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Distinguished participants,
Ladies and gentlemen.

1. Tasks for ACEIU

It is my pleasure and privilege to deliver a keynote speech at this international symposium of great significance. We are all gathered here to commemorate the launching of the Asia-Pacific Center of Education for International Understanding (ACEIU). We are all attending this symposium to present and share our vision and wisdom with one another for setting the future directions of ACEIU, deeply reflecting the constitutional mandate of UNESCO for ‘constructing the defense of peace in the minds of men’ and the dreams and realities of the Asia-Pacific region and the world at large.

Prior to my presentation on the main theme, I would like to first convey my heartfelt thanks to all of you for extending your invaluable assistance and cooperation to establish the Regional Center. Many people have been actively involved in the founding work of ACEIU since the head of the Korean delegation proposed the establishment of the Regional Center to the 29th General Assembly Meeting of UNESCO in October 1997.
On behalf of the Korean National Commission for UNESCO (KNCU) and all other National Commissions in this region, our sincere appreciation should be conveyed to Dr. Colin Power, former Deputy Director-General for Education, to Dr. Kaisa Savolainen, Director of Department of Education for a Culture of Peace of UNESCO, and to Dr. Zhou Nanzhao, Senior Programme Specialist of PROAP, for their strong endorsement of the proposed Regional Center from the outset and their continuous propagation and facilitation of the proposed idea through UNESCO and its member states for the adoption of the resolution at 30th General Assembly.

I should also thank Prof. Toh Swee-Hin, University of Alberta, Canada, and Prof. Gadish Gundara, University of London, UK, for their devoted efforts for conducting the feasibility study with a keen insight into the missions and roles of the Regional Center.

Without the unanimous support of all the Asia-Pacific Member States of UNESCO and scholarly groups, especially APNIEVE (Asia-Pacific Network for International Education and Value Education), it would not have been possible to succeed in the adoption of our joint draft resolution submitted to the 30th General Assembly. Thus, I would also like to extend cordial thanks to the governments, National Commissions, and scholars concerned in this region.

Lastly, I think all of us should express our gratitude and respect to Dr. Kwon Tai-joon, Secretary-General of KNCU for successfully playing his role as the prime mover in this institution-building. During the past few years, he has devoted all his time and energy fully to giving birth to the new institute.

It is no doubt that the Asia-Pacific Center of Education for International Understanding is not a Korean institute, but a regional institute of and for all the UNESCO Member States in the Asia-Pacific region, although the Korean government in close collaboration with KNCU took an initiative to establish the Regional Center in Korea, and was commissioned the operational responsibility for the Center through the Agreement between UNESCO and the Government of Republic of Korea on the Establishment of ACEIU. Thus, I would propose an exchange of congratulations to one another for the opening of our Regional Center.
Ladies and gentlemen.

We are now faced with the important but formidable tasks that demand our strong leadership, both intellectual and moral, to promote and strengthen Education for International Understanding (EIU) in this region and, thus, to set a model to other parts of the world.

First of all, the most important task facing us is to clearly envision the missions and goals of ACEIU. It calls upon us to have broad and farsighted visions on the increasingly interdependent globalizing world, a deep sense of compassion with human suffering from war, violence, injustice and ecological destruction in the world, and, more importantly, a firm sense of commitment to the realization of universal values and ideals of humanity without negligence of our own cultural traditions, faiths and identities in the Asia-Pacific region.

Then, the next task is to design the programmes and activities that the Center will carry out to accomplish its missions and goals. In order to maximize the effectiveness of programmes of the Center, it should widely cultivate the functional linkages with UNESCO and its organs, the governments and National Commissions of Member States, schools and universities, NGOs and academic circles in this region and the world. The Center should also search for target groups that will have multiplying effects on EIU in this region.

These tasks call upon all the Member States in this region to actively participate and cooperate in the operation of ACEIU. The Center should fully utilize the intellectual expertises and practical experiences which they have developed and accumulated through promoting EIU in their counties. The goals and programmes of the Center should reflect the long - esteemed values and ideals, and the urgent social needs and problems of this region. Then, we will be able to design EIU to be really relevant in the Asia-Pacific context. We all well recognize that it is not such an easy task. It is more so because the Asia-Pacific region is characterized by the great diversity of its cultures and the vastness of its territories and populations.
2. New Challenges of the Globalization

Ladies and gentlemen.

We, present here today, understand well how Education for International Understanding started in the early days of UNESCO and how it has evolved along its history. It is thus not necessary to make a long review on the whole evolution process of EIU. I simply intend here to present a synoptic view on EIU and to highlight the changing visions and concepts of EIU in the era of globalization.

In light of the great shock of the massive destruction caused by World War II, world leaders at UNESCO envisioned and advocated EIU for building lasting world peace through education. The principal aims of EIU at the outset therefore was to develop in the minds of men, particularly young ones, genuine international and intercultural understanding and friendly images towards other nations, peoples and cultures. With this idealistic spirit, UNESCO has encouraged its Member States to promote EIU through the Associated Schools Project (ASP) in their respective school systems. I understand that many countries in this region have actively participated in EIU through ASP, each having its own colors and shades of the educational programme.

During the past half century, the changing realities of international relations between the rich North and the poor South, and ideological and political conflicts between the socialist East and the liberal, democratic West have made demands for new visions and approaches to EIU. The threatening social and human problems incessantly arising on the globe have created needs for the new forms of EIU designed to directly cope with each of those global problems. Moreover, the rising expectations and sharpening awareness of peoples around the world, particularly belonging to underdeveloped, underprivileged and alienated groups, have continuously demanded to reshape the goals and programmes of EIU to be fit for improving their destiny.

Consequently, EIU has now contained diverse and multi-dimensional views and concepts concerning the objectives, contents and approaches of education. A comprehensive view on EIU is well represented in the landmark guidelines for EIU set by
the 1974 UNESCO recommendation and the subsequent standard - setting instruments, declarations and action plans issued by UN and UNESCO. International education has been carried out under such various titles as international/intercultural education, human rights education, peace education, education for non-violence, studies of global problems, environmental education, education for tolerance, education for disarmament, development education, etc., with their own emphasis on the international dimension of education. Sometimes those programmes were conducted outside the conceptual umbrella of EIU.

In recent years since 1995, UNESCO has promoted “education for a Culture of Peace”, as the most comprehensive form of EIU. It seems that a recent movement for a Culture of Peace has returned to the original spirit of the UNESCO constitution, although it covers a wider spectrum of the objectives and approaches of education to include broad concerns of “civil peace among communities and social groups within states” and international peace, as well as the socio-cultural aspects, military and political aspects of world problems, and social movements through NGOs, along with education through school systems.

Whatever the title, the principal goal of EIU is to educate people to be enabled and empowered to contribute to the solution of social problems arising at the local, national and, especially international levels. EIU has been envisioned to play a crucial role in the prevention and solution of war and violence, human rights violation and social injustice, ethnocentrism and xenophobia, racism and fascism, poverty and hunger, and all other social forms and causes of human suffering. Therefore, EIU is basically education for problem - solution, conflict-resolution and societal development. It is based upon the fundamental assumption that education is not an end itself, but a means to an end, namely, the eradication of social conditions causing human suffering and ultimately the maintenance of peace, justice, democratic ideals and sustainable development in the world.

As claimed in the traditional and humanistic notion of education, however, education has the inherent intrinsic value for the self-realization of individuals through the full
development of their potentialities. In this regard, I would like to point out that the globalizing world has stressed the importance of EIU for human self-realization.

We are rapidly moving into the era of globalization that creates new social, cultural, economic, and political milieu for human living. Technological advancements have intensified and expanded more than ever the inter-dependence and inter-relatedness among peoples, communities, and nations beyond their boundaries to a global scope. Globalization was initially a striking fact and trend in economies and communication. Now its profound effects are spread all over the socio-cultural and political spheres and are even infused deeply into human consciousness. An increasing number of children live and grow under the diverse socio-cultural influences in the increasingly plural society.

The globalizing society demands even more enhanced international understanding and awareness of global interdependence not only for the maintenance of peace and justice in the world, but also for the self-realization of individuals. Education must place its emphasis on learning to live in harmony with others and on developing an integral collective self, to be fit for the globalizing society. It is then imperative to transform the whole personality, innermost value orientations and ways of living and thinking of people.

It is an important goal of education to develop a sense of self-identity of an individual as a world citizen. The narrow local and national perspectives of an individual should be expanded to global perspectives simply to be a sound person in a global village. Therefore, ‘learning to live together’ should be regarded as a process of being a man, not simply as a peace-building process.

3. Some Impediments to EIU

It is common in all human endeavours that there is a gap between the initial goal and the actual achievement. Although a half century has passed since the founding fathers of UNESCO set a high ideal for building a peaceful and just world through education, we have found that their visions and goals are yet to be accomplished. Unfortunately, we still frequently witness cruel acts of wars and violence, and violations of human rights
and democratic principles in many parts of the world. We tend to feel that education is powerless to play a positive role in peace-building and democratization of the society. In order to strengthen the power of EIU for the planned social change, it is in a keen need of scrutinizing the theories and practices of EIU.

First, one of the most serious impediments to EIU is the theoretical assumption upon which EIU is based. If a social reform programme or movement is to be really effective, it must contain the two indispensable dimensions and approaches; one, to change the structure of social systems and the other, to change the consciousness and behavior of the members of society, both to be geared for the desirable state of society. Even if EIU is effectively carried out to develop personal capacities and attributes, for instance, a peace-loving mind and a sense of egalitarianism, it hardly guarantees to maintain peace and equality in the society unless the social structure and international dynamics of the countries work in that way.

We often found similar theoretical limitations of psychological reductionism in the various educational programmes proposed by UN and UNESCO to solve global problems in the past. In order to achieve the ultimate goals of EIU more effectively, therefore, it is demanded to implement the programme for the structural reform in accordance with the educational programme. It also implies that EIU must expand its target groups to include, in addition to schoolteachers, and students, NGOs’ leaders, politicians and government officials who are more influential on the structural and legal reforms of the society.

Secondly, another impediment to EIU is the inward-directed reactions of many nations to globalization. The high wave of globalization has washed away the boundaries of national economies, significantly weakened the sovereignty of nation-states, and has forced widely open the doors for cultural interchange among nations. The nations and peoples in the world have responded differently to increasing openness in the newly emerging borderless world. They reacted in many different ways, for example, to multinational corporations, the neo-liberalist economic policies of the advanced countries, IMF, WTO, green round, global telecommunications via satellites and internet, the international alliance of NGOs, etc.
One form of the inward-directed reaction to the globalization is heightened nationalistic and chauvinistic sentiment. Another form is an intensified sense of competition with other nations to defend their national interests. I think that the self-defensive reactions, especially of political leaders, to globalization would seriously inhibit policy-making for the promotion of EIU. Therefore it is imperative to enhance the awareness of policy-makers as well as the general public of the increasing need for international cooperation and solidarity, and 'cooperative globalism' for peaceful coexistence and common well-being of humanity in the globalizing world.

The third impediment to EIU in this region is a dearth of research on Asia-Pacific cultures and values. Asia has created and maintained rich and diverse cultural traditions and profound religious faiths in which we could find the guiding principles and essential values for EIU. The aboriginal and immigrant cultures of the Pacific region also constitutes another abundant source of wisdom and beliefs which are relevant to EIU. Fortunately, APNIEVE has recently made an initial but worthwhile effort to draw the core values relating to peace, human rights, democracy and sustainable development from the perspectives of the Asia-Pacific cultures. The pioneering work of APNIEVE is most important for designing and implementing EIU on the basis of the Asia-Pacific values without losing the cultural identity of this region. However, I feel that there is a serious lack of comprehensive and systematic studies on the theme. It is important to conduct research on the theme by applying a multi-disciplinary approach of historical, philosophical, sociological and anthropological studies. Such research will provide a firm intellectual foundation for EIU which is relevant to the Asia-Pacific context.

Lastly, another impediment is the fragmentary and divisional concept and approach of EIU. As above-mentioned, EIU includes a wide scope of the objectives, contents and approaches of education addressed to various global problems. Thus, EIU has often been carried out in a fragmentary way, not in an integrated way. It is necessary to devise and apply an integrated and holistic approach to EIU to improve the effectiveness of education. Since this issue is very important and needs a little longer discussion, the following section will more elaborately deal with the issue.

4. A Holistic Concept of EIU
A man perceives and responds to his or her social, political, and economic environment as a whole. He or she learns through the entire process of social life in the organically integrated society. Therefore education must be based upon holistic views of a learner, knowledge, education and the society.

As mentioned earlier, EIU is currently implemented in many countries under the many different titles using diverse approaches, each focusing on a limited scope of the goals and contents concerning the major world problems. In this regard, the recent normative instruments and declarations of UN and UNESCO have continuously stressed the necessity to develop an integrated and holistic concept of education. It was also strongly recommended by the feasibility study of ACEIU and by several participants in the Regional Workshop on International Understanding and Peace in Asia and the Pacific, held in Seoul in September 1999.

Holism in EIU could be represented in several aspects of education. First, an integrated and holistic concept and approach could be applied to the goals and contents of EIU. The various programmes of EIU could be integrated or combined into a comprehensive programme by interrelating the contents concerning global problems in terms of their causes, effects, and resolutions. Secondly, a learner in EIU should be viewed as a whole person. The main objective of EIU is to teach people how to live peacefully and harmoniously with others and develop the whole personality of learners. Thus, EIU must aim to exert influence upon the whole scope of personal capabilities and attributes; knowing, understanding, valuing and acting of a learner, although the latter ones seems to be more important for EIU. Thirdly, an integrated and holistic approach should also be applied to the various forms of education, including formal or non-formal educational process. The development or learning of an individual is facilitated by many different socializing agents, such as parents, teachers, peer groups, youth organizations, mass media, internet, civil organizations and social movements and ever work places. If EIU is to be effectively carried out, all the learning experiences of individuals, in and out of school, should be interrelated and interwoven in a way to complement and support one another.
Fourthly, the teaching and learning process should also be viewed in the integrated and holistic concept. It is a generally accepted pedagogic principle that the broader involvement of a learner in learning processes ensures the achievement of higher effectiveness in education. A lecture method which classroom instruction is usually heavily relied upon requires a learner to be only partially involved. In order to enhance the effectiveness of EIU, it demands teachers broaden a learner’s active involvement in the teaching/learning processes by using such methods as participatory, interactive and experiential learning. Fifthly, a holistic approach to education implies that EIU must constitute a coherent whole within the curricula’ across many subject-matters, such as history, geography, language, civic or moral education, music and physical education. Since a man lives and learns in an integrated social reality not in a fragmented conceptual world, such an integrated curriculum for EIU seems to be more relevant and effective than a separate subject for EIU, particularly for young children.

Lastly, a holistic approach to education must be applied to the target groups of EIU. This point was rightly stressed by Mr. Koichiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO. He said in his opening address at the Fifth Session of the Advisory Committee on Education,

“A holistic approach to learning implies that we also take a holistic approach to the learners. Alternative delivery systems must be developed to reach street children and out-of-school youth, semi-literate or illiterate young adults, the poorest girls and women, isolated rural populations, ethnic minorities, those with disabilities.”

Ladies and gentlemen,

To conclude, I have to say a few more words to ask for your cooperation for ACEIU.

Education for international understanding must be placed at the center of all the forms of education, whether formal or non-formal, in the globalizing world. It is essential not only for peace-building in the world, but also for the self-realization of an individual as a world citizen. It is our shared hope that ACEIU plays a crucial role in promoting EIU in the Asia-Pacific region. The Asia-Pacific region has abundant intellectual resources and
high aspirations for building a peaceful and developed world. I am very hopeful that ACEIU could play an important role in the future in promoting and strengthening EIU through mobilizing the intellectual resources and moral support of all the member states of UNESCO in this region. Thus, I believe that the future of ACEIU is bright.
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Representatives of Member States of UNESCO
Ladies and Gentlemen

It is indeed a great honour for me to be with you today at the inauguration of the Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding. I have long believed that we must assign a much higher priority in our education policy and programmes in this region to education for international understanding and to the promotion of regional co-operation in the context of APEID. When visiting the Ichon Centre with the Korean National Commission just over five years ago, the possibility that it might one day become a regional centre for education for international understanding was very much on our agenda, and I have been very happy to have played a role in supporting the efforts of my friends in the Korean National Commission to help make this dream a reality. It is thus with some sense of parental pride that I am delighted to be here. My task this morning is to help set the developmental chart of our new infant for the future.

Let me begin by outlining why I see the promotion of education for international understanding in the Asia-Pacific region must assume a much higher priority in our
international, regional and national education programmes and then move to some of the tasks for which ACEIU might play a key role.

**Challenges facing Education at the dawn of the 21st Century**

Conceived while the bombs were still falling in the darkest hours of World War II, UNESCO was established by world leaders who, mindful of the failures of nationalistic education systems, were determined to ensure that education in future would be reshaped so as to build a better future for all but building the defences of peace in the minds of men and women. Education for international understanding and the promotion of co-operation among Member States from all region has therefore always been central to the mission of UNESCO.

Of course, over the past fifty-five years, the nature of threats to world peace and security have changed: the Cold War is over and the bulk of the violence now stems more often from the breakdown of social ties and moral order within nations than wars between them. At the dawn of the new millennium, we find that in our constantly changing global village, globalisation represents a powerful standardizing force, but also that it is leading to greater cultural diversity in every country, greater interdependence among nations, greater inequality and new opportunities and threats. In an intensely competitive world, we must discover ways in which diverse cultural groups can and should live together, respect the dignity and worth of each person, learn to share and care about our common future.

The rapidity and scope of the transformations underway at the end of this century not only mean that our fate is increasingly linked with that of others, but paradoxically, it also has created greater political and economic uncertainty, larger gaps between nations and greater cultural diversity within them. Unity within diversity is difficult, but it is the only option for every nation and for the Asian-Pacific region if we really want peace and development for our children.

The political and economic restructuring underway has had a significant, often negative, impact on the social institutions (family, community, school, church or mosque) which form the contexts within which our children develop. In particular, many Asian-Pacific countries are deeply worried about the problems of drugs, HIV-AIDS and violence - seeing them as manifestations of an underlying “moral crisis”
facing our world. The most serious threats to our security are now largely from within our nations, rather than between them. And in all regions of the world, there are calls to produce a statement of values or a moral code to guide educational policy and practice. Indeed, the Ministers of Education of this region at MINEDAP VI placed moral education as its top priority for regional co-operation.

For its part, UNESCO has continued the process of dialogue among the religions, philosophies, cultures and educators of the world in the search for a common substratum of values that make co-existence possible on a worldwide scale and provide a global dimension to the curriculum and our rights and responsibilities as citizens of a given nation and of the world. Public opinion surveys in many countries of the world show that there is wide agreement on the values and principles which should be taught to children, particularly concern for others, responsibility, good manners, tolerance and respect for other people.

We live in a world in which some 10,000 societies, each with their own culture, co-exist in about 200 states. Building peace and resolving conflicts globally or within any nation is not possible unless there is an underlying unity in the diversity of cultures and religions. Much of the work of UNESCO has involved the quest for that unity, for a universal set of values which all societies and recognized religions accept. The Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development (UNESCO, 1995) defines these underlying common values as “a global ethics” and sees the principles of democracy, peace, human rights and pluralism as basic ingredients. But at the same time, our global ethic stresses respect for the dignity and worth of every individual, every culture. How then does one combine the universality of core values with an acknowledgement of different cultures, social interests and individual freedoms?

Somehow we must find a way around the impossible choice between a mass culture which unites the world in the consumption of the same products and the differentialism which confines us all in closed communities unable to communicate other than through the market or war, between the disappearance of all differences in a mass globalised society and the direct clash of these differences and communities. Seeking an educational programme which equips our children and adults with the knowledge, skills, values and sensitivities to resolve ongoing and new conflicts peacefully are key tasks for UNESCO and, in this region for the ACEIU. As Touraine
(UNESCO, 1998) put it “Education must not be merely a means of strengthening society: it must also serve to build personalities capable of innovating, resisting and communicating, affirming their universal right, and acknowledging that of others, to participate in the modern technical age with their own personalities, memories, languages and desires.”

The UNESCO document “Towards a Culture of Peace” submitted to the 1997 General Assembly of the UN outlines the extent to which is an agreed ethical basis, a set of universal principles for developing and assessing educational programmes for a desirable future society, global and national. The document makes it clear that from an international perspective, the basic human values on which education should be built are those which have been established and reaffirmed over the years in a number of standard-setting instruments, beginning with the Constitutions of the UN and UNESCO and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and more recently in the Declaration and Integrated Framework for Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy (UNESCO, 1995). The challenge is that of ensuring these values which centre on human rights and the dignity and worth of each individual and culture help define educational priorities and practice, rather than those which are based on a given economic ideology or imposed by any powerful political, religious or cultural group.

Today, our populations have become much more diverse in terms of culture, religion and agendas. It is no longer possible or appropriate to use a particular religious tradition or the authority of the ruler to determine, justify or impose universalism of culture and its associated educational policy and practice. Slowly we are beginning to see the richness and diversity of cultures which make up our nations and the Asia-Pacific region as an asset rather than as a liability; to understand that diversity is valuable in its own right as the expression of human creativity; that recognition of each cultural identity is required by democratic principles of equity, human rights and self-determination; that as with biological diversity, it provides the basic elements for adaptation and survival in times of change while serving as a reservoir of knowledge and experience.

Thus we see, on the one hand in the history of education the demand for an education which aims at developing social cohesion and respect for common values, but on the other, an education which is respectful of the dignity of every individual
and every cultural identity. But can education promote unity in diversity within the Asia-Pacific region, and if so, how?

Long ago, one of my heroes, Mahatma Gandhi gave us an answer: “I do not want my house to be walled in on all sides and my windows to be stuffed. I want the culture of all the lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet by any.” Gandhi remains an inspiration to all who seek to oppose violence and to mobilize diverse groups in support of a larger vision of unity. He understood the value of cultural diversity.

For Europe, education for international (or at least European) understanding has been seen by the EU and the Council of Europe as every bit as important in laying the foundations for the future as political or economic agreements: thus the massive investments in co-operative education programmes throughout Europe. What we need at the dawn of the 21st century is a Ghandi–like vision and an EU type action for the Asia-Pacific region. For our region to develop, we must also learn to live and work together, to respect each other’s languages and cultures, and to put aside our old hatreds and indifference to the plight of the our neighbours.

As I have stressed elsewhere (Power, 2000), global forces mean that we will live in increasingly multi-cultural and inter-dependent societies, and thus we need to develop education policies and programmes which eliminate old and new types of discrimination in education, show much greater respect for the rights and cultures of minorities, and to promote intercultural understanding and tolerance of other religions and national cultures. We do need to replace the melting pot model by a mosaic, rich in diversity but nonetheless having a clear unifying pattern based on global ethics and regional solidarity.

However diverse cultures and religions may be and however determined we may be to respect each cultural identity, national governments must make decisions about education priorities and the curriculum, they must frame policies and they will do so on the basis of value positions, be they more or less agreed, more or less explicit. And as in any community, schools, be they secular or religious, cannot function without a reasonably coherent, consistent and shared set of values on which to base the myriad of professional and moral decisions to be made in building responsible citizens.
Human Rights and International Understanding

In the fifty years that have passed since the Declaration of Universal Rights was proclaimed, almost all countries have ratified it. A surprisingly large number of national educational laws contain the key elements of Article 26. Basic Education for All is an essential condition for participatory democracy, and repeatedly nations around the world on occasions such as the World Conference on Education for All in 1990 have reaffirmed the principle. In April at Dakar, we found that since 1990 most developing countries are making slow but steady progress in quantitative terms, but much remains to be done by all countries to meet the basic learning needs of all. But as the latest World Education Report concludes, the biggest challenge we face relates more to the purposes of education than access. Paragraph 2 of the Universal Declaration insists that the education we provide must promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations and groups of the region and the world.

However much we may espouse education for international understanding as a key goal of education for the future, we need to recognize that in everyday life, including life in schools and universities, we do always act in conformity with the values we espouse. Each generation must identify and struggle to surmount the barriers, old and new, which reinforce our national prejudices and weaken our resolve to make cut back on the national to create more space for regional and international understanding. We must look critically at our own biases and attitudes, and understand what aspects of our existing political, economic and social systems contribute to inequity, poverty, violence, drug abuse and exclusion, as well as new threats to security and social cohesion which stem from the economic and social structural transformations of the information age.

Globalisation and new communication technologies threaten further marginalisation of the poor and minority cultures. We are witnessing a rise everywhere of intolerance, violence, ultra-nationalism and xenophobia, the fear of difference of any kind: of skin colour, language, ethnic origin or sex, and too often we see the new technologies being used to corrupt rather than to educate. There are new threats to security, new forms of violence and indoctrination more subtle than those of the fascist regimes, but perhaps even more dangerous. In many cases, conflicts and tensions - ethnic, social, religious or linguistic - draw on the many
sources of individual and community frustration created by the spread of poverty, exclusion and injustice inflamed by misuse of our new tools of communication. The ACEIU and UNESCO do need to play a role in promoting the development and exchange of high quality educational software, multimedia packages and networks as well as conventional teaching materials to prepare a new generation of young people with the inner strength needed to say no to violence and racism, and with a commitment to continue to learn more of the languages, literature, history and cultural achievements of others throughout their lives.

Our century has been as much one of sound and fury as of economic and social progress - progress that in any case has not been equally shared. It is a world of enormous and constant change, and as such, one in which cultures are constantly being forced to change or die. The threats to our common future stemming from the reduction in the earth’s cultural richness and diversity stemming from modernization and globalisation are no less real than the threat to ecological diversity. Sadly, in Australia as in most of the new world, education was too often used as a tool of assimilation and played a key role in the loss of cultural identity for indigenous and minority immigrant groups. It has only been in the last twenty years or so that we have deliberately set out to develop education policies and programmes based on values which respect the dignity of all peoples and aim to help our children to value the richness and diversity of cultures within our country.

In my view, the multi-cultural and multi-lingual educational policies of recent years have contributed much to the building of stable, cohesive democracies in which the way of life and rights of most, but not all, major cultural groups are respected. Nonetheless, as recent events in several Asian-Pacific countries remind us, intolerance, racism and xenophobia lurk in the dark corners of most societies, and are likely to breed quickly in times of economic or political uncertainty.

At the end of this century, we need now to re-examine educational priorities in a situation in which the threats to peace and security are predominantly internal rather than external. ACEIU together with APNIEVE could help Member States to look critically at their successes and shortcomings in ensuring that their educational systems are effective in developing the values which will make for peace, democracy and respect for human rights, and while exploring ways in we can modify educational
policy and practice to take advantage of new communication technologies and major structural transformations underway at the end of this century.

I would like to propose that we think of an education programme for the ACEIU under the general umbrella of UNESCO’s international and regional programme which aims at promoting multiple citizenships, a composite identity wherein the treasure within, the full development of the individual personality through a programme with a balanced emphasis on learning to know, to do, to live together and to be is actualized in ways which enable the young to participate effectively in a rapidly changing and uncertain world, to assume their responsibilities as citizens of the Asia-Pacific region as well as the world, as well as their own country.

The concept of “multiple citizenships” begins with an acceptance of the oneness of the human family and the interconnectedness of all nations, cultures and religions as we address global and regional problems. It implies, for example, that we systematically seek to develop through national education programmes, a passionate respect for the “inherent dignity and equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family” as the “foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world” (preamble of International Declaration, 1948).

World citizenship does not imply an abandonment of legitimate national and cultural loyalties, nor the abolition of national autonomy, nor the imposition of uniformity. It does imply unity in diversity, internationally as well as nationally. As Gandhi stressed indeed the Universal Declaration demands, understanding and respecting the culture and religion of others is possible only if one respects one’s own cultural identity. While much of our education must focus on our own national languages, literature, history, rights and responsibilities, we must also acknowledge that our education systems tend to be somewhat ethnocentric and nationalistic. In the 21st century, we will need to give much greater attention to developing an understanding of, and respect for, the richness and diversity of the world’s cultures and ecosystems, to global issues, universally accepted values, and our rights and responsibilities as citizens of the world.

The Report of the International Commission for Education in the 21st century begins with an analysis of the global tensions facing us, between the global and local
(as described above), the universal and the individual, tradition and modernity, long-term and short-term considerations; competition and equality of opportunity; the spiritual and the material. For the Commission, designing and building our common future means: "a renewed emphasis on the moral and cultural dimensions of education, enabling each person to grasp the individuality of other people and to understand the world's erratic progression towards a certain unity; but this process must begin with self-understanding through an inner voyage whose milestones are knowledge, meditation and the practice of self-criticism."

The title of the Delors Report (Learning: the Treasure Within) conveys its central message: learning, that is, everything that humanity has learned about itself, is the treasure within the rich diversity of cultures which make up our global village. To find the treasure within, the ACEIU together with other Centres like the ACCU in Japan could encourage our educators to explore the accumulated wisdom, literature, knowledge and values of their own and other Asian-Pacific cultures.

Whereas the Report of the International Commission provides a broad framework for reflection and debate on the types of educational reforms needed to build a peaceful, pluralistic democratic society, ACEIU must at a more practical level seek to articulate what this means in terms of educational policy, curriculum and teacher education programmes, publishing and disseminating many reference materials in many languages to promote "a culture of peace and non-violence."

Given the theme of this Conference, it is important to recall that the Ministers of Education of the Member States of UNESCO approved at the 1994 International Conference on Education and formally adopted during the 1995 General Conference, a Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy. The Ministers promised to base their education systems on "principles and methods that contribute to the building of respect for others, human rights," and to "strengthen the formation of values and abilities such as solidarity, creativity, civic responsibility, the ability to resolve conflicts by non-violent means," to introduce into curricula "education for citizenship which includes an international dimension, the ethical, religious and philosophical bases of human rights, their historical sources," "national and international standards such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights," the problem of racism and the history of the fight against sexism and all other forms of discrimination and exclusion, and "curriculum
reforms which emphasise knowledge, understanding and respect for the cultures of others” and linking “global problems to local action.”

The Integrated Framework sets out the aims of education for international understanding; strategies, policies and lines of action; teaching materials and resources; programmes, teacher education; action on behalf of vulnerable groups; non-formal education, higher education; co-ordination of effort with family, media and other agents of socialisation etc. If governments and their Ministries were to meet their commitments and follow the guidelines which they approved, considerable progress can be made.

To assist Member States, UNESCO has studied their policies and programmes (eg. Teacher Training and Multiculturalism, IBE, 1995), monitored the extent to which they meet their legal obligations with respect to Conventions like that on Discrimination in Education and, if necessary, draw their attention to allegations of violations; developed manuals to illustrate exemplary practice (eg. UNESCO Kit on The Practice of Citizenship, Manual for Human Rights Education, Education for Tolerance, Language Education in Multi-cultural Societies), supported bilateral co-operation, NGOs and networks to promote the revision of school history and geography textbooks, values education and civics education; promoted education for religious, cultural and linguistic pluralism, and linked schools serving violent communities.

For more than 40 years, the Associated Schools Network has linked schools (currently about 6,000) from all regions (over 150 countries) and has served as a grass-roots movement of teachers and students aimed at promoting international understanding and intercultural dialogue and co-operation in the production of practical and innovative approaches to education. For example, the ASP “Peace Pack” is presently being experimented in over 80 countries, and the World Heritage Educational Resource Kit for Teachers “World Heritage in Young Hands” containing videos, CD-ROM and materials developed by the schools on their heritage sites provides an attractive resource to promote appreciation of the richness and diversity of the world’s cultures. I certainly see the ACEIU as a focal point for encouraging co-operation among the leaders and students of our Associated Schools network in this region. It is an ideal setting for launching sustained developmental projects in which teachers and students from ASP schools work together to develop
teaching and learning materials aimed at promoting an understanding of each others cultures and for understanding and reducing tensions and conflicts among neighbours.

Promoting education for international understanding based on mutual respect for the dignity of the individual and his or her culture is most difficult in conflict situations. Under the Culture of Peace programme we are trying to build peace in situations where there is, or has been a history of violence within or between nations. Difficult though it may be, the ACEIU and UNESCO in its regional programme must do its best to build the foundations of international understanding by working with the education authorities and teachers of member states to eliminate all forms of racism, stereotyping and distortions of history and to promote educational exchanges aimed at promoting solidarity within the region – just as the EU and Council of Europe have tried to do in Europe. I would also like to stress the need to disarm our history (i.e. to focus more on the human and cultural achievements of our nations and the region) and to promote (as we have with our Associated Schools movement) heroes of peace like Gandhi and Martin Luther King rather than of war. Thus I would hope that the ACEIU will build on its past successes as a place in which in the tranquillity of the forests of Ichon, youth leaders, ASP teachers and students, curriculum and assessment specialists, teacher educators and educational administrators from many parts of Asia and the Pacific can work together in practical ways to translate the ideals of education for international understanding into action in their fields of competence.

Finally, I should stress the importance of educational research and cooperation in the development of educational statistics and indicator systems. Given the strong emphasis on values, moral education and international understanding in the region, it seems to me to be imperative that we do not allow the internationalisation of education and the global indicator systems being used to assess national progress to be dominated by market economists: we must develop new systems for judging the extent to which we have been effective in promoting international understanding, tolerance and respect for the rights and dignity of others – and not just focus on achievement in maths and science, the utilization of internet or the expansion of virtual universities as indicators of quality.

Conclusion
We need to change our own concepts and practice of power in schools, the work place, economic, national and international politics from one based on force, self-interest and aggression to one based on respect for human rights and cultural differences, participation, consensus and non-violent social change. To do so will not be easy in a world accustomed to resolving conflicts by force and where national and self interest often triumph over the common good. For example, if it has proved difficult for the Council of Europe to promote its programme for constructing European citizenship through education and training, we should pretend that it will be easier to promote our international rights and responsibilities as citizens of the Asia-Pacific region or as world citizens: few curriculum guidelines have followed the example of Norway which does seek to do so, and few school systems other than the International Baccalaureate will withhold their graduation certificate if community service requirements are not met.

Our common future will rest on whether we do manage to educate ourselves throughout life for richness and diversity in an international context where the greatest threats to security, democracy and equity lie within. The ACEIU will help Member States in this region if serves as the focal point for a select number of mutually agreed programmes for ASP, history and language teachers, curriculum and assessment specialists and teacher educators which focus on the sharing of policies, practices and materials aimed promoting greater understanding of the cultures, religions and values of the rich tapestry which makes up the Asia-pacific region: that is the treasure within which the ACEIU must help us discover and share.
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