Preface

We are proud to present this book on intercultural dialogue as a joint effort by the International Association of Universities (IAU) and the Council of Europe. This co-operation – between an international university organisation with global scope and a European intergovernmental organisation with important activities in higher education policy as part of its focus on democracy, human rights and the rule of law – underlines how important the ability to conduct intercultural dialogue is to our societies. It also underlines the fundamental role of higher education in developing and maintaining this ability.

The book is based on close co-operation between our two organisations around two events: a conference organised by the Council of Europe's Steering Committee on Higher Education and Research (CDESR) at the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia in June 2009 and the IAU International Conference at Notre Dame University – Louaize in Lebanon in November 2009. Each organisation contributed decisively to the conference of the other: the IAU provided the rapporteur for the conference in Moscow whereas the Council of Europe gave one of the plenary presentations in Lebanon. The idea of a joint book grew out of this co-operation, and the book is edited by those who were the strongest advocates of the co-operation: Hilligje van't Land of the IAU, who was rapporteur to the Moscow conference and one of the main organisers of the conference in Lebanon, and Sjur Bergan of the Council of Europe, who was the main organiser of the Moscow conference and spoke at the conference in Lebanon.

As President of the IAU and Chair of the CDESR at the time the foundation for this book was laid, we are convinced that a tolerant and respectful dialogue is both necessary and unavoidable for the recognition of diversity and multiculturality in the world in which we live. We hope this joint book will serve as a window and a mirror to overcome our cultural ignorance, will help prepare its readers not only to debate but to listen, will help foster the emancipating powers of cultural diversity and will help us learn how to use them more effectively in our responsibilities as educators and researchers.

As the world moves closer together, a vital skill for nations, communities – including the higher education community – and individuals will be the ability to deal positively with otherness. In this context, cross-cultural education and education for dialogue represent one of the best options for the future of our societies. The internationalisation of higher education cannot be understood without this cross-cultural component. It is not just a matter of having more foreign students or having more foreign faculty. That will help, but it is not enough. It is a matter of understanding and accepting each other, and that is where education comes in. That is where dialogue, tolerance and democracy come in.

As our world becomes ever more globalised and knowledge-based, education and science themselves have also become more knowledge-intensive. It does not require great elucidation: more and more knowledge will be produced – it has been estimated that the amount of knowledge doubles in less than every five years – and the average levels of education are rising – not with equity, not with even quality, but they are rising.

While the whole concept of education is shifting as a result of this knowledge growth, the main aim of education as well as research is to contribute to the next generation of locally rooted, well-informed global citizens capable of jointly ensuring peace, progress, freedom and democracy. We are therefore increasingly confronted with questions about the direction which education and science must take on a number of crucial issues, and one of those issues is cultural diversity and the ability of those with different cultural backgrounds to relate constructively to each other. Education and research of course play an important role in developing our economy but their role cannot and should not be limited to that. Education and research are equally vital in preparing for democratic citizenship, in enhancing the personal development of learners and in enabling our societies to develop and maintain a broad and advanced knowledge base.

In our diverse and interconnected world we have many neighbours – nearby and faraway, neighbours who come from very diverse backgrounds. It is essential to increase and improve our knowledge, information and understanding about other people, other cultures and other societies. It is vital that we understand that what is different is not necessarily less worthy of esteem. To achieve this, we must be prepared to engage actively in dialogue, unconditionally and with a truly open mind.

Increasing knowledge, awareness and understanding is, then, the main aim of this book. It aims to explore the role of higher education – institutions, faculty, students and policy makers – in enabling our societies to function in an interconnected world in which contact with those of different backgrounds is a given and not an option. This book aims to be a small contribution to ensuring that such contacts will lead to co-operation and not to antagonism. The book aims to enable its readers not to win a debate but to try to understand the other by listening carefully – and, to do so, it will be necessary at times to remain silent as well.

We hope this book will inspire its readers to initiate dialogue in their own institutions and societies, to explore how they as well as their institutions can be actors in intercultural dialogue and to help further develop the role of higher education as a crucial actor in modern societies, not only in implementing the political agenda of our societies but in setting that political agenda in the first place.

Professor Juan Ramón de la Fuente　　　　　*Professor Radu Mircea Damian*
President, IAU　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　*Chair CDESR, 2007-2010*

Message from the rectors of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia and Notre Dame University – Louaize

Our universities both hosted one of the conferences from which the articles in this book are drawn. We are proud to be associated with this publication, and the backgrounds of our institutions help explain why we both feel that intercultural dialogue should be a key concern of modern universities, regardless of where they are located.

The Russian Peoples' Friendship University was established fifty years ago to provide education opportunities for students from Africa, Asia and Latin America, in particular. It was therefore an international institution from its inception and intercultural contacts were part of its daily life from its first day. Over the past twenty years it has faced the unusual challenge of transforming itself from an institution for foreign students only to one where half the students are foreigners and the other half are Russians. This has not made intercultural dialogue a less pressing concern: rather, the new situation has highlighted the relationship between the host country and its culture and the highly diverse cultural background of its students. It has pinpointed the need for students to be fluent in the host country's language and at least one foreign language and it has underlined the openness to other cultures that should follow from being fluent in several languages. Based on its experience in promoting intercultural dialogue among its students, as well as its research and experience with intercultural dialogue in internationalising higher education, the Russian Peoples' Friendship University has made dialogue on campus an important part of its institutional policy and also plays an active role in fostering dialogue in broader society.

Notre Dame University – Louaize, Lebanon is also a young university, founded in 1987. It has a confessional identity in a society of many faiths and persuasions. On the foundation of its own identity and heritage, the university remains open to the cultural and religious diversity of the society and the region of which it is a part, and its student body reflects that diversity. It stresses the importance of fluency in Arabic, as the language of the country and the region, as well as in foreign languages, particularly English and French. Notre Dame University – Louaize is convinced that it cannot fulfil its mission of preparing future citizens of Lebanon unless it seeks to instil in its students and faculty respect for the dignity of others, regardless of their cultural background and religious or political persuasion. Notre Dame University – Louaize aims to develop a culture of dialogue in all its students so that the intercultural dialogue conducted on campus will be pursued in the broader society of which the university is a part.

Both our universities illustrate why higher education needs to be highly sensitive to intercultural dialogue and why developing the ability and desire to engage with

those whose background and convictions are different from our own is an integral part of the mission of higher education, just as much as the more traditional concepts of specific academic disciplines. Dialogue requires knowledge of other cultures and societies, but knowledge alone is not enough. After all, if knowledge of the other is treated as the puzzled discovery of the exotic, there is little basis for dialogue based on respect. Universities must develop knowledge but also a deeper understanding of other cultures and they must foster the attitudes that lead to open minds treating others with respect and never putting the basic human dignity of others in doubt. This also means that those who talk must sometimes raise their voices when the basic condition of respect for human dignity is disregarded, whether by members of their own institution or by outside actors.

Engaging in dialogue does not mean giving up one's own traditions and convictions, but being open to those of others. Engaging in dialogue does not mean saying our own views are wrong, but being open to the possibility that those of others may be right. Engaging in dialogue does not mean giving up teaching, but remaining open to the possibility of learning in all circumstances. Not least, engaging in dialogue means being open to the possibilities that while some truths are self-evident, there is often more than one side to an issue. These are not only attitudes and values on which democratic, pluralistic societies must build: they are also part and parcel of the heritage of higher education.

As leaders of higher education institutions, we are proud to have offered the possibility for academics, students and civil servants from a variety of backgrounds to exchange views on the role of higher education in helping our societies grow in wisdom and maturity. We are also proud to be associated with a book published jointly by the International Association of Universities and the Council of Europe, and we find it fitting that this book should be published jointly by an organisation of higher education institutions with global membership and an intergovernmental organisation that, while its membership is European, has demonstrated its openness to the world by adopting a White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue.

We hope this book will not only demonstrate why intercultural dialogue is essential to higher education but also illustrate some ways in which higher education may take the dialogue forward, on campuses but also far beyond.

Our institutions demonstrate, through their origins and present circumstances, why intercultural dialogue is important. Through their polices and practice, they also illustrate how dialogue can be made a pervasive reality. We hope that our examples as well as the many views and ideas presented in this book will provide inspiration for institutions and governments, faculty and students to make intercultural dialogue a reality on campus and an essential element of the societies we aim to build and develop.

Professor Vladimir M. Filippov　　　　　　　　　　*Fr Walid Moussa, OMM*
Rector　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　*President*
Russian Peoples' Friendship University　　*Notre Dame University – Louaize, Lebanon*

A word from the editors

Sjur Bergan and Hilligje van't Land

The book you are about to read bears the title *Speaking across borders*. Had we lived in an age in which sound bites were longer, we would have made a point of including listening in the title because true dialogue requires the will and the ability to both listen and speak. One of the main aims of this book is to make the case for the role and responsibility of higher education in developing the competences and attitudes that will help its graduates further intercultural dialogue in our societies. The contribution of individual academics and graduates is one aspect of the role of higher education in furthering intercultural dialogue; but equally institutions, as important actors in society, share that role.

The second part of the title – across borders – may seem obvious. If we speak about intercultural dialogue, we speak about dialogue across national borders. We do, but the issue is a little more complicated than that. State borders are not the only ones – though history provides a long list of examples where better dialogue across political borders could have meant less armed conflict. Luckily, history also provides many examples of successful dialogue and co-operation across national borders, of which the European construction is perhaps the most spectacular.

When referring to intercultural dialogue, however, borders between political systems are not the only borders. Few if any countries are entirely monocultural and even less so in an age in which international migration is the rule rather than the exception. Of course, immigration is far from a new phenomenon. The countries of North and South America were built on immigration from Europe and elsewhere, and co-existence with the original population was rarely easy and seldom charac-terised by dialogue. As has been remarked, to decide the contentious issue of who discovered America, one would need to ask the people who stood on the shore to greet the discoverers. Immigration to and within Europe has also been the historical rule rather than the exception, to the extent that a period of the early Middle Ages in Europe has come to be referred to as the Period of Migration.[1]

Borders are not only international. Cultural borders also exist within countries, regions and local communities, and in many cases these borders determine with whom one socialises, what kind of work one does, where and how one worships and how one is considered in the community. The Dutch-American political scientist Arend Lijphart coined the term *verzuiling* (literally "pillarisation" but the Dutch rather than the English term is used for good reason) to describe communities in which all or most interaction is between individuals belonging to the same group.

---

1. The equivalent term in German is perhaps even more poignant: *Völkerwanderung* means literally "the wandering of peoples".

Needless to say, *verzuiling* is not a prescription for cohesive societies, and one important purpose in furthering intercultural dialogue is to promote cohesion and prevent *verzuiling*: the division of society into comfort zones that are almost mutually exclusive and between which interaction is limited as far as possible.

Democratic societies have abolished formal borders between easily identifiable groups in society, as exemplified by the legal provisions that not so many generations ago institutionalised discrimination against Blacks in the US Deep South, Sámi in northern Norway or all but the indisputably white in apartheid South Africa. Nevertheless, informal borders remain and may have almost as strong effects as formal borders. The symbolic border of the railway tracks can be almost as powerful as the physical borders manned by immigration officers. If the prevailing mood in a community is strongly isolationist or exclusionist, only the most persistent individuals will be able to break the mould. Borders may also exist in people's thoughts and habits, even without undue pressure from their immediate surroundings. For a variety of reasons, individuals may be reluctant or uncomfortable engaging in dialogue or co-operation with people who have a different background, speak another language, dress differently or hold different values.

That physical, international boundaries between states – which are, after all, political constructs – are not the only borders is also underlined by the UNESCO Constitution, which states that "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed" (UNESCO 1945: Preamble). Open minds and open-mindedness are ideals which are often talked about, but less often practised. When closed, minds may be our most important borders and the most difficult to open. Yet, without open minds, dialogue is impossible and borders cannot be crossed. We may experience this in our everyday lives when new ideas are too often met with the "argument" that, since things have always been done in a certain way, they should continue to be done that way. Had that been nature's way, humankind would not have existed and the animal kingdom would have been entirely amphibious. We may also experience the effect of closed minds in the big issues of our times, when we fail to rise to the challenge of climate change or the need to cross our personal borders as well as those of our countries and cultures.

Whatever the reasons may be that make individuals, groups or societies reluctant to cross formal or informal borders, the result is often suspicion and lack of co-operation. Sometimes the results can be dramatically worse, for societies and individuals. Even if improved knowledge and better acquaintance with the values and backgrounds of others do not automatically lead to more respect and, to borrow the title of the recent Council of Europe White Paper (Council of Europe 2008), living together as equals in dignity, one of the key tasks of education, at all levels, in modern society must be to prepare citizens to live and work in a world in which contacts across borders – international borders as well as those within our own societies and our own minds – will occur frequently, and the ability to handle such contacts will be crucial.

This is the conviction that led an international global non-governmental organisation devoted to higher education – the International Association of Universities (IAU)

– and a European intergovernmental organisation devoted to democracy, human rights and the rule of law – the Council of Europe – to co-operate on a book on the role of higher education in furthering intercultural dialogue. The book builds on two conferences: one organised by the Council of Europe in Moscow in June 2009, in which the IAU played a key role, and one organised by the International Association of Universities in Lebanon in November 2009, to which the Council of Europe contributed one of the main presentations. Both conferences were held at universities – the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia and Notre Dame University – Louaize – and each brought together the main stakeholder groups in higher education: institutions, staff, students and public authorities.

Beyond the two conferences, which provide the immediate background for the book, this joint venture also builds on the long-standing commitment of both organisations to intercultural dialogue. This has always been an important dimension of the Council of Europe's work, but its importance has been made particularly clear through the White Paper adopted by its Committee of Ministers in May 2008. More specifically, the Council of Europe's Steering Committee for Higher Education and Research (CDESR) has adopted a statement on the contribution of higher education to intercultural dialogue (CDESR 2006) and in March 2008 it organised a conference on intercultural dialogue on campus (Bergan and Restoueix 2009).

As an international representative of the universities of the world, one of the IAU's primary functions is to identify and research issues that are of concern and interest to its members and beyond. Convinced of the key role that higher education has to play in fostering intercultural dialogue and understanding, the IAU selected this topic as one of its thematic priorities and created an international task force in 2002. This led to the organisation of an expert seminar in Budapest in 2005, the outcomes of which were published in the IAU review *Higher Education Policy* (van't Land 2005). Since then, the association has regularly devoted special sessions to this topic at its international events, and it was chosen as the theme of the 2009 international conference at Notre Dame University – Louaize in Lebanon. The international nature of the association has contributed to the diversity of voices that have been involved in these events and related publications. The IAU also maintains a series of fairly comprehensive websites providing case studies, bibliographical data, links to higher education institutions and more.[2]

This book is organised around four main themes of intercultural dialogue: its political context; on campus and in society; higher education as an actor; and the roles it can play in practice.

The first theme places intercultural dialogue in its proper political context, where it plays an important role in seeking to develop and maintain a humane society. This part of the book is made up of three weighty contributions from key actors in international education and work for intercultural dialogue. UNESCO's former

---

2. See www.iau-aiu.net.

Director-General **Federico Mayor** explores the role of higher education in fostering a culture of peace and understanding. His starting point is the city of Beirut, which hosted the IAU conference and, earlier on, a UNESCO general conference. On the basis of its history as well as of its present, Beirut aspires to dialogue rather than confrontation. Beirut illustrates the need for a new beginning, which is reflected in UNESCO's constitution as well as in numerous United Nations initiatives. Mayor emphasises that education goes well beyond the technical transmission of knowledge: education also develops personalities and attitudes. Higher education has a key role to play in developing a culture of dialogue and understanding, and Mayor regrets the fact that this positive role of universities draws insufficient attention from the media, for which the important and peaceful role of universities does not seem to be newsworthy. Higher education must be a major actor in a transition from using force to using words, in a profound rethinking of our priorities and actions as individuals and as societies.

Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, the Council of Europe's Director General of Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport as well as its Co-ordinator for Intercultural Dialogue, analyses the White Paper drafted under her leadership. She underlines the two key messages in its short title – Living together as Equals in Dignity. First, living together implies much more than co-existence or simply living side by side: it presupposes close contacts and interaction between individuals of different cultures. Second, we do not speak only of the equality of rights but also of equality of dignity: we are all of equal value as human beings. Even if the White Paper encompasses all areas of the Council of Europe's activities, education plays a particularly important role in making intercultural dialogue not only a right but a reality in our daily lives.

In exploring the background to the conference in Lebanon, **Eva Egron-Polak** – Secretary-General of the IAU and an accomplished international educational policy maker – makes the case for putting intercultural dialogue high on the agenda of universities, but she argues from another point of view: that of educators and institutional policy makers. She underlines the fact that the world faces not only a financial crisis but also a crisis of values, an environmental crisis and a social crisis, and she maintains that higher education must be a key contributor to finding our way out of these multiple crises. Echoing Mayor's views, Egron-Polak observes that the issue is not a lack of declarations or intentions but the transformation of these into action. Higher education must help develop individuals who are locally rooted and at the same time educated to be informed global citizens, able to make sound choices, recognise what they do not know and learn how to learn continually about and from others – without prejudice or preconceptions. To do so, those in higher education must, among other things, recognise fully the contributions of all civilisations, all cultures, all religions and faiths, and create conditions of equality and dignity in dialogue, ensuring that we empower especially those who are most marginalised to take part in the dialogue.

The second part of the book sets the scene by linking dialogue on campus and the role of higher education in furthering dialogue in broader society. **Bernd Wächter**, drawing on his report from the Council of Europe conference in March 2008, shows the need for intercultural dialogue on campus. Higher education has been international from its inception and international mobility is a key policy goal in the European Higher Education Area – as it is in many other parts of the world – but that does not mean that the university campus is automatically intercultural. Too often, foreign students are isolated on campus and their contacts are mainly with other foreign students, especially those from the same home country or region. Also, higher education institutions often do not have policies for integrating foreign students and for taking advantage of the resource they represent. Nevertheless, there are promising examples of good practice and Wächter makes a number of suggestions for improving institutional policy and practice.

Hilligje van't Land, who is in charge of developing projects on intercultural dialogue for the IAU, draws on her experience at the IAU (Blasi and van't Land 2005), as rapporteur of the Council of Europe's Moscow conference and as organiser of the IAU conference in Lebanon. Universities are communities in themselves, and diversity on campus is a reality that needs to be fully seized and valued. At the same time, universities are key actors in the broader society. To fulfil this role, the institutions must of course make this a priority but so must public authorities. Staff and students, collectively and individually, NGOs (non-governmental organisations) and university networks all have important roles to play. Policy makers and practitioners need to value all the major purposes of higher education, not just its role in preparing for the labour market. Developing the kind of society in which people can live together as equals in dignity, and in which all citizens are fluent in intercultural dialogue, is an important purpose in higher education and it must be among the goals of higher education reform – in particular in the context of the European Higher Education Area. Intercultural competences should form an integral part of higher education learning outcomes; frameworks for implementation of the principles of intercultural learning and dialogue should be developed, and norms and values adopted, to ensure proper intercultural teaching and learning and to favour dialogue.

The third part of the book examines the role of higher education as an actor in intercultural dialogue. **Edward Alam** maintains that, if higher education is to play a role in fostering intercultural dialogue, higher education itself needs to be transformed into a culture of dialogue. There is much talk about the need for dialogue between disciplines, but there is more talk than practice; and increasing specialisation within disciplines means that even intradisciplinary dialogue can be a formidable challenge. Higher education needs to search for "holiness" – not in a religious sense, but in the sense of searching for the whole truth. Alam makes the point that, unless we start with a unity and wholeness in the curriculum that facilitates genuine dialogue among members of the faculty from the same disciplines, there can never be the kind of interdisciplinary and intercultural dialogue that is so urgent in our global age. It is easy to see why today's strong disciplinary

specialisation has come about – so easy, in fact, that one needs to be reminded that this was not the only possible development of research and learning. Alam believes that the success of interdisciplinary education depends directly on the success of intercultural education, and vice versa, and this needs to be understood by policy makers and academics, as well as by religious leaders. The current emphasis on natural sciences must be complemented by research in philosophy and other areas that emphasise a holistic view of human and natural development. One example mentioned by Alam is the success that phenomenology has already had in the way it has cultivated a more robust and unified sense of reason in natural law theory. Dialogue must not be turned into another industry, nor should it be conducted for its own sake: higher education should develop attitudes that make dialogue natural and the preferred way of approaching those from other backgrounds.

Sjur Bergan makes the point that, even when potential interlocutors have the physical or technical means to communicate, they also need to have a frame of mind that will make dialogue possible. Education is about changing attitudes and helping develop our frames of mind. In an age when contact with individuals from very different cultural backgrounds is not an option but an everyday reality, education cannot remain indifferent to this basic fact of human existence. Higher education should be particularly well suited to furthering intercultural dialogue because it is committed to assessing ideas not on the basis of their origin but on the basis of their intrinsic merit, even if there are numerous examples of higher education institutions, staff and students who have acted differently. Higher education must take a comprehensive view of its purposes, and the plural is used here with emphasis. Institutions must aim to develop a practice of dialogue, on campus and beyond, bearing in mind that the ability and will for dialogue cannot be developed solely by listening to lectures. Higher education institutions are excellent at training highly competent subject specialists but they are perhaps less good at educating intellectuals – graduates with a good general culture and the ability to see their own academic discipline in a broader context, able to assess advantages and disadvantages not simply in terms of their own discipline but also in terms of their effects on broader societal goals and in the longer term, people able to take account of knowledge and understanding from several academic fields. It is essential that our higher education institutions produce intellectuals as well as subject specialists.

Darla Deardorff discusses the competences required for intercultural dialogue and the role of higher education in developing these competences in students. Her own recent work suggests that the competences may be categorised into attitudes, knowledge, skills and internal and external outcomes. They may be placed in a visual framework that illustrates how intercultural competence is a lifelong process and how there is no single point at which an individual becomes completely inter-culturally competent. She also notes that intercultural scholars in the United States do not agree on the role of language in intercultural competence development. Another important point is that intercultural competence does not just happen; for most learners, it must be intentionally developed. Deardorff stresses that the model

she presents is based primarily on experience from the United States; it should be tested against and complemented by experience from other parts of the world.

Writing from a student perspective, **Olav Øye and Andrea Blättler** argue that intercultural dialogue must be more than just talk. For most students, intercultural dialogue means occasional chats with international students at their own institutions. When these contacts develop into more substantial discussions, intercultural dialogue begins in earnest. Opportunities for intercultural dialogue are strengthened by organised mobility, and the authors recall that the European Students Union played an important role in establishing 20% mobility by 2020 as a goal of the European Higher Education Area. It is important that mobile students be offered language courses and that these courses also address issues of intercultural communication. Integration of international students into the life of their host institution – and even more so into the life of their host community – remains a challenge, even if some institutions have policies for integration. Øye and Blättler see student organisations as particularly important in providing a space where students can work side by side and discuss freely. At international level, student organisations are faced with many of the same issues of dialogue between people from different backgrounds that challenge other parts of our societies. Nevertheless, in recent experience it has proved less difficult than expected to bring student representatives to agree on key student issues, which seem to be largely the same in most parts of the world, though totalitarian societies present some particular challenges for student participation.

Germain Dondelinger writes from the perspective of another key actor, viz. public authorities. He maintains that we can see why intercultural dialogue is important if we look at the changing nature of our societies. Migration, globalisation, international and domestic security issues and increasingly multicultural societies make the development of intercultural competences and the promotion of intercultural dialogue fundamental. It contributes to a number of strategic priorities, such as respecting and promoting cultural diversity, solidarity, social justice and cohesion. Dondelinger also points to possible tensions, but maintains that individual rights prevail over collective rights in intercultural dialogue contexts. He explores different approaches and the contributions of various actors, concluding that public authorities must develop strategies for provision, staff, curriculum and language policies. Intercultural dialogue should be seen as a way of coming to terms with other world views, traditions and lifestyles through empathy, non-violence and creativity; but the concept of "identity", on which intercultural dialogue hinges, is not static and should not automatically be seen in Manichean terms.

Yazmín Cruz and Cristina Escrigas emphasise that higher education must train professionals but even more it must educate responsible citizens. This requires graduates to have a vision of reality that extends well beyond their own discipline. Higher education must contribute to positive social transformation, taking into account the challenge of intercultural understanding. This corresponds to the mission of the Global University Network for Innovation (GUNI), which seeks to strengthen

the role of higher education in society by reforming and innovating higher education policies across the world according to the principles of public service, relevance and social responsibility. For higher education to play its rightful role, universities need to reappraise their purposes, functions and practices through critical engagement in dialogue and discourse with the citizenry on the problematic issues of our societies. This, Cruz and Escrigas argue, requires institutions to overcome the inertia of their current model, moving beyond the outdated paradigms of the ivory tower or the market-oriented university, and reorient higher education so it can better respond to society's challenges. They make the point that we live in interconnected worlds and our global society is faced by two major conflicts: the relationship between humans – that is, co-existence – and the relationship between humans and nature. Recovering the human capacity to evaluate, compare, choose, decide and act is therefore more crucial now than ever before. The authors believe that education is the key to this endeavour, but that a new world calls for a new kind of university, one that creatively redefines its missions and functions, that reinvents itself if necessary so it can continue to serve as a space for reflection and creativity, one that provides the tools needed for social analysis, critical thinking and sustainability.

The fourth part of this book provides examples of the roles education can play in developing intercultural dialogue. **Barasby S. Karamurzov** describes north Caucasus, which is a plural region in various respects – linguistic, ethnic and religious – often in a kind of duality between the native cultures, which are themselves diverse, and the culture of broader Russian society. The fact that the region is relatively less developed in its economy adds to the challenge. The values and norms that dominate a society's culture determine the behaviour and social practices of individuals. In north Caucasus, societies as a whole, and young generations especially, are being influenced by mass culture, which is devoid of national content or symbols; but they are also influenced by the traditional "indigenous" cultural forms, which are being revived at present and are characterised by ethnic and religious exceptionalism. Karamurzov maintains that the opportunities to realise any rational strategy will depend on an adequate knowledge of the structure of identities, variable patterns of value orientations and social action among the younger generations, whence the crucial importance of education.

Drawing on the particular circumstances of Lebanon. **Michel Nehme** underlines the responsibility of universities for creating conditions that allow the promotion and construction of a civilisation based on intercultural dialogue and respect for cultural diversity, thus contributing to the prevention of violent conflict, the management and control of conflicts and post-conflict reconciliation. At times in history, religious and cultural factors have led to conflict and war; at other times, they have prevented or moderated violence. It is, however, too simplistic to describe the Lebanese conflict solely as one of religion, since economic and other factors also play a role. Nehme suggests that the major intellectual contribution should be to arrive at a proposed national political structure based on living together in a harmoniously interactive manner, recognising the heterogeneous nature of Lebanese society as well as the need for a common destiny.

Is-haq O. Oloyede analyses the role of higher education in the culturally highly diverse context of Nigeria. The increasing importance of cultural background and affiliation within Nigerian society has had negative impacts on higher education. The competition for control of universities derives from the assumption that universities play significant roles in forming and recruiting the elite as well as generating local employment and economic development. Hence, the location of universities, the appointment of their vice chancellors, recruitment of staff and admission of students become vital issues of contention. However, there are also initiatives that seek to counteract polarisation based on ethnic, religious and cultural background. One is the Nigeria Inter-religious Council, which Oloyede heads and which attempts to educate Christians and Muslims about the background and beliefs of the other group. Within higher education, legislation aims to promote equity in the location of higher education institutions and in the admission of students, but without reserving or earmarking any quotas for any designated ethnic groups. This leads to considerable strife and suspicion as each group tries to obtain as high a share of the national resources in this area as possible. There is, however, hope that a relatively complex admissions policy as well as in hiring staff as well as some targeted programmes of teaching and learning will help turn Nigerian universities into a microcosm of Nigerian society. Students from different parts of the country will be forced to live side by side in student hostels, work together in class and discuss the problems of their country; there is good hope that those measures will also help foster better dialogue and understanding.

Georges Nahas explores the role of higher education in promoting a culture of dialogue and understanding on the basis of his own experience as a Lebanese university leader. Lebanon recognises 18 confessions, Christian and Muslim. Since 1922, the constitution has given specific rights to these recognised groups and it is very difficult for a citizen not to belong to one of them. All Lebanese universities except one are private and many of them have a confessional basis. This been accentuated over the past generation, in particular as a consequence of the Lebanese civil war and the developments that led to the war. The University of Balamand is in northern Lebanon, whereas most higher education institutions are in the Beirut area. Founded in 1988 by merging several existing institutions, it made an effort to recruit staff and students broadly and managed to gain the trust and support of the different groups represented in northern Lebanon. The university implements its vision of non-discrimination and nation-building across confessional lines on three complementary levels – academic planning, institutional rules and regulations, and national and international relations – and it has adopted action plans for each. Over the past two decades, the University of Balamand has established an atmosphere of trust and co-operation within the university and has gained recognition as a site of dialogue. At the same time, it faces a challenge in developing its role as an actor of dialogue in broader society.

Zixin Hou and Qinghua Liu present the Chinese experience of internationalisation and intercultural understanding. They see universities playing a crucial role in educating citizens of the world for the 21st century and they maintain

that international understanding is a long-term bilateral understanding implying exchange and interaction, the goal of which is to understand the politics, economics and culture of other countries, while seeking understanding from them in return. Different cultures make the world richer and more colourful, and we should respect and understand the cultural traditions of each country. China has made great efforts to open up its higher education internationally and has shown a very impressive increase in the number of students it sends abroad as well as the number of students it hosts over the past 30 years. The authors illustrate these efforts by the example of Nankai University and its "Nankai-Aichi pattern" in co-operation with Aichi University of Japan and the expansion of the Confucius Institutes, which aim to advance the dialogue between different cultures, further mutual understanding and enhance understanding of Chinese language and culture.

Alf Rasmussen provides an example of public policy specifically devised to improve the internationalisation of education. The Norwegian White Paper on internationalisation encompasses all levels of education, but higher education plays an important role. The Norwegian White Paper is noteworthy for making intercultural dialogue an explicit part of the internationalisation strategy; it sees international success in education and research collaboration and competition as depending on how successful Norwegian society is in intercultural dialogue and understanding. Public policy therefore aims to prepare everyone to be intercultural citizens in this society from early childhood. Norway also finds it needs to enlarge its traditional circle of co-operation with its Nordic neighbours, a few other European countries and North America, which again increases demands for intercultural understanding and awareness, as well as greater and more diverse linguistic competence. The White Paper underlines the fact that international perspectives, languages and cultural awareness are increasingly important competences for those seeking employment. Internationalisation of education must therefore not only focus on students and staff spending semesters or years abroad, but also ensure that education in Norway is international in character and internationally competitive in its quality standards.

We would like to express our appreciation of the work of the authors, who have managed to fit the writing of their articles and answering our sometimes quite detailed editorial questions into their very busy schedules. It is precisely the richness and diversity of the authors' experiences and backgrounds that, we hope, will make this book an interesting and relevant source for further work on intercultural dialogue in higher education. We would also like to put on record our appreciation of the help we received from **Anna Györy**, who was an intern with the IAU for part of the period when this book was being edited, in verifying references and chasing up those that might have been missing.

As editors, we are of course aware that a single book is by itself unlikely to dramatically improve intercultural dialogue. By definition, a book is an instrument of one-way communication, even when it is a collection of essays by different authors in which a variety of views meet within the confines of a single volume. However, it is our hope that this book will help stimulate reflection and that you – our readers

– will then initiate further discussion and dialogue on the responsibility of higher education in further intercultural dialogue.

This book is not an end in itself; nor should it be seen as the final summary of a debate. Through the joint efforts of the International Association of Universities and the Council of Europe, the book is one step on a road that we hope and trust has been only partly travelled, a step which will lead higher education to play its strong and natural role in rising to one of the most important challenges that we face: how, as societies and as citizens, we can communicate respectfully with those whose backgrounds differ strongly from our own, how we can generate a meeting of open minds and how we can live together in equal dignity. We are convinced that our future will depend in part on the ability of higher education to find satisfactory answers to this seemingly simple, yet extraordinarily complex question.

References

Bergan, Sjur and Jean-Philippe Restoueix (eds) (2009): *Intercultural Dialogue on Campus*, Higher Education Series No. 11, Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Blasi, Paolo and Hilligje van't Land (eds) (2005): Intercultural Learning And Dialogue, *Higher Education Policy*, Vol. 18, No. 4, December 2005 (www.palgrave-journals.com/hep/journal/v18/n4/index.html, accessed on 7 July 2010).

CDESR (Steering Committee for Higher Education and Research of the Council of Europe) (2006): "Statement on the contribution of higher education to intercultural dialogue". Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Council of Europe (2001): Recommendation Rec(2001)15 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on history teaching in twenty-first-century Europe.

Council of Europe (2008): *Living Together as Equals in Dignity*, White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue, Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

UNESCO (1945): Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

van't Land, Hilligje (2005): "The IAU Institutional Survey on 'Promoting intercultural learning and dialogue across the institution: some major challenges for the university'", in Blasi and van't Land (eds), Intercultural Learning And Dialogue, *Higher Education Policy*, Vol. 18, No. 4, December 2005, pp. 437-443.

I. The political context: intercultural dialogue for a humane society

The role of higher education in fostering a culture of peace and understanding

Federico Mayor Zaragoza

Beirut is the city where one of the founding general conferences of UNESCO was held, where many lessons were learned and have since been learned again. All the city claims is dialogue instead of confrontation – words instead of violence. Beirut is the symbol of the future of which we dream, an example for the transition from force to word.

As the first paragraph of the Earth Charter says:

> We stand at a critical moment in Earth's history, a time when humanity must choose its future. As the world becomes increasingly interdependent and fragile, the future at once holds great peril and great promise. To move forward we must recognize that in the midst of a magnificent diversity of cultures and life forms we are one human family and one Earth community with a common destiny. We must join together to bring forth a sustainable global society founded on respect for nature, universal human rights, economic justice, and a culture of peace. Towards this end, it is imperative that we, the peoples of Earth, declare our responsibility to one another, to the greater community of life, and to future generations. (Earth Charter 2000)

At the end of the Charter, in "The Way Forward" section, it states:

> As never before in history, common destiny beckons us to seek a new beginning. This requires a change of mind and heart. It requires a new sense of global interdependence and universal responsibility … Our cultural diversity is a precious heritage and different cultures will find their own distinctive ways to realize the vision … In order to build a sustainable global community, the nations of the world must renew their commitment to the United Nations. Let ours be a time remembered for the awakening of a new reverence for life, the firm resolve to achieve sustainability, the quickening of the struggle for justice and peace, and the joyful celebration of life. (ibid.)

"A new beginning" – that is the key notion we have to retain and consider, and the only way to make this true is through education, culture, science and communication. Education is to build peace, foster dialogue and enhance understanding in order "to build peace in the minds of men" as enshrined in UNESCO's Constitution (UNESCO 1945).

Education is much more than information, formation and training. Education is also about being oneself, behaving according to one's own reflections, choosing according to one's own decisions. To be educated is to learn and to be able to feel free of any kind of dependence, submission or fear. It is to be able to create, to think, to imagine, to dream – all distinctive and decisive capacities of the human condition. According to the Delors Commission, which I appointed in 1992 in my

capacity as Director-General of UNESCO, there are four pillars in the education process (Delors et al. 1996):

– learn to know;

– learn to do;

– learn to be;

– learn to live together;

and I would add that the education process is also about learning to dare and learning to share.

For many years, UNESCO's Education Programme was geared to supporting "literacy and basic education". At the request of President Nyerere, Mwalimu ('teacher') of Tanzania, we were able – in a joint venture with UNICEF, UNDP and the World Bank – at the World Congress held in Jomtien, Thailand in 1990 to change it to "Education for all throughout life" (UNESCO 1990a, 1990b).

Higher education is not just a higher level of the education process. Higher education institutions have the capacity and the responsibility to provide advice to, and make a positive impact on, society, governments, parliaments, municipalities and other establishments of the state. Even more, as was emphasised in the First World Conference on Higher Education that took place in 1998 at UNESCO headquarters (UNESCO 1998), higher education institutions have the capacity to be watch towers: to anticipate, to prevent.

It is only with this kind of higher education that we can envisage promoting a culture of dialogue and understanding. And universities can overcome the immense power of the media, which by contrast prevents or reduces substantially the dissemination and impact which our declarations, recommendations and resolutions should have. For instance, in July 2009, when UNESCO celebrated ten years of the World Conference on Higher Education, there was not a single reference to it in the newspapers or the media at large. We are not news, because we often disagree and because we are too silent too often.

Yet higher education is necessary in facing the danger of progressive uniformisation. To be all different, all unique in each moment of our life, is our richness. On the other hand, to be united by universal values is our force. We should be permanently aware of our infinite culture of diversity, alongside the same ethical references of a humanity committed to its common destiny.

Dialogue means to fully express our views (as Article 1 of the UNESCO Constitution says) and to listen to those of others. Dialogue is to respect and to show respect for views completely opposite to our own ideas, to interact with all partners, with only one exception: that of fanaticism, dogmatism, imposition, violence.

All different, holding hands, joining our voices, as a demonstration of brotherhood, otherness and fraternity, so lucidly set out in Article I of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations 1948). All together, all educated, all committed

to future generations. Higher education must tirelessly favour intercultural and inter-religious dialogue: encounter, conversation, conciliation, alliance.

Let us recover the basic principles of the United Nations: "We, the peoples … have resolved to save the succeeding generations from the scourge of war" (United Nations 1945). Which means that 'we', the civil society, have governance capacity, through a genuine democratic system, to "avoid war", which means: to build peace. The question is how to build peace? The answer again is found in UNESCO's Constitution, approved in London only four months after the Charter of the UN was adopted in San Francisco: "As war begins in the minds of men it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be built" (UNESCO 1945). Peace is built through education, culture, science and communication, in order to provide all humans with free wings to fly in the unlimited space of the spirit.

In UNESCO's Constitution, the key concept of equal human dignity is one of the basic pillars of the "democratic principles" of justice, equality and solidarity – "intellectual and moral solidarity" – that are established in UNESCO's constitution, in order to be able to ensure that educated human beings are "free and responsible" (UNESCO 1945: Article I).

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1948, provides directions on how to behave in order to respect human dignity and equality. It is indispensable therefore to better share not only material goods, but knowledge and experience and most of all – wisdom. In order to better share, the concept of development was progressively introduced into United Nations discussions and debates: in the 1960s, it was decided that development should be social as well as economic, and it should be integral; in the 1970s it appeared it should be endogenous as well, and in October 1974 an agreement was reached that the most prosperous countries should provide 0.7% of their GNP for the development of countries in need; in the 1980s, the commission chaired by Gro Harlem Brundtland introduced the concept of sustainability; and, at last, in 1998, publication of the book *Development with a Human Face* (Mehrotra and Jolly 1998), emphasised the main feature of development: it must be human, because human beings are not only the beneficiaries of but the main actors in development for equal quality of life.

Regretfully, today's societies favour states instead of "peoples", loans instead of aid, exploitation instead of co-operation, plutocracy instead of democracy, and market laws instead of values.

Even if marginalised and weakened, the United Nations system has been a permanent guide aiming to promote understanding and conciliation, and facilitate the transition from a culture of imposition, domination, violence and war to a culture of dialogue, alliance, peace. In sum a transition from force to word.

Yes, from force to word …

The recommendations, declarations, resolutions and initiatives put forward by the United Nations system have been manifold. I consider it essential to summarise and list the UN's contributions since 1990 because, in what could be called the age of globalisation, in which plutocrats have tried to take over from "We, the peoples", the UN has given us key milestones:

– 1990: Education for All

– 1993: Agenda 21 for the Environment

  - World Plan of Action for Education on Human Rights and Democracy

  - Vienna Conference on Human Rights

– 1994: The Contribution by Religions to the Culture of Peace

– 1995: Declaration of Principles on Tolerance

  - Copenhagen Declaration on Social Development

  - Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing Declaration

– 1998: International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World

– 1999: Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace

– 2000: UN Millenium Declaration

  - The Earth Charter (Amsterdam)

– 2001: Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (UNESCO)

– 2003: Declaration on Dialogue among Civilizations (AG-NU)

At the 2005 United Nations Summit, the heads of state and government unanimously decided to implement the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace and welcomed the creation of the Alliance of Civilizations. More recently, the United Nations and the major UN institutions have also contributed to the debate with key recommendations, such as:

– A/Res/63/113 on a Culture of Peace of 26 February 2005

– The Hague Agenda on City Diplomacy (2008)

– Charter for a World without Violence (2009)

– European Council of Religious Leaders encounters

– European Council of Religious Leaders/Lille Declaration on a Culture of Peace (2009)

– Adopting a consensus resolution, the General Assembly affirms mutual understanding and inter-religious dialogue as important dimensions of culture of peace[3]

Now that we have all these excellent resolutions and declarations, now is the time to act. We have all the diagnoses and we have to follow up on them – without waiting any longer.

─────────

3. Consensus resolution adopted by the 63rd UN General Assembly – GA/10784, 13 November 2008.

Globalisation has led to an unprecedented, very worrisome and complex crisis situation (financial, environmental, democratic, ethical, food and more). Without regulatory measures, the multiplication of fiscal paradises, the 'globalisers' and plutocrats have led the world into a situation of social disruption and extreme poverty. On top of this, these people have lied and invaded countries in order to further increase the gigantic and aggressive development of industries which consequently, today and every day, absorb armament expenditure of 3 billion dollars or more when at the same time 60 000 human beings die of hunger each day, most of whom are children. This is an unbearable collective shame.

Any crisis can be seen as a true opportunity to instigate change. Indeed all crises can and should lead us all to rethink the world in which we live and to change it – sometimes also leading to radical transformation – as a response and in-depth reaction to the incoherent behaviour of world governance. There was, for instance, no money in the year 2000 for the Millennium Development Goals (United Nations 2000) for food, for AIDS treatment and more, yet suddenly hundreds of billions of dollars have appeared to "rescue" the same institutions that – because of their greed and irresponsibility, in the words of President Obama (Obama 2009) – led to the present situation. But we cannot remain silent, obedient and indifferent any more. We have to be participatory actors and no longer spectators; we have to behave as aware, committed and involved citizens and not as receptors; we have to stop being dormant and be very alive.

We have been submissive to the point of offering our lives to the designs of the powers in place. Now, for the first time in history, we have the possibility of distance participation, through information technologies such as the Internet and SMS texting. Universities, the scientific community, intellectuals, artists and writers must all lead this new era of freedom, of emancipation, of genuine democracy. They must be at the forefront of citizenship mobilisation to ensure the transition from force to dialogue and understanding.

This is a new beginning. A new era can start.

References

Delors, Jacques et al. (1996): *Learning: The Treasure Within*, UNESCO report on Education for the 21st Century, Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Earth Charter (2000): available at www.earthcharterinaction.org/content/pages/ The-Earth-Charter.html (accessed on 1 July 2010).

Mehrotra, Sandtosh and Richard Jolly (eds) (1998): *Development with a Human Face*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Obama, Barack (2009): Inaugural Address, 21 January 2009, available at www.whitehouse.gov/blog/inaugural-address/ (accessed on 1 July 2010).

UNESCO (1945): Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

UNESCO (1990a): Education for All: The Requirements. World Conference on Education for All (Thailand, 5-9 March 1990). Monograph III. Roundtable Themes III, Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

UNESCO (1990b) World Declaration on Education for All – Meeting Basic Learning Needs, the Jomtien Declaration, available at www.unesco.org/education/efa/ed_for_all/background/jomtien_declaration.shtml (accessed on 2 July 2010).

UNESCO (1998): World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century: Vision and Action, available at www.unesco.org/education/educprog/wche/declaration_eng.htm (accessed on 1 July 2010).

United Nations (1945): Charter of the United Nations, available at www.un.org/en/documents/charter/index.shtml (accessed on 1 July 2010).

United Nations (1948): The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, available at www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml (accessed on 1 July 2010).

United Nations (2000): UN Millennium Development Goals, available at www.un.org/millenniumgoals/bkgd.shtml (accessed on 1 July 2010).