



Tertium Comparationis
Journal für International und Interkulturell
Vergleichende Erziehungswissenschaft
Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 158–173, 2020
Waxmann Verlag GmbH

Global Citizenship Education for whom? Indo-German reflections on glocal vignettes from worldwide practices

Gregor Lang-Wojtasik

Pädagogische Hochschule Weingarten, Germany

Dipti J. Oza

The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, India

Abstract

This commentary, by two authors from the Global North and Global South respectively, reflects on the significance of (auto-)ethnographic vignettes as a point of departure for an emic approach, applying the concept of Global Citizenship Education (GCE) to the maxim of ‘education for all’ as promulgated by the UN from 1990. The authors explore GCE from a post- and decolonial perspective, with a particular focus on the universal right to education and the power structures, hierarchies, and misunderstandings that are reflected in or arise from subconscious assumptions or conventions. With a discussion of the global roots and discourses that have led to the emergence of GCE as a concept, the authors point to the complexities of GCE, which needs to combine global responsibility with knowledge about and respect for local traditions if it is to free itself from the imperial connotations of Enlightenment universalism. Ultimately, the authors conclude, in order to ‘learn’ GCE we must first ‘de-learn’ conventional (colonial) power relations.

(Auto-)ethnographic vignettes as the starting point in an emic approach to a Global Citizenship Education for all?

Does it make sense to reflect on Global Citizenship Education (GCE), when 258 million children and young people worldwide lack daily access to school or any kind of education facilities? (<http://uis.unesco.org/en/topic/out-school-children-and-youth>). We believe so. Education remains the key to development with a humane face and a path for all people to participate as world citizens, especially in times of crisis and growing uncertainty.

Indeed, the right to education is an implicit assumption in the vignettes that form the analytical material for this special issue and a crucial basis for any debate on a GCE for all. It is high time for reflection on the aims, traditions, and contradictions or – in the words of the editors of this special issue – the ‘intentions, power, and accidents’ inherent in GCE. Based on our own experiences working from specifically de- and postcolonial perspectives and our positionalities, we will consider such aspects in the light of an *accidental* re-colonialization that might take place as a result of hopeful, well-intentioned, approaches attempting to decolonize education.

Our collaboration here as authors from the Global North and South respectively has its own history in such misunderstandings, in our case happily the beginning of an honest and open debate leading to a productive exchange. I (GL-W) started visiting India in 1987. My motivation was to learn about Gandhi’s relevance today. I used to bring groups to the subcontinent ‘on the trail of M.K. Gandhi.’ These development- and education-based trips followed a minimum of two weekends of preparation on various levels. Field research in Bangladeshi and Indian villages on ‘non-formal education’ for my PhD in the 1990s allowed me to gain valuable insight into the lives of people in the two countries. During this field research I was able to discuss my observations with interested local colleagues and in 2010 I approached one of them, Dipti Oza, my co-author for this commentary, with the suggestion of a cooperative exchange. This resulted in a bilateral symposium one year later on the ‘Role of Education in a Globalized World – Indo-German Reflections.’¹ As a privileged middle-class researcher, I was full of visionary ideas on the subject, and it took me some time to realize that even the term *globalization* is very much connected with British imperialism and colonialism, frequently referred to as ‘the West.’ More frequent visits to India as a scholar, and instructive exchanges with local colleagues, taught me a great deal about how to better approach this sensitive task.

I initially trained as a teacher for both primary and secondary school, with music as one of my specialties. A vivid memory from this time was a course during which we learned to play ‘African’ music. We were told that this was the quintessence of innovative music education and *the* way to deal with ‘difficult’ students; the ‘African rhythm,’ we learned, would motivate them to sing and dance. The sub-text: Look at the ‘poor’ African people and how they celebrate their lives through music and rhythm. The songs we learned were mainly from West-African countries. In retrospect, I imagine our professors really believed in what they were doing; perhaps they even felt they were ‘giving something back’ to a continent they had learned was ‘downtrodden,’ presented under the banner of ‘Intercultural Education’ or even ‘Global Learning.’ They certainly would have been dismayed for their well-intentioned practices to be referred to – as they might be today – as ‘positive racism.’ Indeed, introducing students to ‘African rhythm’ has become a fashion in many

German schools, unfortunately often encapsulated within sweeping generalizations that give the impression, for example, that all Africans have natural rhythm and are able to sing. (What is meant by ‘African rhythm’? Africa is a continent of more than 50 countries and over 1.2 billion inhabitants.) ‘Rhythm’ in the German context is – even today – often associated with Hegel’s remarks that it was not possible for the people of the ‘real’ Africa (in today’s terms sub-Saharan Africa) to develop or be educated (Hegel, 1821/1930, pp. 203–224). This enduring imperialist misunderstanding of a ‘continent without history’ is perpetuated by references, however implicit, to Africa and its peoples as ‘wild humans’ who are ‘in harmony with nature’ having escaped the corruptive influence of civilization – the archetypal ‘noble savage’ associated (again, with good intentions) with Rousseau and 18th/19th-century romantic primitivism.

These memories from my student days came back to me when I read the narrative by Levenson (Vignette 6), which critically describes the use of an “intoxicating African rhythm” for pedagogical purposes in a Scottish school in Israel/Palestine. It seems that a one-world vision is a fundamental, well-intentioned, wish of educators. The music is practiced in a “safe space for students to experiment with global identities,” which also seems to be a universalist, peace-oriented approach. But what is the real aim of introducing this music in the specific context of the conflict-dominated Middle East? As all this is practiced in a Christian school we might read it as an attempt to underline the power of Christian love as a force for change, while bearing in mind that this approach has been used to oppress many people in the world. Further: Is this an approach to be taken by Israelis or Palestinians; by Jews, Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists, or members of other religions? When reading this fascinating vignette, we should be sensitive to major-minor perceptions of religious paths, as well as to the complex and paradoxical colonial implications of a Scottish school in a region that was for a time under British colonial rule. To summarize: Who is responsible for setting objectives in the school, how are historical semantics taken into account, and how sensitively are the possible tensions dealt with?

This highlights an important contradiction inherent in GCE. This area of education practice is full of visions, and it is important that hope for change through education is cultivated. Without this conviction, any educative approach seems useless. So, the visionary positions of people like M.K. Gandhi and Nelson Mandela, and even John Lennon’s ‘Imagine’, described in Vignette 1 to be present in the classrooms of the ‘rainbow nation’ South Africa, are important. Many other names could be mentioned, such as Paulo Freire, whose teachings shape the approaches described by Kertyzia (Vignette 5). Following these visions means initially following one’s own understanding or prioritization of those ideas, many of which can easily be applied to conceptions of cosmopolitanism. In most cases we will never know whether

these visionaries viewed themselves and their teaching in a similar light, or whether such an understanding was their intention; however, such normative questioning can only take us so far. The vignettes in this special issue show what can happen as a result of varying interpretations. Gandhi, for example, is known in some Indian debates and especially in ‘the West’ as an ‘apostle of non-violence’ (Kripalani, 2004). While this is, in itself, positive, it is also a simplistic reduction of his whole concept of democratic social change. In India he is praised – even by his opponents – as the father of the nation and of modern, secular India. Throughout his life he proposed reforms for all areas of society – including education. But how many people today are really interested in his principle of ‘Nai Talim’ (*new education*, popularly referred to as ‘basic education’) today, which places craftwork at the center of any learning and fosters a critical understanding of western/British-driven civilization? (Gandhi, 1951). Or how about Nelson Mandela, his experiences on Robben Island and the process of reconciliation in South Africa with the multilingual constitution of the ‘rainbow nation’? John Lennon was not only a renowned musician but in his last years also to some extent an activist, who moved millions with his song ‘Imagine.’ But can it be sung in all parts of the world? And who does it refer to? Engaging with the dialogical approach of Paulo Freire (Vignette 5) requires an understanding of its emergence in Latin America and how it spread across the world with many regional adaptations.

The example (in Vignette 2) of people who have recently arrived in Berlin and are often reduced to the label ‘refugees’, reminds us of three key points: (i) People who have had to leave their homes remain human beings. (ii) Migration has always been part of world history and should be approached as such. (iii) We are, nevertheless, currently seeing an *increase* in the number of people affected by migration worldwide; let us inquire as to why this is the case.

Migration is frequently open to misunderstanding due to – amongst other things – the challenges of convention, yet it also offers fresh insights and opportunities for reciprocal learning. The world is changing rapidly. Education, and especially GCE, has the potential to help change the narrative in a visionary way. The ‘welcoming culture’ (*Willkommenskultur*) promulgated in Germany in 2015 soon began to give way to the somewhat less welcoming term ‘refugee crisis,’ rendering an *emic* discussion of practices in the so-called ‘welcoming classes,’ as presented in Vignette 2, more vital than ever.

Considering the vignettes and our role in commenting upon them from an analytical perspective, we are aware that science is itself strongly influenced and formed by western beliefs. As members of the middle class in the Global North and South respectively, we are aware of our position within a system or systems, and the potential we therefore have to reproduce structural violence. We are limited in our

ability to appropriate the voices of those (particularly indigenous groups) who have suffered at the hands of western-driven civilization, or to speak for them.

We believe that the vignettes are of ‘glocal’ character (Robertson, 1995). They typically combine two distinct yet interdependent variables: global norms and local particularities. We find a broad consensus among most of the vignettes that the global community must take appropriate and considered action to ensure the survival of the planet and its citizens. We also perceive a general tendency to report and document in a way that enshrines human rights as a universal right and norm. Such a tendency can be beneficial, as a universalist ethos poses a counterpoint to nationalist or fundamentalist solipsism. With their emic perspectives on aspects and situations that are all too often described from the top-down, the vignettes clearly demonstrate that it is high time for a sensitive and participatory approach to education for global citizenship.

At the same time, we understand that this moral and ethical orientation for action challenges the power embedded in forms of structural and cultural violence (Galtung, 1990). English is the current global *lingua franca*, yet it may also be considered to be a tool of oppression and structural discrimination due to its associations with the colonial past. Language therefore presents us with a paradox: on the one hand it represents the desire to communicate and make oneself understood across cultures (and the enabling power that a global language thus affords) but on the other there are power structures embedded in language itself, which create binaries and systems of ‘othering’ that problematize clear, lateral communication – and we would do well to remain cognizant of this balancing act.

The great transformation of the planet can be challenged by the transformative potential of education and learning (Lang-Wojtasik, 2014, 2019a). This implies a clear commitment to education beyond intended purposes and as a force of self-liberation beyond, or in spite of, economic or technological limitations. From this perspective GCE offers a rich context, with interconnections across world history and education science:

- 1) GCE is based on cosmopolitanism and globalization, with their long visionary and sometimes brutal histories, but it offers paths beyond any hierarchical approach or western/northern hegemony.
- 2) GCE consists of three words that are self-explanatory with respect to global perceptions and their acceptance.
- 3) GCE includes clear goals: a commitment to justice in education represented by education for all, inclusive access for all as part of a lifelong perspective, and the fulfilment of the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

- 4) GCE is informed by many education concepts and tackles the key challenges of today's world, while having the potential to motivate students to create a more humane world that avoids any kind of re-colonialization.

In the following sections we build upon these four premises from a historico-systematic perspective. We will look at the roots of cosmopolitanism, decolonized globalization as the basis for global citizenship beyond western/northern hegemony, the UN concepts of Education for All and Sustainable Development Goals, and the precursors to GCE.

Cosmopolitanism and globalization as the historical basis of GCE

1) GCE is based on cosmopolitanism and globalization, with their long visionary and sometimes brutal histories, but it offers paths beyond any hierarchical approach or western/northern hegemony.

Vignette 1 (Robinson) demonstrates how the tangible legacies of visionaries such as M.K. Gandhi, Nelson Mandela and even John Lennon are present in South African classrooms. We also draw clear parallels with the educational concept of Paulo Freire and his dialogically based approaches of reflecting the *what* and the *how* of education presented by Kertyzia in Vignette 5. The idea of global citizenship as visionary cosmopolitanism dates back to Indian and Greek antiquity. According to current research, the Indus valley civilization (approx. 2800–1800 BC) as well as the Buddhist universities of Taxsila (approx. 600–200 BC) and Nalanda (500 BC–1300 AD) played important roles in catalyzing information and knowledge in their respective time periods. Greek and Roman antiquity (approx. 1600–27 BC; 750 BC–476 AD respectively) are historically significant periods as well (Nussbaum, 2019). We should remember that ancient educational institutions were by their nature exclusionary, intended for specific social groups. The process of mass education is inextricably linked to the development of the nation state (Meyer, Ramirez & Soysal, 1992).

The European understanding of cosmopolitanism is very much informed by authors of the European enlightenment (e.g. Kant, Rousseau) and their precursors in the Roman-Catholic (e.g. Erasmus) or Protestant traditions (e.g. Comenius) (Trembl, 2005, 2011). In recent times it has become more common for national governments to declare themselves to be the representatives of one single religion or ethnic group. It is our belief that this is the 'sweet poison' of the European enlightenment – claiming a type of rationalist emancipation from former superstition and the hitherto prevailing norms. When taken to its logical conclusion, such a process paves the way for oppression, such as we find manifested historically in intense colonization and imperialism. In the majority of cases, a volatile mixture of economic, religious, scientific, and philosophical factors combined, with brutal and deleterious conse-

quences for non-Europeans. From today's perspective, the end of the 15th century marks the beginning of economic globalization with a destructive face (Galeano, 1971/1997). We now recognize, for example, that the 'discovered' people of America had of course explored their landmass long before Christopher Columbus disembarked in 1492.

Equally from today's cosmopolitan perspective, it seems important to be clear about the fragility of democracy and the different narratives regarding world history; i.e. who recounts events of creation, development or civilization, and from which perspective. From a scientific point of view, there is no need to reconstruct who was first in offering important ideas to the world but it is important to accept that there were and are a range of valid ideas. This is not only the basis of a constructive understanding of global citizenship beyond historical mainstream narratives, but also the root and expression of a decolonized cosmopolitanism. We believe that the cosmopolitan perspectives of Vivekananda, Sri Aurobindo, Tagore, Gandhi or Makiguchi, Ikeda, Freire, Nyerere, Montessori, Key and many more foster an understanding of the plurality of world thoughts and perspectives with a humane cosmopolitan face as the basis of continuous innovation in education (Morsy, 1997; Datta & Lang-Wojtasik, 2002; Sharma, 2018). These reformist thinkers include lesser-known names from more rural areas of the world, whose work is often subject to a narrowed-down understanding of civilization in the name of a ruling minority.

GCE: Toward a world community

2) GCE consists of three words that are self-explanatory with respect to global perceptions and their acceptance.

The key desiderata of GCE are possible if we accept all beings as autonomous, and independence and democratic existence as fundamental rights of every human being. Self-reliance and self-respect are the driving forces of any life; if these are protected and respected, the chances of a successful global citizen education may be higher. This is connected to an understanding of cosmopolitanism today, and provides options for inclusive world responsibility (Nussbaum, 2019). Education is the only tested tool that brings together these various strands of understanding. The acronym also encompasses the unconditional right to education of all people (UNESCO, 2020), including those with learning difficulties or special educational needs (Oza, 2016).

When we embarked upon our journey of co-authorship, we discussed cosmopolitanism and its societal and educational meaning for today's society and quite quickly agreed that from a contemporary perspective each word of Global Citizenship Education is self-explanatory: Global means universal, representing and connecting all who are residents of this planet. It is non-imperial and non-colonial. It

requires clear commitments to a decolonization of educative thinking (Abdi, Shultz & Pillay, 2015). Citizenship refers to everyone who resides on the globe (all *homo sapiens*). Each citizen abides by the unwritten rules of humanity or human society. A notion of citizenship brings people closer, allowing the development of confidence, faith and trust in one another. Ultimately this experience will help individuals to question, and hopefully eliminate, certain perceptions, biases, prejudices, discriminatory behavior and myths which they may not have experienced personally but have either heard of or read about. It is crucial that we move forward towards global citizenship in a spirit that will nurture a humane society – beyond apartheid (Vignette 1), neo-colonialism (Vignette 5) or only one path of faith (Vignette 6).

In order to sustain education, there is a need to inculcate and enrich the values of collaboration, cooperation, sharing, tolerance, loyalty and learning to live together. All this might sound visionary, normative, and out of date in a climate where large scale, top-down assessments seem to set the trajectory for competency-based education. We believe that education has a responsibility, beyond cognitive results and merits, to believe in change. In other words, education is not viable without this hope.

GCE in the UN context: The right to education and lifelong learning

3) GCE includes clear goals: a commitment to justice in education represented by education for all, inclusive access for all as part of a lifelong perspective, and the fulfilment of the UN's Sustainable Development Goals.

In Vignette 4 (Gardinier), university students in Albania take their future into their own hands and underline their understanding of global citizenship by organizing and participating in protests against neoliberal reforms that threaten to lead to the privatization of higher education. The enacting of global citizenship in the context of higher education, here approached through the emic perspective of an ethnographic vignette, refers implicitly to the UN, the SDGs and the universal human right to education.

With the Declaration of Human Rights, adopted in 1948, education became a fundamental human right as promulgated by the United Nations and laid down in article 26. This has been underscored in numerous reports and declarations since. An important step towards attaining the goal of educational access and sustainable learning options was the 1990 World Conference on Education for All, held in Jomtien, Thailand. Since then, the strategies and actions of the world community have been based on the six goals agreed at that conference (UN, 1990). These were reaffirmed and refocused in the Framework for Action agreed in Dakar, Senegal, in 2000.² Since the Dakar conference, education monitoring has been expanded and every year the world can learn about the developments, achievements and deficits in the visionary process

through extensive statistics prepared by the UIS (UNESCO Institute of Statistics) and disseminated through annual Global Monitoring Reports (latest: UNESCO, 2020). The Jomtien-Dakar process was continued at the Incheon conference as well as in the SDGs (UN, 2015).

The central message subheading the Delors report is that learning should be valued as a ‘treasure within’ (Delors, 1996), which makes clear that education can pave the way for lifelong learning. The SDGs underline the fact that the formerly separate processes of Education for All and development-related concerns of the world community have to be taken as a joint endeavor. SDG 4 is very clear on this point: it aims to “ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all” (UN, 2015, p. 17). The sub-goals strengthen the Jomtien-Dakar agenda in terms of anti-discrimination, gender-equality in access and retention, appropriate learning opportunities and perspectives for societal connections, as well as examining vulnerable members of society in precarious conditions (e.g. indigenous people). Here we can find the inseparable interconnection between Education for All (EFA) and Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) embedded within the pragmatic vision of Global Citizenship. This seems to be a feasible path, combined under the umbrella term of GCE. Referring to the EFA and the GMR 2020 subtitle, ‘All means all’ (UNESCO, 2020) we have in mind all possible learners from early childhood to fourth grade, reachable through various education paths. According to the UNESCO data there is still much progress to be made in terms of universal access and retention from early childhood care through primary and secondary education as well as literacy based on learning needs for all. The known challenges of the Global South in its various dimensions can be informed by alarming data from the Global North too. We know, for instance, of 6.5 million functional illiterates (Grotlüschen, Buddeberg, Dutz, Heilmann & Stammer, 2019) in Germany.

We also suggest that the current pandemic can serve as a forewarning to the world community. The pandemic and its consequences could be the starting point for implementing the shared vision of cosmopolitanism and related education efforts. So GCE could be the dynamic orientation concept to realize full access for all learners to their respective education facilities and beyond any discrimination, restrictions or marginalization – starting from Early Childhood Care and Education up to pluralistic opportunities of andragogy. A viable option may be to start with the learning needs of the most vulnerable members of a society. That would aid understanding of the need for cooperation and solidarity between local and global levels.

The quality of education and its relationship with societal circumstances must be sustainable, meaning that no one is forced to drop out, but that each person is given the chance to value education as a tool toward self-reliance and democratic development. This includes alternative learning paths for those who start their discovery of

‘learning treasure’ later than their respective age-group. It is important, in our dynamic world, that continuous, lifelong education opportunities are created and ‘the line’ of world community is maintained. This requires didactic innovation and the provision of innovative and highly qualified teachers as facilitators.

To overcome human rights violations, inequality and poverty, the visionary path of sustainability and peace is imperative. As the world becomes increasingly interconnected, education opportunities offer the time and space to explore feasible options of concrete activities. As understood by UNESCO,

[GCE] aims to empower learners to engage and assume active roles, both locally and globally, to face and resolve global challenges and ultimately to become proactive contributors to a more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable world. (2014, p. 15)

This pragmatic vision includes some other important convictions. It aims to encourage critical and reflective learners, ready to explore creative innovations constructively. Such an understanding of education supports the revisiting of “assumptions, world views and power relations in mainstream discourses” (ibid.). It considers the challenges of the members of the world community within their specific circumstances of underrepresentation, marginalization or vulnerability and creates “individual and collective action to bring about desired changes” (ibid.). All this is only possible, however, if multiple stakeholders work comprehensively from local to regional level and nationally as well as globally.

When it comes to questions of the basic understanding of learning within GCE, three mutual and interdependent domains are important: cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioral (UNESCO, 2015, p. 15). These are strongly connected to the previously mentioned four pillars of learning (Delors, 1996). Basic cultural techniques like reading and writing should certainly be part of measurable learning results, but at the same time we should be clear about a wider understanding of competence, combining knowledge, skills, values and attitudes as learning outcomes. So *cognitive* aspects would encompass the acquisition of “knowledge and understanding of local, national and global issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations” and the development of “skills for critical thinking and analysis.” *Socio-emotional* aspects would be based on learner’s experiences of “a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, based on human rights”. That would be the basis to “develop attitudes of empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity.” *Behavioral* aspects would focus on effective and responsible activities “at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world,” including the “motivation and willingness to take necessary actions” (ibid., p. 22).

All this might sound visionary and one may ask how to translate this into pragmatic action. Examples such as the implementation of ESD in India (Lahiri, 2017),

global education in Europe (McAuley, 2018) or the status of Sustainable Development and GCE within the worldwide teacher education (Bourn, Hunt & Bamber, 2017) demonstrate that necessary changes are always two-sided and mutual, and involve political frameworks and the willingness of people at all levels to act. In some cases it may take at least a generation for the visions to become inculcated into the consciousness of the people. The concept of universal human rights has been around for more than 70 years, while the empirical situation of human action in this regard unveils a discrepancy between knowing and acting. As education is often driven by hope of change, these visions require the rationale to propel the whole endeavor forward.

GCE toward a more human society for all

4) GCE is informed by many education concepts and tackles the key challenges of today's world, while having the potential to motivate students to create a more humane world that avoids any kind of re-colonialization.

GCE can be interpreted and understood in many different ways, (Abdi et al., 2015; Dill, 2013; Jorgensen & Shultz, 2012) derived from various educational concepts and understandings. There is some friction between historical concepts such as post-colonialism and de-colonialism and between systematic concepts such as economics and humanity. In other words, globalization and education can be understood as vehicles of worldwide economic development, whereas human beings and citizenship are seen as human capital. It is also possible to combine globalization and education on a human level as paths to an equal and just world community, where economy comes second. As education scientists we follow a critical approach to GCE and will mention some of the educational concepts informing GCE for the future.

It is helpful to look at the agreed definition of global education within the Maastricht Declaration in order to give us a taste of the discourse over the last 20 years. Here we find that:

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. (O'Loughlin & Wegimont, 2003)

This definition is the result of a European conference that discussed worldwide participation, perspectives and understandings beyond colonialist structures. The definition is clear in its attempts to bring about a change of consciousness and conceptual relations. It includes a clear statement to try altering perspectives, where possible,

within the complete frame of universal human rights. It combines various cross-sectional concepts that aim to deal with the challenges of a world society and underlines the related necessity of the global dimension to create an understanding of citizenship. While exploring the specific histories of different conceptual frames would exceed the scope of this commentary, we will have recourse in the following to the perspectives of Global Education and Global Learning (Lang-Wojtasik & Klemm, 2017; Bourn, 2020).

Development Education derives from different worldwide movements that focus on post-colonial thinking and activities as part of economic cooperation. It is based on a critical revision of development theory and on bringing liberating education into practice (Bourn, 2003). Based on the Declaration on Human Rights, the related *Human Rights Education* deals mainly with reflections on human rights in different educational settings, human rights as a subject within education, and children's rights to education (Lenhart & Savolainen, 2002). *Education for Sustainable Development* now has a long tradition within environmental education, having gained in significance in the context of the 1992 Rio Conference, combining the two societal and political debates on ecology and development (Bormann, 2017). *Education for Peace and Conflict Prevention* mainly offers options to equip people with skills to deal with conflicts in a constructive and peaceful way. The possibility of successful action is very much based on the ability to analyze and perceive the dynamics and chances of conflicts. This is related to knowledge of direct and indirect violence as well as related approaches (Frieters-Reermann, 2019). *Intercultural Education* is a concept that has the (somewhat maligned) nation state as its main reference. Consequently, there are challenges due to migration as well as inter-national aspects of experiencing other countries through a national cultural lens (Gogolin, Georgi, Krüger-Potratz, Lengyel & Sandfuchs, 2018).

Undoubtedly, GCE implies a clear normative commitment to the kind of global transformation necessary to deal with the upcoming challenges of the world, such as the survival of humankind in the face of ecological disaster. Transformation as a structural change encompasses the inner and outer self within community and as related to society. However, all education efforts have to address four challenges in order to bring about such a transformation:

- 1) *From norms to attitudes*: This includes preparedness for a universal view on pluralistic history, equal value perception and decolonized approaches to the world-community – shaping it as a place for everyone.
- 2) *From attitudes to information*: There must be clarity about people's shared norms beyond hierarchies and based in socialization processes of various kinds (e.g. spirituality/religion, ethnicity/culture).

- 3) *From information to knowledge*: Education in its true sense is the basis of a maturity that enables an understanding of one's positionality within the world being created and framed as the selection of knowledge.
- 4) *From knowledge to acting*: Learning how to deal with knowledge creates options enabling one to act within a world of growing variation, risk and insecurity.

Innovative GCE must have a firm historical basis. In order to properly consider the future role of schools and other education facilities (Lang-Wojtasik, 2021) and the existing friction between formal and non-formal education (including learning as a lifelong approach) (Rogers, 2014; Lang-Wojtasik, 2017), it is necessary to revisit existing didactic approaches and reassess their suitability for the 21st century (Lang-Wojtasik, 2019b). Special attention should be paid to international connectivity (UNESCO, 2015) and to the role of teachers as professional global facilitators (Darji & Lang-Wojtasik, 2014; Bourn, 2016).

In terms of citizenship debates, we should be prepared to look most critically at questions of diversity, identity and quality (Osler, 2000) as well as of status, feelings and practice (Osler & Starkey, 2005). This debate must include discussion of how to move from international to transnational global citizenship and how we can balance the role of self-transformation within the individual, and societal transformation on the level of global governance (Wintersteiner, Grobbauer, Diendorfer & Reitmair-Juárez, 2014, pp. 22 ff.). A consideration of the history of cosmopolitan potential mentioned at the beginning of this commentary may be beneficial here. This leads us to some enduring questions. From the perspective of GCE we can ask: What understanding of development, human rights, sustainability, peace and conflict as well as inter-culture is referred to and how is this interlinked with education? And is it enough to talk about the global when it comes to the question of (world) citizenship or is the local an indispensable counterpart? Should we not rather be talking about *Glocal* Citizenship Education? The vignettes presented here and the emic approach they entail may give us reason to answer in the affirmative.

Notes

1. The symposium took place in 2011 at the Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda. This was followed by a student exchange program funded by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), 'A New Passage to India' (2011–2015), which is continued within the DAAD-funded ILAP (*Internationalisierung der Lehramtsausbildung an Pädagogischen Hochschulen/International Teacher Education at Universities of Education*), encompassing partners from Brazil, Chile, India, USA and Germany (2019–2022).
2. These were: expansion of early childhood care and development activities; universal primary education by the year 2000; improvement in learning achievement; reduction of the adult illiteracy rate to one-half its 1990 level by the year 2000, with sufficient emphasis on female literacy; expansion of provisions of basic education and training in other essential skills required

by youth and adults; increased acquisition by individuals and families of the knowledge, skills and values required for better living and sound and sustainable development (UNESCO, 2000).

References

- Abdi, A.A., Shultz, L. & Pillay, T. (Eds.). (2015). *Decolonizing global citizenship education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-277-6>
- Bormann, I. (2017). Nachhaltigkeit und Bildung. In G. Lang-Wojtasik & U. Klemm (Eds.), *Handlexikon Globales Lernen* (pp. 294–297) (2nd ed.). Münster: Klemm + Oelschläger.
- Bourn, D. (2016). Teachers as agents of social change. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 7(3), 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.18546/IJDEGL.07.3.05>
- Bourn D. (Ed.). (2020). *The Bloomsbury handbook of global education and learning*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Bourn, D., Hunt, F. & Bamber, P. (2017). *A review of education for sustainable development and global citizenship education in teacher education. Background paper for the 2017/18 global education monitoring report*. London: UCL Institute of Education.
- Bourn, S. (2003). Towards a theory of development education. *The Development Education Journal*, 10(1), 3–6.
- Darji, B. & Lang-Wojtasik, G. (2014). Preparing globally competent teachers – Indo-German perspectives. *International Journal of Global Learning and Development Education*, 6(3), 49–62. <https://doi.org/10.18546/IJDEGL.06.3.04>
- Datta, A. & Lang-Wojtasik, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Bildung zur Eigenständigkeit. Vergessene reformpädagogische Ansätze aus vier Kontinenten*. Frankfurt a.M.: IKO-Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation.
- Delors, J. (1996). *Learning. The treasure within. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (Highlights)*. Paris: UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.7788/ijbe.1996.24.1.253>
- Dill, J.S. (2013). *The longings and limits of global citizenship education: The modern pedagogy of schooling in a cosmopolitan age*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203374665>
- Frieters-Reermann, N. (2019). Frieden durch Friedensbildung – Grenzen und Chancen erhofften Transformationspotenzials. In G. Lang-Wojtasik (Ed.), *Bildung für eine Welt in Transformation. Global Citizenship Education als Chance für die Weltgesellschaft* (pp. 147–160). Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvpbnpz8.13>
- Galeano, E. (1971/1997). *Open veins of Latin America: Five centuries of the pillage of a continent*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(3), 291–305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343390027003005>
- Gandhi, M.K. (1951). *Basic education* [printed & published by Jivanji Dahyabhai Desai]. Ahmedabad: Navajivan.
- Gogolin, I., Georgi, V.B., Krüger-Potratz, M., Lengyel, D. & Sandfuchs, U. (Eds.). (2018). *Handbuch Interkulturelle Pädagogik*. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- Grotlüschen, A., Buddeberg, K., Dutz, G., Heilmann, L. & Stammer, C. (2019). *Leo 2018 – Leben mit geringer Literalität. Pressebroschüre*. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg. Retrieved from <http://blogs.epb.uni-hamburg.de/leo>.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (1821/1930). *Philosophie der Weltgeschichte. Erster Band: Die Vernunft in der Geschichte* (3rd ed.). Leipzig: Meiner.

- Jorgensen, S. & Shultz, L. (2012). Global Citizenship Education (GCE) in post-secondary institutions: What is protected and what is hidden under the umbrella of GCE? *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education*, 2(1), 1–22.
- Kripalani, C. (2004). *Mahatma Gandhi: Apostle of non-violence*. New Delhi: Rupa & Co.
- Lahiri, S. (2017). Education for sustainable development in teacher education in India. *Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik*, 40(3), 30–36.
- Lang-Wojtasik, G. (2014). World society and the human being: The possibilities and limitations of global learning in dealing with change. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 6(1), 53–74. <https://doi.org/10.18546/IJDEGL.06.1.04>
- Lang-Wojtasik, G. (2017). *Globalisierung und Globales Lernen als ein Epizentrum politischer Erwachsenenbildung!?* Ulm: Klemm + Oelschläger.
- Lang-Wojtasik, G. (Ed.). (2019a). *Bildung für eine Welt in Transformation. Global Citizenship Education als Chance für die Weltgesellschaft*. Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvpbnpz8>
- Lang-Wojtasik, G. (2019b). Globales Lernen als transformative Bildung – Überlegungen zu einer Allgemeinen Didaktik mit weltbürgerlichem Anspruch. In G. Lang-Wojtasik & S. König (Eds.), *Die Vielfalt methodischer Zugänge in der Unterrichtsforschung. Beispiele aus Fachdidaktik und Allgemeiner Didaktik* (pp. 23–48). Ulm: Klemm + Oelschläger.
- Lang-Wojtasik, G. (2021). Great transition and world collective – Education for transformation within school. In L. Heidrich, Y. Karakaşoğlu, P. Mecheril & S. Shure (Eds.), *Regimes of belonging – schools – migrations. Teaching in (trans)national constellations* (pp. 113–126). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Lang-Wojtasik, G. & Klemm, U. (Eds.). (2017). *Handlexikon Globales Lernen* (2nd ed.). Münster: Klemm + Oelschläger.
- Lenhart, V. & Savolainen, K. (Ed.). (2002). Human rights education as a field of practice and of theoretical reflection. *International Review of Education*, 48, 145–158. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020382115902>
- McAuley, J. (Ed.). (2018). *The state of global education in Europe 2018*. Dublin: GENE.
- Meyer, J.W., Ramirez, F.O. & Soysal, Y.N. (1992). World expansion of mass education, 1870–1980. *Sociology of Education*, 65(2), 128–149. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2112679>
- Morsy, Z. (Ed.). (1997). *Thinkers on education* (3rd ed.) New Delhi: UNESCO/Oxford University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2019). *The cosmopolitan tradition. A noble but flawed ideal*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674242975>
- O’Loughlin, E. & Wegimont, L. (2003). Executive summary. In E. O’Loughlin & L. Wegimont (Eds.), *Global education in Europe to 2015. Strategy, policies, and perspectives. Outcomes and papers of the Europe-wide Global Education Congress Maastricht, The Netherlands, 15–17 November 2002*. Lisbon: North-South-Centre of the Council of Europe.
- Osler, A. (Ed.). (2000). *Citizenship and democracy in schools: Diversity, identity, equality*. Sterling: Trentham Books.
- Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing citizenship: Democracy and inclusion in education*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Oza, D. (2016). Inclusive education. Indian perspectives and challenge. In G. Lang-Wojtasik, K. Kansteiner & J. Stratmann (Eds.), *Gemeinschaftsschule als pädagogische und gesellschaftliche Herausforderung* (pp. 83–94). Münster: Waxmann.

- Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization, time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25–44). London: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446250563.n2>
- Rogers, A. (2014). *The base of the iceberg. Informal learning and its impact on formal and non-formal learning*. Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich. <https://doi.org/10.3224/84740632>
- Sharma, N. (2018). *Value-creating global citizenship education. Engaging Gandhi, Makiguchi and Ikeda as examples*. New York: Palgrave. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-78244-7_6
- Treml, A.K. (2005). *Pädagogische Ideengeschichte. Ein Überblick*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Treml, A.K. (2011). Globalisierung als pädagogische Herausforderung. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen einer weltbürgerlichen Erziehung. In W. Sander & A. Scheunpflug (Eds.), *Politische Bildung in der Weltgesellschaft* (pp. 190–203). Bonn: BfPB.
- UN. (1990). *Final report: World Conference on Education for All: Meeting basic learning needs, 5–9 March 1990, Jomtien, Thailand*. New York. Retrieved from <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/100741?ln=en>
- UN. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. New York. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E
- UNESCO. (2000). *The Dakar framework for action. Education for all. Meeting our collective commitments. Draft to be finalized and adopted at the World Education Forum Dakar, Senegal, 26–28 April 2000*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2014). *Global citizenship education. Preparing learners for the challenges of the twenty-first century*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2015). *Global citizenship education. Topics and learning objectives*. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002329/232993e.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Inclusion and education: All means all. Global education monitoring report*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Wintersteiner, W., Grobbauer, H., Diendorfer, G. & Reitmair-Juárez, S. (2014). *Global citizenship education. Politische Bildung für die Weltgesellschaft*. Wien. Retrieved from <https://bimm.at/publikationen/global-citizenship-education/>