish Gundara

Head of International Centre for  
Intercultural Studies (ICIS)  
Institute of Education  
University of London  
20 Bedford Way  
London WC1H 0AL  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 20 7612 6722  
j.gundara@ioe.ac.uk

### Christiane Jeitani

Coordinator of ASP Schools  
Lebanese National Commission for  
UNESCO  
Ministry of Culture Building  
Hamra  
Beirut  
LEBANON  
Tel: +961 1 7491 05  
cnlu@cyberia.net.lb

### Dai-Geun Kang

Director  
UNESCO Asia-Pacific Centre for Education  
in International Understanding  
50-14 Myeong-dong 2-ga, Jung-gu  
100-810 Seoul  
Republic of Korea  
Tel: +82 2 774 3981 (Extension 101)  
dgkang@unescoapceiu.org

### Johanna Lasonen

Chair  
UNITWIN/UNESCO Programme on  
Intercultural Education  
University of Jyväskylä  
P.O. Box 35  
40014 Jyväskylä  
Finland  
Tel: +358 14 260 3307  
johanna.lasonen@ktl.jyu.fi

**Luis Enrique Lopez**

Asesor Principal  
 PROEIB Bolivia  
 Casilla 6759  
 Cochabamba  
 Bolivia  
 Tel: +591 4 411 8372  
 lelopez@proeiband.es.org

**Alexandre Marc**

Director  
 Roma Education Fund  
 Váci utca 63  
 1056 Budapest  
 Hungary  
 Tel: +36 1 235 8038  
 amarc@romaeducationfund.org

**Sylvia Schmelkes**

Coordinación General de Educación  
 Intercultural y Bilingüe  
 Secretaría de Educación Pública  
 Sede Torre Diamante (TD):  
 Insurgentes Sur No. 1685  
 Col. Guadalupe Inn  
 Delegación Álvaro Obregón  
 01020 México D.F.  
 México  
 Tel.: +52 55 5480 8163  
 schmelkes@yahoo.com

**Crain Soudien**

Professor and Head of Department  
 School of Education – University of Cape  
 Town  
 Private Bag  
 7701 Rondebosch  
 South Africa  
 Tel: +21 650 2768  
 cs@humanities.uct.ac.za

**II. UNESCO PARTICIPANTS :****Mary Joy Pigozzi**

Director  
 Division for the Promotion of Quality  
 Education  
 Education Sector  
 Tel: +33 1 45 68 10 99  
 mj.pigozzi@unesco.org

**Linda King**

Chief  
 Section of Education for Peace and  
 Human Rights  
 Division for the Promotion of Quality  
 Education  
 Education Sector  
 Tel: +33 1 45 68 06 32  
 l.king@unesco.org

**Frédéric Sampson**

Coordinator of the UNESCO World Report  
 on Cultural Diversity 2007  
 Culture Sector  
 Tel: +33 1 45 68 46 66  
 f.sampson@unesco.org

**Melanie Seto**

Programme Specialist  
 Section of Education for Peace and  
 Human Rights  
 Division for the Promotion of Quality  
 Education  
 Education Sector  
 Tel: + 33 1 45 68 19 39

# Annex 2: Agenda

## Expert Meeting on Intercultural Education

UNESCO HQ, Paris, 20-22 March 2006

Section of Education for Peace and Human Rights

Room V

### Programme

20 March 2006

- 9.30am** Opening of the session,  
Mary-Joy Pigozzi, Director, Division for the Promotion of  
Quality Education
- 9.45am** Presentation of Participants  
Linda King, Chief of Section, Education for Peace and  
Human Rights
- 10.15am** Discussion of the agenda
- 10.30am** **Panel discussion I: Languages and culture – are they  
mutually exclusive?**  
Moderator: Luis Enrique Lopez  
Rapporteur: Liam Gearon  
Presentations: 1. Sylvia Schmelkes  
2. Prof. Ade-Ajayi
- 11.00am** Coffee break
- 11.15am** Continuation of panel discussion
- 13.00pm** Lunch with the invited experts at the UNESCO  
Restaurant, 7th floor
- 2.30pm** Continuation of panel discussion



**3.00pm**      **Panel discussion II: Changing scenarios for intercultural education**

Moderator:      Dai-Geun Kang  
Rapporteur:      Sylvia Schmelkes  
Presentations: 1. Luis Enrique López  
                         2. Alexandre Marc  
                         3. Crain Soudien  
                         4. Johana Lasonen  
                         5. Christiane Jeitani

**4.00pm**      Coffee break (15 minutes)

**6.00pm**      End of session

**21 March 2006**

**9.30 am**      **Panel discussion III: Are interfaith education issues part of intercultural education?**

Moderator:      J. F. Ade-Ajayi  
Rapporteur:      Crain Soudien  
Presentations: 1. Liam Gearon  
                         2. Ali El Khashef  
                         3. Gary Bouma  
                         4. Dai-Geun Kang  
                         5. Jagdish Gundara

**11.00am**      Coffee break

**11.15am**      Continuation of panel discussion

**1.00pm**      Lunch

**2.30pm**      Presentation and discussion of paper UNESCO  
Guidelines on Intercultural Education

**4.00pm**      Coffee break (15 minutes)

**5.00pm**      Presentation of the work on the World Report on Cultural  
Diversity 2007

**6.00pm**      End of session

## 22 March 2006

- 9.30am** Presentation and discussion of database on intercultural education
- 10.15am** Reports/synthesis of panel discussions by the rapporteurs
- 11.45am** Wrap-up and closing of meeting
- 12.00pm** End of the meeting