PETER GSTETTNER
VLADIMIR WAKOUNIG

INTERCULTURAL LEARNING AS A TOOL FOR LIVING TOGETHER IN A DEMOCRACY BASED ON RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

1. Rebuilding Europe by learning from the past

The developments in Europe which only recently provided a reason for general rejoicing and euphoria now give cause for alarm. The rebuilding of the "Common European Home" has exposed remnants of old ruins which are clearly not good foundations for democracy. The rebuilding process has also highlighted the new walls springing up where individuals and groups seek to trace borders around their identities and anxiously safeguard them.

While these attempts at demarcating identities continue, new buzz-words and phrases such as "Europe of the regions" or "European ethnic group rights" are being floated into the general atmosphere of insecurity. This not only stirs hopes for further possible development of the "Common European Home" but also reveals the actual democratic deficits of Western European states and the sore points of representative multiparty democracy. Our insecurity must make the countries of Eastern and Southern Europe which we in the West like to classify as being "on the road to democracy" well aware that all is not well with the ways things are done in Western democratic states and that the latter are hardly suitable for unquestioning duplication and emulation.

The "failure of the state" is the term now applied to cases where the state frequently demonstrates its inability to come to grips with the causes of problems of social inequality and to produce forward-looking economic and social structures. States show a decided "inability to act" when faced with developments with ecologically catastrophic implications. We only have to look at the helplessness and inactivity of political and state security institutions in finding some kind of effective countermeasures against ever more brutal criminal attacks on foreigners and asylum-seekers, anti-semitism which is worringly on the increase in both Western and Eastern Europe, growing racial harassment of Sinti, Romanies and other "foreign" groups, to see that the capacity of states to govern and direct in the areas of society and democratic politics is clearly underdeveloped.

While some claim that this potential for racial violence is limited to a small and radical minority and can be "explained" by national chauvinism or inborn instinct, others take the view that it is a "scandal" for democratic society and draw parallels with the pogroms of the so-called Kristallnacht of 1938. Those warning that "militant chauvinism" is growing into an "international edpidemic on a global scale" include Lev Kopelev who in February 1990 issued an urgent appeal to Western democratic states to put Eastern European countries on the right track to critical self-enlightment and international understanding: "Use the knowledge and experience you have drawn from (German) history to help them find their own way back to the truth and true human understanding. A precautionary anti-nazi clarification is now needed, as a matter of life and death on both sides of the fence." (An abridged version of his letter is published in: KOENEN / HIELSCHER 1991, p. 11-13)

This comment is a strong indication that, if countries and regions are to develop an open, multi-ethnic identity and a deep awareness of the meaning of fundamental human rights, enlightened learning in democratic states must always be based on objectives designed to combat racism and fascism. Kopelev's comments are also relevant to the context of our discussion, in that anti-fascism, in the sense of "learning from one's own history", is part of a programme of enlightment which is currently not placed very highly on the West's syllabus. Even in our country, the history of human rights infringements is rather more suppressed than taught. Descriptions of the systematic annihilation of minorities and individuals in the Third Reich are neglected, the state-legitimised racism of the fascist dictatorship is regarded rather as an "accident of history" and the perpetrators and accomplices of the system of that time are now seen as its "first victims". Views which discredit the objectives of anti-fascist education benefit right-wing extremists who go one step further, interpreting anti-fascism as an attempt at re-education. For these people, who clearly wish to learn nothing from the past, the fascist education system of the Third Reich is just as much a model for today as the militant anti-communism and anti-bolshevism of the day which the nazis used as a pretext for their bloodthirsty pillaging throughout the European continent.

2. The need for decentralisation and democratisation

The collapse of the great Eastern power-blocks and mega-states has also made the notion of the state as an over-powerful and untouchable body of control and regulation popular in the West. This notion is also the reason for the disillusionment with the state experienced by many citizens, who are above all shut out by increasingly bureaucratic processes and growing central power in party apparatus and political decision-making bodies and are now turning to territories which are more local and more familiar to them. But alternatives to established control by central state bureaucracies are hardly likely to be found in proclaiming one's differences, drawing up territories and adapting the aforementioned state control to regional politics.

Demands for the functional and geographical decentralisation of state and political institutions are doubtless justified; nevertheless, comparing decentralisation and democratisation and equating "Europe of the regions" with "Europe of human rights" would be disastrous since one does not guarantee the other. Bureaucratic meddling and everyday indoctrination through decrees and laws will not be stopped by decentralised "Europe of the regions" but will continue to tie up free interactive space for the open promotion of understanding, exchange and interrelationships in red tape. In education, in any case, adherence to the constitutional line,whose decrees and paragraphs have, in our region, restricted minority rights to a specific territory and firmly fixed ethno-political language boundaries even in school education, is a clear indication of the unbroken "lawyers' monopoly" in the field of communication between human beings. This is just another obstacle in the struggle for conflict-solving understanding and the concrete exercise of learning for human rights.

The objective of introducing democratic processes which imply individuals' increased involvement in social developments and greater freedom to decide on their own living conditions, must also seek to protect everyday life from

further state meddling (particularly as far as areas of interethnic relations and understanding are concerned) - even when prescriptions and decrees of this nature have "only" local or regional significance. Freeing the areas in which people can interact with one another from alienating regulations and threatening sanctions must be a priority task, even if the high priests of politics pretend that such new laws are aimed at remedying some of the above-mentioned democratic deficits or claim to be making amends for the state's inability to act.

The current focal points of social and ethnic conflits in Europe show that it is the very countries which flew the colours of decentralisation and local autonomy whose reaction has been most typical of a national state and central power: new state boundaries are being defined or old ones revised, national guards and territorial armies are being armed, nationalistic historical myths are being revived, the numbers killed by fascist genocide and ethnic destruction are being totted up for either side, "property rights" are validated and others presumed and so on. Moreover, current examples, which we assume to be common knowledge, demonstrate that those newly created regions or states laying claim to the freedom to run their own foreign policy in respect of neighbours and their own home affairs with regard to minorities, have neither the mechanisms required to resolve conflicts nor an evolved method for information exchange and much less so any coordinated levels of interethnic understanding. This leads us to the following hypothesis: if we leave the "Europe of the regions" to those who sound off loudest in populist terms and push their ideas hardest, then the result, in all probability, would be anything but peaceful and transfrontier "Europe of human rights".

3. The disastrous orchestration of nationalism

Wishful thinking and future promises contrast with a reality where borders are being defined and the true meaning of "openness" and "autonomy" made clear. This reality is typified - both in East and West - by the political orchestration of a dusted-off nationalism and the closely related struggle for independence. The taking up of the "national cause" is also seen as the answer to the progressive multicultural nationalisation of Europe, and in such a way that the answer is taking the form of pressure to believe in nation from above and of a highly emotional local patriotism pushed from below. The "right of self-determination of the peoples" is played off against the "protection of human rights from the viewpoint of the potential victims" (Gyoergy Konrad). The "right of self-determination of the peoples" is regarded as an effective and politically legitimate tool with which to create ethnically homogeneous territories. When "majority democracies" reach for this tool, their action is certainly rather more immune to criticism than was the case for previously fallen single-party dictatorships.

Nationalism (more in the East) and similarly federalism with a national flavour (more in the West) do not change the fact that the political elite have, and are holding on to, the monopoly over power, which is another reason why there are no structural changes in the "organised dissatisfaction" (Dieter Senghaas) in society. The basic structure of man's mastery over men, of dominance and subordination, of command and obedience is obscured by new national consciousness and by the self-conscious hooray-patriotism of the "Europe of the regions", but has become no less effective for all that. Neither the politically

active or those affected by their activity seem to realise what they are doing and what is happening to them.

The political function of the media-driven and recurrent seizure of the supposed "fundamental right" to self-determination of the people is quite clear: transregional, transfrontier education policy aims and duties, such as bilingualism and peaceful coexistence on the ground, intercultural learning as a means of getting to know one's neighbours and building links between peoples, ethnically mixed teaching in open schools, etc, is being withdrawn from broad politico-social thematics, dismissed and classed as an "also-ran".

4. Europe is breaking up as we speak

Developments in the crisis areas of Europe show that notions of regional autonomy with a national flavour have worked their way into a position from which they can be used to demand new boundary demarcations, create new reserves for ethnic minorities and reformulate images of the "enemy". Both the strengthening of ethnocentric self-awareness and the creation of new power-monopolies within regions (local summary courts, territorial armies, regional armed forces and security organs) fall neatly into the old structure in which one group fought for power and supremacy over another. National ideals do not therefore mirror those of democracy. It is rather more the case that "nationalism and democracy are qualitatively two different and unrelated things. Nationalism is a conglomerate of feelings whereas democracy is a from of government" (O'Brien 1991, p. 37). If this is true, then nationalism cannot be regarded as a purely functional means of founding a state identity and loyalty which can be switched off as soon as its task is complete.

The advent of a notion of "Europe of the regions" is indicative of the education policy deficiencies of this concept. What is lacking here is precisely what is needed to master current conflicts and build lasting peace, i.e. the demilitarisation and defusing of violent conflicts involving nationalities and minorities in the regions. It is typical of the current trend towards regionalism that its advocates fail to mention the prominent role of solidarity in a changing Europe, solidarity in the form of support for initiatives on the equal distribution of wealth, for programmes aimed at erasing images of the "enemy", for the implementation of intercultural learning and for the fight against racism in everyday life.

Looking into the future, we can see - and this is still less of a threat to peace in the West than it is in the East - that the revival of nationalism is bringing the risk of expansionist tendencies with it. And these tendencies are not only destabilising but also a very real threat to peace. The unification of Germany sparked worries among German nationals in Austria that they had been left behind in a small country. Other fears were probably stirred in other neighbouring countries. Additional comments such as "in the new Europe, no stone will rest on another" (Joerg Haider, FPOe federal party boss, in an interview printed in the AULA, Volume 12/1990, p.18) are not exactly calculated to build faith in the free play of national forces in the reconstruction of Europe.

The danger of a lasting or recurrent destabilisation of security and peace in Europe is further reinforced by the predominant policy of "ethnicisation". The policy of ethnicisation, ie the diversion of frustrations arising from economic inequality and social misery into nationalist conflict, is the ideological foundation for discord, disputes and war between neighbouring peoples and regions. The

pattern of military intervention to settle issues of national and hegemonious rivalry on a given territory then becomes accepted.

From this perspective, the much-vaunted new European order seems to be tantamount to playing with fire, risking rekindling national instincts and myths born of blood and soil which were thought to have disappeared a long time ago. Today, this zeitgeist of the extreme right is offensively manifested and popularised by right-wing European politicians whose number includes the liberal-nationalist top echelon of the FPOe. They are joined by a voice from the so-called liberal-nationalist camp in Austria: "Something has been suppressed and stereotyped for over seventy years and is now powerfully and quite natural-ly refinding its voice and demanding its right to live. That something consists of the peoples and tribes who wish to live in their own way, with their own blood traditions on their own land. This is an evidence and also a human right!" - that is the view of the editor of the AULA (Volume 9/1990, p.3), Werner Widmann, who also collaborates on the Kaernten FPOe party newspaper "Kaerntner Na-chrichten". What this man is getting at with his "human right to blood and soil" is not too clear, but he certainly believes (and would like to think) that the "Europe of the regions" should in no circumstances be multicultural, since "multicultural" is equated with "infiltration by foreigners" and "melting pot".

5. Intercultural learning is not a concept for political action

Many see the concept of "intercultural learning" as a magic formula which is suddenly on everyone's tongue and even frequently used by those in favour of the segregation and exclusion of minorities. Owing to the ubiquitous appear-ance of intercultural learning in current socio-political issues and discussion, there is an increasing danger that people will lose sight of the real, intended and potential meaning of this concept.

We feel that this is all the more reason to rethink the possibilities and limita-tions of intercultural learning from a critical viewpoint. Intercultural learning is no remedy for the failures of political strategies and acts which are the responsibili-ty of those that govern. Nor must it be interpreted as a political procedural concept useful for the study and solution of structural questions and social problems. Intercultural learning can have little effect on social realities if those who act on a political level do not show willing to break down economic and social inequalities existing between different sectors of the population and reverse the tendency to push minorities to the fringe of society. The needs of the people who cannot lead decent human lives in a multicultural society, who are discriminated against because of their colour, threatened because of their social and political status as refugees or foreigners, cannot be palliated or satis-fied by relying on pedagogically sourced intercultural concepts. In a society founded on a constitution which permits racist and xenophobic activities and measures and does not guarantee social and legal equality for immigrants or foreigners, calls for calm and tolerant coexistence with these so-called outsiders go unheeded.

6. Intercultural learning and human rights

Our seminar too, with its set objective of discussing the theme "Intercultural learning for human rights", has its limitations and restrictions, particularly with

regard to influencing political structures which ultimately govern the coexist-ence of different peoples with laws and decrees.These limitations in terms of political infuence do not however mean that we should withdraw into our expert shells and bemoan our helplessness in the face of discrimination and xenopho-bia. On the contrary, we feel it all the more important when discussing the topic of "Intercultural learning" to abandon the narrow self-image of conventional pedagogical circles. The intercultural learning concept, which serves as a basis for a new model of society emphasising human values and guaranteeing human rights, must be introduced as an institutional practice which promotes the consideration of others and other lifestyles. Efforts made in intercultural learning will bear no political or pedagogical consequences unless measures to combat incitement to hatred and incrimination of minorities are immediately considered and put into effect.

A democratic multicultural society must be built upon universal republican values, as is the case with human rights. However, states and countries which build their self-image on the "national identity" cannot proceed on the assump-tion that human rights are available to all their citizens. The coexistence and unity of people in a national state are not governed on the basis of human rights but on the basis of so-called communities of origin which are ethically defined.

Since intercultural learning communicates universally applicable values which become valid only when recognition is given to a nation or ethnic community, it is incompatible with nationalism of any tenor. Whereas intercul-tural learning - in its true sense - attempts to build identities through human values and human rights, the process resulting from the national identity approach involves "the division of ingroup and outgroup and the corresponding enhanced esteem of one's own nation." (PFAHL-TRAUGHBER 1990, p. 94.).

Political and pedagogical concepts centring on the consolidation of "national membership" are a smoke-screen for the fiction of cultural purity and unity. The thought processes of intercultural learning demand a departure from this fixed view. This is why particularly those who strive for a homogeneous society graded from a national point of view see intercultural learning as a threat to "national unity". The introduction of intercultural principles means that the conventional models of hierarchy based on identifying individuals with the "state nationals" or the majority population must be dropped. Neither being a state national, nor proof of state citizenship nor assimilation of individuals to "sets of values" held dear by state nationals can be criteria entitling people to enjoy basic rights. The ONLY criterion for intercultural learning must embrace human values and human rights.

Intercultural learning seeks the causes of inequality, rights violations and dis-crimination. The best way to fight against disregard for human rights is to high-light cases of inequality in society and its institutions and make an issue of them. Intercultural learning is often perceived as an unpleasant, oppositional form of education, a pedagogy which does not yield to political hierarchy but calls it into question.

7. Learning to live in peace and without violence

One of the most important tasks of intercultural learning is teaching people to live in peace, to adopt the values of non-violence and social justice. Wars and acts of violence happen first in people's minds before becoming reality. It is a

fact that foreigners, immigrants and minorities live in a constant state of threat and discomfort in nearly every country. This finds its expression not only in forms of institutionalised violence (such as being expelled from one's accommodation or being sacked from one's job) but also personal violence (taunts, attacks, murder). Declarations of war on foreigners harboured in the minds of the native population are above all triggered and fed by the tendentious statements and distorted interpretations advanced by politicians and the mass media. Foreigners are rendered responsible for criminal deeds, they are blamed for environmental pollution and the dereliction of our cities, they are accused of taking jobs from the native population. Phrases such as "flood of immigrants", "tidal wave of asylum-seekers", "too many foreigners", "infiltration" etc are to be found in the daily vocabulary of political agitators. They are battle-cries, vehicles of hatred and an incitement to people to perpetrate violence upon those who have been stigmatised with these phrases.

Intercultural learning must oppose such simplifying models of interpretation through the committed teaching of peace. Critical peace-oriented education is directed against social injustice and exposes the conditions which give rise to contempt, discrimination and intolerance. Appeals for peace made to individual peoples and peace negotiations will only be convincing if we are all made aware of socially unjust structures in our own society and these structures are eliminated. International peace missions in particular will only be credible if we strive for policies at home which guarantee peace for migrant foreigners or those seeking sylum.

Intercultural learning aspiring to educate people in the virtues of peace can only be effective on a social level if it reaches beyond the narrow confines of the conventional pedagogical remit. While it is true that schools from an important basis for all learning processes, education promoting peace and non-violence must be dispensed in all institutions providing education or further education and capable of influencing public opinion.

The level of democracy in a state will be measured by its investment in peace-oriented education and how and to whom it guarantees the right of peaceful existence. Despite the horrors of Auschwitz and the Holocaust, peace studies have never figured strongly in post-1945 education policy. We are now seeing the results of many years of neglect of peace studies in action. The failure of politicians in negotiations between hostile groups is certainly due to the fact that these politicians have themselves never benefited from peace studies and nor have they envisaged any in their educational progammes.

8. The role of the media within an intercultural public

Public media are among the influencing factors of society which have a lasting effect on the political climate and community life. Life in a multicultural society greatly depends on how the media respond to the new requirements of this society and what kind of image of the latter they present to the public. The way in which information is transmitted and presented is not free of constraints which are imposed by economic and political structures.

The image of multicultural society in the mass media closely reflects the expectations, "vision" and anxieties of those in power and is shaped by the predominant political pragmatism of the moment. Multicultural society oscillates between a "vision of horror", a "driving force in society" and a "means to com-

pensate for the ageing of the native population". In each case, such images are passed on to the general public with information on the conditions in which multiculturalism might be acceptable and which dangers it conceals. In this respect, even ethnic conflicts are considered as an effective product with which opinion-formers can influence the masses and demonstrate their strength and monopoly of definitions. There is certainly no shortage of examples which show how so-called conflicts of nationality are garrously passed on by the media, how wars and their outcomes are perceived chiefly as a result of media coverage. Xenophobia and racism should therefore be seen as the "consequence of a political and media-driven experiment with anxiety" (LARCHER 1991, p. 18).

It should be noted that the media make particular use of two types of reporting, both of them aimed at discrimination and segregration:

a) There is no reporting about foreigners and minorities. Their existence is ignored.

b) Any reporting concerning foreigners and minorities is linked to a specific problem. In this case, their existence is interpreted as a cause of social conflict, and they are downgraded to problem-cases and trouble-makers.

Media practices of this type wreck any attempts at intercultural communication. Even the interethnic relations and intercultural co-operation work which has been built up to a certain degree is under threat because many people do not wish to be equated with or named in the same breath as groups which appear only to cause trouble and to be "collective causes of social unrest" (HALL 1989). The implementation of intercultural relations will only be possible if the right to free self-expression and the right to transmit and receive information are guaranteed to all the people living in a country, and particularly to the groups which have been ignored or pushed to the fringe of society by the media for so long.

The greater the re-orientation of the media scene and media practices towards human rights and the promotion of human values, the stronger the possibility of implementing intercultural learning in a multicultural society. Such a re-orientation must take the following points into account:

* Access by individual minorities to the media must not be hampered, but actively encouraged. A protected area, free from commercial influence, must be created so that minorities, too, can run their own media in their own languages. The presence of minority languages in public media is useful in shaping the identity of contemporary society and helps preserve and further develop these minority languages.

* The equality of languages and cultures should be underlined with the promotion of bilingual and multilingual media (local radio programmes, newspapers and television brocasts). Multilingual media are a vital expression of the multicultural nature of a society. They help overcome the barriers to communication built by stereotyping. Furthermore, multilingual media provide a particularly good means of understanding one's own cultural narrowness and going beyond it.

* Those working in the media should be obliged to follow the principle of intercultural communication. In both media research and reporting, anything which discriminates against minorities, places them at a disadvantage or downgrades them to mere objects, must be avoided. In particular, critical media work should combat everyday racism and highlight the dangers of downplaying racist attitudes and acts.

* The trainig of journalists from individual minority groups should be strongly encouraged. Intercultural communication can only become a reality if the native or majority population gives up its cultural imperialism and policy of paternalistic representation and yields some of its power to minorities/foreigners. The latter must be given the means to express themselves, to forward their interests in intercultural matters and to pass on information to the public from their own viewpoint.

9. Multilingualism as a future educational concept for all

The unrestricted presence of bilingualism and multilingualism in society is one of the essential criteria for a democratically organised and constituted society.

The degree of importance which a state attaches to a minority language is an indication of current policy on language and minorities. Even in Western democracies, ethnic minorities and their languages are generally relegated to the fringe of society and implicitly urged to use the language spoken by the majority population.

Society's contempt for minority languages (eg the lack of education in minority languages, no multilingual signs, limited language skills of employees in the administration, etc) is an expression of political hierarchy and a subtle from of cultural and institutional racism (cf SKUTNAB-KANGAS, 1988).

Language does not only function as a means of communication. It builds and reinforces identities in every respect. Its significance in personal developement, the importance of its role in the development and stability of ethnic and cultural identities and its social status derived from its presence and use in the relevant public areas are unquestionable. In view of this fact, it is understandable that language policy has become a politically sensitive area. Development prospects for minorities greatly depend on the extent to which the measures affecting social structures are intended to undermine or support minority languages.

A modern educational and schools policy which serves the interests of human rights and prepares citizens for life in a multicultural society, must inevitably include the concept of bilingual or multilingual education. Today's national state-motivated curricula based on monolingualism, for example, are clearly unprepared for Europe. They make no provision for the teaching tolerance, openness and understanding. Qualification in several languages should therefore become a reality in all educational institutions (nurseries, elementary schools, secondary schools, universities, job training centres). And such a reality draws a clear distinction between the practice of ethnic segregation and linguistic classification and the principles of intercultural learning for human rights.

10. A Europe of human rights in perspective

A Europe without violence, a "Europe of human rights" is only imaginable in a multicultural Europe which has learnt the lessons of history and freed itself from internal and external boundaries, old and new. Meeting the accumulation of ethnic conflicts and racist outrages with national ideology and military armament (with multinational forces or a national guard or territorial army, it makes no difference) is just as wrong as a political build-up on both sides oriented

towards unilateral plans for autonomy and seccession. The only possible correct action is to introduce democracy into all areas of life and politics, and since history has shown us that, even in relatively well developed representative democracies, nationalism can reach unthinkable proportions, inevitably leading to schisms and violence, the introduction of democratic processes must abandon the practice of delegating power to the top on a voting machine basis.

Interethnic links, transfrontier meshing of autonomous movements (women's movements, peace movements, ecology movements, etc), a new intercultural openness, new forms of conflict settlement and levels of communication, guidance and pressure through international, transfrontier organisations, new negotiating bodies and arbitration courts to settle questions of denied human rights and racial discrimination and many other political innovations of this type will be necessary. It is essential that the countries formerly of the "Eastern Bloc" are also included in these deliberations, regardless of the stage they have reached in transformations into a market economy. The West must stop arrogantly defining these evolutionary steps as taking the "road to Europe", as these very countries illustrate how disastrous it is to believe that, with the introduction of free elections and a free market economy, national ambitions would be instantly fulfilled and old ethno-political scores could be settled. National popu-00lists and regionalists in the West have unfortunately omitted to point out this erroneous belief and draw the necessary conclusions from it.

It may well be, as claimed in a headline in an Austrian daily newspaper, that "multiculturalism does not win votes" (Der Standard, 14.10.91). But multiculturalism should not be held in check either. A correctly understood multicultural education is the right pedagogical solution to the challenges of the new Europe, in every respect.

Povzetek

MEDKULTURNO UČENJE KOT SREDSTVO DEMOKRATIČNEGA SOŽITJA NA PODLAGI ČLOVEKOVIH PRAVIC

Do pred nedavim je evropski razvoj ljudi navdajal z optimizmom in evforijo. Dogajanja v zadnjih dveh letih, predvsem pa v neposredni preteklosti in sedanjosti, so več kot vznemirljiva. Ob prezidavi " skupne evropske hiše", se vedno bolj kažejo stare razvaline, ki nikakor ne pospešujejo demokracije, marveč silijo k ponovnemu vzpostavljanju zidov in s tem k razmejevanju med raznimi skupinami in narodi. Razpad starih sistemov in mega-držav na vzhodu in jugovzhodu Evrope ni pomenil vzpostavitve demokratičnih struktur kot se je to napovedovalo in obljubljalo.

Aktualna žarišča socialnih in etničnih konfliktov dokazujejo, da sta se v deželah, ki so decentralizacijo in avtonomijo proglasile za svoj novi politični program, razpasla hudi nacionalizem in oblastni centralizem: začrtujejo se nove meje, oborožuejejo se nacionalne in teritorilane obrambe, oživljajo se stari nacionalni in zgodovinsko obarvani miti, obujajao se nove teritorialne zahteve , etnično čiščeneje postaja nova strategija genocida in etnocida. Vse bolj jasne konture dobiva domneva, da če prepustimo "Evropo regij" tistim, ki to najbolj glasno in populistično oznanujejo in jo hočejo uveljaviti, da potem po vsej verjetnosti v tej Evropi ne bo prostora za mir in človekove pravice.

Krizne regije v Evropi pa tudi potrjujejo, da nacionalni koncepti teritorialne avtonomije niso zmožne ohraniti mir in pospešiti demokratizacijo življenskih okoliščin. Čedalje bolj očitna postaja tudi puhlost ideje o "Evropi regij". Kajti ta je doslej brez vsakih vsebinskih zahtev po novih izobraževalnih konceptih, ki bi se naj osredotočili na ključne probleme mirovne vzgoje, demilitarizacije in reševanja nacionalnih in manjšinskih konfliktov.

Tipično za zagovornike trenutnega regionalizma je, da ob vseh teh socialnih in političnih spremembah nočejo govoriti o solidarnosti, o medse- bojnem podpiranju za pravičnejšo razdelitev ekonomskih resursov , o boju proti rasizmu in medkulturni vzgoji.

Medkulturna vzgoja ni nadomestek za zgrešene politične strategije. Tudi ni navodilo za političnea dejanja, za reševenje socialnih problemov in strukturnih vprašanj. Medkulturno vzgojo pojmujemo kot eno izmed možnosti , podpirati družbeni načrt, pri katerem gre za človekovo dostojanstvo in za upoštevanje človekovih pravic. Ta prizadevanja ostanejo tako poltično kot tudi pedagoško brezuspešna, če se obenem ne zoperstavimo kriminilaziranju in zaničevanju različnih manjšin.