

Werner Wintersteiner
Heidi Grobbauer
Gertraud Diendorfer
Susanne Reitmair-Juárez



Global Citizenship Education

Citizenship Education for Globalizing Societies

Werner Wintersteiner, Heidi Grobbauer, Gertraud Diendorfer, Susanne Reitmair-Juárez

Global Citizenship Education

Citizenship Education for Globalizing Societies

In cooperation with the Austrian Commission for UNESCO

Klagenfurt, Salzburg, Vienna 2015

Contents

Preface

1. Introduction: An overview of <i>global citizenship</i>	3
Excursus 1: <i>Global Citizenship Education</i> within the UNESCO framework	6
2. What is <i>Global Citizenship Education</i>?	9
2.1 Origin and definitions	9
2.2 The “ <i>global citizen</i> ” approach	11
2.3 The “ <i>global citizenship</i> ” approach	12
Excursus 2: Comparing different <i>citizenship</i> concepts	14
3 Fundamental questions related to <i>Global Citizenship Education</i>	19
3.1 National and/or cosmopolitan identity?	19
3.2 Three dimensions of <i>Global Citizenship Education</i>	20
3.3 Critical analysis of our past	21
Excursus 3: <i>Global Citizenship Education</i> in relation to other political pedagogies	25
Recommended literature	31
4. <i>Global Citizenship Education</i> in practice	33
4.1 Knowledge, competences, values and attitudes	33
4.2 Different levels of implementation	36
5. Summary	37
Bibliography	40
Appendix: Curriculum for the continuing Masters programme <i>Global Citizenship Education</i>	42

Preface

This text reflects the work we have been doing for many years in the area of *Global Citizenship Education* (GCED) in Austria. Two endeavors particularly stand out: first, the continuing Masters programme GCED at the Alps-Adriatic University (Alpen-Adria Universität) in Klagenfurt, which is a specialized course of study for educationalists, teacher trainers, NGO associates and teachers (participants may either graduate with a certificate after two years or an MA degree after three years respectively), and second, our cooperation with the Austrian *UNESCO Associated Schools Project Network*. This was the originally intended audience for the German version of this brochure, which constitutes the programmatic basis for our training programs. We understand GCED as a concept that is located at the interface between civic education, global education and peace education, as well as education for sustainable development and intercultural learning. Our approach is characterized by these four features:


- * theoretical grounding and a particular focus on terminology in order to foster competence of judgment regarding political concepts
- * investigating the historical dimension of GCED in depth in order to account for colonialism and neocolonialism
- * socio-critical orientation in order to set us apart from strands of GCED that ultimately perpetuate concepts of Western hegemony
- * didactic implementation that is systematic and based on appropriate theoretical work in order to avoid pragmatism

With this English edition (the section specific to the Austrian context was omitted) we wish to initiate a dialog with colleagues in the whole world and hope to engage in lively exchange.

The authors

Klagenfurt, Salzburg, Vienna – August 2015

Introduction: An Overview of *Global Citizenship*



A school class refuses to accept the pending deportation of their class mate – she does not have the right of residence – because they perceive their friend as integrated and belonging to their group; they do not accept the fact that she does not have the right to stay.

Vienna, Austria: Refugees who have asked for asylum are angered about the slow-moving work of officials. They demonstrate for more humane asylum politics and assemble a catalogue of political demands; that is, they act as if they had all the political rights of local citizens. This “as if” turns out to be an efficient strategy not only to gain media attention but, moreover, to point out very explicitly that they are without rights and that they are determined not to accept this.

A European school class has a partnership with a class in an African country. The liaison does not manifest itself in the usual charity for the “poor children down there”, but in a project: the pupils investigate opportunities of political participation in both countries and are engaged in an equal exchange.

These are examples of individuals seeing themselves as *global citizens* and acting accordingly. The third example, moreover, illustrates what *Global Citizenship Education* may look like, which is also the subject of this brochure. Although the notion of *global citizenship* is “in the air” in times of globalization such as these, and is taken up time and again, there is a need for systematic learning in order to prepare young people for this new situation.

But why should this way of learning be called *Global Citizenship Education*? Why is there a need for a new term? In educational science, a new term is needed and justified when it delineates facts and concepts that cannot be expressed otherwise. To put it differently, terms provide mental frameworks, which allow us to classify and understand certain phenomena.

While it is true that terms like *intercultural learning*, *global education*, *cosmopolitan education*, *peace education* or *civic education*, next to being much better established (at least in the German-speaking world), definitely have validity, they cover only partial aspects of *what Global Citizenship Education* is all about.

As an educational concept, *Global Citizenship Education* is not entirely new, but builds on the pedagogies mentioned above; it combines them or some of their essential components and thereby gives them a new and unique focus. *Global Citizenship Education*, in any case, constitutes an original, necessary and forward-looking mental framework, which seems to be indispensable to education in times of globalization and a global society.

Global Citizenship Education (GCED)

- * responds to globalization by expanding the concept of civic education to global society
- * adopts the ethical values of peace education and human rights education
- * draws upon the “global society” perspective provided by global education, which not only investigates global topics, but more specifically merges the global and the local into the *glocal*
- * combines mainly these three pedagogical fields through the concept of *global citizenship* in terms of political participation as such, but particularly on a global scale

The *global citizenship approach* as such does not mean that national identities are deemed obsolete, just like the formation of nation states could not erase local and regional identities. Neither would it be appropriate to say that a parallel identity, namely a cosmopolitan one, is added to all other existing identities. *Global citizenship* rather means a paradigm shift: the relevant frame of reference is no longer the nation state, but a global society that is networked on multiple levels and equally localized and globalized. Within the framework of this paradigm, national identities do play a role, albeit a changed one (see chapter 3.1).

Global Citizenship Education thereby shifts attention to an important question of contemporary education that has received insufficient attention so far: how can we nurture responsible *global citizens*, who envision the ethical goal of a peaceful global society, and do whatever they can to promote it in both their private and professional lives as well as in their role as citizens?

Global Citizenship Education is not a mere theoretical concept, but also a practical program to be implemented at schools, in youth work and adult education. *Global Citizenship Education* also offers clear-cut prospects to learners, who grow up in a world that holds both conflicts and chances; learners, who aspire to a life of solidarity. To these learners, *Global Citizenship Education* conveys knowledge, competences, values and attitudes that enable them to work towards a more equitable world for all.

Global Citizenship Education is a pedagogical field that has established itself internationally in the past few years. In the English-speaking world, the term citizenship is the most important category for what is called “civic education” or “education for democracy” in the German-speaking world. It is used when competing ideas of citizenship are discussed (Tully 2008: 15pp). This means that pedagogical fields differ from each other in how they define *citizenship* – how broadly they define the term and how much importance they attach to it. It was a milestone in directing international attention to *Global Citizenship Education* when the UN and the UNESCO adopted the concept. The *Global Education First Initiative* (2012) of UN General-Secretary Ban Ki-moon refers to education as the means with which to foster *global citizenship* and defines it as one of its three focal points¹ (see box 1).

In order to support this initiative and implement it in practice, the UNESCO chose *Global Citizenship Education* as its pedagogical guideline in 2013, based on a series of international conferences held in order to discuss different approaches to *Global Citizenship Education*. The initial result was the publication of the “*Global Citizenship Education: Preparing learners for the challenges of the twenty first century*” brochure in the spring of 2014, which

“WE MUST FOSTER GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP”

Education is a major driving force for human development. My new Education First initiative aims to give a “big push” to the global movement for education. The Initiative focuses on three priorities: [..]

Third, fostering *global citizenship*. Education is much more than an entry to the job market. It has the power to shape a sustainable future and better world. Education policies should promote peace, mutual respect and environmental care.

Source: Statement by UNO General-Secretary Ban Ki-moon, 26 September 2012, *Global Education First Initiative (GEFI)*²

Box 1: Statement by UN General-Secretary Ban Ki-moon

1 www.globaleducationfirst.org/289.htm

2 Ibid.

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: AN ANSWER TO NEW PEDAGOGICAL CHALLENGES

The globally networked world is an inevitable reality and makes great demands on individual orientation efforts. These include, for instance, orientation in a world of highly diverse values and lifestyles, the ability to liaise in a positive way with people of diverse cultural backgrounds and with equally diverse values, the ability to respond appropriately to new quality requirements and flexibility demands in a changing world of work, being mindful of the ecological and social consequences of consumerism, making appropriate political decisions or even estimating the implications of deciding not to act at all. All of these require political individuals who think globally – *global citizens*, in other words.

The context of a globalized world also makes demands on pedagogic thought and action and requires a new understanding of education that goes beyond the teaching of factual knowledge. The educational concept of global education, which should be an interdisciplinary consideration across all areas of teaching, centers on an increasing growth of complexity and development towards a global society. As described in the Global Education Strategy, the core purpose of contemporary education is to enable (young) individuals to understand these complex developments and to reflect critically on them. Amidst all of the confusion and external forces ruling our lives, it is crucial to interpret economic, social, political and cultural processes as malleable developments and to recognize possibilities of social participation, and active shaping of and shared responsibility in global society.

Source: Excerpt from the curriculum of the continuing Masters programme “Global Citizenship Education” p. 3

Box 2: New challenges for education

is available online and free of charge.³ *Global Citizenship Education* has thus joined the tradition of previous political pedagogies to which the UNESCO has committed itself, such as human rights education, education for democracy and sustainable development, as well as peace education (see Excursus 1).

As is the case with any concept, *Global Citizenship Education* is defined and interpreted in different ways in academic discourse. While this is an expression of lively discussion, it can be confusing for practitioners. In this brochure, we therefore aim to outline this multi-perspective concept, which we (the authors of this brochure) have developed particularly in the framework of the continuing Masters programme “*Global Citizenship Education*” (see box 2). It takes into account the

most significant points of discussion from each of the included approaches and attempts to combine them as far as possible, but also draws clear boundaries to certain concepts.⁴

This brochure essentially consists of three main chapters: chapter 2 deals with definitions and concepts related to *Global Citizenship Education*, chapter 3 discusses fundamental questions related to *Global Citizenship Education*, and chapter 4 is dedicated to prerequisites for the practice of *Global Citizenship Education*. The three inserted excursuses are about *Global Citizenship Education* within the UNESCO framework, about different conceptions of *Global Citizenship Education* and about GCED as compared to other political pedagogies.

3 unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002277/227729e.pdf

4 For the three-year study program mentioned above, whose second round started in 2015, see information in the appendix of this brochure, or www.uni-klu.ac.at/frieden/downloads/ULG_GCED_Curriculum_eng.pdf

Global Citizenship Education within the UNESCO framework

Since it was founded, the UNESCO has been working on the question of how education can prepare individuals to live together peacefully and solidarily. Already in 1946 it passed its *Resolution on the revision of textbooks*, which was followed by a number of related activities. The aim has been the revision of textbooks regarding their role in improving the mutual understanding of peoples and nations. In 1953, the *Associated School Project* was started, which has grown considerably since then. In 1968, the *International Bureau of Education (IBE)*, which is connected to the UNESCO, issued its *Recommendation on Education for International Understanding*. In 1974, the UNESCO developed – as a joint document of all its member states – its *Recommendation concerning education for international understanding, co-operation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms*. This declaration on “international education” examines the connection between international understanding, human rights, cultural education and, quite early on, environmental education. In a key passage, the recommendation demands an education policy aimed at “international solidarity and cooperation, which are necessary in solving the world problems.” On all educational levels, the international dimension and global perspective should be taken into consideration and central “world problems” (such as equality of peoples, peace, human rights) should always be addressed. Despite some of the document’s weaknesses discernible in retrospect (see Wintersteiner 1999, chapter 5.II), the text is an important milestone. The *Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy* (1995), however, goes much further.

After the end of the Cold War, societal problems like racism and intolerance, but also the growing divide between North and South were identified as the most urgent issues. It was no longer solely in the understanding between nations that solutions were sought, but also by looking at civil society. This text is arguably the most comprehensive depiction of a systematic pedagogic program for worldwide peace education. In later documents the focus shifts to other aspects, such as *education for sustainable development*, but specifically to education for a global *culture of peace*, which was developed even further in the UN international year of a *culture of peace* in 2000 and the subsequent decade 2001–2010. In the most well-known document in this regard, the 1999 *Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace*, it says in a key passage (Article 4): “Education at all levels is one of the principal means to build a culture of peace. In this context, human rights education is of particular importance.”⁵ In this and a range of other documents, an educational concept is developed that no longer merely advocates civic education, education for democracy, human rights education, peace education and intercultural understanding, but does so with a global perspective, i.e. with an awareness of global interconnectedness. Thus the groundwork for what is known today as *Global Citizenship Education* was laid. Based on several preparatory conferences and documents, the UNESCO finally published the ostensive brochure *Global Citizenship Education. Preparing learners for the challenges of the 21st century*.⁶ In this way, *Global Citizenship Education* can be understood as an integrative approach, which builds on the concepts mentioned above, but without wanting to ignore their respective significance.

5 www3.unesco.org/iycp/kits/uk_res_243.pdf

6 unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002277/227729e.pdf

THE UNESCO CONCEPT OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Global Citizenship Education (GCED) is a framing paradigm which encapsulates how education can develop the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes learners need for securing a world which is more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable.

It represents a conceptual shift in that it recognizes the relevance of education in understanding and resolving global issues in their social, political, cultural, economic and environmental dimensions. It also acknowledges the role of education in moving beyond the development of knowledge and cognitive skills to build values, soft skills and attitudes among learners that can facilitate international cooperation and promote social transformation.

GCED applies a multifaceted approach, employing concepts, methodologies and theories already implemented in different fields and subjects, including human rights education, peace education, education for sustainable development and education for international understanding. As such, it aims to advance their overlapping agendas, which share a common objective to foster a more just, peaceful and sustainable world.

Source: UNESCO (2014): Global Citizenship Education. Preparing learners for the challenges of the 21st century, p. 9

Box 3: *The UNESCO concept of Global Citizenship Education*

2. What is *Global Citizenship Education*?

2.1 Origin and definitions



Global Citizenship Education is a concept that has been established predominantly in the English-speaking world, but not only in the Western world or the “*global North*”. It is increasingly gaining recognition as an umbrella term that includes other pedagogies like *peace education*, *intercultural learning*, *global education* and *citizenship education*. This does not mean that these other pedagogies have become dispensable and should be substituted by this new concept, but one particular quality of *Global Citizenship Education* is that it connects all of them. An example would be the definition of the initiative “*Education Above All*”, a Qatar-based foundation that operates globally and whose aim it is to foster educational opportunities for children worldwide in cooperation with the UNESCO⁷ (see box 4).

AN UMBRELLA TERM

In this book the term “*education for global citizenship*” is used as an “umbrella term” covering themes such as education for tolerance and appreciation of diversity, conflict resolution and peace, humanitarian action, and introduction to the principles of human rights and humanitarian law, as well as civic responsibilities, – as these themes relate to local, national and international levels.

Themes within the field of education for *global citizenship*:

1. Values education and life skills education
2. Peace education; studies of the causes of conflict and its transformation, and other global issues.
3. Human rights education: critical thinking, empathy, avoiding stereotyping and exclusion, and the concepts associated with human rights and responsibilities.
4. Citizenship or civic education

Source: *Education Above All* (2012)⁸

Box 4: *Global Citizenship Education as umbrella term*

The *North-South Centre* of the Council of Europe, located in Lisbon, pursues a similarly holistic approach and has made global education its major focus. This concept, to which the *Austrian Strategy Group for Global Education* (a platform of educational federal authorities, NGO representatives and academia) has committed itself, pursues a broad and integrative approach, which strongly resembles the *Global Citizenship Education* approach presented here. This is apparent in the most significant pro-

⁷ see website: educationaboveall.org/#!/about/1

⁸ www.protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/eea_-_education_for_global_citizenship.pdf

grammatic document of the North-South Centre, the so-called *Maastricht Declaration* of 2002 (see box 5) where *Global Education* is, among other things, referred to as the global dimension of *Education for Citizenship*.

The term *Global Citizenship Education* is somewhat ambiguous, though. Those who refer to it use it in different ways and sometimes connect it to similar, but also clearly divergent objectives and programs. It is always the divergent interpretations of the *citizenship* term that make up the dividing line between them. *Global Citizenship Education* can, therefore, be understood vaguely as a global take on *Citizenship Education*, which means that *global* questions come into play, but the concept remains within the national *citizenship* paradigm; at other times, however, the term is interpreted as education for *global citizenship* and therefore does transcend the national paradigm. These are the two prototypical tendencies to be identified among the plethora of definitions and concepts of *Global Citizenship Education*. They are sometimes referred to as the *humanitarian* and the *political* approach. What distinguishes these two from each other is that the former perceives itself as *education of the global citizen*, but the latter as *education for global citizenship*. This means that the former focuses on the individual, who should develop the human qualities of a cosmopolitan (“individual cosmopolitanism”), while the latter focuses on societal structures that need to be changed in order for cosmopolitanism to become a viable option in the first place (“structural cosmopolitanism”). For this reason, we use the terms individual-humanitarian and structural-political approach. These differences somewhat correspond with terms used by other authors, such as *soft versus critical Global Citizenship Education* (Andreotti 2006), *humanitarian versus political approach* (Dobson 2005) or *modern versus diverse citizenship* (Tully 2008).

An example for individual cosmopolitanism would be the *Oxfam Curriculum*, a concept by the great charity and NGO Oxfam in England, which has become popular even beyond the English-speaking world, because it addresses the personal level in a very concrete manner: “Oxfam sees the *global citizen* as someone who is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen” (Oxfam 2006: 3).

In our view, this is an important aim of education, but a cosmopolitan type of education cannot restrict itself to developing a “sense of one’s own role”. It must also deal with the (societal, political, ideological, mental or cultural) obstacles that oppose a solidary global society and enable learners to question the latter critically.

An example for the structural approach stems from a standard reference on *global citizenship* by the US-American social scientist Luis Cabrera: “Its [the *global citizenship approach*] emphasis on global community can help to check tendencies toward viewing those within less-affluent states as passive recipients of morally required transfers, rather than as co-equal agents capable of contributing to their own rights protections, and justified in pressing their own interests” (Cabrera 2010: 14). Cabrera emphasizes the *global community* aspect, which is basically conceived of as one political unit, and shows that it is not all about humanitarian aid, but the redemption of legal claims. This means entering the political “arena”, which is precisely what constitutes the strength of this approach. The following illustration (box 6) intends to highlight these differences more clearly.

We advocate – following the principle of the citizenship term – the paradigm of political or “structural cosmopolitanism”, which questions societal power relations. However, we believe that some aspects of the individual-humanitarian approach should be adapted and

THE NORTH-SOUTH CENTRE OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE – DEFINITION OF “GLOBAL EDUCATION”

Global Education is education that opens people’s eyes and minds to the realities of the world, and awakens them to bring about a world of greater justice, equity and human rights for all.

Global Education is understood to encompass Development Education, Human Rights Education, Education for Sustainability, Education for Peace and Conflict Prevention and Intercultural Education; being the global dimensions of Education for Citizenship.

Source: *Maastricht Global Education Declaration (2002): European Strategy Framework For Improving and Increasing Global Education In Europe to the Year 2015*

Box 5: *Global education as global dimension of education for citizenship*

integrated into this paradigm. But which practical consequences would this primarily academic debate have on school teaching and education practices on site? In order to elaborate this question in more detail, these two terms need to be defined more clearly.

2.2 The “global citizen” approach

The *global citizen* approach corresponds with the school of thought known as “individual cosmopolitanism”. It defines the qualities that distinguish *global citizens* of today – namely as a combination of *knowledge, competences, values and attitudes*. The combination of these three levels, which belong together and constitute a unit (they also correspond with the Austrian *Decree on Civic Education*⁹), is the essential accomplishment of this conceptual model.

- * Knowledge: *global citizens* are able to recognize global problems and topics in their social, political, cultural, economic and eco-political dimension and combine their understanding of people’s diverse (often also multiple) national, religious, cultural, social, etc. identities with their own awareness of a common overarching identity (as humans), which bridges individual cultural, religious, ethnic and other differences.
- * Values: *global citizens* use their knowledge about global issues in order to convey universal values like justice, equality, dignity and respect.
- * Competences: *global citizens* have competences that allow them to question and reflect their own

(local or national) situation critically, systematically and creatively, and to take different perspectives to understand topics from diverse angles, levels and positions; they have social competences like empathy, the ability to solve conflict, communication skills, the ability to engage in social interaction with people from different contexts (origin, culture, religion, etc.) and the ability to collaborate in cooperative and responsible ways with others in order to find joint global solutions to global challenges.

- * *Global citizens*, however, are also self-reflective and have an enhanced awareness of connections between their own actions, social structures and economic processes, such as forms of inequality and injustice on different levels, and can identify possible opportunities for action (my local actions or my choosing not to act have global consequences).

The strength of this approach, namely the focus on the individuality of the learner, is at the same time its weakness. It assumes the perspective of every individual’s opportunity for action, but thereby has a tendency to neglect structural problems. It regards *global citizenship* as an individual decision, as a conscious feeling of being connected to all humans alike, beyond geographical, religious or cultural borders. While this is very honorable, it fails to focus on global differences in wealth, status and power. If I cannot change unjust conditions as an individual, any “critical consumerism” remains without serious consequences or moral indignation. Or I may realize that I must find political ways in order to effect change. Taking into account political

“INDIVIDUAL-HUMANITARIAN” OR “STRUCTURAL-POLITICAL” APPROACH?	
<p>Acts grounded on [a] moral basis are easily withdrawn and end up reproducing unequal (paternalistic) power relations.</p> <p>Being human raises issues of morality.</p> <p>Argument common humanity: interdependence and world-wide interconnectedness</p> <p>Is defenseless in the face of and/or naturalizes the myth of Western supremacy</p>	<p>Justice is a better ground for thinking as it is political and prompts fairer and more equal relations.</p> <p>Being a citizen raises political issues.</p> <p>Argument unequal power relations: against the projection of Northern/Western values as global and universal</p> <p>Criticizes the myth of Western supremacy</p>
<p>Source: Vanessa Andreotti (2006): “soft” versus “critical” Global Citizenship Education</p>	

Box 6: Individual-humanitarian or structural-political approach to GCED

9 Grundsatzlerlass, Abschnitt I, www.bmbf.gv.at/ministerium/vp/2015/2015_12.pdf?4xy9q1

structures is the strength of the second, the *global citizenship* approach.

2.3 The “*global citizenship*” approach

“Structural cosmopolitanism” not only investigates the personal, but also political prerequisites for *global citizenship*. For what is the use of all good intentions, when an unjust world order still prevails and when differences in wealth, life chances and political power are as tremendous as they are at present? How can one be a *global citizen* in the full sense of the term, when the structure of international relations prevents it? The *global citizenship approach*, thus, first critically investigates international crises, problems, and developments. Typical examples would be climate change, war, and hunger, but also education, the condition of human rights or fair trade. At the same time, this approach deals with the world order as a whole, such as international relations, legal frameworks, international regulations and regimes, and therefore with political opportunities for action. Effective political action is, after all, still tied to the nation state. At the same time, however, it is becoming increasingly clear that this level is no longer sufficient. For this reason, the normative guideline for the citizenship approach is a *world domestic policy*, which is the notion that the same standards should apply on an international level (even if this is not the case at present) as inside of democratic states, particularly:

- * “democracy” (no oppression of the weak by the strong)
- * human rights (as an internationally accepted standard)
- * nonviolence (i.e. use of violence only as ultima ratio according to UN rules for the protection of civil society)
- * global concepts of justice (political measures in order to curtail economic injustice)
- * transnational citizenship (political rights beyond citizenship that is restricted to the nation state)

This conception of *global citizenship*, however, has been drawn up from a western perspective in terms of diction and terminology, which may be questioned critically. A detailed discussion of the *global citizenship approach* can be found in Excursus 2.

Particularly the latter point is significant in this context: so far, *citizenship* as an ensemble of citizens’ rights and duties has been tied to statehood. An individu-

al has no *citizenship* status without being citizen of a particular state. For this reason, the nation state is still the most significant political arena. Difficulties related to the *global citizenship* concept result from the fact that no legal status is attached to it. *Global citizenship* emerges as a conscious act of either attribution or self-attribution. It can be understood as a status similar to human rights: each and every individual is entitled to demand human rights, regardless of her or his personal and social properties, origin and life situation. In analogy, *global citizenship* can be regarded as a “status” that is granted to all humans due to their identity as humans. This stance offers a critical measure for how imperfectly “cosmopolitanism” has been implemented so far. The *global citizenship* approach is, therefore, also an instrument with which to denounce legal inequalities and expose social inequalities as scandalous; as there should be no place for either of them in the One World of *global citizens*.

The *global citizenship* approach, however, not only stands out because of its critical view of social inequalities on a global scale. It also unveils the deficits of our own migration societies as political ones. It draws attention, for instance, to the number of people (refugees and migrants) living in our countries without any political rights, and that this is not their own personal problem, but a problem related to a lack of democratic development. *Global citizenship* thus also has a national and a “glocal” aspect: the entitlement of all of a country’s citizens to political participation, as well as their duty to consider the global dimension in all of their decisions.

The fact remains that *global citizenship* (as status) cannot be realized in the same way as *national citizenship*. There is not a single country in the world that can award *world citizenship* to all of its citizens. This is a good thing, because at this point, a world state can only be conceived as a totalitarian entity, which would be forced upon a diverse range of individuals. However, the *global citizenship* notion should not be dropped. On the contrary, the tension between aspirations and realization options adds a utopian element to the *global citizenship* concept. Maybe it could be put like this: “Its essence is the absence of it.” The fact that it cannot be implemented at this point calls attention to a deficit. This stimulates our sense of possibility and steers our practice towards a peacefully organized, just, and democratic global society – not a world state! – according to Robert Musil, who said that “if there is a sense of reality, there must also be a sense of possibility.”

Global citizenship is not, however, an absolute, but a concrete utopia. It inquires about conditions and possibilities in order to develop democratic participation beyond the borders of the nation state as well as the juridification of international relations in order to replace the “law of force” with “the force of law”. The question posed by structural cosmopolitanism is, thus, how citizenship education and participatory action can operate not only from a cosmopolitan perspective, but also in a cosmopolitan arena to the greatest possible extent. A range of approaches are concerned with the latter. The following are examples for *transnational* or *global citizenship*:

- * The codification of human rights, first in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948), then in other documents, has created an international legal sphere, that is binding “only” in a moral sense initially, but in which similar or the same standards apply. This is an important first step beyond the nation state. If human rights are generally accepted, it means that national law can operate only within the frame of human rights.
- * The UN system is a tremendous step – one that is often underestimated today – towards regulation and juridification of international relations. Previously, with very few exceptions, the relations between states were mainly anarchic, which meant unrestricted prevalence of the “might makes right” principle. Although this could not be fully overcome by founding the United Nations, the latter did lead to its moral denunciation and partial restriction.

- * Institutions of civil society, organized internationally, such as the *World Social Forum* or the *World Educational Forum*. These institutions are far more than mere global gatherings of NGOs. They contribute to the emergence of a very concrete political “world awareness” in activists from all over the world. In this way, it becomes possible to understand important, often locally embedded concerns of citizens in their global dimension and to organize global movements of solidarity.
- * The European Union is an advanced form of partially overcoming national structures. In contrast to other examples, there are implications on the status level. For instance, the right to vote in communal elections is granted not only to actual citizens, but also EU citizens, who have had permanent residence in an area for a particular period of time. On the other hand, the flipside of the inward opening up of the EU cannot be ignored – namely the increasingly rigid outward closure, which means ever more dramatic forms of misery for refugees at the fortified external borders of the EU.

While all of these examples are only approaches to global or *cosmopolitan citizenship*, they do show that this is about more than a purely notional construct. It is about an incremental transformation of reality. The development of *global citizenship* is a process that is historically possible and actually in progress today, even if we do not yet know whether it will succeed. *Global Citizenship Education*, in any case, can make a real contribution to promoting this process.

Comparing different *citizenship* concepts

This Excursus aims to consolidate reflections of the significance of *citizenship* for political systems and ways in which the concept is being further developed. Chapter 3 then continues to outline a range of fundamental questions related to *Global Citizenship Education*.

1. What does *citizenship* mean?

Citizens are constituent elements of a nation state: a state needs its population in order to exist in the first place (Bauböck/Vink 2013: 622). Citizenship means being a member of a political community. In this way, legal equality of all “members”, i.e. citizens, is established in democratic states. The members of this political community have the same rights and duties towards the state and the other members of the community. Thus, citizenship is a legal status (relationship between individual and state) on the one hand, and a social relationship between citizens on the other hand (Gosewinkel 2008: 31). Granting citizenship to the residents of a state creates a political and symbolic community of all people living in a state; a great abstract *We* is created, which conveys both a sense of belonging and a sense of safety. By implication, a *You* is created, which is a group of people that does not belong to this community and, therefore, does not have the same rights and duties (Bloemraad/Korteweg/Yurdakul 2008: 155; Osler/Starkey 2005: 11; Thüser 2000: 179). A delineation of this kind is, on the one hand, necessary in order to shape one’s own identity (Mouffe 2013: 18), but must, on the other hand, not be misused for racist or violent exclusion.

The concept of citizenship, that developed historically, comprises three aspects (Stack 2012: 873–875):

- a) *Legal status*: democratic states entail social rights, such as entitlement to social benefits, access to education and health services, as well as civil rights and freedoms like personal freedom and integrity, freedom of assembly, freedom of opinion and religion or right to free information and media, which may be restricted to the citizens of a state. Particularly the right to political participation is often reserved for citizens.
- b) *Political participation*: the legal status of citizenship is closely linked to the right to political participation (Benhabib 2007: 167). It is the practice of political and social participation that lends meaning to the legal status as citizen.
- c) *Feeling of belonging*: humans live together in a society. Daily active cooperation and shared realities, values and institutions shape their identities; people identify with “their” state and feel as if they belong to “their” national community (Bloemraad/Korteweg/Yurdakul 2008: 154).

2. What does *citizenship* mean for democracy?

Democracy is based on the idea that a group of citizens governs itself. This means, in theory, that the governing and the governed are the same group. All people governed by and subjected to the laws of a group also have the right to be part of the government, or respectively to choose it (Beckman 2013: 49; Näsström 2011: 124). This is the fundamental notion of the democratic principle, whose direct implementation would be direct democracy. As a result, the question about who is part of the citizenry is of great importance in any democracy. In contemporary nation states, the democratic principle means that the governed are the sovereign people, who have active and passive electoral rights, allowing them to vote their own government in this kind of democratic political system; they may also vote that very same government out of office again. Sovereignty of the people denotes the idea that “the people” (thus the entirety of all citizens or the *demos*) are both subject and object to legislation (Benhabib 2007: 171). Citizens determine the creation of laws to which they are then subjected. Both the concept of the nation state and the concept of wide-ranging democratization have historically developed in parallel in Europe. For this reason, contemporary modern democracies are institutionalized predominantly as nation states.

3. Challenges posed to national concepts of *citizenship* and democracy

Since the middle of the 20th and particularly the beginning of the 21st century, there have been developments

that pose certain challenges to the historically developed concept of citizenship, which is closely tied to democratic systems that are structured as nation states.

* International migration

International migration is a global and actually very old phenomenon. It has increased substantially in numbers over the last decades for various reasons. Between 1910 and 2000, for instance, the world's population tripled, but the number of migrants multiplied by six (Benhabib 2007: 175). In 2011, a total of about 33.3 million people lived in the EU without citizenship status in their country of residence, equaling about 6.6% of the total population. Most of them, namely about 20.5 million, were not EU citizens, but so-called third country nationals (Eurostat 2012: 1). Overall, people have become more flexible and mobile, and it is no longer uncommon for someone to live in or have ties to different countries and to identify with different cities or countries to the same extent (Osler/Starkey 2005: 12). People shape their identities from a patchwork of affiliations that can be expanded flexibly, but hardly reduced (Cattacin 2005: 6). Increasing migration and the related necessity of integrating new population groups into the respective host society impacts a number of political areas of a state, such as the labor market, social and health services, the education system or housing policy. In terms of democracy, a growing population of people without citizenship status constitutes a particular difficulty (Vernby 2013: 15; Reeskens/Hooghe 2010: 594): The question about the structure of the demos and access to rights of political participation is posed anew and must be renegotiated. The permanent exclusion of a growing population segment from political participation may eventually lead to deficient legitimization of the democratic system.

* Globalization

Globalization denotes a process during which global relations in various areas and on different levels become stronger and more frequent.¹⁰ Expressions of globalization are, for instance, economic cooperation between communities of different countries as well as between regions and nations, scientific exchange, travel, networking via the internet and the "shortened" distances between states. Due to technological progress and increasing wealth in one part of the world, border crossing has become logistically, technically and economically easier and takes place more frequently.

This growing trend of globalization has led to increased deterritorialization, not only of economies, capital flows and trade of goods, but of people, ideas and identities (Bloemraad/Korteweg/Yurdakul 2008: 165). It has also created common problems and challenges that can no longer be controlled or solved by one country alone, but need to be worked out among different states. Since the creation of the UN Charter in 1945 and the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* in 1948, a kind of *global constitutionalism* has gradually developed; an increasingly dense network of international treaties, legal regulations and binding minimum standards, which supports and at the same time regulates the mutual dependence and cooperation of different states (Brunkhorst/Kettner 200: 13). A range of additional players have joined the ranks of nation states, who used to be the central players in the international political system. Such additional players include NGOs (non-governmental organizations), international organizations, supranational players, institutions and large corporations. They are mainly civil society or non-governmental players, who are not democratically legitimized, but claim to be better at promoting or monitoring norms such as human rights, environmental standards, constitutionality and the like. This development is termed "democratic transnationalism" by Chantal Mouffe (2005: 122): global problems are to be solved on a transnational level by non-governmental, democratically organized players.

* International political regimes

Global phenomena such as climate change, pollution, international economic relations or international conflicts are developments or structures that affect a vast number of people in many countries of the world – even if in different ways or to different extents. At the same time, they are occurrences that are not tied to a particular territory, but have global or at least regional impacts (e.g. on a particular continent). It is indeed another consequence of globalization: what results from increased interconnectedness is a much greater mutual dependence and vulnerability of individual states. If there is a crisis or problem in one state, it has implications for many other states.

International political cooperation has increased tremendously over the last decades, which has led (almost as a matter of course) to the internationalization and institutionalization of "western" concepts, institutions and values. International regimes are supposed to

10 www.globalisierung-fakten.de

solve the existing problems. At the same time, the emphasis of “international collaboration” in political, economic and media discourse often masks the fact that there are basic conflicts of interest and structural differences in power between states, whereby the nature of “collaboration” differs significantly for each respective country. Increased political collaboration on an international and transnational level gradually curtails the scope of action of nation states and their governments. This happens partly because states are confronted with phenomena they cannot handle by themselves, to some extent because their political and legal scope of action has been limited by international treaties, international law or European integration. More and more often, decisions are no longer made by national (democratically legitimized) politicians, but by international or transnational players, who have no such legitimization (Näsström 2011: 124).

This poses a challenge to democracy, which is organized within national frameworks. The type of “political cosmopolitanism” discussed here advocates the worldwide extension of nationally organized democracy, whereby familiar democratic institutions like parliamentary assembly, elections, jurisdiction and the like should be “globalized”, so to speak (Mouffe 2005: 122pp.). Accordingly, the debate about the potential extension of democracy and civic participation to a transnational level is a very current and utterly important one both in the development of democracy and in concepts of citizenship.

4. New concepts of citizenship

In response to the above mentioned challenges posed to the traditional understanding of citizenship and democracy, various alternative concepts of citizenship have been developed in political science. They are suggestions for how to expand or even substitute the hitherto known and nationally bound concept of citizenship and the democratic structures connected to it. It must be noted that neither of these concepts are monolithic, but that there are diverse and even competing definitions and notions for each of them, which require detailed analysis. Some of these concepts are briefly outlined and subsequently discussed below.

* *Global citizenship*

The concept of *global citizenship* does not relate to nation states or similar geographical and political units. It is rather about participation in a global community,

about human identity and solidarity, and about the validity and adherence to human rights on a global scale. It is proposed that certain rights and the condition of being human itself constitute stronger ties than being part of a nation. The example that can be given for empirically observable developments in that direction is the *global constitutionalism* mentioned above. Based on human rights and other treaties designed for the protection of individual freedoms and rights vis-à-vis the state, it ranks above and in some ways curtails state monopoly on the use of force (Brunkhorst/Kettner 2000: 13).

Political scientists have argued that due to the above developments and circumstances, such as migration and globalization, the nation has become too small in order to continue to be a valid reference frame for politics, participation and identity (Thürer 2000: 178). They also assert that in times of increased mobility and flexibility, in which cross-border interactions are becoming ever faster and more frequent, both an identity based on territory and a geographical reference frame for citizenship have become too rigid and must be expanded in flexible ways. Also, the universal validity of human and minority rights and the spread of *global constitutionalism* on the one hand, as well as global threats facing humanity on the other hand, contribute to the emergence of a human identity, which must become the basis for any future political reflection (Morin/Kern, 1999). While this is the inevitable and indisputable premise, quite adverse concepts of *global citizenship* have been derived from it. One particular school of thought concludes that there is no longer a need to divide the world up into nations or continents (Stephens 2010: 33-34). How this solidarity with all humans worldwide can be expressed in concrete terms and implemented (institutionally) is a question that, of course, remains unanswered.

This approach, however, discounts several important aspects: on the one hand, the western notion of liberal democracy and the corresponding understanding of law and justice are considered as “normal” and to be expanded worldwide. This notion seems to ignore the fact that a variety of political systems and practices, disparate understandings of human rights and a plurality of diverse identities have developed worldwide. From this range, a particular system of norms is to be singled out, according to this approach to *global citizenship*, and to be declared universal.

On the other hand, what also remains hidden is the fact that despite universal human rights, there are substan-

tial structural differences and inequalities worldwide. These would have to be changed through political action, which is masked by the marked focus on the connectedness of all people as full equals. In other words, the significance of (necessarily conflictual) political action is not highlighted sufficiently.

Another strand of *global citizenship* places importance on precisely this structural aspect. Cabrera asserts: “[...] it also should be an institutionally oriented conception. [...] Its emphasis on global community can help to check tendencies toward viewing those within less-affluent states as passive recipients of morally required transfers, rather than as co-equal agents capable of contributing to their own rights protections, and justified in pressing their own interests” (2010: 14). The concept advocated in this brochure is committed to this approach.

* **Cosmopolitan citizenship**

The notion of the cosmopolitan individual originates in the ancient world and was broadly adopted in the era of Humanism and during 18th century European Enlightenment. Particularly the German philosopher Immanuel Kant was a major influence in shaping this notion (Osler/Starkey 2005: 20). In the late 19th century, however, nationalist movements in Europe gained strength and in the 20th century, the idea of the cosmopolitan was almost forgotten due to (nationalist) conflicts and world wars and was deemed a threat by nationalists and racists. At present, however, *cosmopolitan citizenship* is increasingly introduced again into discussions about new concepts of citizenship (Seitz 2009: 37). The term is sometimes used synonymously with *global citizenship*, and sometimes defined as an independent term, as in *global citizenship* as “core component of the cosmopolitan approach” (Cabrera 2010: 14).

Cosmopolitanism is also often linked to *global governance*. Forms of *global governance* (*global constitutionalism*) that exist today through international organizations and institutions, binding international treaties and conventions, as well as multilayered systems (in which decisions are made on different levels, i.e. national, regional and global) show that such a cosmopolitan form of government is certainly possible (Seitz 2009: 43). What must be kept in mind is the fact that, in the final analysis, it is the nation states that make ultimate decisions in all of these multilayered and *global governance* systems. *Global governance* is thus a kind of superstructure intended to coordinate and monitor nation states, into which new players are integrated. International organizations, NGOs, social movements, company repre-

sentatives, scientific institutions (*think tanks*), parliamentary boards or committees working on specific topics have increasingly emerged as independent players in the international arena in recent years and are heard and integrated to greater extents by nation states as well (Fues 2007: 2). Nevertheless, the nation states remain the key players.

The basis of legitimacy of regional and international organizations that want to regulate the behavior of nation states is often based on moral and normative approaches, the universality of human rights or environmental protection. The *cosmopolitan citizenship* approach is based (often inexplicitly) on a person’s identity as a human being, as a bearer of certain rights and duties, regardless of the country in which she or he was born or is currently living (Seitz 2009: 44). These are rights of individuals towards other people, animals, the environment, other states and their authorities. They are also individuals’ duties towards other people, states and the Earth. In this way, this approach shares similarities with *global citizenship*, which also starts with the premise of an overarching identity as a human being. Cosmopolitans are more aware of elements that unite all of humankind, rather than those that divide (Osler/Starkey 2005: 21). This notion of citizenship can therefore be assigned to “individual-humanitarian cosmopolitanism” as discussed in chapter 2. Quite often it does not address the issue of how the (democratic) legitimization of players through (cosmopolitan) citizens can be ensured in an international or even global political system. Moreover, the approach neglects the fact that there are tremendous structural differences between people from different states and their options, as well as between different states and their scope of influence. Structural differences, which exist in every society, are also prevalent on an international scale, and can hardly just be “done away with” (*antagonism*), are masked by referring to solidarity and the assumed equality of all humans and are thereby eliminated from consciousness. In this context, Chantal Mouffe speaks of an “anti-political vision of cosmopolitanism” or *post-politics* (see Mouffe 2005: 8; 2014).

* **Postnational citizenship**

This concept starts with the premise that citizenship must overcome the category of the nation state, because the latter is no longer an appropriate reference for identity formation in a modern globalized world. Two questions remain unanswered, namely how a post-national community can be the basis for identification

and how *postnational democracy* or politics shall work in practice.

The idea of postnational citizenship, as does *global citizenship*, refers to the necessity (in the long run) of overcoming the rigid focus on the nation state as frame of reference and action for both the political and social sphere. The postnational approach, however, does not relate to a global civil society or a global polity (political unit), but rather envisions regional structures. An example for a feasible postnational experiment would be the European Union. Another central question remains unanswered: how can political institutions that are necessary for any democratic society be transferred to a supranational level in meaningful and functional ways (Tambini 2001: 195)? Even the EU, which has made immense progress with the integration of national responsibility, has had problems in expanding limited democratic structures that have grown out of nation states and remained limited to them.

* Transnational citizenship

Citizenship is conceived as the relationship between individuals and the *polity*. *Polity* is a term in political science that signifies the form and structure of a political unit. A state, for instance is a *polity*. However, the nation state as *polity* is limited too narrowly in a mobile, globalized world (Fox 2005: 175). As is the case with the concepts of *global* and *postnational* citizenship, the question referring to the new frame of reference remains unanswered. How can a new political unit be defined? Who gets to be member of this new community, i.e. a citizen? How can one become a member? How will such issues be decided? How can democratic institutions and processes be transformed on this new level? These questions are largely answered in the traditional understanding of citizenship: the nation state is the *polity*, which is clearly defined by borders, has a government and democratic structures including legitimization and a scope of action within the nation state. Federal law determines who can become member of this political community and how. These important issues are still to be resolved in the transnational approach.

These concepts and new forms of citizenship are only one part of the debate on this topic taking place mainly in political science. It touches upon several important points and common features of this discussion: for one, all of these concepts are based on the insight that the democratic nation state as player, regulatory framework and category as such is increasingly losing its sovereign

scope of action in a world that is ever more globally networked. New concepts of citizenship therefore ask “what now?” and “what’s next?” The particular focus of such considerations includes the development of democratic mechanisms and the scope of civic participation.

The approaches introduced above are facing the following dilemma: they may either accept their “utopian element”, i.e. the fact that there are no answers (yet) – and cannot be at this point – to questions regarding the political and legal implementation of *global citizenship*, in which case they might be disregarded as “unrealistic” or “unworldly”. If, however, they opted for the concretization of the concept within existing geopolitical structures and power relations, they would run the risk of subscribing to an apolitical understanding of the citizenship term, and, while emphasizing the commonalities of all humans worldwide, leave the reality of unequal power relations unaddressed. Universal “cosmopolitan” rights thus remain notional for as long as there is no effective mechanism that allows individuals to enforce these rights. Such legal instruments normally do exist within nation states, which is why their weakening may well lead to decreased constitutional protection for individuals (Mouffe 2005: 133). Moreover, developments like globalization, international political collaboration and specifically their concrete implementation tend to be regarded as “natural” or “normal”, which masks the fact that rules and systems are social constructs and can therefore be changed (Mouffe 2013: 17).

This leads to the following conclusion: *Global Citizenship Education* faces the challenge, on the one hand, to create a notion of citizenship that is as open, pragmatic and cosmopolitan as possible, while, on the other hand, it must be careful not to subscribe to apolitical thought. The multiple connections between local, regional and global levels, as well as global structures must be clearly delineated, so that starting points and concrete scopes of action to change these conditions and structures can be presented. Thus, it is a matter of adding an action-oriented component to the theoretical concepts of *global citizenship* and *cosmopolitanism*. The utopian element must be maintained as “that extra something”, because it points to the fact that the current global political setting does not yet provide conditions that allow for the implementation of *global citizenship* as introduced in this brochure.

3. Fundamental Questions related to *Global Citizenship Education*

3

This section examines some frequently discussed problems related to any type of cosmopolitan education, and in particular the following questions:

- * What is the relationship between a national or regional/local sense of belonging and cosmopolitan aspirations?
- * How can someone develop an identity as *global citizen* when there can be no corresponding legal status?
- * How do we deal with the adverse dimensions of our historical heritage as Europeans, especially colonialism? How do we prevent the perpetuation of such traditions (as in neo-colonial paternalism)? This is an essential question, whose significance immediately becomes apparent in any international school project.

3.1 National and/or cosmopolitan identity?

It is important to investigate the relationship between the cosmopolitan approach of *Global Citizenship Education* and the dominant pedagogical orientation towards the nation state. Cosmopolitan thought is nothing new; it can be found in all cultures and civilizations. Frequently it was religions that expressed the idea of the oneness of humankind in one way or another. In ancient Greece, for instance, the philosopher Diogenes (probably 405 to 320 B.C.) referred to himself as citizen of the world (*kosmopolítēs*). His intention was to be critical of the existing (city-)state. He demanded the abolition of all forms of government existing at the time, as the only true form of government was the order of the cosmos. Cosmopolitan and nationalist thought thus seem to have been in a relationship of mutual tension since time immemorial. As pointed out before, contemporary cosmopolitanism neither strives to replace national identity, nor to abolish nation states. What the cosmopolitan approach does is offer a new mental framework that provides room for national, regional or other identities *within* one cosmopolitan approach.

Along these very lines, American philosopher Martha Nussbaum also argues that cosmopolitanism should take precedence when she emphasizes that students in the USA should definitely develop and cultivate traditional familial, religious, ethnic, cultural and national ties. But, Nussbaum continues, this is no longer enough in times of globalization. Much more than this, they must learn to understand the oneness of humankind. This can only work through open exchange with the “other”. In this process, they must be “undeterred by traits that are strange to them, and be eager to understand humanity in all its guises. They must learn enough about the different to recognize common aims, aspirations, and values, and enough about these common ends to see how variously they are instantiated in the many cultures and their histories” (Nussbaum 1996: 9).

DIALECTICS OF DIFFERENT IDENTITIES, DIALECTICS OF UNITY AND DIVERSITY

The terran identity card of the new citizen of the world involves a group of concentric identities: family, city, province, and nation. Western identity, even when it will have possessed itself of elements stemming from other civilizations, will have to be seen as only one facet of earthly identity.

Internationalism aims for the human species to be one people. Globalism wants it to be one state. What matters is to turn the human species into humanity and the planet Earth into a common home for human diversity. A planetary society/community would truly achieve human unity/diversity.

Source: Edgar Morin/Anne Brigitte Kern (1999): *Homeland Earth*. Hampton Press, p 97.

Box 7: The planetary society

Nussbaum thus encourages us to recognize the oneness of humankind through its veil of diversity, while neither dissolving this diversity, nor welcoming it too eagerly. She makes the concession that all people may be irritated by other cultures and unfamiliar behaviors, but demands our effort to look beyond them for what is human. This is a concrete application of human rights to the area of education.

The notion of the oneness of humankind, as in equal rights for everyone according to the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, however, must not be taken to mean that all humans are actually equal in a political sense. On the contrary, it is globalization in particular that makes us acutely aware of immensely unjust differences in wealth, life chances and scope of influence. *Global Citizenship Education* draws attention to means by which we could bridge the gap between the demand for a fairer global society and our present reality. The dialectics of oneness and diversity, as described by the French philosopher Edgar Morin, thereby remains an everlasting challenge. Because even if we recognize the “other” as equal, the differences in interests, perceptions and ideologies prevail; they can only be dealt with through politics, i.e. democratic dissension (see box 7).

3.2 Three dimensions of *Global Citizenship Education*

How can we – in view of the utopian nature of *global citizenship* – envision this concept in practice (at school)? The British educators Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey have devised a highly useful differentiation of the citizenship term that is relevant for the practical implementation of *Global Citizenship Education*. They differentiate between *citizenship* as *status, feeling and practice*.

The status of citizenship is, as pointed out before, still tied to the nation state for the most part. The example of the European Union, however, already constitutes a transnational approach: all EU citizens have active and passive electoral rights in municipal elections and elections of the European Parliament in their respective country of residence. From a *global citizenship* perspective, it could be argued that there should be an expansion of these rights, maybe in terms of comprehensive EU civil rights. It would also correspond with the rationale of the EU concept, if EU citizenship was extended to all people living in an EU country permanently, irrespective of the national passport they hold. It would be an important first step to raise awareness about the injustice inherent in restricting civil rights to formal citizens. This would be highly relevant for the integration of refugees and migrants.

Citizenship is, after all, also a feeling of belonging to a community of citizens (Osler/Starkey 2005: 11). According to Osler and Starkey, this feeling of belonging in migrants and members of minority groups strongly depends on the behavior of the non-migrant majority population and the political currents in their country of residence. “Access to citizenship therefore requires a commitment by the state to ensuring that the education of all its citizens includes an understanding of the principles of democracy and human rights and an uncompromising challenge to racism in all its forms. [...] There will be conflicts and tensions within society and these are the legitimate and necessary subjects of education for citizenship, which is therefore inevitably controversial” (Osler/Starkey 2005: 13p).

This is an immensely important principle of any type of citizenship education, which also corresponds to the “Beutelsbach Consensus”, whose second principle is that “matters which are controversial in intellectual and




Illustration 1: Three dimensions of citizenship

political affairs must also be taught as controversial in educational instruction.”¹¹

Finally – and this is the decisive level for classroom teaching –, *citizenship* can also be regarded as *practice*. Only through their own practical participation can learners become aware that they have means to impact “the way of the world”. Osler and Starkey conclude that “citizenship is not confined simply to a formal status in relation to a nation state. Nor is it confined to those able to exercise the right to vote. The scope of citizenship has expanded as new groups have demanded to be included among those who make decisions concerning their lives” (Osler/Starkey 2005: 15).

Only at this point a dynamic moment enters the concept of *citizenship*, which otherwise seems inflexible and tends to have a legal sound to it. It is through taking active steps that rights can be claimed, but also exercised in practice, which ideally also leads to an actual extension of legal possibilities. Even more important, however, is the notion that there is always a certain scope of action, and that political action is always possible and makes sense, even without a concession of full formal rights. Moreover, the pedagogically relevant principle is this: “Young people are not ‘future citizens’, but active citizens now!”¹² This means that we have to fathom opportunities to open up a scope of action for young people that allows them to actually feel like *global*

citizens and thereby make an important bottom-up contribution to creating a more peaceful global society. Even if we, as individuals or NGO members, cannot solve the “great problems”, we can definitely make a contribution by cultivating awareness for injustices and possibilities for change. This creates hope that political decision making processes may turn out differently in the long run than they do now. In this sense, *Global Citizenship Education* is also a transformative type of education that not only introduces learners to the world as it is, but enables them to participate actively in its transformation.

3.3 Critical analysis of our past

Global Citizenship Education is incomplete and unthinkable without its historical dimension. Any attempt to build on the cosmopolitan and *global citizen* tradition in European thought must inevitably face the dark side of not only European, but more generally Western history, i.e. *colonialism* and *imperialism*. The process of globalization as it presents itself today is, among other things, the product of the geopolitical constellation as created by worldwide Western dominance; a dominance that not only applies to politics and economy, but also science and culture. In addition to this colonial-imperial tradition, there is the need to confront both “breaches of

11 The Beutelsbach Consensus establishes three ethical-pedagogical principles for citizenship education: first, the “prohibition against overwhelming the pupil”; i.e. a ban on indoctrination to allow students to form their own opinions and become independent thinkers; second, “treating controversial subjects as controversial”; i.e. the imperative to discuss controversial political and economic topics just as controversially in the classroom and, again, to allow students to form their own opinions; and third, “giving weight to the personal interests of pupils”, i.e. teaching pupils to analyze a situation in relation to their own interests and to find ways to impact the given situation accordingly. The Beutelsbach Consensus was drawn up at a conference of the German national offices for citizenship education in 1976 and also applies to Austria. Source: www.lpb-bw.de/beutelsbacher-konsens.html

12 unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002277/227729e.pdf, p. 23

civilization” of the 20th century epitomized by *Auschwitz* and *Hiroshima*. Taking all of this into consideration is the prerequisite for a global pedagogical exchange as intended by *Global Citizenship Education*.

“Education after Auschwitz”, as Adorno called it in his famous piece, has its firm place in curricula and in practical school teaching. The currently recurring anti-Semitic, racist, and more recently also anti-Muslim tendencies indicate that there is still an urgent and immediate need for it. This sense of being alert applies – after the NS regime and the Holocaust – particularly to Austria and Germany.

Hiroshima is also taught in schools, but, in our opinion as a mere historical event, rather than a central place of remembrance (*lieu de mémoire*) in our collective memory. Hiroshima, after all, stands for the hubris of modern civilization to exhaust every possibility to manufacture weapons for the destruction of the “enemy”, which, in the final analysis, turn out to be instruments of self-destruction. Ever since the historical Hiroshima of 1945, the arsenals of NBC weapons and their carrier systems have grown indefinitely. Today, human self-destruction has turned from an abstract possibility into a real danger. And these instruments of self-destruction are still being honed. The particular approach to nature, science and technology, although it was the underlying principle for the development of the atomic bomb, has not changed since then. On the contrary, more examples of a problematic or even scandalous approach

to technology have emerged. For this reason, the duty and crucial pedagogical endeavor to examine the ways in which we develop and use technology remains of utmost importance. It is a Western-European-American tradition that we need to reconsider carefully.

The third problematic historical heritage, colonialism, still is – in our opinion – neither perceived nor taught to the required extent in a way that corresponds to its historical and “paradigmatic” significance. What we mean by paradigmatic significance is that colonialism was not only a political and economic phenomenon, but also one that has been dominating the ideologies and mindscapes of western civilization substantially – and still does to this very day. The ancient racism, on which modern anti-Semitism is based, was systematically developed as “scientific construct” during colonial conquests since the “discovery” of America (Mignolo: 2011). In this way, as asserted by Aimé Césaire, colonialism has barbarized colonizers, who believed they were bringing civilization to barbarians (see box 10).

Which conclusions can be drawn from these considerations for practical teaching? For one, there is a need for systematic knowledge about the history of colonialism, which must be seen as a pan-European phenomenon. The argument, for instance, that the Austro-Hungarian Empire did not possess colonies and was therefore not “involved” does not hold. On the one hand, the Habsburg monarchy did profit from colonialism, and, on the other hand, the political strategies employed

THEODOR W. ADORNO – EDUCATION AFTER AUSCHWITZ

The premier demand upon all education is that Auschwitz not happen again. Its priority before any other requirement is such that I believe I need not and should not justify it. I cannot understand why it has been given so little concern until now. To justify it would be monstrous in the face of the monstrosity that took place. Yet the fact that one is so barely conscious of this demand and the questions it raises shows that the monstrosity has not penetrated people’s minds deeply, itself a symptom of the continuing potential for its recurrence as far as peoples’ conscious and unconscious is concerned. Every debate about the ideals of education is trivial and inconsequential compared to this single ideal: never again Auschwitz. It was the barbarism all education strives against. One speaks of the threat of a relapse into barbarism. But it is not a threat – Auschwitz was this relapse, and barbarism continues as long as the fundamental conditions that favored that relapse continue largely unchanged. That is the whole horror. The societal pressure bears down, although the danger remains invisible nowadays. It drives people toward the unspeakable, which culminated on a world-historical scale in Auschwitz.

Source: Theodor W. Adorno: *Education After Auschwitz*. (1966) In: Pickford, Henry W. (2005): *Interventions and Catchwords*, p. 191

Box 8: Education after Auschwitz

GÜNTHER ANDERS – HIROSHIMA IS EVERYWHERE: THE OUTDATEDNESS OF HUMAN BEINGS

Even if it never takes place, the possibility of our definitive destruction is the definitive destruction of our possibilities.

This age is the final one: its *differentia specifica*: the possibility of our self-obliteration can never end – only through the end itself.

The characteristic of the current situation is such that technology, also nuclear technology, with all its political and military ramifications, has become universal; that its exclusivity has been revoked; that everyone is in the “club”, able to blackmail everyone else; and because they can, they incessantly do. In terms of history philosophy this means: it is not merely true that today exist, among other things, technology for the manufacture of nuclear weapons and tactics of unmitigated threat therewith; conversely, it is true that this technology and the products manufactured through it, and the incessantly practiced blackmail by those who possess them, is the medium in which history is unfolding.

What we fight is not one enemy or another, who could be attacked or eliminated, but the nuclear condition as such. As this enemy is the enemy of all humankind, those who have been enemies to each other should unite as allies against this collective threat.

The three main theses are: that we are unable to cope with the perfection of our products; that we manufacture more than we can imagine or take responsibility for; and that we believe we are allowed to do whatever we are able to: in the face of the environmental dangers that have become apparent in the last quarter century, these three theses are, sadly, more relevant and controversial than in the past.

Source: translated from Günther Anders: The Atomic Threat. Radical Considerations. (Beck 1981) and The Outdatedness of Human Beings (Beck 1956)

Box 9: Reflections on the atomic threat

in the Balkans definitely compare to colonial practice (Feichtinger et al. 2003). Moreover, it is a matter of integrating the “post-colonial perspective” into considerations of current topics: When discussing certain questions with pupils, such as a comparison of African and European educational systems, it is important to pay heed to the history of the colonial educational system. A discussion of Hiroshima could gain focus by comparing how the atomic bombing was received by Japan, the USA, Europe or various Asian countries. More importantly, still, we must identify the logic of technological destruction that underlies the development and use of the bomb, and question the extent to which we have actually overcome this logic.

Through its very arrangement, Illustration 2 establishes a relationship between these three problematic

traditions. In fact, racism is a substantial factor in all three above traditions – in extreme anti-Semitism and antiziganism (Auschwitz), in the colonial contempt for “uncivilized” peoples, as well as in the US-American racism towards Japan (and vice versa) during the Second World War. Yet these three phenomena can neither be equated with each other, nor be placed on the same level. Colonialism (and neocolonialism) constitutes a centuries old syndrome and fact. Auschwitz and the Shoah are breaches of civilization beyond compare, executed by the NS regime (including Austria) and numerous accomplices. Hiroshima stands for a tremendous step towards the self-destruction of humankind. Not even in the western world, however, can we find an indisputable position towards the dropping of the bomb on Hiroshima.

AIMÉ CÉSAIRE – DISCOURSE ON COLONIALISM

A civilization that proves incapable of solving the problems it creates is a decadent civilization.

A civilization that chooses to close its eyes to its most crucial problems is a stricken civilization.

A civilization that uses its principles for trickery and deceit is a dying civilization.

The fact is that the so-called European civilization – “Western” civilization – as it has been shaped by two centuries of bourgeois rule, is incapable of solving the two major problems to which its existence has given rise: the problem of the proletariat and the colonial problem; that Europe is unable to justify itself either before the bar of “reason” or before the bar of “conscience”; and that, increasingly, it takes refuge in a hypocrisy which is all the more odious because it is less and less likely to deceive.

First we must study how colonization works to decivilize the colonizer, to brutalize him in the true sense of the word, to degrade him, to awaken him to buried instincts, to covetousness, violence, race hatred, and moral relativism; and we must show that each time a head is cut off or an eye put out in Vietnam and in France they accept the fact, each time a little girl is raped and in France they accept the fact, each time a Madagascan is tortured and in France they accept the fact, civilization acquires another dead weight, a universal regression takes place, a gangrene sets in, a center of infection begins to spread.

Source: Aimé Césaire (1968): *Discourse on Colonialism*.

Box 10: Colonialism and colonizers

THREE NEGATIVE HISTORICAL TRADITIONS OF THE WEST

The premier demand upon all education is
that Auschwitz not happen again.
(Theodor W. Adorno)



Even if it never takes
place, the possibility
of our definitive
destruction is the
definitive destruction
of our possibilities.
(Günther Anders)



How colonization works to decivilize
the colonizer ... (Aimé Césaire)

Source: own illustration

Illustration 2: Negative historical traditions of the west

Global Citizenship Education in relation to other political pedagogies

While there are certain differences between *Global Citizenship Education* and other political pedagogies, there are also many commonalities and convergences. This has already been pointed out in the *Maastricht Declaration* (box 5): *Global Education* is presented there as a conjunction of development education, human rights education, education for sustainable development, education for peace and conflict prevention and intercultural education; and additionally it represents the global dimension of civic education.

These convergences as well as specific features of political pedagogies will be discussed below:

Civic Education

* Definition

Civic education is conceived as the promotion of theoretical and practical abilities for the critical reflection of political and power relationships and conveys a comprehensive understanding of rights and fundamental democratic values, such as equality, freedom, tolerance or dealing with diversity. It is important in any democratic system that as many individuals as possible participate actively in the formulation and implementation of ideas and programs. Democracy not only allows for active participation, but its very subsistence and success depend on it. Participation, however, must be learned and practiced first. It is the duty of all school teaching to be educating independent, critical and alert citizens; but specifically, it is the purpose of civic education.

* Civic Education and *Global Citizenship Education*

Civic education and *Global Citizenship Education* share a variety of contents due to their shared focus on the global dimension and political aspect of any topic. Their orientation towards competences is another shared feature. *Global Citizenship Education* – as has been emphasized in previous chapters – places importance on global questions, the global dimension of all political questions, as well as the connection of the local and the global (glocality) and globality. GCED should thereby increase awareness for structures and global connections, which is termed structural-political cosmopolitanism in chapter 2. This focus on the investi-

gation of structural power relationships or inequalities is a demand that has also been made in other political pedagogies since the 1970s, particularly in critical civic education (Andreotti 2006: 46pp). This implies that civic education (as well as peace education, human rights education, global education, etc.) have developed an orientation towards competences and action over the past decades, which has increased the interfaces between these pedagogies and *Global Citizenship Education*.

Peace Education

* Definition

Peace education does not distinguish itself from other political pedagogies through its fundamental objectives or the methods it uses, but rather through its very specific focus, which is the critical investigation of all forms of violence. Günther Gugel provides the following concise definition by saying that the core of peace education is to overcome war and violence and to contribute to a culture of peace through education. This happens through the initiation, support and supervision of social and political learning processes aimed at developing prosocial behavior and the ability to practice political participation (Gugel 2008: 64p).

The first part of this definition points out the social goal of overcoming the institution of war and violence as a means of political life. This presupposes a *culture of peace* – a historic revolution of social interaction between people as well as the behavior of states or political entities among each other.

The second part of this definition explains how peace education can specifically contribute to this goal, namely by enabling individuals to build the respective competences that are necessary to achieve these goals. These are, first, social competences, i.e. peaceful behavior on a personal level. This would, however, not suffice, because it also takes participation in the public assertion of a *culture of peace* – in other words, the ability to practice political participation. In this sense, peace education conceives of itself as a main dimension of civic education.

Peace education must thus be understood as both a contribution to and a core component of a *culture of peace*, which is the secular program for the peaceful revolution of social behavior, structures and power relations that eventually enables sustainable and lasting social and political peace, or in other words, a non-violent resolution of conflicts.

In summary, peace education strives to make a pedagogical contribution to the abolition of the institution of war and the reduction of social violence. The focus on violence and its reduction is what constitutes its *differentia specifica* as regards other related pedagogical disciplines, but also connects it to other academic disciplines such as peace research (oriented towards political science).

* Core issues and establishing peace education

Peace education may relate to many diverse topics and questions, but its core comprises human rights education, the theory and practice of non-violent communication, as well as knowledge about war and peace and corresponding (international) mechanisms of peace keeping and *Peace Building*.

* Peace education as cosmopolitan enterprise

Peace education in a modern sense has been around since the 19th century. Educationalists from all over the world including John Dewey, Maria Montessori and Paulo Freire contributed to its development. Peace education typically has an implicit and sometimes also explicit claim on cosmopolitanism and *global citizenship* respectively. Peace must be built everywhere on a small scale, but can only be kept on a large scale as world peace. This is reflected both in the content-related orientation and the global organization of peace education. An early example is the *International Bureau of Education IBE*, which was founded with peace pedagogical intentions in 1925 (and is part of the UNESCO today). This genuinely cosmopolitan approach was rekindled by the progress of globalization.

It is two very influential books in peace education that stand at the beginning of what we call *Global Citizenship Education* today: Elise Boulding's *Building a Global Civic Culture* and Betty Reardon's *Comprehensive Peace Education*. Both were published in 1988, a time when the discourse of globalization had not yet been established. Particularly Betty Reardon's book was disseminated worldwide and is thereby itself an example for the global orientation of peace education. But, above all, it

contributes content, as suggested by its subtitle: *Educating for Global Responsibility*. Reardon elaborates three basic values, which she defines as *planetary stewardship*, *global citizenship* and *humane relationship*:

"The value of *stewardship* calls on us to foster in our students a consciousness of their relationship to the whole natural order and their responsibility to assure the health, the survival, and the integrity of the planet [...]

The value of *citizenship* calls on us to educate people to be capable of creating a nonviolent, just social order on this planet, a global civic order offering equity to all Earth's people, offering protection for universal human rights. [...]

The value of *humane relationship* is one that recognizes the interconnections and interrelationships that make up the web of life, starting with the interconnections between the human order and the natural order and emphasizing a human order of positive human relationships" (Reardon 1988: 59). In this sense, Betty Reardon was a leading contributor in the foundation of the *Global Campaign for Peace Education* in 1999, which is a loose network of peace educators from all over the world, publishing a global newsletter to date.¹³ The programmatic "textbook" by the Global Campaign, called *Learning to Abolish War*, defines itself as "conceptual framework for peace education for *global citizenship*" (Reardon/Cabezudo 2002, book I, p 24). It closely connects peace education with *global citizenship* and human rights education.

Peace education as it exists in many countries today can therefore be understood as a strand of *Global Citizenship Education*, particularly dealing with forms of violence and how to overcome them.

Global Education

* Definition

Global Education is defined as an educational concept that reacts to challenges of globalization, to the increasing complexity of our life circumstances, and to the current development towards a "global society". The essential objectives of this concept include recognizing and analyzing global developments and evaluating their consequences, as well as developing responsibility and social participation. *Global Education* investigates the challenges that emerge in education and educational systems in an increasingly globalized world. Which key competences do people need in order to orientate themselves in the face of highly complex political, eco-

conomic and sociocultural developments? What is the contribution made by education and schools in order to foster the understanding, analysis and evaluation of such processes? How can one be prepared to live successfully in an interwoven, networked and culturally very heterogeneous world? What must be learned in which ways and how must learning be encouraged and supervised, so that (young) people may recognize opportunities for political participation and may also act responsibly and participate in a global society? *Global Education* demands that the global dimension be taken into consideration with any educational contents. Topics are investigated from their local and global dimension as well as from different angles. In this way, *Global Education* aspires towards fundamentally broadening the perspective of any teaching; it is a matter of teaching and learning in the global context.

* Establishing Global Education in Europe

The term *Global Education* has been used since the 1970s in the English-speaking world to denote pedagogical conceptions aimed at shaping globalization in a context of ethical-moral goals like justice and sustainability. In the German-speaking world, the term global education has been used since the 1990s, whereby the educational concept of global education was mainly developed further by developmental NGOs. The programmatic basis was work done by the Swiss Forum *Schule für eine Welt* (school for one world), who were the first to publish main ideas for global education in 1988. The *Austrian information service for development policy* (ÖIE) launched an initiative for the establishment of an educational principle (Unterrichtsprinzip) on global education, which could not be enforced despite well-founded content-related justification and political support. The concept then experienced a boost after the European Congress on Global Education in Maastricht in 2002. During the congress, the resolution to promote a European strategy for the dissemination and strengthening of global education was passed. This led to strategic developments in some European countries, backed by the respective ministries for education in different ways and to varying degrees (e.g. Finland, Ireland, Portugal, Austria). Furthermore, the Global Education Network Europe (GENE) was created. It cooperates well with the European Centre for global Interdependence and Solidarity, better known as the *North-South Centre* of the Council of Europe.

* Close links to *Global Citizenship Education*

From the very beginning, *Global Education* defined itself as an integrative concept including interfaces with various other pedagogical concepts such as development education, intercultural learning, peace education and human rights education, but also with global environmental education or education for sustainable development.

Over the past years there has been an apparent convergence of *Global Education* and civic education, intercultural learning, peace education and human rights education, as well as global environmental education or education for sustainable development. On the one hand, there have been political-didactical publications focusing on the topic of globalization and dealing with *Global Education* as an investigation of internationally linked and influenced systems and structures, processes and actions as well as stakeholders in political education (Moegling/Overwien 2010: 11). On the other hand, *Global Education* has been positioned more clearly as a concept for globally oriented civic education, for instance also in the Austrian *Global Education Strategy*. Both *Global Education* and *Global Citizenship Education* are concepts that evolve and respectively include diverse conceptual orientations. Some of these perspectives are so similar to each other as to allow for the conclusion that *Global Education* and *Global Citizenship Education* are simply different names for the same concepts. The two educational concepts do overlap in many ways and even the definition of *Global Education* in the 2002 *Maastricht Declaration* points out connections between them: "Global Education is understood to encompass Development Education, Human Rights Education, Education for Sustainability, Education for Peace and Conflict Prevention and Intercultural Education; being the global dimensions of Education for Citizenship" (Maastricht Global Education Declaration 2002).

The concept of *Global Citizenship Education* outlined in this brochure focuses on one particular dimension of *Global Education* through the term citizenship in the sense of political participation. *Global Citizenship Education* investigates questions and conceptions of transnational political participation (*world domestic policy*) and transnational democracy more thoroughly than traditional strands of *Global Education*. The enhanced combination of *Global Education*, civic education, peace education and intercultural education that is

being developed in practice in the continued education master's course (ULG) *Global Citizenship Education* is conducive to the further development of both the separate pedagogical fields and integrative approaches such as *Global Citizenship Education*.

Education for Sustainable Development

* Definitions of sustainability

Sustainable development is regarded as one of the major challenges of the 21st century. Economic systems and lifestyles – particularly in industrialized countries – endanger the life chances of current and future generations through their total exploitation of natural resources and the enormous ecological degradation they cause. The UN *World Commission for Environment and Development* (Brundtland Commission) demanded a new orientation towards “sustainable development” already in 1987. The latter was defined as a type of development that safeguards the quality of life of the current generation without taking away the ability of coming generations to mold their own future.¹⁴ It was the basis on which 178 states agreed to declare sustainable development as the paragon for the 21st century at the UN conference on environment and development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. Among the prerequisites for sustainable development it mentions the fight against poverty, an appropriate population policy, the reduction of non-sustainable ways of consuming and producing goods, as well as a comprehensive inclusion of the populace in political decision making processes.¹⁵ The Rio conference passed *Agenda 21*, which consists of tangible recommendations for action – for both states and individual citizens.

The paragon of sustainable development emphasizes the necessity to reconcile economic, ecological and social developments and objectives. It emphasizes both intra- and intergenerational justice, meaning a balance between generations living today and responsibility towards future generations. The term justice includes a fair distribution of resources, chances, gains and costs between North and South, rich and poor, present and future, aiming to achieve a balance between abundance and lack. Sustainable development has become a political approach. While there has been agreement over the necessity of steering sustainable development,

the required processes of change and political regulation, national implementation, as well as international agreement and cooperation lag far behind the expectations and objectives established at the Rio UN conference in 1992.

* Sustainability and education

Chapter 36 of *Agenda 21* emphasizes the role of education. Ten years after the conference (in 2002), upon the recommendation by the *World Summit for Sustainable Development* in Johannesburg, the UN General Assembly agreed to proclaim the world decade of “Education for Sustainable Development/ESD” from 2005–2014. The aim of this decade was to contribute to the implementation of chapter 36 of Agenda 21 (as agreed in Rio and reinforced in Johannesburg) through educational measures, and to enshrine the principles of sustainable development in national education systems. The UNESCO was commissioned as lead agency for the coordination of the world decade and defined the following fields of action in the guidelines for implementation:

- equality of women and men
- peace and humanitarian safety
- health promotion
- sustainable consumption
- environmental protection
- cultural diversity
- rural development
- sustainable urban development

* Relationship to Citizenship Education

The debate on the post-2015 development agenda shows that questions of global development and the paragon of sustainable development are closely linked to each other. This also closely connects educational concepts like *Global Education* and *Education for Sustainable Development*, even if they cannot be understood as one and the same concept due to their diverging origins, priorities, responsible stakeholders and pedagogical objectives.

In its flagship report, The German *Advisory Council on Global Change* (WBGU) points out the urgency of a systemic change towards a post fossil-fuel society and pleads for the following perspective: “This is, in fact, all about a new global social contract for a low-carbon and

14 www.nachhaltigkeit.info/artikel/brundtland_report_563.htm

15 Ibid

sustainable global economic system. It is based on the central concept that individuals and civil societies, states and the global community of states, as well as the economy and science, carry [joint responsibility]. The social contract consolidates a culture of attentiveness (born of a sense of ecological responsibility), a culture of participation (as a democratic responsibility), and a culture of obligation towards future generations (future responsibility)" (WBGU 2011: 1–2). The WBGU speaks of an urgently required "great transformation" and emphasizes the importance of education as the driver of societal change. Several aspects of such a new social contract mentioned above indicate important links to *Global Citizenship Education. Education for Sustainable Development* and *Global Citizenship Education* share interfaces particularly in the critical investigation of an ever-pervasive economization of society and in restoring the primacy of politics. Political participation and democratic responsibility constitute interfaces as much as do questions of global justice.

Intercultural Education/Multicultural Education

*** Definition**

Establishing *intercultural education* as educational principle in Austria (1991) and as interdisciplinary dimension of classroom teaching was a reaction to increasing immigration and the fact that school routines were increasingly shaped by a growing number of children from different cultural backgrounds and first languages other than German. Intercultural education started as a clear delineation from the so-called *immigrant pedagogy* dominant during the 1980s, whose main objective it was to integrate "foreign" children and youths into local school routines and their assimilation (in the sense of conformity) with local society. There were a number of support programs, because even at the time it was the lack of German language proficiency that was seen as an obstacle to successful integration.

*** Stages in the development of intercultural pedagogy**

The development of intercultural pedagogy has gone through several phases, each of which has been subject to severe criticism. German and subsequently Austrian assimilation policies were heavily criticized at the beginning of the 1980s, as was the corresponding pedagogy for being "deficit-oriented". This approach focused on shortcomings and deficits of "foreign" children and

youth and presented them as "problems". This was followed by a phase in which "cultural identity" and "cultural difference" was emphasized and there was a stronger focus on the countries of origin of these children and youth. This perspective still dominates educational practices today; difference is often regarded as enrichment. The dominant culture of mainstream society is the unquestioned point of departure for the evaluation of difference here; it is regarded as the universal norm (Mecheril 2004: 101). The self-evident reference to the dominant culture is justified, on the one hand, through the pragmatic approach that it simply happens to be the dominant culture. On the other hand, there is the evolutionistic justification that attributes advanced development to the dominant culture – as opposed to the modernization deficits of migrants – as well as moral superiority (Mecheril 2004: 101).

Critiques of intercultural pedagogical approaches, which focus on cultural difference, point to the danger of culturalization (assigning cultural and unchangeable "peculiarities/qualities") and the production of cultural stereotypes through intercultural education. In this context, the debate on racism is taken up again and a distinction is made between different types of racism, such as biological, cultural and institutional racism. It was the politics of the New Right in France that prompted the French philosopher Etienne Balibar to expand his definition of racism. He addresses the emergence of "racism without race" as a consequence of immigration in European countries, that no longer focuses on biological heritage, but the irrevocable nature of cultural differences (Balibar 1989, quoted in Auernheimer 2005: 97).

Even when the resources and equality of particular cultures are emphasized, the reference to cultural difference remains problematic and the danger of culturalization continues because identity is primarily understood as cultural identity and seen as closely related to an individual's national or cultural origin. There is a focus on "being different" in terms of national, ethnic and religious categories. The cultural origin of the other remains the frame of interpretation of social practice. What is neglected are people's possibilities to take a critical or even detached perspective on their cultural origins and the influences that shape them.

In contrast, the discrimination approach is clearly distinguishable from culturalistic approaches, but pedagogic attention often remains focused on deficits. It invests

tigates the issue of power constellations and questions the relationship between majority and minority as well as social inequality. It is approaches of antiracist educational work that take this perspective; their key concepts include critical social analysis, economic and social inequality, social justice and political and legal equality. The analytical view of discrimination focuses on those obstacles and limits that affect people with migration backgrounds in institutions and social sub-systems. Their scope of action, however, remains limited and they are not given subject status. The question that remains unaddressed is how ethnic and cultural others, such as people with migration backgrounds, may develop productive patterns of appropriating and newly describing their own position in a pedagogic space marked by access barriers and patterns of attribution (Mecheril 2004: 103p). Although pedagogical contexts could provide ideal conditions for perspectives, perceptions and interpretations particularly to people with migration backgrounds, it is a problem, that intercultural education is often designed in such a way that pupils are declared as representatives of their countries and hence deprived of their "subject status". In contrast, there is a lack of approaches that offer pupils the chance to be active, have their own views, practice their ability to make their own interpretations and take positions.

* **Links to *Global Citizenship Education***

Migration pedagogy focuses on dominant schemata and practices of differentiation between a nationally/ ethnically/culturally defined "us" versus "not us" and advocates an expansion of possibilities to abolish these powerful differentiations. This approach does not focus on changing or promoting people with migration backgrounds, but on institutional and discursive systems and possibilities to change those. Paul Mecheril describes the potential links between migration pedagogy and *Global Citizenship Education* when he asserts that migration pedagogy investigates one of the most basic schemata of modern states and societies, namely that they tend to differentiate in a complex and often controversial manner between those who belong to mainstream society and those who do not. Education systems and pedagogical practices further contribute to the manifestation of schemata of difference, such as the institutionalization of social work targeted specifically at migrants or schools choosing to fall back on mechanisms of ethnic discrimination. They also have the ability, however, to reflect on those schemata and the practices that confirm them and ultimately consider alternatives (Mecheril 2013).¹⁶

16 www.bildung-interkulturell.de/cweb/cgi-bin-noauth/cache/VAL_BLOB/9518/9518/6372/Was%20ist%20Migrationsp%C3%A4dagogik_MOZAIK_Mecheril.pdf

Recommended literature

ANDREOTTI, Vanessa (2006): "Soft versus critical Global Citizenship Education", in: Policy & Practice – A Development Education Review, issue 3, 40–51. <http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue3-focus4>

One of the most renowned authors on the topic depicts two major strands of Global Citizenship Education.

ANDREOTTI, Vanessa de Oliveira/Lynn Mario T.M. de Souza (eds.) (2014): Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education. New York/London.

From a transdisciplinary and post-colonial perspective, this book offers critiques of notions of development, progress, humanism, culture, representation, identity, and education. Probably the most important reference work on Global citizenship education, a truly multifaceted perspective.

APPIAH, Kwame Anthony (2007): Cosmopolitanism. Ethics in a World of Strangers, London: Penguin Books.

Knowledgeable and ostensive reflections by the author, whose family background is in Ghana, but who lives in the UK today.

MORIN, Edgar/KERN, Anne-Brigitte (1999): Homeland Earth. A Manifesto for the new Millennium. Hampton Press.

A very accessible but highly instructive introduction to global thought, conveying an immensely broad horizon; by one of the most renowned French philosophers. It challenges us to think differently about our past, our present, and our future.

NUSSBAUM, Martha (1996): For Love of Country. Debating the Limits of Patriotism. Boston: Beacon Press.

Martha C. Nussbaum argues that we should distrust conventional patriotism as parochial and instead see ourselves first of all as „citizens of the world“. Sixteen prominent writers and thinkers respond.

OSLER, Audrey/STARKEY, Hugh (2005): Changing Citizenship: Democracy and Inclusion in Education, Berkshire: Open University Press.

This book supports educators in understanding the links between global change and the everyday realities of teachers and learners. It explores the role that schools can play in creating a new vision of citizenship for multicultural democracies and of cosmopolitan citizenship.

PETERS, Michael A. (ed.) (2007): Global citizenship education: philosophy, theory and pedagogy. Rotterdam: Sense Publ.

The first overview of the field of Global Citizenship Education, very rich and still very important. Many of the contributors argue that global citizenship education offers the prospect of extending the liberal ideologies of human rights and multiculturalism, and of developing a better understanding of forms of post-colonialism.

4. Global Citizenship Education in practice



From the above considerations it has likely become clear that *Global Citizenship Education* is not merely about pursuing yet another educational goal. While *Global Citizenship Education* is indeed a separate field of work, it is, first and foremost, a paradigm of education and instruction. A paradigm is a lens through which we look at our work, a mental framework that guides our work, or a perspective that we adopt in it.

This means that there is no additional educational task to fulfill. On the one hand, this is a major relief, as there is no added workload for teachers. On the other hand, the requirements are not easily achieved either; after all, *Global Citizenship Education* is meant to be integrated into school and curriculum development as well as in subject teaching. This is crucial, because *Global Citizenship Education* is not restricted to certain subjects or teaching units, but must be understood as a concept that is applicable to all topics and subjects, as well as school culture as a whole.

4.1 Knowledge, competences, values and attitudes

Global Citizenship Education requires cognitive knowledge as well as practical competences. Moreover, the connection to ethical values and perceptions is indispensable. This section introduces essential values, perceptions, competences and bodies of knowledge that constitute the basis for any implementation of GCED into practice.

Global Citizenship Education contributes to the education of *global citizens* as well as to the promotion of *global citizenship* (see discussion on individual-humanitarian versus political structural cosmopolitanism in chapter 2). Education should thus not only take up “western” topics, but also highlight their global dimension, discuss genuinely “global” topics and manage the shift of perspective towards globalism and glocalism (see illustration 4 in the subsequent conclusion). How can this be achieved?




Illustration 3: *The pedagogical triangle*

How can teachers integrate a global perspective more extensively into their teaching and thereby broaden their students' frame of interpretation? The three crucial dimensions of *Global Citizenship Education* will be introduced below – knowledge, competences, values and perceptions – which should help to find answers to these questions.

Knowledge

In their introduction to the documentation of the 2012 national symposium on global education in Austria, the editors highlight that sustainable, future-oriented education needs to go beyond national educational politics and international standardization (Grobbauer/Hartmeyer 2013: 4). This means that national educational systems should no longer focus exclusively on their national point of view, but examine developments and issues worldwide by going beyond the limits of familiar interpretations and world views. However, in order to be able to talk about and reflect certain topics in classroom teaching, pupils need a certain body of basic or working knowledge. For this reason, knowledge (and the imparting of knowledge) constitutes an important dimension of any educational concept. Opinion formation and well-founded discussion can only work successfully on the basis of a certain body of knowledge.

In terms of content, *Global Citizenship Education* combines topics from historical-political education, peace education, education for democracy and human rights, development education, education for sustainability and other political pedagogies. These diverse pedagogies deal with very similar subject matters, but each of them with a different focus. Some of the important questions include peacekeeping, democratic participation, economic relations between the global South and North, questions of justice and the identification of global (power) structures, which are ultimately reflected in all topic areas. The concept of *Global Citizenship Education* does not necessarily want to integrate additional topics or questions into curricula and thereby overcrowd them even more, but wants to help identify connections and structures on an international and/or global level, and at the same time point out the scope of action for each one of us. The major focus, therefore, is not dealing with new topics, but taking a new perspective on "familiar" ones.

Developments over the past decades – particularly increasing globalization and technologization – have caused the world to accelerate and "grow together" in the sense that knowledge (images and information)

are available in unimaginable amounts and accessible to pupils and teachers at all times via the internet and new media. The central purpose of educational systems is, therefore, no longer the mere acquisition or dissemination of knowledge, but rather the question "What do I do with all this knowledge?" How can such a flood of impressions and facts still be processed reasonably? This is where the close connection with the second dimension of *Global Citizenship Education* becomes apparent.

Competences

For several years now, there has been a discussion on the significance of competences as abilities, skills and dispositions for pedagogical practice that is in keeping with the times (Kühberger 2009: 11). Different competence models for different pedagogies have been devised, such as the structural model of competences for citizenship education (Krammer 2008), competences for peace education (Wintersteiner 2005; 2009), for global education (North-South Centre of the Council of Europe 2012), historical competences (Körber/Schreiber/Schöner 2007; Kühberger 2009) and many more. This indicates a paradigm shift in pedagogy from an orientation towards content to an orientation towards competences, which also becomes apparent in the emergence of different international tests and comparisons like PISA (Kühberger 2009: 11). These comparative tests, again, do not test concrete contents, but specific skills that are necessary to solve particular tasks. If knowledge or information is easily and abundantly accessible, it is important for pupils or young citizens to be able to distinguish reliable information sources from biased ones; it is also important to know and reflect one's point of view and interests in order to then form an opinion or make a judgment based on new information. It is important to be able to read and interpret statistics, to collect, analyze and present data independently, and thereby strengthen one's action competence through this "preparatory work". All of these skills must be learned and practiced. This is why these competences should be specifically promoted (by discussing certain topics or through exemplary learning) in *Global Citizenship Education*.

The Austrian "structural model of competences" for civic education, which has already been well established, will be outlined below and complemented with further individual competences from other political pedagogies and in the sense of *Global Citizenship Education*. The structural model of competence for civic education draws on a model developed in Germany in 2004 and distinguish-

ishes between the following four core competences (Krammer/Kühberger/Windischbauer 2008: 3; Krammer 2008: 7–12):

- * *Competence of judgment* is the ability to form independent judgments and to substantiate them, as well as to recognize and question existing prejudices
- * *Competence to act* refers to the independent formulation and argumentation of positions, but also the ability to act (politically) in an independent way
- * *Methodological competence* comprises understanding and critically questioning texts, statistics, arguments, and more (deconstruction), as well as independently using media, research options or presentation techniques.
- * *Basic expertise* means the familiarity with basic terms, concepts and categories in order to understand political and social questions, to critically question them and answer them if necessary.

These competences can also be found in other models, where they sometimes go under different names and are combined with other competences. The most important skill is analyzing and questioning facts critically. Only on the basis of factual knowledge and critical analysis can *global citizens* recognize and criticize (power) structures and connections, which is the first step towards conscious action aimed at change. Critical analysis, in the sense of *Global Citizenship Education*, requires multiperspectivity (Crawford 2013: 3) and the ability to shift perspective: What does “free trade” mean for each of the affected countries? And what does it mean for different social groups in each of the countries involved in it? What does political “participation” mean for women in Europe, Africa, Asia or Latin America? Realizing that there is no “uniform” way of looking at a topic, but that one’s own position influences any analysis, is an important learning experience. At the same time, young people should be challenged to clearly identify and reflect their own standpoint, and to defend their beliefs and opinions argumentatively in confrontation with others who disagree. After all, being able to shift perspective does not mean having (or not being allowed to have) a position of one’s own.

In peace education, as in global education, there is an emphasis on *social competences* like empathy, communication skills, the ability to live and work together in a solidary, respectful, self-confident and responsible way and the *ability to resolve conflicts* (see for example UNESCO 2014), also and especially when people of

different languages, cultures, religions or traditions interact with each other (intercultural competence; see Wintersteiner 2005: 285). Methodological competence is often complemented with media or digital competence, which is meant to emphasize the fact that the critical consumption and independent use of new technologies and media are central instruments for critical analysis on the one hand, and for the competence to act on the other. Specific methods are required for the acquisition of knowledge, the evaluation of reliable information sources, reading complex texts as well as statistics and graphs, as well as for doing research or arguing opinions. In the 21st century, rapid technological developments in the areas of information and communication technology pose an added challenge to citizens (Crawford 2013: 3; North-South Centre of the Council of Europe 2012).

The skills and competence areas above should enable *global citizens* to recognize structures and connections in a globalized world, to recognize the different dimensions of all questions – those presented in illustration 4 – and, based on these, formulate opinions, advocate values and, most of all, to identify their scope of action and its limits.

Values and Attitudes

Of course interpretations of facts and judgments based on them do not occur in an “objective” space or vacuum. Everybody has a certain set of values and attitudes, which (consciously or unconsciously) influences the interpretation of problems and the conclusions we draw. At the same time, certain values are dominant in every society and have a substantial influence on the interpretation of facts and conclusions drawn from them. This is where the connection to the third dimension of *Global Citizenship Education* becomes apparent. On the one hand, responsible *global citizens* should be able to reflect their own attitudes and values and become aware of them. On the other hand, they should advocate a certain canon of values and actively promote the realization of such values. *Global Citizenship Education* thus strives to enable citizens to actively stand up for their beliefs and values. The (non-violent) discussion of convictions, values, interests and concepts is, after all, the core of any democratic system (Mouffe 2014). Peace, human rights, democracy, social justice and equality are the cornerstones of a recognized canon of values that derives from work done by the UN and its subsidiary organizations as well as the declaration of human rights. These terms stand for values that are recognized worldwide, but there needs to be elaboration on how

different states interpret them in different ways. The dialogic negotiation and communication regarding the meaning of values and concepts is, therefore, an important component of *Global Citizenship Education*.

4.2 Different levels of implementation


Global Citizenship Education is both a central premise for all education and a particular perspective on all subjects, which means that it can either be an educational principle, or a separate independent topic that can be taught as part of a subject or even as a subject of its own. In this sense, we have to differentiate multiple levels, which should all be intertwined in order to ensure the optimal implementation of *Global Citizenship Education*. There are different levels, such as curricula and decrees, or concrete content-related links to *Global Citizenship Education* in curricula for individual subjects and educational principles, as well as mechanisms of school democracy. There are also pilot projects in classroom teaching that aim at the implementation of

Global Citizenship Education. The major emphasis, however, is on offering orientation and encouragement to teachers regarding the ways in which they may implement the principles of *Global Citizenship Education* in their own classroom teaching.

The following levels and/or elements can be identified as potential areas of implementation to *Global Citizenship Education*:

- * educational policy and establishing *Global Citizenship Education* in school law, central steering impulses such as curricula and educational principles, as well as
- * school and curriculum development
- * teacher training (basic training as well as continued education) and education of multipliers outside of school
- * science and research
- * school culture/school democracy
- * subject teaching and/or interdisciplinary teaching
- * international school partnerships and transnational school projects, particularly with countries of the South

5. Summary



Global Citizenship Education

- * broadens our horizon regarding global questions, always guided by human rights values
- * takes a fresh look at our migration societies while no longer discerning their problems as intercultural, but political
- * opens up new ways of conceiving civic education and global education: “democracy” on a global scale – world domestic policy
- * allows for a connection of the ethical dimension (*citizen* approach) and the dimension of democratic politics (*citizenship* approach)
- * is civic education on a global scale and in this way merges the global and the local into the glocal
- * includes a historical, self-reflective element; a critical discussion of Europe
- * also includes a utopian element, namely the realization of actual *global citizenship* as prerequisite for a sustained peaceful co-existence

The following illustration (illustration 4) summarizes both the dimensions and scope of *Global Citizenship Education*. The outer circle establishes the global horizon, which is sub-categorized into multiple aspects:

- * *global questions*, such as climate change, world peace or the Sustainable Development Goals; by no means solely “catastrophes”, but a variety of social challenges and opportunities for development
- * the *global dimension of every question*, even if it is not visible at first; examples for making issues visible include the ecological footprint and the various “Clean-Clothes” campaigns
- * this is at the same time the base for merging the local and the global into the glocal; *glocalization* can be observed in numerous phenomena of everyday life, particularly in urban areas, which shows that globalization not only affects “others”, but ourselves and our global responsibility to the same extent
- * finally, there is a focus on the meta-level of *globality*, i.e. on questions regarding the possibility of cosmopolitan thought, cosmopolitan organization and cosmopolitan action. This means that the global dimension must also become part of our mental frameworks, theories and sciences; colonialism must not continue to exist in our theoretical work, particularly such theory that is the basis of school subjects.

This last point addresses an epistemic dimension as envisioned by French philosopher Edgar Morin, when he said that “The realization of our common earthly fate ought to be the key to this turn of the millennium: We are answerable for this planet; our life is bound to its life. We must put our household affairs in order. We are citizens of the Earth and, thus, we share the same fate as the Earth” (Morin/Kern 1999: 146). This common earthly fate, which exists objectively, does not mean that

differing political interests or ideological differences automatically disappear. However, political discussions can now be held within the frame of a (virtual) world domestic policy. The reference to utopia at the edge of the large circle is intended to emphasize that *Global Citizenship Education* is always committed to a “sense of possibility”, i.e. thinking in terms of alternatives to existing conditions.

The four rays of the star stand for the four pedagogical principles of *Global Citizenship Education*:

- * Orientation towards human rights values, peace and social justice. This is what differentiates this approach from “education for globalization” that has recently become popular, but whose mere aim is to prepare individuals for international competition, as it is based on the notion that learners are “human capital” that must be equipped in the best possible way.
- * A didactics of participation, which promotes the competence to act and practices political participation. This participation does not necessarily have to lead to action at all times, but should promote independence in learners’ thoughts and actions, so that they may develop a political competence of judgment.
- * A way of working, which does not merely proclaim ethical principles, but which conveys what peace educator Betty A. Reardon called *critical inquiry*, which means critical investigation of reality including the questioning of common judgments.
- * This also includes taking a historical-critical position, i.e. an investigation of our own past as part of the colonial-imperial European system, as well as the breaches of civilization of the 20th century.

Finally, there is the element of self-reflection, which is located in the inner quadrant. It emphasizes the fact

that *Global Citizenship Education* always requires an increased measure of self-observation and self-criticism.

The illustration aims, on the one hand, to delineate *Global Citizenship Education* more clearly, but can also be used as “check-list” for practical implementation in classroom teaching

- * when preparing curricula or teaching units (have I taken all aspects and dimensions into consideration, which ones would I like to focus on in this unit?)
- * when evaluating classroom teaching (in which areas has my work been successful, in which ones less so?)

An ethics of planetary understanding

In his programmatic text *Seven Complex Lessons in Education for the Future*, drafted for the UNESCO in 1999, Edgar Morin developed a series of essential principles for a new kind of education. They are also of fundamental importance for *Global Citizenship Education* and should therefore conclude our considerations:

“We have to learn to place our ‘being there’ on the planet. Learning to be there means learning to live, share, communicate, commune; things that used to be learned only in and by singular cultures. Henceforth we have to learn to be, to live, share, communicate, commune as humans of Planet Earth. Not to be in one culture alone, but to be earth people as well. We have to stop trying to get mastery and learn to manage, improve, understand. [...] The anthropological double imperative imposes: save human unity and save human diversity. Develop our identities which are both concentric and plural; our ethnic, homeland, community of civilization identity, and our citizens of the earth identity. [...] The education of the future should teach an ethics of planetary understanding” (Morin 1999: 38–39).

THE PERSPECTIVES OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION




Illustration 4: Perspectives of Global Citizenship Education

Bibliography

- Adorno, Theodor W.: Education after Auschwitz. (1966) In: *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords* (2005) trans. Henry W. Pickford, New York: Columbia University Press, 191–204
- Anders, Gunther (1982): Die atomare Drohung. Radikale Überlegungen. Beck
- Anders, Gunther (1956): Die Antiquiertheit des Menschen. Beck
- Andreotti, Vanessa (2006): "Soft versus critical Global Citizenship Education", in: *Policy & Practice – A Development Education Review*, Vol. 3, p. 40–51
- Ban Ki-Moon (2012): Global Education First Initiative: www.globaleducationfirst.org/289.htm
- Bauböck, Rainer/Vink, Maarten Peter (2013): Citizenship Configurations: Analysing the Multiple Purposes of Citizenship Regimes in Europe. In: *Comparative European Politics*, Vol. 11 (5), p. 621–648
- Beckman, Ludvig (2013): Irregular Migration and Democracy: the Case for Inclusion. In: *Citizenship Studies*, Vol. 17 (1), p. 48–60
- Benhabib, Seyla (2007): Zwielficht der Souveränität oder kosmopolitische Normen? In: Beck, Ulrich (Hg.): *Generation Global. Ein Crashkurs*. Suhrkamp, p. 167–186
- Beutelsbacher Konsens (1976): <http://www.lpb-bw.de/beutelsbacher-konsens.html>
- Bloemraad, Irene/Korteweg, Anna/Yurdakul, Gökse (2008): Citizenship and Immigration: Multi-culturalism, Assimilation and Challenges to the Nation-State. In: *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 34, p. 153–179
- Boulding, Elise (1988): Building a global civic culture: Education for an Interdependent World. Teachers College Press
- Brunkhorst, Hauke/Kettner, Mattias (2000): Einleitung. In: Brunkhorst, Hauke/Kettner, Mattias (Hg.): *Globalisierung und Demokratie*. Suhrkamp, p. 7–17
- Cabrera, Luis (2010): *The Practice of Global Citizenship*. Cambridge University Press
- Cattacin, Sandro (2005): Migration und differenzierte Citizenship: Zur Post-Amerikanisierung Europas, Kommission für Migrations- und Integrationsforschung. Working Paper Nr. 8
- Césaire, Aimé (1968): Discourse on Colonialism. In: Robin D. G. Kelly (1972): *A Poetics of Anticolonialism*. New York. Monthly Review Press
- Crawford, Elizabeth O. (2013): Exploring Our Roles as Global citizens. Educator's Guides (Grades 3–5). UNICEF
- Dobson, Andrew (2005): "Globalisation, Cosmopolitanism and the Environment", in: *International Relations*, Vol. 19, 259–273
- Education Above All (2012): www.protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/eea_-_education_for_global_citizenship.pdf
- Eurostat (2012): Population and Social Conditions, 31/2012
- Feichtinger, Johannes/Ursula Prutsch/Moritz Csáky (Hg.) (2003): *Habsburg postcolonial*. Innsbruck: Studienverlag.
- Fox, Jonathan (2005): Unpacking "Transnational Citizenship". In: *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 8, p. 171–201
- Fues, Thomas (2007): Vereinte Nationen und Global Governance. In: DGVN Policy Paper 3/2007
- Goswinkel, Dieter (2008): Historical Reflections on Citizenship in Europe. In: Georgi, Viola B. (Hg.): *The Making of Citizens in Europe: New Perspectives on Citizenship Education*. Bonn, p. 31–36
- Grobbauer, Heidi/Hartmeyer, Helmuth (2013): Globales Lernen in Österreich. Potenziale und Perspektiven. In: Heidi Grobbauer (Hrsg.), *Globales Lernen in Österreich. Potenziale und Perspektiven* (= Aktion & Reflexion, 10), p. 4–5
- Grundsatzlerlass zur Politischen Bildung (1978): www.bmbf.gv.at/schulen/unterricht/uek/pb_grundsatzlerlass_15683.pdf?4dzgm2
- Gugel, Günther (2008): Was ist Friedenserziehung? In: Renate Grasse/Bettina Gruber/Günther Gugel (Hg.). *Friedenspädagogik. Grundlagen, Praxisansätze, Perspektiven*. Reinbek: Rowohlt (= rowohlt's enzyklopädie), p. 61–82
- Körber, Andreas/Schreiber, Waltraud/Schöner Alexander (Hg., 2007): *Kompetenzen historischen Denkens. Ein Strukturmodell als Beitrag zur Kompetenzorientierung in der Geschichtsdidaktik*. Neuried: ars una Verlag.
- Krammer, Reinhard (2008): Kompetenzen durch Politische Bildung. Ein Kompetenz-Strukturmodell. In: *Forum Politische Bildung* (Hg.): *Kompetenzorientierte Politische Bildung. Informationen zur Politischen Bildung*, Nr. 29, 2008, p. 5–14
- Krammer, Reinhard/Kühberger, Christoph/Windischbauer, Elfriede (2008): Die durch politische Bildung zu erwerbenden Kompetenzen. Ein Kompetenz-Strukturmodell. BMUKK
- Kühberger, Christoph (2009): *Kompetenzorientiertes historisches und politisches Lernen. Methodische und didaktische Annäherungen für Geschichte, Sozialkunde und Politische Bildung*. Studienverlag
- Maastricht Global Education Declaration (2002): *European Strategy Framework For Improving and Increasing Global Education in Europe to the Year 2015*
- Mecheril, Paul (2004): *Einführung in die Migrationspädagogik*. Basel-Weinheim
- Mignolo, Walter D. (2011): *Epistemischer Ungehorsam. Rhetorik der Moderne, Logik der Kolonialität und Grammatik der Dekolonialität*
- Morin, Edgar (1999): *Seven Complex Lessons in Education for the Future*. UNESCO Publishing
- Morin, Edgar/Kern, Anne Brigitte (1999): *Homeland Earth. A Manifesto for the New Millennium*. New Jersey, Hampton Press Inc.
- Moegling, Klaus/Overwien, Bernd/Sachs, Wolfgang (Hg.) (2010): *Globales Lernen im Politikunterricht*
- Mouffe, Chantal (2005): *On the Political*. Routledge
- Mouffe, Chantal (2013): *Democratic Politics and Conflict: An Agonistic Approach*. In: Lakitsch, Maximilian (Hg.): *Political Power Reconsidered. State Power and Civic Activism between Legitimacy and Violence*. Peace Report 2013. LIT-Verlag

- Mouffe, Chantal (2013): *Agonistics. Thinking the world politically*. London: Verso
- Näsström, Sofia (2011): The Challenge of the All-Affected Principle. In: *Political Studies*, Vol. 59 (1), p. 116–134
- North-South Centre of the Council of Europe (Hg.) (2012): *Global Education Guidelines. Concepts and Methodologies on Global Education for Educators and Policy Makers*
- Nussbaum, Martha (1996): *For Love of Country. Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Boston: Beacon Press
- Osler, Audrey/Starkey, Hugh (2005): *Changing Citizenship: Democracy and Inclusion in Education*, Berkshire: Open University Press
- OXFAM (2006): *Education for global citizenship: A Guide for Schools*: http://www.oxfam.org.uk/~media/Files/Education/Global%20Citizenship/education_for_global_citizenship_a_guide_for_schools.ashx
- Reardon, Betty A. (1988): *Comprehensive peace education: educating for global responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Reardon, Betty A./Cabezudo, Alicia (2002): *Learning to Abolish War: Teaching Toward a Culture of Peace*. New York: Hague Appeal for Peace
- Reeskens, Tim/Hooghe, Marc (2010): Beyond the civic-ethnic Dichotomy: Investigating the Structure of Citizenship Concepts across thirty-three Countries. In: *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol. 16 (4), p. 579–597
- Seitz, Klaus (2009): Globales Lernen in weltbürgerlicher Absicht: Zur Erneuerung weltbürgerlicher Bildung in der postnationalen Konstellation. In: Overwien, Bernd/Rathenow, Hanns-Fred (Hg.): *Globalisierung fordert politische Bildung – Politische Bildung im globalen Kontext*. Opladen & Farmington Hills, p. 37–48
- Stack, Trevor (2012): Beyond the State? Civil Sociality and other Notions of Citizenship. In: *Citizenship Studies*, Vol. 16 (7), p. 871–885
- Stephens, Angharad Closs (2010): Citizenship without Community: Time, Design and the City. In: *Citizenship Studies*, Vol. 14 (1), p. 31–46
- Tambini, Damian (2001): Post-national Citizenship. In: *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 24 (2), p. 195–217
- Thürer, Daniel (2000): „Citizenship“ und Demokratieprinzip: „Föderative“ Ausgestaltungen im inner-staatlichen, europäischen und globalen Rechtskreis. In: Brunkhorst, Hauke/Kettner, Matthias (Hg.): *Globalisierung und Demokratie*. Suhrkamp, p. 177–207
- Tully, James (2008): Two Meanings of global citizenship: Modern and Diverse. In: Peters 2008, 15–40
- UNESCO (1974): *Recommendation concerning education for international understanding, co-operation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms*. Paris. http://www.unesco.org/education/nfsunesco/pdf/Peace_e.pdf
- UNESCO (1999): *Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace*: www3.unesco.org/iycp/kits/uk_res_243.pdf
- UNESCO (2014): *Global Citizenship Education. Preparing learners for the challenges of the twenty-first century*, available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002277/227729e.pdf> Paris: UNESCO
- Weiglhofer, Hubert (2013): *Die Kompetenzlandkarte für Unterrichtsprinzipien und Bildungsanliegen*. BMUKK
- Vernby, Kate (2013): Inclusion and Public Policy: Evidence from Sweden's Introduction of Noncitizen Suffrage. In: *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 57 (1), p. 15–29
- Wintersteiner, Werner (1999): *Pädagogik des Anderen*. Munster: Agenda
- Wintersteiner, Werner (2005): *Friedenskompetenz als universitäre Aufgabe. Probleme und Perspektiven. Mit einem Schwerpunkt auf Friedenspädagogik*. In: Palencsar, Friedrich/Tischler, Kornelia/Wintersteiner, Werner (Hg.): *Wissen schafft Frieden. Friedenspädagogik in der LehrerInnenbildung*. Drava, p. 279–306

Appendix: Curriculum for the continuing Masters programme *Global Citizenship Education*

Klagenfurt, May 2012

Table of Contents

1. Preface
2. Objectives, target groups, course locations, basic principles of the course
 - 2.1 Objectives
 - 2.2 Target groups
 - 2.3 Course locations
 - 2.4 Basic principles
3. Organization and duration of the course
 - 3.1 Organization of the course
 - 3.2 Duration of the course and classes
4. Admission requirements and entrance procedures
 - 4.1 Admission requirements
 - 4.2 Entrance procedures
 - 4.3 Credit transfer
5. Examination regulations
 - 5.1 Requirements for successful completion
 - 5.2 Master's thesis
 - 5.3 Final board examination
 - 5.4 Admission requirements for the oral board examination
 - 5.5 Examination board
 - 5.6 Assessment of examinations
6. Graduation and diploma
7. Monitoring/evaluation
8. Scientific board and overall responsibility

1. Preface

Title of the continuing Masters programme: "*Global Citizenship Education*"

2. Objectives, target groups, course locations, basic principles of the course

2.1 Objectives

The beginning of the 21st century is marked by profound societal changes as well as rapid social change. The complexity of the world has increased exponentially, and political, economic and sociocultural developments can at present only be analyzed and understood in a global context.

The globally networked world is an inevitable reality and makes great demands on individual orientation efforts. These include, for instance, orientation in a world of highly diverse values and lifestyles, the ability to liaise in a positive way with people of diverse cultural backgrounds and with equally diverse values, the ability to respond appropriately to new quality requirements and flexibility demands in a changing world of work, being mindful of the ecological and social consequences of consumerism, making appropriate political decisions or even estimating the implications of deciding not to act at all. All of these require political individuals who think globally – *global citizens*, in other words.

The context of a globalized world also makes demands on pedagogic thought and action and requires a new understanding of education that goes beyond the teaching of factual knowledge. The educational concept of global education, which should be an interdisciplinary consideration across all areas of teaching, centers on an increasing growth of complexity and development towards a global society. As described in the Global Education Strategy (Strategie Globales Lernen), the core purpose of contemporary education is to enable (young) individuals to understand these complex developments and to reflect critically on them. Amidst

all of the confusion and external forces ruling our lives, it is crucial to interpret economic, social, political and cultural processes as malleable developments and to recognize possibilities of social participation, and active shaping of and shared responsibility in global society. Teachers therefore require specific competences and instruments so that they, as multipliers, may offer support for (young) people and society. In response to these new challenges, this course offers comprehensive continuing education for teacher trainers and other multipliers: civic education, global education, intercultural learning and peace education merge into one integrative concept. The course strives to enhance the perception and understanding of globally networked processes and global perspectives, as well as competences that facilitate independent judgment. In this way, it constitutes an indispensable contribution to contemporary general education.

It is the very combination of civic education, global education, intercultural learning and peace education that constitutes the new and unique feature of this course. The course participants will develop specialist knowledge and didactic competences that allow them to create teaching and learning processes revolving around civic education, global education, intercultural learning and peace education and gain essential qualifications that allow them to plan, implement and document curricula and curricular research.

The course has the following objectives:

- * participants reflect on their own role as political individuals and gain in-depth knowledge about globally networked processes of globalization and worldwide developments and can analyze “key questions” of the present time in their global context
- * participants critically investigate social change as well as its resulting (new) challenges for education
- * participants gain specialized knowledge about the conceptual groundwork of “*Global Citizenship Education*”, which integrates civic education, global education, intercultural learning and peace education, and familiarize themselves with current theoretical discourse in these fields of study
- * participants explore relevant global questions from the different perspectives of the different disciplines and pedagogical concepts; through this they get to know interdisciplinary approaches
- * participants hone the competences that are necessary for contemporary cosmopolitan (political) edu-

cation: basic expertise (Sachkompetenz), competence of judgment (Urteilskompetenz), competence to act (Handlungskompetenz) and methodological competence (Methodenkompetenz)

- * participants research and document the implementation of competence-oriented civic education, global education, intercultural learning and peace education in their own practical work
- * participants establish a network in order to exchange their research findings and experiences and can thereby act sustainably as multipliers for civic education, global education, intercultural learning and peace education, particularly in their respective educational institutions

2.2 Target groups

The course is targeted at professionals who are conceptually or practically involved in the training (and continuing education) of teachers. In keeping with a “train the trainer” program, this crucial group of multipliers will be given an understanding of cosmopolitan civic education with a focus on *Global Citizenship Education*. The course is also open to teachers of all school types and levels in German-speaking regions, as well as to participants from the areas of adult education, politics, (public) administration, media and society (social issues), who are multipliers in these areas.

2.3. Course locations

Courses will be held in various Austrian educational facilities.

2.4. Basic principles of the course

The course is based on the following principles:

- * The core contents of the course modules are scientifically sound and offer insight into current and international academic discourse. Hence the program offers a theory-based advanced training in *Global Citizenship Education*.
- * The course offers interdisciplinary approaches and thereby fosters the development of networked thinking and the ability to cope with complexity.
- * The course is based on blended learning and combines classroom teaching with online modules.
- * The course serves the consolidation and reinforcement of social competences required for competence-oriented teaching, i.e. it fosters the implementation of acquired competences of civic education in the everyday understanding of political matters.
- * The program organizers create an environment that fosters the development of educational processes

and skills, and in which the participants reflect on their experiences. They are able to systematically reflect their own teaching practices and integrate the required paradigm shift in their professional stance.

3. Organization and duration of the course

3.1 Organization of the course

The course is organized on a modular basis, with an even balance between theoretical and practice-oriented components. Courses are taught in German but some specialized texts are provided in their original English version. The participants acquire expertise based on the latest research findings. Members of staff of the Center for Peace Research and Peace Education and the CPD-Cluster as well as the cooperation-partners KomEnt and the Carinthian teacher training college (Pädagogische Hochschule Kärnten) vouch for the didactic quality of the program:

- * time-proven organization of the Klagenfurt course: continuous support and mentoring by a permanent team, selected experts, module-based setup, combination of theory and practice, action research
- * decades of international experience of the leadership and team members
- * state of the art theory
- * case studies, field research and educational trips
- * competence orientation
- * blended learning: intensive phases of classroom teaching, an e-learning platform, virtual conferences and personal mentoring

3.2. Duration of the course and classes

The course modules:

The entire course is both extra-occupational and blocked, and lasts for a total of six semesters. It includes four compulsory seminars, two working group sessions, an educational trip and six blended learning sessions. It comprises 90 ECTS credits including the master's thesis.

4. Admission requirements and entrance procedures

4.1 Admission requirements

One of the following is required:

- (1) teacher training degree from a teacher training college, university of education, university or equivalent institution abroad
- (2) equivalent university degree
- (3) other equivalent qualifications can only be recognized in combination with a minimum of five years of practical teaching experience

The admission application (letter of motivation) must be submitted in writing with all the documents required for admission. In accordance with § 70 Section 1 Universities Act, candidates must apply for participation in the course as non-degree students. Admission applications for this course must be submitted to the Alps-Adriatic University (Alpen-Adria Universität) of Klagenfurt.

Applicants are admitted on fulfilling all the formal requirements and based on the quality of their written application.

Fulfilling the given admission requirements does not automatically grant the right of admission to the course. Decisions about admission to the course are made exclusively by the course management.

4.2 Entrance procedures

The applications for admission to the course are submitted to the admissions board. The admissions board consists of the course director and two members of the teaching staff. The application documents are examined, evaluated and assessed by the scientific board.

4.3 Credit transfer

The course management is entitled to credit previous academic achievements to the amount of 20 ECTS. Further education and training in the areas of civic education, global education, conflict transformation, peace education, intercultural learning, human rights education and the like are eligible as relevant previous academic achievements. Graduates of the continuing Masters programme Citizenship Education (Klagenfurt-Krems) will receive 50 ECTS worth of credit. In order to receive credit, relevant documents that allow evaluation and assessment of previous academic achievements must be submitted to the course management.

Modules	Semester	Contents	Mode of teaching	Teaching units	ECTS
1 Civic education in a global world	1	Introduction – Democracy and Globalization (power, violence, peace) – <i>Global Citizenship Education</i>	Seminar 1	48	6
			Study group	32	4
			e-learning/blended learning	24	3
			Reflective Paper 1	16	2
2 Concepts and methods of <i>Global Citizenship Education</i>	2	Consolidation – terms, concepts: cosmopolitanism vs. ethnocentrism – culture of peace vs. clash of civilizations – conflict theories and practical conflict work – methods of <i>Global Citizenship Education</i>	Seminar 2	48	6
			e-learning/blended learning	24	3
3 Global conflicts	3	Educational trip: case study of global conflict	Educational trip	64	8
			e-learning/blended learning	24	3
			Reflective Paper 2	16	2
4 <i>Global Citizenship Education</i> – development of competences and their transfer into practice	4	Consolidation and taking stock – competences in <i>Global Citizenship Education</i> – discussion of final papers – review and outlook	Study group	32	4
			Seminar 3	48	6
			e-learning/blended learning	24	3
			Final Paper	80	10
5 Academic work	5	Content-related input for the Master's Thesis Topics	Seminar 4	64	8
	6		e-learning/blended learning	24	3
6 Master's Thesis		Writing a practice-oriented and scientifically based research paper on a topic relevant to the program	e-learning/blended learning (Master's Thesis)	32	4
			Master's Thesis	120	15
Total				720	90

The scientific board then decides whether credit will be given for previous academic achievements.

- * successful completion of all prescribed courses; missed courses can be compensated up to a maximum of 25% and require a written contribution of adequate length

5. Examination regulations

- * a pass grade on the two reflective papers and the final paper

5.1. Requirements for successful completion

- * a pass grade on the master's thesis

The following achievements are required in order to complete the course successfully:

- * a pass grade on the oral board examination

5.2. Master's thesis

In order to complete the course successfully, participants are required to write an academic paper in the form of a master's thesis. The master's thesis is a practice-oriented research paper that deals with a topic relevant to the course. At the end of the course, participants defend the core content of their thesis and are assessed by the examination board. The assessment is included in the diploma.

5.3 Final board examination

The course concludes with an oral final examination before an examination board. This examination allows for the assessment of participants' skills in the core areas of the course and the defense of the content of their master's thesis. The contents of the examination are determined by the scientific board and comprise all modules from all subject areas of the course.

5.4 Admission requirements for the oral board examination

The admission requirements for the final oral board examination include a pass mark in all modules, the approval of the master's thesis and a minimum classroom attendance of 75%.

5.5 Examination board

The final examination is held before a constitutive board. The course management appoints the board, which consists of the course director and two members of the teaching staff.

The respective examination board must comply with the examination regulations. The examination board makes decisions about examination results by means of a simple majority.

5.6 Assessment of examinations

All examination assessments are conducted with reference to a five-point grading scale (in accordance with § 73 Section 1 Universities Act), as are the master's thesis and the presentation and defense of the latter.

In addition to assessments of the written papers, an overall grade is to be awarded in the final board examination, in accordance with § 73 Section 3 Universities Act. The latter must read "pass" ("bestanden") if every partial examination was passed successfully. Otherwise it must read "fail" ("nicht bestanden"). The overall grade must read "passed with distinction" ("mit Auszeichnung bestanden") if none of the partial examinations was graded below "good" ("gut") and at least half of the subjects were graded "excellent" ("sehr gut").

6. Graduation and diploma

Participation in the course and successful completion of the required written papers as well as the final examination are stated in a diploma. Graduates of the course who complete it with a positive overall assessment are awarded the academic degree "Master of Arts (*Global Citizenship Education*)", abbreviated as "MA (*Global Citizenship Education*)", which is given after the participant's name in accordance with § 88 Section 2 Universities Act.

7. Monitoring/Evaluation

The evaluation of a continuing Masters programme at Klagenfurt University must be carried out in compliance with the regulations of the university statute, Part B § 23. The program is subject to evaluation throughout its duration. Evaluation tools are adapted for all courses and phases of self-directed learning. The insights obtained are analyzed and fed back into the continuous course design. The intended specialist publication will also include a contribution on the evaluation of the course. The course managers have sufficient experience to carry out self-evaluation. In addition, it is also intended that there will be an external evaluation.

8. Scientific board and overall responsibility

For the scientific board and overall responsibility, the Alps-Adriatic University (Alpen-Adria Universität) of Klagenfurt designates a course director with a subject-relevant *venia docendi*. The designation must be carried out in compliance with the regulations of the university statute or according to internally determined guidelines of the university. Thus, the scientific board is held by the Alps-Adriatic University Klagenfurt. The scientific board is responsible for the content-related focus, the structure of the program, the recruitment and appointment of teaching staff and the regular evaluation and both the academic/content-related and didactic development of the course program. The appointment of teaching staff must be carried out in compliance with the regulations of the university statute or according to university-internal guidelines. Finally, the scientific board is also responsible for the economic implementation of the program.

The Authors

Mag. Gertraud Diendorfer is a contemporary historian and head of the Democracy Center (Demokratiezentrum) in Vienna. She is also co-publisher and editor of the biannual special issue *Information on Civic Education* (Informationen zur Politischen Bildung), published since 1990 and issued by the Forum for Civic Education (Forum Politische Bildung), as well as editor and author of a number of publications and articles. She is also curator (together with Cornelia Kogoj) of the traveling exhibition "Migration on Tour". Her work focuses on democracy research, civic education, *Global Citizenship Education*, (e-) participation and migration.

Dr. Heidi Grobbauer is managing director of KommEnt – Society for Communication, Development and Dialogic Education (Gesellschaft für Kommunikation, Entwicklung und dialogische Bildung) in Salzburg and member of the Strategy Group for Global Education (Strategiegruppe Globales Lernen). Her work focuses on the implementation of continuing education programs for teachers and multipliers in education, such as the continuing Masters programme *Global Citizenship Education*, and the drafting of teaching materials for Global Education.

Mag.a Ursula Posratschnig teaches English at the Department of English and American Studies at the Alps-Adriatic University (Alpen-Adria Universität) Klagenfurt. Her research interests include second language acquisition

and *Global Citizenship Education* with a particular focus on animal rights. She is a graduate of the first continuing Masters programme "Global Citizenship Education" offered in Klagenfurt.

Susanne Reitmair-Juárez, MA, is a research assistant at the Democracy Center Vienna. She studied political science at Salzburg University and has carried out research in Latin America. Her work focuses on democracy research, participation, civic education, *Global Citizenship Education* and migration.

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Werner Wintersteiner is university professor for German Studies and teaches Peace Education. He is staff member at the Department of German Language Education and head of the Center for Peace Research and Peace Education (Zentrum für Friedensforschung und Friedenspädagogik) at the Alps-Adriatic University (Alpen-Adria Universität) Klagenfurt. He is also co-editor of the journal "Information on German Didactics" (Informationen zur deutschdidaktik – ide) and the series of books "ide-extra", as well as the yearbook "Culture of Peace". He has written numerous books, anthologies and pertinent articles in various languages. His research focuses on (transcultural) literary didactics and literary education, intercultural learning and literary multilingualism, literature, politics and peace, peace research and peace education in cultural studies, and *Global Citizenship Education*.

Impressum:

Authors: Gertraud Diendorfer,
Heidi Grobbauer, Susanne Reitmair-Juárez,
Werner Wintersteiner
c/o Zentrum für Friedensforschung und Friedenspädagogik
Studentendorf Haus 8, Universitätsstraße 65–67
9020 Klagenfurt
Layout: Katrin Pflieger Grafikdesign
Print: druck.at
Cover-Photo: Werner Wintersteiner



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons 3.0 Unported License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>
ISBN Nr. 978-3-902379-02-3
Klagenfurt, Salzburg, Vienna, 2015



komment

Demokratiezentrum Wien
www.demokratiezentrum.org

BM | **BF**
Bundesministerium für
Bildung und Frauen

**AUSTRIAN
DEVELOPMENT
COOPERATION**

