



# Introducing Speech to the Workshops

## Developing Global Citizenship: Contemporary Challenges and Opportunities for the World Scouts Movement.

**Fernando M. Reimers**

*Ford Foundation Professor of International Education.*

*Director of Global Education and of International Education Policy*

*Graduate School of Education*

*Harvard University*

It is a distinct pleasure to be with you at this Congress. It is a pleasure because the World Scout Movement embodies many positive citizenship qualities. What could better reflect citizenship than the many efforts of volunteers around the world to help educate the young for a life of purpose? That this volunteer movement is global in its nature, that it is celebrating its first hundred years and that the World Scout Organization has proven to be a learning organization, with the ability to adapt to the changes in times, while firmly rooted in the core values laid by the founder is all the more admirable. It is for these reasons that I consider it a high privilege, an honor, to be among you as you make this pause after 100 years of good work, to think ahead and sharpen the vision that is to guide the efforts of this organization for the next 100 years.

Much of my academic work focuses on how to improve the options in life of children in poor countries. I am very interested in what schools can do to prepare students for lives of purpose. My interests include also what schools can do to prepare students in more economically developed nations to teach them about the world in which they live, to make them globally competent. The focus of my talk today will be on the necessity to prepare the young, in advanced and developing nations alike, to be global citizens. I will define the competencies of global citizenship, will explain why schools should be doing more to develop them and also talk about the constraints schools face to make progress in this area. I will conclude that our best hope at present is for social movements and social entrepreneurs working in non-formal education to do what formal education systems find so challenging. I will recognize some of the many initiatives the World Scout Movement is already advancing that are fully consistent with the purpose of developing global competency to conclude suggesting seven challenges for your organization as you continue along this path.

## **1. Why the purpose of preparing for citizenship is especially important today**

Our 21st century Globalization, characterized by the increased frequency and speed of exchanges among civilizational streams, the growing integration of the world economy, the competition for energy and water, demographic changes and flows, climate change and political conflict, call for concerted action across national divides. We need global governance and strong transnational institutions that make such governance possible. To make such governance possible we need, in addition to global institutions, global citizenship. Global citizenship will not only enable the effective work of global institutions, but will support those actions at the local and national level that permit global cooperation, governance and stability. The connection between the local and the global is increasingly porous and increasingly there are important dimensions of citizenship that are global. The development of global citizenship skills among the majority of the population is consequently an important challenge for democratic societies, and even for those societies which do not aspire to be democratic. If the globalization of the past could be served by the specialized global knowledge and competency of a few individuals in the foreign service or in business, the globalization of the present and of the future requires a widely shared set of competencies that help us seize the opportunities made possible by globalization, and that permit to manage wisely the conflicts that are already resulting as a result of it. I submit that there are three core dimensions of global citizenship: Knowledge, Attitudes and Competencies. In a nutshell they include ability to speak and understand fluently a range of languages to be able to communicate across cultures and civilizational streams, knowledge about world history, geography, cultures and religions as well as knowledge of specific aspects of the process of globalization itself such as world trade, global economic and social development, global health, global poverty, global conflicts and the role of institutions of global governance, and lastly a positive disposition, an affect that embraces the opportunities as well as the challenges of globalization, a positive orientation towards the many forms of difference with which globalization brings us into contact, at the very least empathy and tolerance.

These competencies include those that allow people across cultural groups to address peacefully and effectively political conflicts, such as border disputes or conflicts arising out of historical and political differences among cultural or national groups, but also the competencies that allow different cultural groups to collaborate effectively in addressing the challenges of world trade, of competition for natural resources such as fossil fuels or water, or the challenges caused to the ecosystem by human-environmental interactions such as the atmospheric impact of growing carbon emissions or the ecological impact of waste disposal or the health impact of global epidemics.

This knowledge, disposition and competencies will allow those who have them to engage peacefully and constructively across cultural differences for purposes of addressing personal and collective needs and of achieving sustainable human-environmental interactions. Most important among these dispositions is the internalization of a set of Global Values. A universal commitment to global values, including to universal human rights and tolerance will be essential to prevent the civilizational conflict predicted by Samuel Huntington:

It is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations

and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future. (Huntington, 1993, p. 22)

Addressing these challenges of globalization will require making citizenship education and the development of global values an explicit objective of efforts to improve education quality throughout the world, critically examining theories and evidence about the effectiveness of various approaches to developing citizenship and global citizenship and supporting activities aligned with this public purpose. This public purpose should support the development of a political culture that fosters the rule of national and international law and respect of human rights, the development of understanding to support trade and economic and peaceful bilateral and international diplomacy as the preferred means to solve international disputes, the development of the capability to understand and address the serious environmental challenges facing humanity and to collaborate across national boundaries in the creation of sustainable forms of human-environmental interactions and in the development of the skills to promote rationality in deliberation and action, and to advance science and technology as means to improve human health and well being. While it would make sense to expect that schools and school systems should take a more proactive role in developing these competencies, at present, however, many education systems and reforms are insufficiently focused on quality, or focus instead on a very narrow and self-referenced definition of quality.

It is possible to educate people to understand and appreciate cultural differences and to understand and accept human rights in a framework of global values that includes compassion and caring, concern for others, respect and reciprocity. These values, dispositions, knowledge and skills can be developed in a range of institutions that societies have to pass on what they value to the young, and to re-create culture: families, religious institutions, the media, workplaces, political institutions and also schools.

Societies throughout the world support schools in the expectation that these institutions can help each new generation develop the skills and knowledge that will equip them to have a good life as adults. This basic recognition that schools are organizations that exist for a purpose that is, temporally as well as sociologically, external to schools themselves is necessary to inform reflection about the way in which schools function and to inform conversations about school reform. In the United States, for example, public schools have for most of their existence focused on citizenship education, although this emphasis has diminished in recent years.

These conversations about purpose are, of course, complicated in part because different people, different groups in societies, and different societies, may hold different views concerning the definition of “a good life” and hence of the basic goals or purposes of education. These conversations are further complicated because, particularly with regard to some areas of knowledge and skills, what is known about the way in which experiences in schools and the development of cognition, emotion or attitudes, especially in terms of effects sustained over the long term, is limited. Absent a strong knowledge base about the way in which school experiences contribute to preparing people to live a good life, and absent effective processes to reconcile competing views defining the good life, educators may be tempted to focus conversations about school reform inward, to make them self-referenced to the educational organization, to focus on proximal and minimalist goals.

It is this state of affairs that characterizes many contemporary efforts of school reform. While it is possible to find at some level narratives of larger societal goals that are presumed to justify the educational enterprise—preparing workers for the knowledge economy, promoting citizenship, contributing to national cohesion—much educational practice is dissociated from an explicit articulation with larger social goals.

This dissociation between educational practice and the larger public purposes that schools are presumed to contribute to advance undermines the relevancy of education as relevancy is about the way in which educational goals keep pace with important changes in the larger societal context in which schools are embedded. Globalization is one of the most important changes taking place in societies around the world today and yet it is unclear that schools have realigned their purposes to prepare students to be competent citizens in an age of globalization.

If educational practice is only poorly coupled with larger societal goals, the core of educational practice can remain unchanged, fueled by a self-referenced inertia, where the objective of educators at any given level are simply to help students learn the objectives of the curriculum or prepare for the next level of education, even as discursive efforts periodically update the narrative about the larger goals of schools. It is this disconnect between the changing purposes of schools and the “core” of instructional practice that some authors demonstrate as characteristic of many efforts of education reform.

This dissociation between school purposes and school practice is at the heart of the inherently conservative inertia that characterizes school life throughout much of the world. Schools thus continue producing graduates that are, in fundamental ways, ill equipped to meet the contemporary demands of citizenship. This conservative bias of schools places new generations at risk, particularly when the larger social context is changing at unprecedented speed in ways that make effective and tolerant collective action across cultural divides essential for survival. The consequences of the deficient citizenship capabilities of school graduates around the world contribute to poor government, to poor public understanding and deliberation of important policy issues—such as immigration or international conflicts—and as a result to exacerbate conflicts at local, national and international levels.

It is not just that competent global citizenship is necessary to avert inter-national conflicts, and thus to maintain world peace, it is that the very survival of life on the planet, sustainable forms of human-environmental interactions, require understanding these global problems as shared across national divides in order to be able to devise effective forms of international cooperation to address them. Aside from the social global challenges resulting from growing global inequalities in the distribution of income and access to knowledge, science and technology or from the demographic expansion in poor countries, there are challenges related to the interaction of human with the environment that are equally consequential such as the exponential growth in the appetite for fossil fuels as industrial expansion proceeds, the challenges of global warming and other forms of environmental degradation, or the challenges posed by new health epidemics.

These social, political and human-environmental challenges are only some examples of the new global challenges that call for concerted efforts across nations and across different

cultural groups. These concerted efforts will only be possible if the vast majority of citizens in those nations are equipped to think deeply about these problems, to understand them as truly global problems, and are disposed to support collaborative actions to address them. Equipping people to do this will go beyond explicit education for global citizenship. Schools around the world are not at present doing enough to foster the competencies necessary to understand and act upon global challenges.

Contemporary insufficient attention to the global and civic purposes of schools translates in education reforms that attempt to “improve” education while they undermine its basic relevance. In a number of countries standards based and accountability reforms during the last decade have resulted in narrowing the curriculum in many high schools towards an almost exclusive emphasis in language and mathematics<sup>1</sup> .

For some students, awareness of this lack of relevancy of education, of the fundamental disconnect between the world of school and the world around them, translates into disengagement with schools, and in some cases in physical or psychological dropout. A recent study of high school dropouts in the United States for example, confirms that the students who abandon high school are not necessarily those with the lowest levels of academic performance, but those who do not find high schools challenging and do not see how continuing in school will fit with their own life plans and expectations, even as most of them eventually regret dropping out of school <sup>2</sup> .

Educational purposes must include clear moral purposes and those should be aligned with universally accepted values and standards, informed by different philosophical and cultural traditions, but which provide clear guidance with regards to standards of fairness, the rights of individuals and with regard to accepting and addressing differences among individuals and cultural groups.

Indeed, illustrative of the confusion that surrounds much debate on education quality today, in the United States, some fundamentalist groups have advocated that “Intelligent Design” (a thesis that human life is the result of divine and deliberate creation, discontinued from other forms of life, rather than of biological evolution of the species) should be taught in the science curriculum in schools on a par with the theory of evolution. To these groups preferring one of these theses over another is a matter of belief, without regard for evidence or for the knowledge accumulated in evolutionary sciences. Similarly, around the world, there are wide variations in the level at which the same subjects are taught within schools in the same country, and in the official curriculum across countries. Yet there are well-established disciplines and fields of knowledge and their universal organization defines what is “advanced” or “elementary” access to these fields, not the preferences of local or national groups. A nation may exclude coverage of algebra, calculus or trigonometry in the high school math curriculum, or it may pretend that there is no difference between religion and science, but it does this at its peril. Rigor and excellence in teaching mathematics, or in sciences, are defined by reference to universal standards in the disciplines, not to local preferences. There should be similar universal standards norming whether the civic and global education content of a curriculum is aligned with universal standards of rights and justice and with universal standards of the disciplinary knowledge which informs our understanding of some contemporary global challenges in particular human-environmental challenges and historical conflicts.

In contrast to the thesis that what should most matter about schooling are its purposes and how those align with preparing students for global civility, much contemporary rethoric about education, particularly in developing countries, focuses on the factors that influence student attendance to school and the attainment of more years of schooling, a flawed self-referenced notion that assumes that education is valuable irrespective of purpose. The Millenium Development Goals, for example, a compact to reduce poverty incidence in the developing world by the year 2015, include two goals explicitly related to education (achieving universal primary education and promoting gender equality in primary and secondary education) 3 . But these goals refer only to targets of access to school and quantitative educational attainment. Similarly, the Education For All goals established at the Jomtien and Dakar Conferences 4 identify six education goals: expansion of early childhood care, universal access to free and compulsory primary education, access to appropriate learning and life skills programs, improvement in adult literacy rates, elimination of gender disparities and improvement in education quality. While quality is acknowledged as a goal in the Education For All Framework it receives significantly less conceptual development than the quantitative targets of educational expansion.

The concern with educational opportunity in developing countries reflected in the Millenium Development Goals and in the Education for All Goals should go much further than the current emphasis on access and completion of a basic education to focus instead on how teachers can help students develop capabilities that help expand their options in life and in particular how they can develop global civility, teaching human rights and tolerance. This requires focusing on the intended purposes of instruction as well as on the instructional processes that help teachers achieve those purposes. I define teaching quality as this dual concern with purposes and pedagogies that expand the freedoms of students. Quality teaching is thus the teacher mediated process that assists students in effectively gaining the knowledge, skills, capabilities and moral dispositions that are of value in expanding their freedoms. Because freedom is interdependent with justice and respecting the freedoms of others, quality teaching needs also to include civic instruction in the “Common Values” that can best balance individual and collective rights. Note that I include the definition of curriculum purpose as a component of quality, as teachers that are efficient in teaching a low level, irrelevant or outdated curriculum cannot be deemed to teach with quality. Similarly, teachers educating their students in hatred towards other people, cannot be deemed to teach with quality as this form of education would not expand the freedoms of their students in any sustainable way.

The practical implication of thinking about education quality in this way becomes apparent when applied to analyzing situations of political change, of tension among dominant and subdominant groups or among different cultural or ethnic groups. Consider for example nations in the midst of democratic transition. It is apparent that education reform should revisit not only questions of who has access to school, but principally to what extend the education received is adequately preparing students to meet the new demands for effective political participation in a democratic society. Depending on the definition of democratic citizenship that is adopted to guide these reform efforts, a democratic curriculum may include examination of relations among different groups in the society, for example where past institutions condoned notions of racial, ethnic or religious superiority and of domination—as in South Africa during Apartheid, for example. Similar issues arise with regard to the ways in which education institutions in democratic societies foster notions of equality among different social groups. The democratic imperative is to prepare all students to recognize and accept the basic equality among all persons, even as the achievement of this imperative is always a work in progress.

## 2. Globalization and Citizenship Education

Globalization has had multiple forms of impact in most societies throughout the world. One of the consequences of Globalization has been the increase in the frequency and type of interactions among people of different cultural origins. In some countries this has resulted from immigration. In most it results also from the increasing use of telecommunication technologies and from the transformation of the way in which goods and services are produced and traded. Immigration, trade and communications flows present unprecedented opportunities, but also challenges, to most people. These enhanced interactions among people with different worldviews and cultural values impact social expectations, notions of self and identity, as well as political processes in ways that are insufficiently understood at present. We are learning that even as countries are economically interdependent they may find themselves in situations of political conflict with the countries with which they are interdependent.

Immigration, for instance, challenges the definition of citizenship and identity, both for the immigrant and for the non-immigrant. Emerging evidence documents that young people, particularly immigrants and children of immigrants, experience novel challenges as they define their sense of self and identity in the social contexts created by globalization. Implications of immigration for national politics include debates on the concept of membership, on the definition of who does the social contract extend to and who is excluded. Rousseau, one of the political theorists who addressed the concept of membership, argued that democratic equality—in membership—was essential to prevent the emergence of partial societies within the state that would undermine the common good <sup>5</sup> .

As cultural exchanges, and sometimes conflict, increase, this causes some groups to expand the definition of citizenship, while in other cases it generates anxieties that translate into trying to “close the door” or narrow the definition of citizenship or “national identity” or to increase “barriers to entry” for example instituting citizenship selection mechanisms that will provide assurances regarding the acceptance of the new members of the core dominant political values.

That these social processes take place at a moment when telecommunication technologies make it possible for many people to be part of communities that span large geographical distances, and well beyond the territorial limits of nation states, creates further opportunities, and challenges, to the definition of “citizenship”. It is more apparent today than in times past that there is a global aspect to the definition of “citizenship”. Cosmopolitanism is arguably both more necessary and more possible than in years past because the enhanced forms of interaction that are available make it possible to sustain cosmopolitan identities that challenge nationalist conceptions of citizenship and other forms of racial or ethnic tribalism <sup>6</sup> .

A radical cosmopolitan is one who refrains from fixating on tribal (racial/ethnic/national) loyalties and is especially suspicious of employing such loyalties as criteria in moral deliberations. Such an individual would not attach any sense of superior value to his cultural, ethnic, or racial identity but would instead see himself as a compound of several contingencies that make up the identity he has. (Hill 2000, 121)

While these increased interactions among different people and civilizational streams can represent clear opportunities for enhanced understanding and collaboration, they also represent opportunities for increased conflict. Whether individuals or groups respond in one way or another to these opportunities depends in part in how they are prepared to understand cultural difference, and to think about globalization and its attendant processes.

People can be educated to be more or less cosmopolitan or tolerant. Unless schools take notice of the new imperative to develop tolerance, the opportunities for civilizational clashes and conflict which Huntington anticipates will likely increase. Schools should thus focus deliberately on the public purposes of educating children to be more cosmopolitan and tolerant, better prepared for citizenship and for global citizenship. This calls for renewed attention to the purposes of schools and for a clear incorporation of the civic purposes of schools in the definition of their quality.

One need not dwell too long on the numerous contemporary examples of intolerance that still run freely around the globe: the ethnic cleansing in Sudan, the genocide in Rwanda, the ongoing forms of war and terrorism in which humans lose their humanity in consciously acting to physically take the lives or oppress those whom they perceive as different, the renewed expressions of anti-semitism in France and other parts of the globe. In spite of the moral clarity that inspired the drafting of the declaration of universal human rights as a better path to create the conditions for lasting peace, in too many ways present social institutions, including religious institutions, families and schools, still breed hatred, intolerance and conflict among tribal groups. There are too many examples of humans killing or oppressing other humans in the name of God.

We could argue that global and international conflicts have origins in conditions that are independent of individuals and independent of the action of educators, that objective situations of historical conflict, of present real differences in interests, or of national and international politics, cause global conflict, instability or genocide. While I accept the importance of such sociological, economic or political analysis, and the need for more effective ways to create the lasting conditions for global peace at those levels, the forces at those levels are still mediated by how individuals make sense of those events, of cultural differences and of history and by how individuals choose to respond to those conditions. Educators can help their students develop the capabilities to make sense of those conditions in ways that lead to productive and peaceful cross-cultural dialogue and conflict resolution.

For this reason it is necessary to educate people with the skills that would make global peace and stability possible. Doing so should become a principal purpose of education around the world. This goal is very difficult to achieve for international institutions and for governments for reasons that I will describe shortly. In the near future we should probably concentrate in mobilizing social entrepreneurs and citizens in the hope that strong social movements leading the way and demonstrating what kinds of interventions are effective can then mobilize international institutions and governments behind a large scale effort to civically educate all students for tolerance and respect of human rights and to address global challenges collaboratively.

Global education for tolerance and human rights can succeed only if undertaken simultaneously nearly everywhere. Progress in educating for global civility has to occur simultaneously in different places because it is extremely risky to commit unilaterally to educating one's children for tolerance and global values when some States and groups actively socialize children for hatred. The most tolerant children would be at a serious disadvantage if only some commit to the enterprise.

In a context where some institutions educate people to kill others in the name of God, teaching tolerance has the same risks of unilateral disarmament. The issue then is not whether educating for tolerance is desirable, or whether we know how to do it and with what effects, the issue is how to achieve a global commitment to doing this on a planetary scale. The moral argument for a global commitment to educating for global civility is akin to the argument for investing in the education of one's neighbor. We should all want to help all members of the communities in which we live to be educated because we will all benefit from everyone being educated, perhaps beyond the benefits that particular individuals can capture. As the communities in which we live are increasingly also global we extend the same reasoning to a commitment to the education of our global neighbors. Similarly, individuals are more likely to educate their children to be trusting, tolerant and accepting of those who are different, if assured that all parents are making similar commitments to educating their children. International institutions and global social movements can underwrite this kind of assurance to the communities and nations that agree to make global education a priority as they support global efforts to educating all.

### **3. The Challenges of Citizenship, Tolerance and Human Rights Education**

If educating for tolerance, citizenship and respect of human rights, and for global civility is desirable, and if we know how to do it at least in part in schools, why then isn't it happening on a massive scale around the world? The problem is one of lack of political will on the part of national governments, of the ensuing insufficient development of a knowledge base to support effective citizenship and human rights education, of failure of international institutions and of implementation.

In the fierce competition to define the purposes of schools, and in the conservative inertia that fuels school practice without attention to purpose, few of the most active national and local stakeholders have incentives to focus on tolerance and human rights education. Education for tolerance on a global scale requires strong institutions of global governance committed to this purpose. Those that exist have failed at this task. Another important reason why there is not global education for tolerance on a massive scale is the limited ability of international institutions to influence the implementation of educational change at a national level.

#### **4. Citizenship Education and Human Rights Education and the need for Common Values**

But the problem with tolerance education is not just with lack of political will on the part of development institutions. Because the notion of citizenship is contested and best understood as a work in progress, as an ongoing negotiation among different groups in society, approaches to citizenship education are consequently also contested. To some, citizenship education is about instilling patriotism, love for country and internalization of the institutions of the nation State. To others, citizenship education is about recognizing basic rights of all persons, irrespective of their membership in particular States, it is an education for cosmopolitanism, for egalitarian cosmopolitanism (Appiah 1996). Restricted definitions of citizenship include participation in processes that provide legitimacy to government, for example participating in elections in democratic regimes. Expanded definitions of citizenship include more extended notions of participation, for example participation in civic and community associations or social movement, Benjamin Franklin's understanding of democracy as the work of ordinary people to achieve common purposes.

Defining the civic purposes of schools is a most difficult task. The definition of what should be taught to develop citizenship capabilities, by necessity, is one that reflects values 7 . Which values should an education to prepare people for citizenship and for global citizenship reflect? Which values should be considered global values? From the perspective of a democratic society one can argue that the means to global values are democratic processes to define the purposes of schools, as well as explicit civic content that recognizes the perspectives of oppressed groups and toleration among different groups and that favors egalitarian cosmopolitanism (Gutmann, 1999). The challenge of extending a democratic theory of education on a global scale is that not all societies are, or aspire to be, liberal democracies.

Differences in the political aspirations of various nation states limits the extent to which a democratic theory of education can resolve the question of deciding which civic content to teach in schools. But this challenge should not lead to a cultural or political relativistic point of view about the values of citizenship education—particularly in terms of preparing students for global civility, for tolerance and understanding towards different civilizational streams. While one could argue that countries could implement citizenship education programs each drawing on their own political and historical traditions, this would be insufficient to prepare students for the increased interactions with others who are different resulting from globalization. Since the particular form of citizenship education each country would adopt would be mediated by the interpretations of national policy makers, administrators, and eventually teachers, a cultural relativistic orientation could possibly lead to local interpretations that negate the very purpose of preparing students for global civility. It would not be the first time that states use schools to indoctrinate students in views prejudiced about citizens of other states, in the name of advancing national interests or historical destinies.

Therefore, in order to educate globally and for global civility it is imperative to use a common framework that informs the enterprise. Common values are essential to the survival of every society and they are recognizable across societies. These values are essential to human coexistence at all levels of interaction, from personal and family, to national and international relations it is therefore possible to define a minimalist ethic that cuts across cultures and civilizations and is therefore universal. These common values are necessary to

support cross-cultural dialogue and to address military, environmental and other common challenges of humanity 8 .

The best approximation we have at present to this common framework of values is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 9 . Those who drafted the declaration struggled sufficiently with the challenges of drawing from different cultural and philosophical traditions, and while it may be possible to see the Declaration as a work in progress, in the sense that additional rights could be defined or it might be possible to perfect more specific and operational ways to represent each right, the Declaration is a starting point. The work of schools globally could be aligned to teach all children to live these rights (not just to know them), to appreciate that others have the same rights. This would be a sufficient framework for much greater global civility than many schools promote at present.

The adoption of a common framework based in Human Rights sharpens the focus of efforts to align school improvement with civic purpose. School reform on behalf of citizenship education however is further complicated because extant knowledge about the effectiveness of different approaches to citizenship education is also limited. We do know that direct instruction is an important aspect of a citizenship curriculum. Opportunity to learn about history and about government and social institutions and issues develops part of the cognitive repertoire necessary for citizenship. Opportunity to know what is contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is certainly an important component of education for tolerance.

But more than direct instruction is needed. It is important to learn facts, about history, to think historically or to learn what is contained in the Declaration of Human Rights, for example, in ways that engage the students and engage their moral reasoning, and in ways that motivate them to act. The opportunity to deliberate, with classmates and teachers, with authors in the silent dialogue of reading books, in texts on universal ethics are part of the process of expanding students' understandings and their ability to reason morally. Opportunities to reflect on contemporary real life situations reflecting human rights violations can bring home the message and facilitate understanding of what could otherwise be abstract principles, unrelated to the day to day lives of their students. Citizenship education is not just about fact knowing, but about understanding the implications of that knowledge for the capacity and disposition for personal responsibility and action. Opportunities therefore to participate in action settings which are engaging and help develop and practice skills and to connect abstract knowledge to action are consequently important. Service learning projects are examples of activities which can bridge the acquisition of knowledge with an orientation to service and a disposition to assume personal responsibility for community needs.

Beyond direct instruction, engaged opportunities for moral deliberation and reflection and service learning opportunities, the context of educational institutions is a fundamental component of citizenship education. This includes the opportunities students have to get to know, interact and collaborate with students of diverse cultural, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds—and the social norms that govern those interactions—, the climate in the school in terms of relationships among school staff and students as well as among school staff and parents and other members of the community. These multiple opportunities to develop citizenship competencies are embedded in a community and larger cultural and social context that influences how students interpret what they experience in school and the choices they make about the roles they want to take outside the school at present and in the future. All

of this is to say that the approaches to citizenship education are also varied and contested terrain but also that we should aim at developing international standards of best practice that can guide efforts in the same way as those exist to guide efforts to develop mathematical or scientific literacy.

## **5. The competition to define the purposes of schools and the failure of international institutions**

Schools, relatively recent institutions in human history, have been guided at different times by different purposes, from building nation states and national and political identities, to helping the poor, from improving national competitiveness to assimilating immigrants, from educating citizens to educating workers. The proposition that schools should be about educating for global civility, to teach human rights and to promote tolerance needs to account for how this purpose competes with alternative purposes. While many nations around the world at the end of World War II could see the necessity of planting the seeds of peace in children's minds, this purpose has been crowded out over the last fifty years. The dominant competing purposes at present are: educating for economic competitiveness, educating for the formation of national identity and educating for local relevance.

The justification of education as an economic investment predicated on the contributions to individual and national productivity has become so widespread that it is easy to miss that it is a relatively recent construction. The idea took particular force with the development of the concept of Human Capital in the 1950s, and was disseminated by international development institutions. With the increasing globalization of the world economy many groups, particularly leaders of business firms, have again advanced rationales to get schools to make people more competitive in the world economy. Little in the claim that schools should make people better or more competitive workers would lead to the development of skills for global civility. Economic competitiveness is largely about competition while global civility is largely about solidarity and empathy with others.

Second, nationalisms compete with the purpose of educating for global civility. Perhaps as a result of some of the dislocations caused by globalization, there is a reemergence of nationalist and populist leaders around the world. Many of them are turning to schools to build their own legitimacy and to advance their political agendas. Schools are particularly apt to do this, as most national school systems were established to consolidate nation States.

In the last twenty years, educational governance was decentralized towards lower levels of government, including communities and schools, to increase the efficiency and local relevance of what is taught. It is not clear how the localization of education could impact the development of global civility. Some of the most traditional and tribal cultural conflicts find expression at the local, subnational level, where some communities have clear incentives to conserve the values and memories that are at the root of many of these ethnic, cultural and religious conflicts. However, of the three forces competing with the purpose of global civility, this one's effects have been least studied.

The local and national pressures to educate for community, national identity and work compete with the pressure to educate for global civility within a normative framework common to all nations. International institutions seem ideally suited to promoting global civility. However, it has proven extremely difficult for international institutions part of the United Nations or of the Bretton Woods system to make a clear difference in the purpose of the curriculum and in the content of instruction, relative for instance to the significant progress achieved in favor of promoting universal literacy and the expansion of enrollments at all levels, probably because amidst the cold war reaching agreement on the purposes of schools was almost impossible in a multilateral institution that was often a political arena for ideological battles between the superpowers. It is not that the task has not been attempted, but that the instruments under the control of international institutions are too weak to influence implementation of substantial qualitative changes in what happens in the conversations among students and teachers.

Bilateral development agencies are still less well suited to align the work of schools with global civility. Many of them are instruments of cultural diplomacy, expressing the interests of single governments. For this reason recipient governments resist letting such assistance influence the curriculum.

## **6. Implementation Challenges.**

“How we teach is what we teach,” as John Dewey would say. The curriculum is not only in the publicly stated goals, in the content of official programs of instruction or of textbooks. It is also in the organization of schools, in the interactions of teachers with students, in how students are sorted into schools, in their interactions with each other, in the kind of relationships schools have with local organizations. The recent decentralizations in many parts of the world have opened up school governance to local representatives who bring in the agendas of community organizations: religious views, local welfare agencies, community and political groups.

Changing the poor work schools do at present in preparing students for global civility will be a challenging task because it will require much more than including new objectives in the curriculum of instruction. It will require developing capacity among teachers, and in some cases supporting them to change their minds about the need to change. This may create conflict as students develop values different from traditional values in their communities. Unless there is attention to the micropolitics of implementing these changes, they will not happen in most schools.

## **7. Options for the present**

I have argued so far that developing global citizenship skills is critical to global stability and peace. I have also explained that educational institutions should take this challenge more deliberately and have argued that formal education institutions find it very difficult to respond to this challenge. So where does this leave us?

One option is to conclude that on a global scale schools are not adequately preparing children to be tolerant, to understand and accept to live with a commitment to the human rights of all people and to be global citizens, and that it is unlikely that they will do anything very different in the future. As a result we can expect to see growing intolerance, hatred, and global instability in rich and poor nations alike and the cultural conflicts that some have predicted will extend and escalate.

Another option is to recognize the groups that are doing good work in individual schools or on a small scale and to learn from that work. An established body of practice can be codified from this work and developed to support efforts at large scale. The challenge then is to identify and codify good practice, and use it to build communities of practice that can support members and grow, with more or less government approval.

Many organizations that build transnational social capital could stimulate further innovation in this field. The mobilization and empowerment of social entrepreneurs working to educate for global civility is potentially the most effective short term strategy to scale up what is already known in this area. Educational innovators, publishers, and social movements together could expand the number of schools that develop global civility. This is the opportunity that the World Scouts Movement is already seizing and, to the extent the education mission of the Scouts focuses on the development of critically important sets of competencies this will render the movement all the more relevant to the 21st century.

As progress continues, it would make sense to try to get individuals, international organizations and other groups focused on the goal of educating for tolerance, human rights and global civility. International institutions could develop standards of civic and tolerance education and expose governments that teach bigotry and intolerance, for example. More important they could learn from and support successful efforts to teach human rights, tolerance and global civility. Engaging international institutions should be easy since the UN system was created to establish conditions for global peace and stability. But in many ways it will be very difficult to do for we all live in times and with institutions that have produced people who believe it is acceptable to kill others in the name of God.

## **8. Opportunities and Challenges for the Scout Movement**

It is apparent that the World Scout Movement has already recognized the importance of developing global skills. In many ways it is uniquely positioned to play a critical role in this area. It is a transnational social movement, with a mission to making a real contribution to creating a better world. With a clear commitment to value-based education based on a promise to help other people at all times and on a law that emphasizes honor, loyalty, solidarity, friendship, courtesy, responsibility to all forms of life, respect to elders, resiliency, prudence and high personal standards.

The incorporation in the vision of the goal to attract increasing number of youth of both genders and from broader segments of society is particularly important. Teenagers and young people are a critical demographic group, not only because there are so many of

them, particularly in developing countries where most of them live, but because in many places they are not engaged in productive occupations or in social activities that engage them in positive ways with their communities and societies. In the preoccupation with the early stages of education which has dominated most of the last 50 years, we have neglected middle schools and high schools. Our understanding of the importance of interventions in the early stages in life, has led us to neglect the young. There has been more worldwide attention to the importance of advancing pre-school education, than to thinking through how to make middle schools and high schools places where students can develop valuable skills and places where they can be engaged. The many youth who drop out of high school, either because they never learned to read or because they found what was taught in high school uninteresting, are a good target for disaffected groups that offer in crime or political violence excitement and a purpose that many of these young people did not find in school or in legitimate work. The Scouts Movement has appropriately recognized the importance of this demographic group and of supporting them in developing valuable social skills.

Many initiatives of the World Scout Movement are clearly aligned with developing the kind of global competencies I have described today. For example the Jamborees in the air, these large world scouting events, which allow young people from distant parts in the globe to connect with one another and to find common purpose. This year the Jamboree in the Internet was conducted in 13 languages and involved participants from 130 countries. The partnership between World Scouting and the World Community Grid to facilitate collaboration across the globe in tackling projects that benefit humanity is a most promising initiative.

The environmental campaigns to clean up the world which have taken place over the last 15 years are excellent ways to help develop environmental awareness. I have participated in several of those with my two while they were scouts and remember them as significant initiatives where many members of our community, children, young people and adults, came together on this important work. The new partnerships the organization has developed with a number of UN organizations and in special projects to promote active citizenship of young people are important efforts to promote global citizenship. The actions to support the Global Call to Action against Poverty and the UN Millenium Campaign are excellent initiatives to develop awareness about significant global challenges. The participation in Peace Day and in the Gifts for Peace projects, involving scouts in local communities to tackle social issues are also critical components in an education strategy to foster global values.

Recognizing how much the World Scout Movement already does to contribute to the vital task of developing global values and competencies, I would like to conclude with eight challenges for the present, in response to your kind invitation to think with you about the second hundred years of this movement. In thinking about these seven challenges I draw on insights from the field of formal education.

### **8.1. The first challenge is to grow faster in developing nations.**

Most young people today live in developing nations. Of all the children less than 15 year old today, only one in ten lives in a high income country, 46% live in a low income country and 44% live in a middle income country. Furthermore, given trends in population growth, even more of the future young will live in low income countries. Population growth rates

are almost three times greater in low income countries than in high income countries. If the World Scouts Movement is going to become a relevant social movement to foster global citizenship it will need to make it a priority to grow significantly in low income and middle income nations. This may require examining the kind of programs most appropriate to the social context of young people in these nations.

### **8.2. The second challenge is to make efforts to reach those socially marginalized and excluded everywhere.**

I have suggested that in the 21st century global skills are a requisite for all people, not just for a few. If the World Scout Movement takes on the task of becoming a significant force in providing the opportunity to develop the skills it should do so for all youth, not just for the more privileged. There are already important efforts in this direction reaching marginalized groups in Europe, but as the work of the organization works in developing countries it should focus on reaching the excluded there too. The Scouts have the potential of becoming a very positive force to develop not only global citizenship, but social cohesion and trust among different groups in the society, in effect to build bridges across social class, gender, religious, or racial divides.

### **8.3. Integrate action and service learning with conceptual learning in the development of global skills.**

A number of the activities already included in the programs of the World Scout Movement foster global citizenship, the jamborees, environmental activities, the partnerships with UN agencies. It would be helpful if those activities were clearly part of a curriculum with explicit objectives and with a full set of activities that integrated action with conceptual learning and with development of knowledge. For instance, getting scouts to communicate with scouts in distant places is an excellent activity to foster awareness of the global nature of the movement, and to stimulate interest in geography and culture. This activity could provide the foundation for serious and academically rigorous instruction of world geography, history or of aspects of the process of globalization itself. The same could be done with the numerous activities to foster environmental awareness, complement them with rigorous curriculum for serious study of these issues. The troop leaders to support this kind of study might expand to include not just those most adept at expeditionary activities, but college students or graduates with strong academic skills who could support the cognitive development of the scouts as they pursue the conceptual dimensions of these activities.

### **8.4. Professional development of those involved in Scoutism**

An ongoing challenge for an organization run by volunteers is to find those who will implement the array of programs that bring the movement alive on the ground. As these programs become richer and deeper, and as the movement expands to reach previously excluded groups the challenge of supporting the professional development of the volunteers grows as well. It would be important to institute clear and high standards of selection for the recruitment of volunteers, and also to develop systems of professional development

(for instance learning communities using technology) to help these volunteers develop and deepen their skills as instructional leaders and mentors.

### **8.5. Attending to the challenges of implementation**

In large organizations such as school systems, and probably also in the Scouts Movement, the process of implementation can substantially alter the intended objectives of programmatic initiatives. As programs and policies are transmitted from one level of the organization to the next, each person in that level makes sense of those programs based on their knowledge, skills, attitudes, and based on the incentives they face in their communities. The impact of the implementation process in transforming policies can be substantial, often turning the purpose of a policy on its head. It is for this very reason that it is critical to attend to the process of implementation, and not just to hope for the best. This requires careful definition of standards, monitoring of implementation and evaluation, formative evaluation and evaluation of results. If done with care and sensitivity, these processes can help organizations learn from their experience and become better at what they do. The development of global skills and values is a challenge that, in some ways, runs counter existing norms and institutions in many contexts. If this is to become an important objective of the Scouts movement attention to the implementation process should become even more critical than it may have been in the past.

### **8.6. Evaluation.**

For an organization that does so many things in so many countries and over so many years we should expect to have a stronger body of scientific knowledge documenting what works well, with what effects, in what contexts and at what cost. Perhaps this should be a more important priority for the second century. To see the work of this important social movement as an incubator of ideas and practices that can be systematized with the purpose of been shared and extended to other institutions. This will require more scientific study and evaluation of the good work taking place now and to take place in the future.

### **8.7. Technology.**

Technology can support the work of the Movement in the coming years in multiple ways, from supporting the creation of professional communities to allow leaders and scouts to develop their skills (for instance knowledge about world geography, or learning foreign languages), to disseminating high quality curriculum and instructional materials, to allowing communication among scouts and interactions across geographic and linguistic divides, to the development of virtual scouting activities and complex computer based simulations. In order to remain relevant and to reach the new contexts and groups I have mentioned the use of technology should become the contemporary equivalent of the use of the pocket knife a century ago.

### **8.8. Build bridges with schools and educational institutions.**

I began this presentation making the case for global education in formal educational institutions. I explained how difficult it would be for them to lead the way in this field and why social movements like the Scouts were uniquely positioned to innovate in this field. But if global skills are indispensable in the 21st century it is necessary to scale up the opportunities for all youth to develop these skills. Schools reach at present, and are likely to reach in the future, most children. The knowledge developed in the Scouts movement could be scaled up in schools. To do this will require developing strong partnerships that permit the exchange of ideas and best practice. Reaching out to teachers and principals would be an excellent avenue to facilitate this exchange.

Second chances, poverty, health. Drugs, crime.

**Fernando M. Reimers**

*Ford Foundation Professor of International Education.*

*Director of Global Education and of International Education Policy*

*Graduate School of Education*

*Harvard University*