

UDC 376:314.04-056.42]37.06-025.28

doi: 10.15330/jpnu.11.1.25-38

LEARNING TO LIVE TOGETHER. A KEY EDUCATIONAL CHALLENGE OF OUR TIME

HIANG-CHU AUSILIA CHANG

Abstract. The commitment of *learning to live together / with others* is considered a key educational challenge of our time. A challenge that we cannot exempt ourselves from because it is an indispensable task for all, without exception. On the basis of contributions by some international organizations - in particular, UNESCO and the Council of Europe - the author focuses on the need to educate people to live together in the culture of human rights. The author presents UNESCO's permanent program *Education for All* as a way of living together, and considers the inclusive education, the quality education, the integral education and education to solidarity as a way forward for the future, and the intercultural education as a strategy of living together. The author concludes by highlighting that these perspectives, and so the same *Education for All*, must be set on the path of *learning to love* in order to succeed, addressing the most vulnerable segments of society, including refugees affected by war, natural disasters and poverty. This emerges as a global challenge today and a consideration absent in the already examined prospects which seems a rare consideration outside the Catholic circles. Confronted with the present circumstances, which include not only wars and organized violence but also a monumental climate catastrophe, it is now crucial to rediscover the profound essence of education and the pedagogical contemplation that enlightens educational endeavors, befitting human dignity. Undoubtedly, the prospects involve instilling the principles of living together through early childhood education, practicing democratic values, fostering serene coexistence, peace, and solidarity, while respecting and promoting the fundamental rights of all human beings. Despite the challenging situations witnessed globally, this vision may seem like an unattainable utopia, but it remains a crucial goal for the future.

Keywords: learning to live together, education for all (EFA), international conference on education, inclusive education, quality education, education to solidarity, integral education; intercultural education, education to love.

1. INTRODUCTION

The history of mankind, with its prodigious achievements, but also with the persistence and worsening of conflicts between human groups, together with the consequent huge destruction and natural and non-natural disasters, highlights the problematic and growing difficulty of human coexistence, that of living together, hence the necessity of an urgent need to learn to live with others. In fact, this urgency is increased and not a few challenges to human coexistence are posed by the massive and imposing migrations of peoples and the ever-worsening dramatic situation of terror not only in countries at war, but everywhere, especially with acts of terrorism. Apart from the ongoing war in Ukraine caused by the Russian attack and between Israel and Palestine/Hamas, it is enough to think of the dramatic events in Paris, Brussels, Nice Sea, Munich, Berlin - which happened in 2016 and after - and for some time now in countries like Turkey and Syria, as well as in Myanmar, Haiti, etc. We question

whether it is really possible to live together in peace, in serenity and in harmony.

In this situation not only the institutions, but each person is called to take a position as regards to the situation, so much so that an effective policy and, at the same time, educational and training action is required at all levels.

Living together, in terms of inclusiveness of the other/others, of the different/difference, is a multidimensional issue that implies references not only to the family and school context, but also to that of work and of civil coexistence, to relations between sexes, ages, ethnicities, religions, languages, ideologies, and between countries and continents.

In this article, the attention is on the pedagogical approach, which focuses on learning to live together with others. The title recalls the theme of the 46th session of the International Conference on Education (ICE), organised by UNESCO-BIE (Geneve, 5-8 Sept.2001): *Education for All for learning to live together: contents and learning strategies - problems and solutions*, in particular the report of John Daniel entitled, *Learning to live together: a priority challenge at the dawn of the twenty-first century*.

In reality, an explicit proposal - on an international level - of Learning to live together can already be found in the Faure Commission Report (1972): *Learning to Be: the World of Education Today and Tomorrow*, as well as in the well-known Delors Report of 1996, drawn up by the UNESCO International Commission on Education for the 21st Century, chaired by Jacques Delors, from whom the Report takes its name. The Report Delors, entitled *Learning: the treasure within* has become the essential reference point for every subsequent initiative and reflection promoted by the same entity and other pedagogical-educational publications.

The Report Faure, already 50 years ago, underscored the necessity of preparing humans capable of relating to others in the community, hence the need to teach: how to live, how to learn, how to acquire new knowledge throughout life, how to think freely and critically, how to love the world and make it more human, how to fulfil oneself in work.

It cannot be denied that learning to live together with others is a crucial educational challenge of today and an indispensable task to be promoted in all spheres of human coexistence. The numerous initiatives of international bodies are fully aware of this, in particular the recent Report entitled *Reimagining our futures together: a new social contract for education* (Nov 2021) in which UNESCO again reaffirms the need to build our relationships with others, with our environment and with technology. There Is also the UNESCO International Day of Living Together in Peace (16 May).

2. LIVING TOGETHER WITH OTHERS: A NECESSARY UTOPIA

As the Italian philosopher R. Mancini points out, utopia “should now be understood not as the representation of what is desirable but impossible, but rather as the consciousness of all that we can express at the height of our authentic humanity and as a choice for the courage of dignity that manifests itself when we reject what is degrading and false” (2019, p. 2).

Living together means living *with other human beings*, in harmony, as emerges from the formulation of the third “pillar” of education indicated in the *Delors Report*. But, *the others*, who are they? And *why* live together? Underlying this issue is the anthropological question and the overriding challenge well outlined by John Daniel who states: “Learning to live with others implies the right of people to remain “others” (p. 268). As it will be better said later, this does not happen and is not realised, in my opinion, without learning to *love others*, that is, to *want the good of others*, which implies coming out of oneself by overcoming selfishness, convinced that there is no love without the capacity and courage of dedication, sacrifice, and renunciation.

In this perspective, in fact, while there is an urgent need to arrive at a personalistic anthropology that recovers the recognition of the dignity of every human being in support of the culture of life and for life, at the same time, the commitment of all (individuals and institutions) for the *common good* emerges. The discourse would broaden to include the perspective of *integral ecology*, the awareness of our

interdependence not only among human beings but also of our interconnectedness with the whole of creation, as well highlighted in the two Encyclical Letters of Pope Francis: “*Laudato Si’ on Care for our Common Home*” (24 May 2015); “*Fratelli Tutti on Fraternity and Social Friendship*” (3 October 2020). In reality, there is no separation in this process; if not, it would empty out the true meaning of ecology (from *eikos*, home).

Therefore, our Living together, with others, is an ideal of an ethical-political nature, a utopia, but it is also, and above all, an indispensable commitment of individuals, insofar as the ability to live together goes hand in hand with properly human growth, while institutions have the duty to defend human dignity and to be guarantors and promoters of peaceful coexistence, as is indicated with extreme clarity in Pope Francis' Encyclical Letter, mentioned above, “*Fratelli Tutti*”.

The challenge focuses, therefore, on education that should be supported by sound politics, on the necessity to realise the dream of a world where sustainable development (DESS 2005-2014; UNESCO 2020) is possible, where every human being strives to live the awareness of his or her own and others' dignity. The *Declaration Transforming our world: the 2023 Agenda for Sustainable Development* outlines the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 2016-2030 and it represents, undoubtedly, a world's best plan to build a better world for people and our planet by 2030.

An arduous task, which challenges everyone and *a fortiori* educators. A remark by Z. Bauman is particularly significant in this regard: “Never before in human history has it happened that educators have encountered a challenge comparable to that represented by the current shift. We have simply never been in such a situation before. The art of living in a world more than saturated with information still has to be learned - in our case: in a world that has become highly multicultural]. Just like the far more demanding art of preparing human beings to live such a life” (2012, p. 114. My translation).

If, on the one hand, it may seem utopian and anachronistic to speak of learning to live together with others - given the dramatic nature of our world in which, as Pope Francis points out, a third world war is taking place in pieces and is currently, one might say, just around the corner -, on the other hand, today more than ever, as Delors himself states in Chapter I of the 1996 Report, *living together is a necessary utopia*, since we are all part of the same human family. In fact, not only the Bible and the monotheistic religions affirm this, but also the Preamble of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, which reads as follows: “Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world”.

More than seventy years have passed since this promulgation, yet the guarantee of human rights for all still remains a far-fetched ideal, given also to the silence and immobility of those who should intervene to break the cycle of violence. Making the foundation of the *Education of All and for All* a UN *Declaration* (2011), almost like a “secular gospel”, should then be an inevitable duty of all those who have educational duties towards the new generations, starting with the family and the school. In this regard, there have been constant and frequent reminders from both the UN and UNESCO, likewise there has been no lack of guidelines from the Catholic Church.

Believing that it is possible to *change both us and the world* and to engage us all gives a perfect response to the meaning of *utopia* which, as R. Mancini states, “is a spirit that gives depth to our perspective on historical time. It is the spirit that allows us to look towards a transformation of reality, for now not given and not visible, which nevertheless presses to take place and may actually have its place in history” (p. 80. My translation).

3. LEARNING TO LIVE TOGETHER, WITH OTHERS: THE CORE OF EDUCATION

Learning to live together has become a necessity in all regions of the world. It is a concept created by the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (1996). Therefore, it is worth recalling the four pillars of education for the 21st century, presented in the Report *Learning: the treasure within*, which I quote here from the summary that appears as Points and Recommendations:

- **“Learning to know**, by combining a sufficiently broad general knowledge with the opportunity to work in depth on a small number of subjects. This also means learning to learn, so as to benefit from the opportunities education provides throughout life.

- **Learning to do**, in order to acquire not only an occupational skill but also, more broadly, the competence to deal with many situations and work in teams. It also means learning to do in the context of young peoples' various social and work experiences which may be informal, as a result of the local or national context, or formal, involving courses, alternating study and work.

- **Learning to live together**, by developing an understanding of other people and an appreciation of interdependence - carrying out joint projects and learning to manage conflicts - in a spirit of respect for the values of pluralism, mutual understanding and peace.

- **Learning to be**, so as better to develop one's personality and be able to act with ever greater autonomy, judgement and personal responsibility. In that connection, education must not disregard any aspect of a person's potential: memory, reasoning, aesthetic sense, physical capacities and communication skills.

Formal education systems tend to emphasise the acquisition of knowledge to the detriment of other types of learning; but it is vital now to conceive education in a more encompassing fashion. Such a vision should inform and guide future educational reforms and policy, in relation both to contents and to methods” (p. 97).

The four pillars are interdependent and each one requires in-depth study and application at many levels, first and foremost at the educational-didactic and socio-political levels. Of the four pillars, highlights Delors: “the Commission has put greater emphasis on one of the four pillars that it proposes and describes as the foundations of education: *learning to live together*, by developing an understanding of others and their history, traditions and spiritual values and, on this basis, creating a new spirit which, guided by recognition of our growing interdependence and a common analysis of the risks and challenges of the future, would induce people to implement common projects or to manage the inevitable conflicts in an intelligent and peaceful way” (p. 22).

Learning to live together with others is, therefore, a foundation of education and of social policies, because “the contemporary world is too often a world of violence that belies the hope some people placed in human progress. There has always been conflict throughout history, but new factors are accentuating the risk, in particular the extraordinary capacity for self-destruction humanity has created in the course of the twentieth century. Education has up to now not been able to do much to alleviate that state of affairs” (pp. 91-92). The document states without hesitation that “living together in harmony must be the ultimate goal of education in the twenty-first century” (p. 235), likewise the necessity to *revitalise the community spirit: a glimpse of the socializing role of the school*. In this view, human-centred development is “the ultimate goal of education and culture”. It would seem that the observation made in this 1996 document is very current. In fact, it is noted in the latest UNESCO Report (2021): “Our humanity and planet Earth are under threat. Urgent action, taken together, is needed to change course and reimagine our futures. Education, long acknowledged as a powerful force for positive change, has new, urgent and important work to do” (*Reimagining our futures together*. Executive Summary).

The usage of the verb *to learn* is closely related both to the complexity of human living and to its inherent character, that is, the act of lifelong learning, which is integrated with *lifewide learning*. It is, by now, a common belief that it is necessary today to learn always and everywhere, hence we speak of *Lifelong learning* and *Lifewide learning* (learning everywhere in all life contexts: in formal, non-formal and informal institutions).

Lifelong learning, proposed and reaffirmed by the International Commission for Education in the 21st Century and the OECD-CERI (1996), has now become the benchmark for all pedagogical-political considerations. Hence, learning also configures itself as the *alphabet* of living together and learning to live together, as its *strategy* and *key* to accessing citizenship in this 21st century.

The *lifelong - lifewide* relation, however, is inseparable in the sense that lifelong learning necessarily

and appropriately must exploit all the opportunities that society can offer. Furthermore, this *lifelong* and *lifewide learning* nowadays emphasised the need to also focus on a third, characterising and integrative, indeed coessential, aspect, namely *life deep learning*, which has made great strides in optimising artificial intelligence (AI) processes. *Lifedeeep learning*, which concerns the dimension of the depth of learning, thus returns to the deeper values and qualities that guide life and make it fully human in the utmost sense.

So, despite the current crisis that threatens humanity for various reasons mentioned at the beginning, more so now, we all need to walk *together* towards a new future for humanity, and this is not possible without education worthy of such a name. As already stated, in 2019, the International Commission on the Futures of Education was established to re-imagine how knowledge and learning can shape the future of humanity and the planet. The UNESCO Report (2021), entitled *Reimagining our futures together: a new social contract for education*, is quite significant the use of the term *together*.

The aim of this Report is precisely to rethink education and shape the future *through a global debate* that will lead to rethinking knowledge, education and learning in a world of increasing complexity, uncertainty and precariousness. The main actors indicated by the Report are teachers, governments, civil society, young people, students, cities and universities.

4. EDUCATING TO LIVE TOGETHER IN THE CULTURE OF HUMAN RIGHTS

It is not possible to *live together* in harmony without ensuring the implementation of all fundamental human rights, in particular, the right to education, enshrined in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948). *Learning to live together* is closely connected above all with UNESCO's commitment: *Education for All* (EFA), indeed it constitutes its complementary goal and at the same time the way forward. It can certainly be said that the EFA represents the 'context', *the way of learning to live together*, and that both perspectives complement each other harmoniously.

There is no doubt that the way of the future is to educate right from childhood to live together, with others, in the family, at school, in leisure time, practising the democratic values of coexistence serene, peaceful, solidarity in the respect and promotion of the fundamental rights of all human beings, despite the fact that several situations in the world today make one think of it as an unachievable utopia.

4.1. Education for All /EFA): way of living together

Since the *World Declaration on EFA* (1990) in particular, UNESCO has been steadily developing ways, means and strategies for its implementation and, with the *Delors Report* (1996), has emphasised more vividly the strong connection that exists between education and *learning to live together, with others*.

Also, the 2015 Incheon Declaration shares the vision of the EFA World Programme, reaffirming its origin in the World Conference in Jomtien (1990) which was later echoed in Dakar (2000). The 2015 *World Forum* therefore aims to ensure equitable, inclusive, quality education and lifelong learning for all by 2030.

Is of special relevance the inseparable connection between EFA and *learning to live together*, which emerges in the report of the 46th session of the International Conference on Education (ICE), organised by UNESCO-BIE (5-8 Sept. 2001), already mentioned at the beginning: "*Education for All for learning to live together: contents and learning strategies - problems and solutions*". Obviously, EFA is considered an indispensable *condition* and the *way forward for learning to live together*.

So, what do we intend by EFA? -From the topics discussed in international fora, it is clear that EFA indicates primarily the schooling of all, without discrimination of sex, religion, ethnicity, language, etc., as well as the conviction that, in order to be effectively *for all*, it must actively and effectively respond to the needs of *each* pupil, it must be of *quality* and truly *inclusive*.

Inclusion has gone beyond, at least conceptually, mere integration, both from an organisational and an educational-didactic point of view; it envisages attention for all pupils: not only for those with disabilities, but also for those who manifest *Special Educational Needs* (SEN), and for those who face any

social disadvantage due to language, economic-cultural conditions, religion, and finally for all others, considered in their peculiar and personal attitudes as well as their learning patterns. Hence the call for a didactic approach that reaches out to everyone by valorising the potential of the entire class, thereby transforming it into an inclusive class. It is indeed a significant achievement to have come to validate the close connection between the three instances that conceive *inclusive* education, *quality* education and *intercultural* education as indispensable conditions, strategies, ways of the EFA.

The awareness of this close interdependence is constant in UNESCO documents, as is also apparent in the title of an important Seminar BIE-GTZ on *Apprendre à Vivre Ensemble (AVE)* (Kigali, Rwanda, 13-17 Oct. 2008) where learning to live together is conceived as directly linked with education to *life skills*, to citizenship, to peace and to human rights.

It is, therefore, more than convinced that implementing and ensuring the principle of the right to Education for All entails a multidimensional action that involves people and institutions in different fields. Without the commitment of all, it is impossible to live together in peace and harmony: there is no future for humanity as reaffirmed during the 48th session of the International Conference on Education (Geneva, Switzerland, 25-28 Nov. 2008): *Inclusive Education: The way of the future*.

4.2. Inclusive, quality, holistic, solidarity-based education: the way of the future

The 48th UNESCO Conference aforementioned constitutes a fundamental reference for reflecting on inclusive education from the perspective of *learning to live together* (2004). The Conference conceived *Special Educational Needs* as a criterion to focus on the most vulnerable sectors of the society: indigenous people, those living in rural areas, migrants, refugees due to wars, natural disasters, poverty. This highlights the need to broaden the concept of inclusive education and its content in order to respect and recognise the diversity that exists in all vulnerable sectors of the population.

The well-known scholar of special and inclusive education, Mel Ainscow, in collaboration with others, offers a clear and complete definition of inclusion, highlighting the significance of the word “all” and the peculiar value of difference: “a) inclusion concerns all children and youths in schools; b) it consists in presence, participation and success; c) inclusion and exclusion are linked to each other insofar as inclusion implies the fight against exclusion; d) inclusion is considered as a permanent process” (2008, p. 22). He further noted: “The teacher focused on the implementation of inclusive education to support all students, engage them in the learning process, and motivate them to participate. Inclusive education, also referred to as integrated education or education-for-all, is based on the principle of equality and is defined as an educational process with the aim of the participation of all students in schools irrespectively of their race, nationality, cultural backgrounds, or learning difficulties” (2005).

It is obvious that inclusion thus conceived is within the perspective of EFA and lifelong learning, and so involves both personal and political commitment. In this way the commitment of the EFA, inherited from the Comenian *Pampaedia* principle, assumes in a particular form the principle of inclusion to be realised throughout life, so that *equity*, *inclusion*, *quality* become inspiring criteria for all educational systems that are called upon to implement the right to education.

It is significant that in the Conclusions and Recommendations of the 48th session of the International Conference on Education (ICE 2008) it is declared: “At the conclusion of our work, participants recalled Article 26 of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights that states that everyone has a right to education. We also affirm that inclusive quality education is fundamental to achieving human, social and economic development. We agreed that governments as well as all the other social actors have an important role in providing a quality education for all and, in doing so, should recognize the importance of a broadened concept of inclusive education that addresses the diverse needs of all learners and that is relevant, equitable and effective” (p. 3).

UNESCO's perspective is quite clear that EFA must be inclusive education in the broadest sense. Therefore, EFA must necessarily be of quality, so as to meet the educational needs of *each* and *every individual*. Particularly significant in this respect is the title of the General Report of the 46th International

Conference in 2001: *Education for All for learning to live together: contents and learning strategies - problems and solutions*. Here, quality education is conceived as an indispensable condition for learning to live together.

Today it is indisputable, at least in the pedagogical sphere, that schools must be democratic, inclusive, hence it can be said that schools are *either inclusive or they are not* schools, in the awareness that learning together is already about learning to live together. In this regard J.-M. Barbier affirms: "The principle of an inclusive school is that of a school designed, for all with all, which adapts to each individual according to his or her abilities and needs. It therefore requires rethinking of the school system" (p. 3. my translation).

Schooling with all does not only mean the inclusion of pupils who are "different" for various reasons, but also *learning together* through planning, collaboration for the common realization of learning, also in the sense of *involving all* the components of the educational community. Hence the inevitable call for a school management and organisation that is concretely adapted to these perspectives.

The Commitment: School "*for All and Everyone*" calls for a commitment by all countries to effectively ensure quality schooling/education for all, an indispensable condition for effective inclusion. Thus, the concept of EFA has expanded to the point of being able to create the equation: *EFA = Universal and lifelong education - inclusive - solidarity - intercultural - integral education*. Undoubtedly, each of these themes has deserved and deserves serious study and implementation.

The question that follows is *how* to achieve an education that is up to its task? There does not exist an easy and univocal solution, given the profound cultural, social or ideological diversities and differences. However, each and everyone is called upon to implement and realise the values of justice and solidarity both between individuals and groups and between countries. Strangely it is noted that, while there is frequent and continuous reference to *inclusion and inclusive education/schooling*, much less is said about the need for *integral and solidarity-based education*.

The perplexity arises from the fact that education cannot be realised without ensuring its natural integral perspective, and this cannot be given without contemplating solidarity as one of its indispensable goals. It therefore embraces every man and woman in all their dimensions, including that of religion because, without the recognition of God as the Creator and Father of humanity, it is not possible to think of oneself as a 'human family' and consider one another as brothers and sisters. Man or woman is a brother or sister to his fellow only where there is a father. Mankind without a father/mother is unable to recognise the other as a brother, goes so far as to kill him, considering his alterity as a threat. By doing so, it prepares for its own self-destruction.

This consideration reawakens the crucial educational problems arising from the profound and widespread crisis of the family. For this reason, "*solidarity* urgently needs to be cultivated in the light of an anthropology open to the Transcendent, as an awareness of the inter-dependence, as a commitment for the common good (of all and of each one) and as a demand of the moral order" (Chang, 2015, p.49). In this regard, Christianity has constantly reaffirmed this necessity. In our present time, Paul VI, John Paul II, Benedict XVI are considered authoritative witnesses of the pedagogical magisterium, as well as the current Pope Francis with his proposal of an integral humanism that embraces the *whole* person and *all people*, starting with the most vulnerable. This magisterium, because of its authoritativeness, reaches out to all peoples and all the world's Assemblies as a guarantor of the values of the civilisation of love. Suffice it to recall Paul VI's speeches at the UN (1965), John Paul II's at the UN (1979 and 1995) and at the UNESCO (1980), Benedict XVI' (2008) and Francis' at the UN (2015).

As it was with the noun 'love', so it is happening with 'education', which is often used improperly, emptied of its intrinsic meaning: to educate (*educere*) not only in the sense of "drawing out" and bringing to fullness the potential present in the person, but also in the task of accompanying the person towards self-realisation as a free person, responsible *for himself* and *from himself* and capable of living *in* the world with participation and solidarity with others and with creation.

It is time to recover the profound meaning of educating and the pedagogical reflection that illuminates educational action as Ph. Meirieu (Radio France 13 Nov 2016: the attack in Paris), like all right-thinking people, reiterated: “*Terrorism cannot be fought by repression alone: educating people about humanity is the first duty*”. One cannot but agree with this statement by emphasising that education is either educating to humanness or it is not education! Education in its totality (integrality) in fact means consideration of humans in its entirety and awareness of its nature and ultimate purpose.

Without this clarity about the human person, who grows through the help of the other and others, and in the measure in which he or she cares for the other and others, there is no true and durable education. Again, Meirieu with P. Frackwowski affirms the urgency of “*an inclusive and integral education, an education that exposes us to the challenges of the contemporary world in a relationship with ourselves in solidarity with others*” (2009⁵, p. 99).

Obviously, as Matsuura Koichiro – the director of the UNESCO 1999-2009 - stated in his Opening Address to the UNESCO-BIE Conference on Inclusive Education (2009), “Inclusion paves the way to a better shared future. It is crucial that the outcomes of this Conference translate into policies and practices aimed at attaining high-quality education for all learners. It is first and foremost a matter of political will based on a vision of society in which learning opportunities are within everyone’s reach” (p. 9).

For the development of an inclusive education system Mel Ainscow highlights four elements “a) Inclusion is a process; b) Inclusion is concerned with the identification and removal of barriers; c) Inclusion is about the presence, participation and achievement of all students; d) Inclusion involves a particular emphasis on those groups of learners who may be at risk of marginalisation, exclusion or underachievement” (2009, 26).

4.3. Intercultural education: a strategy for living together

Learning to live together requires a commitment to live in such a way as to participate and collaborate with others in all human activities starting from childhood, in the family and at school. This commitment lies at the heart of today’s education not only because it has been neglected so far, but also because our society - increasingly multicultural, complex, individualistic and competitive - has made it more and more difficult to live peacefully and in solidarity. In this sense, the third pillar comprises an education *in solidarity identity* that effectively recognises the human person as *a being in relationship* and *alterity* as a constitutive dimension of this identity, therefore forms a whole with it and with *intercultural education*.

This is the perspective advocated on several occasions in my earlier publications of 2002 and 2015, which I hereby quote in the English version: “the acquisition of the identity in solidarity is the passport to a new humanity” (Chang 2015, p. 29) in the 21st century, highlighting a threefold need: “a) to rediscover the *ontological solidarity* as a support to the same concept of *identity*; b) to consider the *otherness* as a constitutive dimension of identity; c) to pass from the concept of *ontological solidarity* and of *otherness* to a pedagogical-didactic consideration of the *identity in solidarity*” (p. 32); “It is a question of recognizing everyone and, in everyone, the dignity of the human person and to consider them as another ‘self’, by which the ME must remove the other from the inanimate world of things, from the condition of being an object, and therefore giving them the dignity, the integrity and the strength of their own presence” (p. 42).

An inclusive school - *for/of/with* all - involves *intercultural education*, an educational-didactic principle that was developed especially in the mid-twentieth century, which is particularly urgent today.

Our societies, now multicultural throughout the world, have been for years now dealing with the problem of integrating immigrants, as attested by publications, study meetings, and international and national guidelines. The topic of intercultural education is vast and has a copious bibliography and ratified experiences. The efforts made, especially on the level of reflection, about *living together* and in harmony, in democratic and culturally diverse societies, indicates a yet far-reaching goal. Intercultural

education aligns perfectly with the content of the third pillar of education for the 21st century: *Learning to live together*, since it requires “an understanding of other people and an appreciation of interdependence - carrying out joint projects and learning to manage conflicts - in a spirit of respect for the values of pluralism, mutual understanding and peace” (Delors, p. 97).

In this sense, intercultural education can be said to be about promoting and acquiring the knowledge, attitudes and skills necessary for living together. The challenges to this objective are obvious, especially when one looks at the enormous socio-political difficulties raised by the phenomenon of immigration. It should, however, be recognised as the principle of Ph. Renard: “Working together to learn to live together, with respect for different cultures and languages, is the role of education in the 21st century” (p. 11).

In the CEC document entitled *Educating for intercultural dialogue in Catholic schools. Living together for a civilization of love* (2013) intercultural dialogue is understood as an “encounter between different people, an open and dynamic comparison [which] helps to understand the differences [...] becoming [...] an opportunity for mutual enrichment and harmony” (Introduction). Considering it as a central challenge for the future, the document states: “Education, by its nature, requires openness to other cultures - without the loss of one's own identity - and acceptance of others, [...] it is essential that young people learn, through scholastic and academic experience, theoretical and practical tools that allow them to gain greater knowledge of others and of themselves, of the values of their own and other cultures” (Introduction).

The issue of integration/inclusion of migrants is closely connected to that of democratic citizenship. The Council of Europe in 2016 considered this reality by publishing a contribution entitled: *Competences for Democratic Culture. Living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies*. The text emphasises that the acquisition of citizenship competences by all is fundamental and that intercultural dialogue is to be understood not so much and not only as awareness of and respect for the diversity existing between individuals and groups of diverse cultural backgrounds, but rather as collaborative mutual enrichment, in the sense of learning, planning, working together, avoiding causing or increasing social inequalities and cultural disadvantage.

The aforementioned text offers a clear conceptual framework on democratic competence and intercultural competence, listing a series of objectives, divided into 4 categories is the result of a careful analysis of the 101 existing conceptual frameworks:

- **Values** – Valuing human dignity and human rights – Valuing cultural diversity – Valuing democracy, justice, fairness, equality and the rule of law;
- **Attitudes** – Openness to cultural otherness and to other beliefs, world views and practices – Respect – Civic-mindedness – Responsibility;
- **Skills** - Self-efficacy – Tolerance of ambiguity – Autonomous learning skills – Analytical and critical thinking skills – Skills of listening and observing – Empathy – Flexibility and adaptability – Linguistic, communicative and plurilingual skills – Cooperation skills – Conflict-resolution skills;
- **Knowledge and critical understanding** – Knowledge and critical understanding of the self – Knowledge and critical understanding of language and communication – Knowledge and critical understanding of the world: politics, law, human rights, culture, cultures, religions, history, media, economies, environment, sustainability (2016, p. 7).

The realisation of these objectives, obviously, involves and challenges both formal and non-formal and informal education, as well as demanding, together with the guarantee of implementing coherent school reforms, adequate training for teachers and all those who work in the educational sector, *a fortiori* parents, who are primarily responsible for education.

It is important, however, to note that at the root of the problems emerging in multicultural societies and massive immigration lies the fundamental issue of education, which has the task of promoting lifelong *life skills* that are integrated and refined over time.

The 46th ICE essentially reaffirms the following key competences for learning to live together,

namely: “1. Learning to learn (which is described in a program as “lifelong learning” but is basically learning to learn); 2. making relevant and effective use of communication technologies; 3. science education, including mathematics, of course; 4. social skills, skills for living together, tolerance and empathy” (p. 14).

The list is similar to the *8 Key Competences for Lifelong Learning - Council Recommendation of 22 May 2018*, which is a revocation of the 2006 list. Here is the new framework of 8 types of competences revised taking into account the complexity of contexts and functions: 1. *Literacy*; 2. *Multilingualism*; 3. *Numerical, scientific and engineering skills*; 4. *Digital and technology based competences*; 5. *Interpersonal skills, and the ability to adopt new competences*; 6. *Active*; 7. *Entrepreneurship*; 8. *Cultural awareness and expression*.

Is noteworthy, in this regard, the proposal of D. L. Grossman that of which: “The experts reached consensus on eight citizen characteristics that constitute the traits, skills and specific competencies that citizens living in the 21st century would need if they were to cope with and manage the undesirable trends, and cultivate and nurture the desirable ones. In descending order of importance, these are:

- The ability to look at and approach problems as a member of a global society.
- The ability to work with others in a co-operative way and to take responsibility for one’s roles/duties within society.
- The ability to understand, accept and tolerate cultural differences.
- The capacity to think in a critical and systematic way.
- The willingness to resolve conflict in a non-violent manner.
- The willingness to change one’s lifestyle and consumption habits to protect the environment.
- The ability to be sensitive towards and to defend human rights (e.g. The rights of women, ethnic minorities, etc.).
- The willingness and ability to participate in politics at the local, national and international levels” (2008, pp. 40-41).

Is certainly not lacking, therefore, the proposals for quality *transformative learning*. To achieve this, of course, it is necessary for the individual countries to commit themselves to drawing up specific guidelines and instruments, a sign of a political willingness that effectively actualises the right to education in all its demands, that is, inclusive, attentive to *all* and *each one*, therefore of *quality, integral, solidarity and intercultural*.

Let it be clear, in all said, that in the face of the anthropological question, always in the limelight and always in need of serious and convincing investigation, we must once again start from a convergence on the vision of the human person. On this foundation, built in synergy, it will be easier to inculcate respect for the dignity of every human person, its intrinsic relational nature, and the resulting interdependence between persons and peoples, and it will be easier to promote peace, harmony, solidarity between human beings, between human groups, between peoples: all these themes are at the very centre of the goals of the United Nations and UNESCO, obviously of the magisterium of the Catholic Church.

5. AN OPEN CONCLUSION: LEARNING TO LIVE TOGETHER AS LEARNING TO LOVE

Faced with the aforementioned current situations not only of wars and organised violence but also of epochal climate catastrophe, we cannot remain indifferent and selfish without reflecting on what to do.

As we have seen, there has always been no lack of international and ecclesial guidelines for an improvement in human civilisation, especially through the UN and Unesco on the one hand, but also through the Magisterium of the Catholic Church on the other.

The examination of international documents carried out so far leads to the conclusion that all so-called 'educations to', such as education for all, quality education, *inclusive, solidarity-based, integral, intercultural, lifelong education* ecc..., are fundamentally ways, conditions, strategies for learning to live together. Similarly, the principle of inclusion is not realised if not by cultivating the authentic love of

each person in relation to others, and of each institution in relation to other institutions. Love, in other words, is a channel/ instrument that concretely demonstrates the effective and unconditional respect for the equal dignity of every human person, of all people and cultures.

Believing that all men and women are part of the same family, in fact, presupposes that they are called upon to have an authentic and rich experience of love in families - the first resource to be restored, of course -, the place where we learn to love others starting from the selfless love, we receive gratuitously from those through whom we are brought into the world.

The plight of disintegrating family relationships and domestic violence reveals the paradox that while all human beings need to experience being loved in order to learn to love and live in peace and harmony with others, unfortunately certain lifestyles - centred on individual success, selfish competitiveness, the pursuit of the ephemeral and wealth, etc. - contradict this aspiration and make human beings *less* human. Suffice it to think how much the very word *love* is often emptied of its true meaning. To educate them is properly to promote the human in every person.

As educators, we must cling with conviction to the *necessary utopia* of learning to *live together*, understood as the task and vocation of every single human being and of humanity as a whole. Let it be clear that this utopia is most effectively realised by *learning to love others as oneself*, a fundamental *ethos* that runs through history. Answering the question put to him on the first of the commandments, Jesus said: "The first is: "Listen, Israel. The Lord our God is the only Lord; therefore, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength". And the second is this: "You shall love your neighbour as yourself". There is no other commandment more important than this" (Mc12, 29-31).

Learning to live together, which entails *learning to love*, begins, for example, with our most basic act of greeting. In this regard, R. Petrella, political scientist and economist, is right when he says that the starting point for *another* education is to set as a priority objective of the school system: "learning to know how to say good morning to others". According to the Author, "to say good morning to the other" means, precisely, that the education system has the task of teaching each citizen to: "recognising the existence of others», "learning about democracy and how to live it", "learning about solidarity" (2000, p. 50, 52. My translation).

The progress of a society is measured by the degree of attention given to marginalised people. So, rather than merely proclaiming the principle of inclusiveness, it is necessary to take action to make this principle a reality by promoting - through education - *a positive view of the other person*, exercising justice fairly, ensuring that human rights are respected, which is to say, loving others as our brothers and sisters. That's what the Bible says. This is why the loss and disregard of God's lordship and the commandment of love in the search for our true happiness creates a chaotic world in constant struggle, despite the reminders and guidelines offered by international bodies such as the UN and UNESCO in particular.

Learning to live together, then, *because* we are called to love in the sense intended by Karol Wojtyła (1920-2005) – future Pope John Paul II - in his lecture *Love and Responsibility* (1960), that is, *to desire the good of the other*. He has some wonderful writings on love, for example: "It is not enough to desire the person for one's own good, one must also, and above all, desire the good of the other person. This orientation of the will and the feelings, altruistic par excellence, is called by Saint Thomas 'amor benevolentiae' or 'benevolentia'. The love of one person for another must be benevolent to be true, otherwise, it is not love but only selfishness. [Benevolence is selflessness in love [...]: "I desire you're good", "I desire what is good for you". A "benevolent" person desires this without thinking of himself, without regard for himself. [...] It is love that perfects its object to the utmost and succeeds in realizing in the most perfect way both the essence of the object and that of the person to whom it is directed" (p. 539. My translation). Here love is linked to and nourished by Christian charity: "Love is patient, love is kind. It does not envy, it does not boast, it is not proud. It does not dishonour others, it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no record of wrongs. Love does not delight in evil but rejoices with the

truth. It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres" (I Cor 13, 4-7).

This brings us back to the urgency of recovering the meaning of education in our time and for our time, that is, the effort to *promote the integral growth of the other person from the point of view of a solidarity-based identity* "that expresses the truth about man, about God, about the world, and thus about their relationships" (Chang, 2002, p.111). The title of the volume of Sh.Turkle - *Alone together. Why expect more from technology and less from each other* (2011) - makes us think much. On the other hand, we must not underestimate the positive capabilities of being alone (Arnett, 1998).

In conclusion, one can endorse what is stated in the document of the Congregation for Catholic Education (CEC, today: Decastry for Culture and Education), *Educating for Intercultural Dialogue in Catholic Schools. Living together for a civilisation of love*, or rather, the "crucial and strategic link that binds 'love of education' and 'education to love' as essential elements, inseparably connected to each other, in which the gaze of the educator and that of the educant are mutually oriented towards the good, respect and dialogue" (CEC, 2013, n.47).

Only a real and integral education, therefore, can guarantee the achievement of the goals of *living together* and building coexistence on the pillars of the pursuit of the common good, mutual love, respect for all and true inclusion. Does it remain a *utopia*? We prefer to believe it is a *necessity* and, as professionals in education, we want to take it on as a challenge to be achieved with the logic of gradual and progressive steps, respecting the rhythms of all, but with the determination of those who are not discouraged in front of difficulties and problems. Because we know not of any other effective way to achieve real fraternal and solidarity-based human coexistence.

The capacity to love, as has been said, begins in the family. This means that love is learned from an early age, even in the prenatal period. In our society, where human life is increasingly losing the recognition of its inviolable value, the discourse developed so far may seem far from the common interest, but a positive and constructive epochal change and historical turning point worthy of man and his dignity cannot ignore it, but must keep it actively in mind. *To be synodal* in the willingness to rebuild, so as not to perish blindly together, is the commitment that challenges each one of us without exception, called to be aware of our interconnectedness and interdependence.

I believe that the international commission that drafted the third UNESCO Report, entitled *Reimagining our Future Together*, is fully aware of this. The active will of all of us in different capacities: How do we want to change the world, as a commitment and implementation of the principle of lifelong learning? In addition to the *World Education Reports* (1972, 1996, 2021) - translated into various languages - UNESCO, at the behest of the United Nations and together, has launched various educational policy initiatives for a better world. The current Pope Francis published this year the second part of the encyclical "Laudato Si": "Laudate Deum". The need not only for a *systemic vision of life*, but also for a *synergetic* effort between each individual and with the institutions, becomes clear: "We must learn to live together as brothers or perish together as fools" (M.L. King, 1964).

NB: The text is largely the translation of the article – *Imparare a vivere insieme. Una sfida educativa chiave per il nostro tempo / Learning to live together. A key educational challenge of our time* - published in 2017 in the *Rivista di Scienze dell'Educazione* [Journal of Educational Sciences, Rome] (55)1, pp. 67-84. Given the current situation that risks a third world war, the proposal of the article, with some appropriate additions and updates, becomes even more pressing and thus the reason as to why it is translated into the most common language. My special thanks to Obiejesi Mary and Kinyanjui Jane (past pupils of Pontifical Faculty of Educational Sciences "Auxilium" - Rome) who have collaborated for translation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ainscow, M. (2009a). Developing inclusive education systems: what are the levers for change?, in UNESCO–BIE, *Inclusive Education: the Way of the Future: 48 ICE Final Report*. Annex Xb. (ED/MD/104 CLD 2447.9), 70-73.
- [2] Ainscow, M. (2005b). Developing inclusive education systems: What are the levers for Change?. *Journal of Educational Change*. 2(6), 109-124.

- [3] Ainscow, M. & MILES, S. S. (2008). Making education for all inclusive: Where next?. *Prospects*, 1(38), 15-34.
- [4] Barbier, J.-M. (2012). L'école inclusive: apprendre ensemble pour vivre ensemble. *La lettre d'opinion de l'APF*, n°13: *Réflexions et orientations de l'Association des paralysés de France*, p. 2. <http://www.Reflexe-Handicap.org>
- [5] Bauman, Z. (2012). *44 letters from the Liquid Modern World*, Polity Press.
- [6] Chang, H.-C.A. (2002a). *School and education for an identity of solidarity*. Roma, LAS.
- [7] Chang, H.-C. A. (2015b). *For a School that Never Fades. Rediscovering the Role of School Education in the 21st Century*, Saarbrücken, Scholars' Press.
- [8] Congregation for Catholic Education (2013). Educating for intercultural dialogue in Catholic schools. Living together for a civilization of love. <http://surl.li/qflgp>
- [9] Council of Europe (2008a). White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue. <http://surl.li/qflhc>
- [10] The Council of Europe (2010b). White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue. <http://surl.li/qflhc>
- [11] European Council (2016c). Competences for democratic culture. Living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies. Executive summary. <http://surl.li/qfmdr>
- [12] The Council of Europe (2016d). *Competences for Democratic Culture. Living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies* - Executive summary. <https://edoc.coe.int/en/human-rights-democr...>
- [13] Council Recommendation of 22 May 2018 on Key competences for lifelong learning. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2766/569540>
- [14] Daniel, J. (2001). Learning to live together: a priority challenge at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Prospects* 3(31), 263-268.
- [15] Delors, J. (Ed) (1996). *Learning: the treasure within*. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century. Paris, UNESCO.
- [16] Faure, E. (Ed) (1972). *Learning to be. The World of Education today and tomorrow*. Paris, UNESCO.
- [17] Grossman, D. L. (2008). Democracy, citizenship education and inclusion: a multi-dimensional approach. *Prospects* 1(38), 40-41.
- [18] Heung, V. & Grossman, D. (2007). Inclusive education as a strategy for achieving education for all: Perspectives from three Asian societies, in Baker, D.P. & Wiseman A.W. (Eds), *Education for all: global promise, national challenges*. Elsevier JAI Press, 155-180.
- [19] Meirieu, Ph. & Frackowiak, P. (2009). Can education still be at the heart of a social project (5th ed), *La Tour d'Aigues (France)*, Éditions de l'Aube.
- [20] King, M. L. (1964). We must learn to live together as brothers or perish together as fools, speech at St Louis. *St Louis Post-Dispatch* 23 March.
- [21] Mancini, R. (2019). *Utopia. From the ideology of change to the experience of liberation*. Gabrielli publishing.
- [22] OECD-CERI (1996). *Lifelong Learning for All*. Paris.
- [23] Petrella, R. (2000). Education is the victim of five pitfalls. *About the Knowledge Society*. Montreal, Editions Fides.
- [24] Renard, Ph. (2001). General report. UNESCO-BIE, *International Conference on Education. 46th session - Final report (Geneva, 5-8 September 2001)*, 11-14.
- [25] UN. Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESS) 2005 - 2014.
- [26] UN. Declaration Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development 2016-2030. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
- [27] UN (2015). Equitable and inclusive quality education and lifelong learning for all by 2030. <http://surl.li/qfmfg>
- [28] UNESCO-BIE (2001a). International Conference on Education. 46th session – Education for All for learning to live together: contents and learning strategies – problems and solutions <http://surl.li/qfmfx>
- [29] UNESCO (2001b). Learning to live together. *Prospects* 3(31) (with 11 contributions).
- [30] UNESCO-BIE (2001c). International Conference on Education. 46th session - Final report.
- [31] UNESCO-IBE (2003d). Learning to live together: have we failed? <http://surl.li/qfmhb>
- [32] UNESCO-BIE (2003e). The Guide to Learning to Live Together; Determining good practice in education for EFE. <http://surl.li/qfmht>
- [33] UNESCO (2006f). Guidelines for inclusion: ensuring access to education for all. <http://surl.li/qfmkm>
- [34] UNESCO-BIE (2008g). Inclusive Education: the way of the future. Conclusions and Recommendations (ED/BIE/CONFINTED 48/5 Geneva, 28 November 2008).
- [35] UNESCO-BIE (2009h). Inclusive Education: the Way of the Future: 48th ICE Final Report (ED/MD/104 CLD 2447.9).
- [36] UNESCO (2009a). Investing in cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue: UNESCO world report. executive summary. Document code: CLT.2009/WS/9 Collation.

- [37] UNESCO (2015b). Education for All 2000-2015: achievements and challenges. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232581>
- [38] UNESCO (2015c). Rethinking Education. Towards a Global Common Good? . <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf00...>
- [39] UNESCO (2021d). Reimagining our futures together: a new social contract for education. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379707.locale=en>
- [40] Wojtyła, K. (2003). *Metaphysics of the Person. All philosophical works and supplementary essays*. Edited by Giovanni Reale and Tadeusz Styczeń, Bompiani. 1040.

Ausilia Chang Hiang-Chu, Doctor (PhD) of Pedagogical Sciences, Pontifical Faculty of Educational Sciences "Auxilium", Rome, Italy;

ORCID ID: 0009-0000-4971-5662

Address: Ausilia Chang Hiang-Chu, Via Cremolino, 141, 00166 Rome, Italy.

E-mail: achang@pfse-auxilium.org

Received: January 13, 2024; **revised:** January 19, 2024; **accepted:** February 03, 2024; **published:** March 18, 2024.

Чанг Хіанг-Чу Аусілія. Вчимося жити разом. Ключовий освітній виклик нашого часу. *Журнал Прикарпатського університету імені Василя Стефаника*, **11** (1) (2024), 25-38.

Прагнення навчитися жити разом / з іншими вважається ключовим освітнім викликом нашого часу; викликом, від якого ми не можемо відмежуватися, оскільки це є обов'язковим завданням для всіх без винятку. На основі матеріалів деяких міжнародних організацій - зокрема, ЮНЕСКО та Ради Європи - автор зосереджує увагу на необхідності навчати людей жити разом у культурі прав людини. Автор представляє безстрокову програму ЮНЕСКО "Освіта для всіх" як спосіб жити разом і розглядає інклюзивну освіту, забезпечення якості освіти, інтегральну освіту та освіту для підтримки солідарності як шлях до майбутнього, а також міжкультурну освіту як стратегію спільного життя. Автор підсумовує, підкреслюючи, що ці перспективи, а отже, і та ж сама "Освіта для всіх", повинні стати на шляху навчання любові, щоб досягти успіху, звертаючись до найбільш вразливих верств суспільства, включаючи біженців, які постраждали від війни, стихійних лих і бідності. Це постає як глобальний виклик сьогодення, якого бракує у вже досліджених перспективах, і який, здається, рідко враховується поза католицькими колами. Зважаючи на теперішні обставини, які супроводжуються не лише війнами та організованим насильством, а й грандіозною кліматичною катастрофою, сьогодні вкрай важливо наново відкрити глибинну сутність освіти та педагогічного споглядання, яке просвітлює освітні зусилля, дотримуючись людської гідності. Безсумнівно, перспективи подальшої діяльності пов'язані з прищепленням принципів спільного життя з раннього дитинства, сповіданням демократичних цінностей, сприяння толерантному співіснуванню, миру і солідарності, поважаючи і просуваючи фундаментальні права всіх людей. Незважаючи на складні ситуації, які спостерігаються в усьому світі, це бачення може здатися недосяжною утопією, але воно залишається важливою метою на майбутнє.

Ключові слова: вміння жити разом, освіта для всіх (ОДВ), міжнародна конференція з освіти, інклюзивна освіта, якісна освіта, виховання солідарності, інтегральна освіта; міжкультурна освіта, виховання любові.