The EWC Statement Series

First issue 2011

Contents

THE EWC STATEMENT SERIES

The dynamic generation of knowledge in the field of value based education

State of the Art: Definitions

"The level of knowledge and development achieved in a technique, science, etc., esp. at present" [1]

"[..]applies to the level of development (as of a device, procedure, process, technique, or science) reached at any particular time usually as a result of modern methods" [2]

"[..] refers to medical, scientific and technological knowledge that what was reasonably known at the time the product was designed, manufactured or sold" [3]

About this publication:

This is the first issue of the *EWC Statement Series*, a collection of expert statements, which have been regularly published since the beginning of 2010, on The European Wergeland Centre's (EWC) homepage. The section was initially called "The State of The Art Project" but has later been renamed into "The EWC Statement Series". Here, scholars and other education professionals have been invited to publish their views on current research and scholarly debates in the field of Education for Human Rights (HRE), Democratic Citizenship (EDC) and Intercultural Understanding (ICE).

Why do we refer to the term *State of the Art* and why did we establish such a format at the homepage of the EWC?

It started with the request that the EWC, which has been set up to create links between policy and practice, but also between research and educational practice in the fields of EDC, HRE and ICE – should have a documentation of the State of the Art in these fields. One might have a *scientific* State of the Art in mind; the kind of condensed knowledge as is found in peer-reviewed articles and between book covers. But, in fact, the EWC wants to make the results of theoretical debates and empirical studies available for non-academics and invite

---

[1] Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged © HarperCollins Publishers 1991, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2003

[2] Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/State_of_the_art (viewed, 8.2.2011)

[3] Mesotheliomahelp, glossary: http://www.mesotheliomahelp.net/mesothelioma-medical-glossarys.html (viewed, 8.2.2011)

them to actively make use of them. Facilitating access to research is an important part of the EWCs mandate and mirrored in several of our activities.

The EWC Statement Series challenges notions of excellence and expertise as reserved to a small elite and linked to highly ritualized and restricted rules of access. It opts for the dynamic and transparent nature of knowledge development by inviting experts - not in order to come up with compressed versions of research findings but with a description of relevant academic positions reflecting ongoing debates and developments in the field of EDC, HRE, ICE. In doing so, the meaning of the concept *State of the Art* comes into question. Looking into dictionary definitions, the focus on development is striking. It is not a static given, but a process of adapting knowledge, technology and other fields of professional expertise with regard to the changing needs and challenges within a constantly changing world. Consequently, *State of the Art* is a result of interaction, even if it often is understood as an elitist project of a "chosen few". The understanding of State of the Art, which the EWC approach is based on, is closely related to crucial questions of how to build sustainable democracies in the 21st century. In recent years the connection between education, social cohesion and democratic participation has become more and more evident. "Knowledge society" and "information literacy" are some of the concepts which have become prominent in public debates. But who are the *agents* of this immense productivity, who negotiates which information is valuable and which knowledge is relevant in the age of digitalized and globalized exchange? The link between knowledge and democracy is made by a third element: critical thinking, leading to the capacity to differentiate and make judgments. More than ever, *everyone* needs to be prepared to take part in the production and negotiation of knowledge in order to act as a citizen.

Citizens are not only passive receivers or consumers of knowledge or even the objects of technocratic or policy strategies developed by experts – they need to be competent in order to actively evaluate, criticize and take part in the generation of knowledge. Does this mean that the idea of *expertise* will completely vanish, being replaced by an egalitarian "every contribution counts alike"? In our view, this is not the case; in complex modern societies with specialization and division of labor, some people will be more prepared to give "informed impulses" for public debate and political decision-making. With regard to our field of work, researchers and educational professionals can contribute with important theoretical and conceptual reflections or empirical evidence. Some people have gained more professional expertise in a long working life than others. But this does not mean that the culminated expert knowledge only has to be applied or operationalized. Expert knowledge and expert views can serve to *inform* and *improve* public debate and people's lives, but they need to be reflected upon, criticized, and negotiated based on individuals' own experiences and expertise.

The experts we have invited to contribute with statements have appreciated this approach. And their contributions show the relevance of theoretical and empirical input for the development within a field which links policy making, societal change, the professional development of educators, and the way in which future generations will be prepared to live together as equals in open and diverse societies. We wish for these statements to give educators impulses for the reflection and development of their own professional practice.

We are very thankful to those who contributed to the first collection of the EWC statements. In "Human Rights Education Research", Felisa Tibbitts outlines that Human Rights Education

still is in contact with its roots in social movements while being institutionalized as educational practice and established as a field of research. Robert Jackson, too, provided a link between past and present, pointing out the correlation between anti-racist education and multi-cultural education. In his statement, he introduces the "interpretive approach" as a scientific and educational resource, avoiding essentialisation when dealing with questions of identity. David Kerr gives an update on recent developments in the field of EDC. Kerr makes it very clear to which extend the policy level, research and educational practice are intertwined. In his statement, Thorsten Knauth reminds us of the different notions, which can be related to the concept of *tolerance*. Relating these distinctions to the field of tolerance education, he opts for "a *weak normative definition* of the term, where the minimum criterion is that education for tolerance is meant to challenge cultural and religious stereotypes." In his statement, Peter Kirchschläger introduces the idea of Universality of Human Rights as it is challenged by notions of cultural diversity. His conclusion, that "cultural mediation and an adaption of the implementation of human rights to the specific religious, cultural and traditional context are necessary" is of great importance for Human Rights Education.

By deciding to create a series based on the collected statements, we hope to encourage the readers to become *active users:* using these statements as impulses for debate in educational settings, in debates about professional, institutional and societal developments.

We are happy to receive comments and feedback which can be sent to the EWC e-mail: post@theewc.org

All the best from the EWC team

Human Rights Education Research[4]

Felisa Tibbitts

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the Wergeland Centre's "the state of the art project" in the area of human rights education. Human rights education (HRE) is an emergent field of educational theory and practice gaining increased attention and significance across the globe. The international human rights movement, spurred by the efforts of non-governmental organizations, the United Nations and other regional human rights bodies, has broadened its focus since the late 1970s by seeking to integrate human rights concepts, norms and values within the mainstream educational systems of world states. This effort, which has gained momentum since the early 1990s has spawned a growing body of educational theory, practice and research that often intersects with activities in other fields of educational study, such as civic education, peace education, anti-racism education, Holocaust/genocide education and education for intercultural understanding.

Research in the field of HRE encompasses studies carried out in academic settings as well as those that take place in the context of program and impact evaluations. In addition, there are primary resources available in relation to the practice of HRE, such as teaching resources, syllabi, curricular policies as well as secondary resources such as conference proceedings. For the purposes of this forum, I am taking into account only formal HRE research and not the broader set of information that presents or describes HRE activities.

In presenting the most relevant and interesting areas of HRE research, I think it is helpful to being by thematically categorizing what is available. Three simple categories are: theory, implementation and evaluation. For each of these, allow me to present an overview of the kinds of research that could fall within them, some key findings to date, and what I consider to be interesting areas of investigation for each.[5]

 1.Theory of HRE. This area of research related to the goals, concepts, definitions and pedagogies (including critical pedagogies) of HRE. Research falling under this category attempts to clarify what HRE is, how it relates to pedagogical conditions, how it relates to other educational approaches (such as citizenship education and peace education), and how HRE relates to other trends in education (such as globalization and trans-national curricular borrowing).

It is not possible to present a comprehensive rendering of relevant HRE research in this area, particularly in such a brief space, but I believe that some key findings to date include

---

1 Tibbitts, Felisa and Fernekes, William (2010). "Human Rights Education". In Totten, S. and Pederson, J.E. (eds.) Teaching and Studying Social Issues: Major Programs and Approaches Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, pp. 87-119.
[5] I would like to recognize Peter Kirchschläger of the Center for Human Rights Education, University of Teacher Education Central Switzerland Lucerne, with whom I have been working in identifying these categories of HRE research.

-   the lack of consensus on a clear and operational definition of HRE that can guide practice, recognizing both its legal and normative dimensions as well as its diversity of approaches

-   overlapping identities of HRE with other educational approaches, in particular citizenship education and education for democratic citizenship, leading some, such as the Council of Europe, to conclude that EDC/HRE should be combined and used as a single approach in school settings

-   the use of critical, emancipatory and/or transformative pedagogical approaches as an ideal within HRE practice

-   the need to critique HRE in the ways that the use of the human rights normative framework is debated: on its claim of universality, as a form of (Western) cultural imperialism and in light of its ability to be relevant to local needs, cultures and values.

An area for further investigation might allow for further elucidation of HRE vis-à-vis other educational approaches in order to recognize learning areas and approaches that are unique to HRE. This should help in the development of competencies and standards for practice, which the HRE field is currently lacking.

2. Implementation of HRE. This research includes presentations of methodologies, curriculum, policies, training programs, as well as conditions promoting HRE practice including curricular and policy frameworks, national human rights environments and the roles of key actors such as non-governmental organizations, educational policymakers and inter-governmental agencies. Examples of research include the practices of HRE, including curricular resources and programming of all kinds (formal, non-formal, educator preparation).

Some key findings related to implementation:

-   challenges related to the implementation of HRE in schools, including lack of teacher knowledge about human rights and a lack of motivation to teach the subject and a general lack of curricular space

-   good practice in relation to the design of HRE training programs with adults and with some HRE programs (mostly of a nonformal educational nature) carried out with youth

-   the link between HRE, whole school approaches and school development in promoting a school culture that reflects human rights values

-   the tendency for curricular frameworks to include quite limited references to human rights, i.e., presenting human rights in a quite philosophical and/or legal way that make them conceptually abstract for students or focusing on human rights in the context of violations that take place in other parts of the world.

-   a lack of recognition and support for HRE among educational actors while at the same time quite active support coming from the non-governmental sector

- country-level predictors for the integration of HRE within national curriculum, especially countries in post-conflict and post-totalitarian political stages.

-

An area for further investigation, given that HRE is seen as an international movement, would be the conditions promoting its practice. Such conditions include national political or policy contexts as well as conditions in individual schools or schooling systems. Research might also assist us in identifying differences in school and non-school HRE practices and how to successfully involve teacher training institutions and government agencies in HRE.

3.Evaluation of HRE. This research and evaluation studies investigate the results of HRE, including outcomes on the learner, educator, classroom/learning environment, institutions, community/society.

In general, we find a lack of impact evaluations to draw upon. However, some key findings related to evaluations carried out to date:

- methodological challenges related to the study of HRE in schools, as school-based programming is often cross-curricular, short-term and infused within other subject areas

- the relationship between pedagogy/methods of instruction and human rights learning

- the "action" gap between HR awareness and knowledge and participation in the political domain or taking steps to change behaviors in inter-personal relationships

- the receptivity to HRE for individuals with particular background characteristics (e.g., highly empathetic persons, membership in a vulnerable group)

-

In terms of areas for further investigation, I believe that we need more examples of HRE evaluations, in particular impact assessments. Some impact evaluation studies have begun to identify areas of investigation and tools for measuring learner outcomes such as learners' awareness of and views about human rights and the importance of caring about the situation of others suffering from human rights violations. As new studies emerge, scholars will be able to benefit from the research designs and tools that have been developed.

HRE Research Examples

Below is a listing of examples of recent HRE research that has been carried out and which are readily available online.

Journal of Social Science Education.Special issue on International Perspectives on Human Rights Education. (2006:1) http://www.jsse.org/2006-1/index.html

Impact Assessment of the Rights Education Action Programme. Amnesty International Norway. Final Report (Felisa Tibbitts, 2010)
http://www.hrea.org/index.php?base_id=104&language_id=1&erc_doc_id=5641&category_id=4&category_type=3&group=

[Human Rights Training for Adults: What Twenty-six Evaluation Studies Say About Design, Implementation and Follow-Up](Katharine Teleki, Cambridge, 2007) (Katharine Teleki, Cambridge, 2007).

[Rights Respect and Responsibility. Report on the Hampshire County Initiative](Katherine Covell & R. Brian Howe, 2008) (Katherine Covell & R. Brian Howe, 2008).

http://www.hrea.org/index.php?base_id=104&language_id=1&erc_doc_id=4715&category_id=4&category_type=3&group=

[Baseline Study on Human Rights Education in Armenia](Lucig Danielian, Lilit Umroyan and Theresa Khorozyan, Yerevan, 2005) (Lucig Danielian, Lilit Umroyan and Theresa Khorozyan, Yerevan, 2005).

[An Evaluation of UNESCO Publications on Human Rights Education. Report to UNESCO Section of Education for Universal Values](Audrey Osler, Hugh Starkey and Kerry Vincent, n.p., 2002) (Audrey Osler, Hugh Starkey and Kerry Vincent, n.p., 2002).

The "Research and Evaluation" section of HREA's On-Line Library (http://www.hrea.org/index.php?base_id=103&language_id=1&category_id=4&category_type=3) contains over 70 research and evaluation studies, tools and resources.

The three resources that follow are not available online but are sources that might be consulted for those interested in cross-national HRE research.

Intercultural Education, (2005). Special issue on Human Rights Education and Transformational Learning. 16(2).

Ramirez, F.O.; Suarez, D.; and Meyer, J.W. (2006). "The Worldwide Rise of Human Rights Education," pp. 35-52. In A. Benavot and C. Braslavsky (Eds.) *School Knowledge in Comparative and Historical Perspective: Changing Curricula in Primary and Secondary Education*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre (CERC) and Springer.

Torney-Purta, J.; Barber, C.H.; Wilkenfeld, B. (2008). "How Adolescents in Twenty-Seven Countries Understand, Support and Practice Human Rights." *Journal of Social Issues*.

Antiracist Education, Multicultural Education and the Interpretive Approach

Robert Jackson

In the UK in the 1970s the term '*multiracial* education' was used, and there was a thriving National Association for Multiracial Education. It gradually became apparent that there were two key positions embraced within this group. One faction was primarily interested in antiracism (seen fundamentally as addressing the issue of imbalance and misuse of power) and the other in what became known as 'multiculturalism'. In the 1980s, multicultural education (or multicultural approaches to particular curriculum subjects), associated with a 'liberal education' philosophy, came under strong attack from some in the 'antiracist' camp (eg Mullard 1984). The following is a summary of some of the key criticisms of multicultural education from the standpoint of the type of antiracism noted above.

- In multicultural education, a culture was often perceived as a closed system, with a fixed understanding of ethnicity.

- The treatment of 'cultures' in the language and practices of multicultural education was usually *superficial*, partly because of a well-meaning attempt to celebrate diversity. Such superficiality reinforced platitudes and stereotypes, and hence helped to maintain racism intact.

- An emphasis on discrete cultures allowed them to be perceived as rivals to the national culture which, through its tolerance, allowed them to express themselves to some degree.

- Multicultural education emphasized the exotic, the other, the different, perpetuating the approaches of early social and cultural anthropologists.

- The superficiality of multicultural approaches resulted in a lack of attention to hierarchies of power *within* different cultural groups. Cultural and religious groups were perceived in simplistic terms as holistic and unified communities.

- Racism was perceived (by multiculturalists) psychologically in terms of personal attitudes that could be changed through knowledge and learning the value of tolerance. The power structures and established social practices within institutions, which were principally responsible for the perpetuation of inequality, were ignored.

For antiracists, individual beliefs about 'race' and the content of cultural traditions were not perceived as the central issue. According to antiracism it is 'structures of power' – institutional and social practices – that produce racial oppression. Racist ideas reinforce and legitimate unequal distribution of power between different groups. Racism, it is argued, needs to be tackled by challenging and changing these structures, not by presenting information about cultures or religions in the classroom.

Because of its primary concern with changing structures, antiracism (especially during the 1980s) was limited in its suggestions with regard to the school curriculum. Some writers offered ideas to promote a more critical stance with regard to awareness of 'institutional racism' and strategies to promote racial justice in the school. However, the issue of how to teach about 'culture(s)' was largely ignored by this group. Having criticized multicultural education's approaches to cultures in the curriculum, antiracists were short of ideas for dealing with *complex* issues of culture, ethnicity and religion. In attacking superficial and closed accounts of culture and ethnicity, some antiracists themselves underestimated the importance of questions of cultural and religious representation, transmission, hybridity and change. This point is recognized by writers who, in various ways, attempt to synthesize antiracist and multicultural education (eg Leicester 1992) or to address issues of culture and 'race' together (Donald and Rattansi 1992). Thus an important issue from this debate is not so much to question whether school education *should* deal with the representation of cultures, but rather to find more flexible ways of representing and interpreting cultural material which take on board key elements of the antiracist critique.

The interpretive approach Jackson (1997) draws on recent social anthropology as a key source for sophisticated models of culture(s), cultural transmission, cultural change, hybridity and cultural identity to replace 'static' models. Instead of seeing a multicultural society as one in which different, clearly distinct cultures exist side by side, the interpretive approach builds on Edward Said's idea that we should think of cultures, less as organically unified or traditionally continuous, and more as negotiated, ongoing processes. The symbols of a culture do not dictate that its members share exactly the same world view. Rather, cultural symbols offer a language with which *to construct* a world view. Symbols are malleable, making coherence and dissent possible within 'communities' simultaneously. Despite conflict, the use of shared symbols by dissenters expresses a sense of belonging to the group. There can be no 'whole picture' of a culture. A culture is neither a scientific object nor is it a discrete and stable symbol system which can be interpreted definitively. A culture is internally diverse and is actively contested. Moreover, the representation of a culture is inevitably deeply influenced by those attempting to interpret it, whether through their intellectual presuppositions or gender or whatever.

The interpretive approach stops well short of a postmodern deconstruction of cultures, however, employing metaphors that try to capture the complexity, vibrancy and constantly changing character of cultural traditions. This position reverberates with ethnographic research showing that there is a good deal of fluidity and inter-influence in which individuals may draw upon a variety of cultural resources in shaping their own identities. Østberg describes this kind of formation as 'integrated plural identity' (Østberg 2003), while Jackson and Nesbitt refer to the young people's 'multiple cultural competence' (Jackson and Nesbitt 1993).

References:

Donald, J and Rattansi, A (eds) (1992) *Race, Culture and Difference*, London, Sage.

Jackson, Robert (1997) *Religious Education: An Interpretive Approach*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Jackson, Robert and Nesbitt, Eleanor (1993) *Hindu Children in Britain,* Stoke on Trent: Trentham.

Leicester, M (1992) 'Antiracism versus the New Multiculturalism: Moving beyond the Interminable Debate' in J Lynch, C Modgil and S Modgil (eds), *Cultural Diversity and the Schools: Equity or Excellence? Education and Cultural Reproduction*, London, Falmer.

Mullard, C (1984) *Anti-Racist Education: The Three O's*, Cardiff, National Association for Multiracial Education.

Said, E (1978) *Orientalism*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Østberg, S. (2003) *The Nurture of Pakistani Muslim Children in Oslo,* Monograph Series, Leeds: University of Leeds, Community Religions Project.

Education for Democratic Citizenship: Key Challenges Ahead

David Kerr

Introduction

In this brief paper, I set out some key challenges facing Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC), drawing on European developments and experiences. I am conscious that this is my perspective and another European may have a different take on EDC. I believe there are four key challenges facing Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) in Europe, and beyond (taking the challenge of maintaining policy interest as a given). They are:

1. **Achieving a clear agreed definition and real focus on EDC**
2. **Building an evidence base and 'joining up' intelligence on EDC**
3. **Closing the 'implementation gap' between policy and practice in EDC**
4. **Ensuring sustainability and collaboration in EDC**

I will focus on these challenges and their relation to research and development (R&D) activities. I want to make brief observations under each challenge to stimulate thought and discussion. The overarching challenge in Europe is consolidating and sustaining interest in EDC at all levels in society, including that of policy.

It should also be noted that context is vital for EDC. There are three important shifts. The first is the impact of the global recession and the subsequent cuts in public finances in countries. The second is the rise of Far Right and nationalist elements and the election of more right leaning governments in a number of countries, who may have a different take on democratic citizenship in society and the role of EDC. The third shift is the continued rapid movements of peoples and the pressures that it is bringing to social and community cohesion. The progress of EDC education in Europe needs to be seen against this shifting context: it contributes to but also is affected by this context.

Key Challenge 1: Achieving a Clear Definition of and Real Focus on EDC

The first key challenge is achieving a clear working definition of Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) and setting out its relationship to related areas notably: human rights education (HRE): global education: intercultural education: sustainable development: environmental education: and peace and values education. There are many definitions of EDC in operation. While this can be a strength it can also lead to real confusion among policy-makers, practitioners, young people and the general public who look for clarity and guidance when approaching EDC, particularly for the first time. Perhaps the time has come to set out a clear working definition of EDC in Europe that can be agreed by all, as a starting point for a real focus on EDC in education institutions and in wider society. EDC needs to be properly understood before it can be successfully mainstreamed across society.

I believe that we need to apply the *'elevator test'* to EDC. By this I mean that it should be possible to explain to someone in an elevator, simply and clear, what Education for Democratic Citizenship is in the time it takes for the elevator to go from the ground floor to

the top floor of a tall building. If we cannot succeed in this task then how can we get people to focus on EDC across society?

The definition of EDC in the Council of Europe Charter on EDC/HRE is a useful starting point. EDC is defined as:

> ***Education for Democratic Citizenship*** *means education, training, dissemination, information, practices and activities, which aim by equipping learners with knowledge, skills and understanding to empower them to exercise and defend their democratic rights and responsibilities in society, to value diversity and to play an active part in democratic life, with a view to the promotion and protection of democracy and the rule of law.*

It will be important, in the coming years, to ensure the relationship between EDC and other areas is crystal clear. This is particularly so with the rise up the political agenda of the global dimension, sustainable development, environmental issues and climate change and the growing interest of young people in these areas

Key Challenge 2: Building an Evidence Base and 'Joining up' Intelligence on EDC

The second key challenge is the need to develop a rigorous and comprehensive evidence base to support and promote Education for Democratic Citizenship. This is particularly important in a context where we are moving from 'input-based' to 'outcomes-based' policy making. The latter approach demands hard evidence concerning the quantity, quality and effectiveness of interventions. There are promising signs that efforts are being made to join up intelligence concerning EDC at national, European and international levels and build this evidence base. The network database 'Share&Connect', that the European Wergeland Centre has launched facilitates links between experts in the field that may lead to more joint activities in the future. I am pleased that such efforts are underway. There are a number of interesting developments underway at national, European and international level which have the potential to add considerably to the EDC evidence base. These include:

- At national level - national initiatives and evaluations such as those in the UK concerning the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS), which I direct at NFER and UNICEF's Rights Respecting Schools Initiative;
- At European level - the new European Wergeland Centre and its planned programme of activities, including R&D;
- At international level - the new IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS), which has 38 participating country from across the world and innovative regional modules for Europe, Latin America and Asia. This will provide the most comprehensive survey results concerning EDC to date

Key Challenge 3: Closing the 'Implementation Gap' and Making Policies and Practices More Consistent for EDC

The third key challenge is recognising and closing the 'implementation gap' that still exists between the rhetoric of policies and the reality of practices. There will always be such a 'gap' but the aim should be to make it as small and acceptable, as possible. The Council of Europe Charter for EDC/HRE and the supporting EDC/HRE Policy Tool should assist policy makers and practitioners in helping to address this 'implementation gap'.

There remain many gaps in our knowledge and understanding about policies and practices in EDC. Evidence of this is provided by the priorities chosen for the Fourth Phase, from 2010-2013 of the Council of Europe's EDC/HRE Project. There are four main priorities for action.

- Capacity building within and across sectors, including schools, higher education, non-formal and informal education and society in order to ensure that EDC is provided in a lifelong learning perspective;
- More comprehensive and systematic training for teachers and educators
- Identifying areas where more work is needed in order to move policy and practice forward, such as assessment of student learning in relation to EDC – what it looks like, identifying and sharing 'best practice'
- Quality assurance, governance and sustainability procedures – ensuring there is a sufficient infrastructure that can underpin these areas. There are many R&D possibilities. The work of SICI around citizenship and the role of inspections/inspectors is an interesting case in point

All these developments aim to ensure that EDC has the same standards and quality of policies and practices as other areas and strives for even higher standards. Such standards are vital in terms of the status, perception and approach to EDC in Europe and elsewhere.

Key Challenge 4: Ensuring Sustainability and Encouraging Cooperation and Collaboration

The fourth challenge is ensuring sustainability and encouraging cooperation and collaboration in EDC. The *Compendium of Good Practice on HRE in School Systems*, produced jointly by OSCE, ODIHR, CoE, OHCHR and UNESCO is an excellent example of how regional and supra-national organisations can collaborate effectively. There is also considerable potential for existing and new networks to assist in maximising cooperation and collaboration and contributing to the sustainability and longevity of EDC at a number of levels in Europe. It will be important that R&D is to the fore in some of these networks. They include existing networks such as the Council of Europe's EDC/HRE Coordinators Network which has a representative from each of the 48 countries that are represented at the Council. New networks, such as those involved with the European Wergeland Centre will also be helpful in the coming years.

Finally, in relation to this challenge, I believe that the rapid advances in information and communications technologies (ICTs) provide many opportunities to network, cooperate and collaborate. We need to ensure that we understand their potential and make the most of them, particularly given children and young people use such new communication channels – web, texting, social networking sites, blogs, e-mail – as part of their daily lives. The medium used for getting messages across about EDC is likely to be as important as the messages in the coming years.

Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) has come a long way in Europe and beyond in a short space time. However, there are considerable challenges, particularly in relation to R&D, still to be overcome. I am confident that the progress that has been made in EDC bodes well for the progress that will be made in the coming years.

References:

For details of the Council of Europe Charter on EDC/HRE visit:
https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=CM/Rec(2010)7&Language=lanEnglish&Ver=original&Site=CM&BackColorInternet=C3C3C3&BackColorIntranet=EDB021&BackColorLogged=F5D383

Details and latest findings from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS) are available at:
http://www.nfer.ac.uk/research/projects/cels/

For more information about UNICEF's Rights Respecting Schools Initiative visit:
http://www.unicef.org.uk/tz/teacher_support/rrs_award.asp

Further information about the IEA ICCS can be accessed at:
http://iccs.acer.edu.au/

Information about the Council of Europe's EDC/HRE Project can be obtained at:
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/edc/default_EN.asp?

Information about the Standing International Conference of Inspectors (SICI) Workshop on citizenship education and inspection can be accessed at:
http://sici-inspectorates.org/web/guest/home

A full version of the *Compendium of Good Practice on HRE in School Systems* can be downloaded at:

http://www.osce.org/odihr/item_11_40041.html

Tolerance –

A Key Concept for dealing with cultural and religious Diversity in Education

Thorsten Knauth

Cultural and religious diversity has for a long time been a matter of lived reality in European societies and their educational systems. Dealing with this diversity has not always implied shaping and developing attitudes of tolerance, respect and understanding towards others, as examples from European history show. We also find traditions of conflict, division and segregation between people of different cultural and religious backgrounds, partly rooted in the development of nation states in Europe and partly rooted in the colonial role of such states. As long as traditions and practices of intolerance and social exclusion are not counteracted, social cohesion in society is endangered. Tolerance is widely regarded as an indispensable commonly shared value for assuring the cohesion of plural societies. The field of education is crucial if future generations are to develop strategies for living together in a context of religious and cultural diversity, where attitudes of tolerance, respect, openness and readiness to learn from difference are honoured.

Also on a global level, it has become clearer that religion is an influential resource in peoples' lives, and also is seen to shape the actions of groups in society. This was very recently confirmed by a high-level meeting of the United Nations in November 2008 on the culture of peace, emphasizing the immense significance of interfaith dialogue based on principles such as tolerance and dignity.[6] There is also a strong impetus, derived from inter-governmental bodies such as the UN, the Council of Europe, the EC and the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), for European states to initiate policies introducing 'teaching about religions (and beliefs)' in European schools, so as to increase tolerance of difference and to contribute to social or community cohesion.[7] Therefore, education for tolerance must take sufficient account of the role of religion.

Education for tolerance is increasingly concentrated in formal education, however it is also noticeable in the public domain where education for tolerance is part of a range of informal education initiatives. Amongst others there are, for example, religious, humanitarian, and other community based organisations and action groups addressing these issues as an integral part of their work. Both in formal and informal education, teaching for tolerance is associated with concepts such as citizenship education, peace education, human rights

---

[6] cf. http://www..un.org/ga/63/meetings/peace_culture_hl.shtml.

[7] Recently, two important documents, signalling policy recommendations to (mainly) European governments on teaching about religions or beliefs in publicly funded schools, have been prepared by inter-governmental organisations in Europe. Both are explicitly concerned with teaching for tolerance in relation to the religion field. The first is a Council of Europe document and is the *'Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the Religious Dimension of Intercultural Education: Principles, Objectives and Teaching Approaches'*, Strasbourg 2008. The second is The *'Toledo Guiding Principles on Teaching about Religions and Beliefs in Public Schools', 2007.* These guiding principles have been produced by the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE).

education, intercultural dialogue and interreligious learning. Further research has to be done to study their possible contribution to civic tolerance. It is necessary to investigate which concepts related to tolerance underlie different pedagogical approaches and under which conditions and presuppositions they most successfully function in practice.

Normative conflicts and the concept of tolerance

The notion of tolerance is in itself manifold and conflictive. Examples in history as well as recent cases show that the call for tolerance arises in conflicts, but it is not always clear which conception of tolerance is being advocated. The Western understanding of tolerance has also changed over the past few centuries, parallel to an increasingly pluralisation in these societies. An important reference in this field is the historical and systematic reconstruction of the term developed by the social philosopher Rainer Forst (2003).[8] Forst distinguishes two overall perspectives in the discourse about tolerance: a so-called *vertical perspective* of state policy and the so-called *horizontal perspective* of intersubjectivity.

A sustainable concept of tolerance includes aspects both of *denial* and of *affirmation* with regard to the values and practices of others. The concept also incorporates a *component of practical rejection*. Without this negation of positions in a normative sense it is not justified to speak of tolerance. Forst further distinguishes four conceptions of tolerance that concurrently exist in societies and may cause conflicting discussions:

- o The concept of *permission* implies that the majority allows a minority to live according to its conviction as long as the supremacy of the majority is not questioned.

- o The concept of *coexistence* uses tolerance as mean to avoid conflicts and to pursue the own interests of groups.

- o The *concept of respect* presupposes mutual acknowledgement between individuals and groups.

- o The concept of *appreciation* is the most challenging one because the others are not only respected but also appreciated in ethical terms. Their way of life is regarded as a valuable contribution to good life in society.

The social philosopher Jürgen Habermas has recently focused on the relevance of religious tolerance for the promotion of cultural rights. Habermas depicted religious tolerance as a pacemaker for an adequate understanding of multiculturalism and of the equitable coexistence of different cultural forms of life within a democratic community.[9] This emphasis on religious tolerance for democratic citizenship can enhance the concept of tolerance by linking general tolerance to the realm of religious diversity in society.

In this sense, tolerance with focus on religion suggests the need for people of all faiths to develop the ability, at very least, to endure the fact that others may believe and live differently within their particular society, or in the wider world, although they might share

---

[8] Forst, R. (2003) *Toleranz im Konflikt. Geschichte, Gehalt und Gegenwart eines umstrittenen Begriffs* (Frankfurt a.M, Suhrkamp).

[9] Habermas, J. (2005) *Zwischen Naturalismus und Religion. Philosophische Aufsätze* (Frankfurt a.M., Suhrkamp) 263f.

some core values. In addition to being an individual attitude, tolerance can be a guiding principle for state relations regarding religion or belief, referring to the need for the state to accept the existence of a variety of religious traditions and convictions. Tolerance can thus – in both senses – be seen as a *minimum* standard or precondition for peaceful co-existence in multi-cultural and multi-religious societies.

Against the background of these theoretical distinctions it is possible to investigate educational practice, both in empirical and in conceptual terms. From the vertical perspective, educational policies in history and within differing contemporary concepts of tolerance can be studied and related to those understandings of tolerance which emerge from the horizontal perspective of inter-subjective educational practice. It can be anticipated that such investigation will be a fruitful enterprise because there seems to be little communication between the different spheres of research, policy and practice, as is shown by the Norwegian researcher Geir Afdal[10].

However, in order to trace educational practice with regard to questions of tolerance and to analyze different conceptualizations of tolerance, it is essential to operate with a wide understanding of tolerance at the outset. Tolerance, in its broadest sense, can be understood as "accepting difference" (Afdal 2006). Tolerance is constituted by two conditions: first, there has to be a situation of difference or plurality, and second, there has to be some reason for passively or actively accepting (even appreciating) this situation of difference. Taking a wider conceptual scope of tolerance it is possible to analyse the understanding of difference or plurality that constitutes the numerous situations of tolerance, and the numerous different theories and reasons for accepting (or not accepting) this diversity. In this way one can also gain a more precise understanding of the "intolerable", that is, the proper limits of tolerance. Such knowledge will be very valuable for politicians and educators in the development of future tolerance education.

Education for tolerance

Tolerance is not only seen as a political or legal requirement but also as an educational one. It would be simplistic to expect education only to transmit knowledge about tolerance to subsequent generations. Learning is rather seen as a complex process of *meaning making through interaction* (bringing together previous and new knowledge, experiences, action and interaction in-between teachers and learners). Following this line of thought, school is seen as a venue for fostering values necessary for living good lives, and for nurturing democratic citizens in plural societies. Even if the research in the field is hitherto limited, it seems to indicate that in general education increases tolerance.[11] Looking at results of the EU funded project FP 6 project *Religion in Education. A Contribution to Dialogue or factor of Conflict in transforming societies of European Countries* (REDCo) there is also empirical evidence that pupils regard school as an important place for learning tolerance.[12] One of the main findings

---

[10] Afdal, G. (2006) *Tolerance and curriculum. Conceptions of tolerance in the multicultural unitary Norwegian compulsory school* (Münster, New York, Waxmann).

[11] Vogt, W. (1997) *Tolerance and education. Learning to live with diversity and difference*. (Thousand Oaks, Sage).

[12] Knauth, Th., Jozsa, D.-P., Bertram-Troost, G. & Ipgrave, J. (Eds.) (2008*) Encountering Religious Pluralism in School and Society. A Qualitative Study of Teenage Perspectives in Europe*, (Münster et.al., Waxmann),; Valk, P., Bertram-Troost, G., Friederici, M., & and Béraud, C. (Eds.) (2009) Teenagers´Perspectives on the Role of Religion in their Lives, Schools and Societies. A European Quantitative Study, (Münster et al., Waxmann).

is that pupils from eight European countries are in general convinced of the fact that the more people know about each other, the better they are qualified to live together and respect each other's 'otherness'. REDCo-research has hinted at the fact that young people in Europe in general appreciate school as a venue to learn about religious and cultural diversity. This does not necessarily mean that they actually act tolerantly or experience tolerance in their everyday life, especially in the school context. The results also touch upon the issue of prejudice and division lines between groups. Outside school, the segregation of social and religious groups seems to prevail. However, as research is hitherto quite limited in this area there is an urgent need to investigate the relation between education in school and informal education in lifeworld outside school.

To cover this, the term *education for tolerance* should be used in a quite open and rather descriptive sense so as to avoid any normative restriction of the research field at stake. In a *weak normative definition* of the term the minimum criterion is that education for tolerance is meant to challenge cultural and religious stereotypes. It seeks to show cultural and religious diversity as a matter of fact and is directed towards the acceptance of those who are denied because of their beliefs or way of life. In a *strong normative sense* it is justified to speak of 'Tolerance Education', which is opposed to identity politics and concerns itself with translating the "lofty ideals of tolerance, respect and recognition into transformative practice".[13]

  As currently understood, tolerance, respect and recognition in relation to religion or belief, do not imply indifference, relativism or syncretism. Indeed, an education which requires knowledge and understanding of different religions, and of people who adhere to those traditions, requires pedagogical approaches that represent religious traditions fairly and accurately – including their diversity – and enables students to engage with the content of what they have studied at a personal level.[14] One can raise the hypothesis that if these conditions are fulfilled, then students will not only have some understanding; they will also be in a position to formulate viewpoints relating tolerance, respect and recognition.

---

[13] Kaymakcan, R. & Leirvik, O. (Eds.) (2007) *Teaching for Tolerance in Muslim Majority Societies* (Istanbul.), 9.

Universality of Human Rights

Peter Kirchschläger

Universality of Human Rights

1 What Is the Universality of Human Rights?

Universality is one of the essential characteristics of human rights. By definition, human rights are rights that apply to all human beings and are therefore universal. All human beings are holders of human rights, independent from what they do, where they come from, where they live and from their national citizenship, their community etc. The universality of human rights is embedded in and also influenced by the other characteristics of human rights: human rights are categorical (every human being has these rights, they cannot be denied to anyone), egalitarian (every human being has the same rights), individual (human rights apply to every human being as individual and protect the latter from violations by a collective recognizing at the same time the important role of a collective for the individual), fundamental (human rights protect basic and essential elements of human existence) and indivisible (the whole catalogue of human rights must be respected, they are complimentary).

Georg Lohmann observes in the actual discussion about the universality of human rights that the terms "universalism" and "relativism" seem to build a pair of two contrary terms. But actually the counterpart for the first is "particularism" and "absolutism" for the second. Lohmann finds the reasons for this misconception in the assumption that universalism can only be legitimated by absolute justification and that a relative way of legitimating would lead to only a relative justification.[15] As a consequence, defenders of human rights try to provide a absolute justification of the universality of human rights as – following this assumption – a relative justification would not be adequate for the universality of human rights. In accordance with the observation of Lohmann, I would emphasize that the two term-couples do not have a direct relation and this has consequences for the understanding of the universality of human rights and the attempt of its justification.[16]

2 Particular Interests and Cultural Diversity as Challenges for the Universality of Human Rights

Human rights struggle with particular interests, e.g. by states which claim the priority of their sovereignty over the universality of human rights or by the private sector which claims self-regulating approaches and uses this to define its sphere of influence within certain limits. This challenge is part of the political and legal dimension of human rights and as a consequence of the moral dimension of human rights as well. In this regard, one can recognize a positive tendency of acceptance of human rights by states, a growth of an

---

[15] See Lohmann, Universalismus 5; Lohmann, Begruendung 218-228.
[16] See Lohmann, Universalismus 6.

international institutionalization for the protection of human rights and a progress of the mechanisms for monitoring human rights performances by states to respect the universality of human rights and some small steps by the corporate world. At the same time, it has to be stated that the implementation of human rights is not yet there where it should be, and that the vast majority of human beings are still victims of violations of their human rights. The universality is still a claim, not reality.

Human rights are challenged by cultural diversity as well. This challenge is taking place in the moral dimension of human rights. Although the UN Conference in Vienna 1993 reconfirmed the validity of the universality of human rights, the universality faced critics from different sides because of its alleged western origin, e.g. in the so-called „Asian Values debate"[17]. At first sight, this could be surprising as human rights protect the freedom of the individual to religion and belief and to a cultural life (article 18 and 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948) and therefore are enhancing cultural diversity. But human rights are individual rights and represent the perspective of the individual, not of the community: human rights do not protect traditions, cultures, religions as such but *the freedom* of the individual to share the beliefs, thoughts and world views of a community, to be part of a community and to practice their way of life. This difference is criticized as an individualistic bias of human rights, overlooking article 29. The latter positions the individual within its community and underlines the important role of the community for the development of the individual and the responsibilities of the individual within the community.

Charles Taylor[18] develops an approach of a consensus on human rights from different perspectives which is based on the „overlapping consensus" of John Rawls[19]: "different groups, countries, religious communities, and civilizations, although holding incompatible fundamental views on theology, metaphysics, human nature, and so on, would come to an agreement on certain norms that ought to govern human behavior"[20]. Taylor sees the possibility of such a consensus. Its content remains quite open in Taylor's understanding. We would maybe assume that such a consensus would include human rights, but Taylor points out that the category „rights" is a western concept and claims: „These norms have to be distinguished and analytically separated not just from the background justifications, but also from the legal forms that give them force."[21] According to Taylor, the striving for practical conclusions independent from their premises and from their different backgrounds, and the interest to understand our difference better lead to convergences.[22] The approach of cultural mediation applies similar ideas.[23] While I recognize the value of such considerations at a practical level, from a normative perspective I would question the unjustified

---

[17] See Senghass, Werte 5-12; Geiger/Kieserling, Werte; Zakaria, Culture 109-126. These critics can we find already in a similar way expressed by E. Burke in his polemic against the "Declaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen de 1789": Burke assumes that every human being must be treated with justice within the political system she/he is living in. The understanding of justice depends on the cultural and social conditions on a local level. Burke sees a variety of understandings of justice. Therefore the idea of unity included in human rights is for him an illusion. At the same time, Burke sees such a catalogue of human rights as a threat for political systems on a local level and their understanding of justice (see Burke, Reflections).

[18] See Taylor, Conditions 124-144.

[19] Rawls, Liberalism, lecture IV. This idea of an "overlapping consensus" has its origin in the thinking of Jacques Maritain.

[20] See Taylor, Conditions 124.

[21] Taylor, Conditions 143.

[22] Taylor underlines at this point the obligation of the West to deliver. See also Taylor, Modernity.

[23] See An-Na'im, Mediation 147-168; Chan, Challenge 25-38; Bell, Challenge 643-645.

assumptions of Taylor that the basic intention of human rights is accepted and that all cultures and traditions lead to the ideas and concept of human rights. At the same time, I would underline Taylor's point that the recognition of the differences lead to a better understanding and supports human rights on a practical level. Concerning the dialogue about differences – this inter-cultural and -religious dialogue –, I would argue that this dialogue would benefit from a frame of reference, how this dialogue should be led in order to exclude the possibilities of discrimination and of arbitrariness. Human rights could serve as this frame of reference.

Yasuaki Onuma aims to overcome a narrow understanding of "culture" from an inter-civilizational perspective. The latter allows him to include the economic, the social, the civil and the political dimension and to avoid its ideological and national use and to emphasize its historic dimension.[24] Onuma points out that cultures and civilizations are not eternal entities, they can change over time. He claims the same contingent nature for human rights as well. Too me this seems again convincing on a practical level. On a theoretical level I would argue in favor of a limitation of the flexibility of human rights. Of course human rights can develop and therefore changes can occur, but only in a limited way, e.g. it seems to be impossible to present acceptable reasons why some human beings should be excluded as holders of human rights. Acceptable could mean at this point that it is imaginable that all human beings would agree with these reasons when they could decide about them in a free and autonomous decision.

Regarding the universality of human rights, I would underline the fact that religions, cultures, traditions, world views and beliefs benefit indirectly from the human right to freedom of religions and belief. This right enables and enhances the authentic practice of an individual and so the peaceful coexistence of religions, cultures, traditions and world views and the dialogue between them. It is an achievement of humanity to protect this variety. Simone Zurbuchen points out: "While I do not deny that human rights establish moral boundaries, it needs also to be seen that these rights enable members of religious communities and of other variants of cultural groups to maintain their distinct identity."[25] As the fundament of protection of ideas, traditions and beliefs, human rights can therefore in change expect to be respected by religions, cultures, traditions, world views and beliefs.[26] At this point, I need to emphasize in agreement with Yasuaki Onuma and with Otfried Hoeffe that religions, cultures, traditions, world views and beliefs should be understood as open for change, not as eternal absolute entities. Human rights do not stop before religions, cultures, traditions, world views and beliefs but influence them on a theoretical level. On a practical level, cultural mediation and an adaption of the implementation of human rights to the specific religious, cultural and traditional context is necessary to respect cultural diversity which is protected by human rights.

Bibliography

An-Na'im A. A., The Cultural Mediation of Human Rights, in: Bauer J. R./Bell D. A. (ed.), The East Asian Challenge for Human Rights, Cambridge 1999, 147-168

---

[24] See Onuma, Approach 29-30.
[25] Zurbuchen, Rights 285.
[26] See Hoeffe, Tausch 29-47.

Bell D. A., The East Asian Challenge to Human Rights: Reflections on an East-West Dialogue, in: Human Rights Quarterly 18 (1996) 643-645

Burke E., Reflections on the Revolution in France, Indianapolis 1987

Chan J., The Asian Challenge to Human Rights. A Philosophical Appraisal, in: Tang J. T. H. (ed.), Human Rights and International Relations in the Asia-Pacific Region, New York 1995, 25-38

Cohen J., Minimalism About Human Rights: The Most We Can Hope for?, in: The Journal of Political Philosophy 12/2 (2004) 190-213

Geiger K. F./Kieserling M. (ed.), Asiatische Werte. Eine Debatte und ihr Kontext, Münster 2001

Goeller T., Kulturverstehen. Grundprobleme einer epistemologischen Theorie der Kulturalität und kulturellen Erkenntnis, Würzburg 1999

Höffe O., Transzendentaler Tausch. Eine Legitimationsfigur für Menschenrechte?, in: Gosepath S./Lohmann G. (ed.), Philosophie der Menschenrechte, Frankfurt a. M. ²1999, 29-47

Keesing R., Theories of culture, in: Annual Review of Anthropology 3 (1974) 73-97

Kroeber A./Kluckhohn C., Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions, Cambridge 1952

Lohmann G., Zu einer relativen Begründung der Universalisierung der Menschenrechte, in: Nooke G./Lohmann G./Wahlers G. (ed.), Gelten Menschenrechte universal? Begründungen und Infragestellungen, Freiburg i. B. 2008, 218-228

Lohmann G., Zur Verständigung über die Universalität der Menschenrechte. Eine Einführung, in: Nooke G./Lohmann G./Wahlers G. (ed.), Gelten Menschenrechte universal? Begründungen und Infragestellungen, Freiburg i. B. 2008, 47-60

Onuma Y., Towards an Intercivilizational Approach to Human Rights. For Universalization of Human Rights through Overcoming of a Westcentric Notion of Human Rights, in: Asian Yearbook of International Law 7 (2001) 21-81

Rawls J., Political Liberalism, New York 1993

Senghaas D., Über asiatische und andere Werte, in: Leviathan 1 (1995) 5-12

Taylor C., Conditions of an Unforced Consensus on Human Rights, in: Bauer J. R./Bell D. A. (ed.), The East Asian Challenge for Human Rights, Cambridge 1999, 124-144

Taylor C., Modernity and the Rise of the Public Sphere, in: Peterson G. B. (ed.), The Tanner Lectures on Human Values, Salt Lake City 1993

Zakaria F., Culture is Destiny: A Conversation with Lee Kuan Yew, in: Foreign Affairs 73/2 (March/April 1994) 109-126

Zurbuchen S., Universal Human Rights and the Claim to Recognition of Cultural Difference, in: Sitter-Liver B./Hiltbrunner T. (ed.), Universality: From Theory to Practice. An intercultural and interdisciplinary debate about facts, possibilities, lies and myths, Fribourg 2009, 259-290

The contributors:

Felisa Tibbits

Co-Founder and Director of Human Rights Education Associates (HREA)and adjunct lecturer at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and Harvard Kennedy School of Government. She has worked as an educator, evaluator and materials developer on the topics of monitoring children's rights, the human rights-based approach to programming and the integration of human rights themes in curricula. She has carried out adult trainings with educators and humanitarian workers in over 20 countries and serves as a consultative expert for the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, UNICEF, UNESCO, UNDP, OSCE, the Council of Europe and the Organization of American States. She is presently working on a doctoral thesis that examines Human Rights Education practices among transnational INGO actors and links with improvement in human rights.

Contact: ftibbitts@hrea.org

Robert Jackson

Director of The Warwick Religions and Education Research Unit (WRERU) and a leading figure in international debates about religions and education in Europe and beyond. He is Professor of Education at the University of Warwick and is also Professor of Religious Diversity and Education at the European Wergeland Centre, a Council of Europe related centre based in Oslo, specialising in intercultural, citizenship and human rights education. Jackson was a member of the drafting team of the Council of Europe Ministerial policy recommendation on teaching about religions and beliefs (2008) and of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe's Toledo Guiding Principles on Teaching about Religions and Beliefs (2007). He contributes to the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations programme on Education about Religions and Beliefs and spoke at the Alliance of Civilizations 2009 Istanbul Forum. He was awarded a higher doctorate (DLitt) by the University of Wales for his contribution to international research in religions and education and in 2010 was elected as an Academician of the Academy of Social Sciences.

Contact: R.Jackson@warwick.ac.uk

David Kerr

Visiting Professor in Citizenship at Birkbeck College, University of London. He is currently the Director of the nine year Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS) in England and Associate Director of the new IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS). In ICCS he has particular responsibility for coordinating the new European Regional Module. He has worked closely with the Council of Europe (CoE) on its Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education Project (EDC/HRE) since 1999. He is a member of the Project Steering Group and EDC/HRE Coordinator for the UK. He was seconded as Professional Officer to the Citizenship Advisory Group whose report (Crick

Report) led to the introduction of statutory Citizenship in schools in England in 2002, He has been a citizenship advisor to the Department for Education and Skills (now DCSF). He has carried out consultancies in Europe and internationally, for CoE, EU, British Council, among others, and spoken and published widely in the field.

Contact: davidkerr7@btinternet.com

Thorsten Knauth

Professor for "Protestant Theology/Pedagogy of Religion" in the Humanist Faculty of the University Duisburg-Essen. Knauth studied theology in Marburg, Freiburg and in Hamburg, where he took his Ph.D in 1995. Until 2002, he worked as assistent professor and coordinator of a research unit at the University of Hamburg. He wrote his habilitation on the subject of „problem oriented Religious Education". After having been visiting professor at the universities of Hamburg, Karlsruhe, Duisburg-Essen and Cologne, Thorsten Knauth worked as a Research-Manager und project leader in a European research project on Religious Education until he was appointed as permanent professor in Duisburg-Essen.

Contact: thorsten.knauth@uni-duisburg-essen.de

Peter Kirchschläger

Studies of Theology, Judaism and Philosophy in Lucerne, Rome (Pontifical Gregorian University) and Jerusalem (Hebrew University) (2001: Master in Theology at the University of Lucerne) and Studies of Philosophy, Religious Studies and Political Science in Zurich (2003: Master in Philosophy at the University of Zurich). He is Co-Founder and Co-Director of the International Human Rights Forum Lucerne (IHRF) of the University of Teacher Education Lucerne. 2004-2008: PhD at the University of Zurich fostered by the Swiss National Science Foundation. Since 2004: Lecturer at different universities. 2005-2006: Research-Scholarship at the University of Chicago from the Swiss National Science Foundation, the "Schweizerischen Studienstiftung" and the "Otto-Herz-Studienstiftung". He is Co-Founder and Co-Director of the Centre of Human Rights Education (ZMRB) of the University of Teacher Education Lucerne since 2007. Peter Kirchschläger is consultative expert for different international institutions and a member of the Board of Advisory of the European Youth Summit and of the Expert-Jury of the Europeans for Peace-Program.

Contact: peter.kirchschlaeger@phz.ch