This year, the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL), the only institute in the United Nations system wholly devoted to lifelong learning, marks its seventieth anniversary. It is a significant anniversary for the International Review of Education – Journal of Lifelong Learning (IRE), since the institute (then the UNESCO Institute for Education) was responsible for reviving the journal in 1955 and continues to edit it to this day. As early as 1953, UNESCO and its new institute, under the leadership of its first director Professor Walther Merck, had identified a need for an international education journal and, rather than create a new one, decided to revive a periodical which had ceased publication four years before. Just as the choice of Germany as host country for the new institute was significant and symbolic – a statement of UNESCO’s commitment to humanism, democracy and reconciliation in a country lately torn apart by fascism – so too was the decision to renew a publication which had likewise successfully emerged from under the shadow of National Socialism.

Professor Friedrich Schneider, then of the University of Cologne, had founded IRE in 1931, and, with co-editor Paul Monroe, quickly turned it into an important forum of comparative education. A critic of Nazism, he was removed from his position in 1935 and replaced by Alfred Bäumler, a prominent supporter of the new regime and one of the individuals “responsible for crafting and intellectually legitimising Nazi racist ideology” (Epstein 2018, p. 7). The journal became a mouthpiece for Nazi ideologues, at that time a pervasive influence in German universities (eight of the twelve men who attended the Wannsee Conference in 1942 held doctoral degrees), losing its global credibility in the process (ibid., p. 9). When the regime began to collapse, so too did the journal, only to be relaunched and renumbered by the indefatigable Professor Schneider in 1947.

Anniversaries, particularly those that mark the creation of an organisation or institution, are usually a time for celebration. But they are also moments for reflection, not only on the past, but also on the values that shaped it and their continuing relevance. Certainly, the work of UNESCO and UIL has changed, as has the world in which they operate, but the commitment to humanism, peace and
multilateral collaboration has remained the philosophical core, if not always the heartbeat of the work. Maren Elfert (2018) describes how revulsion at the horrors of totalitarianism, the mass killings in the name of racist and anti-Semitic ideologies, and the misuse of science and education in this terrible cause, shaped the thinking of some of UNESCO’s founders, leading them to affirm distinctively humanist missions for education, culture and science. They took the view that the purpose of education should not be indoctrination or “the reproduction of social class or racial hierarchies” but “to bring out [people’s] full potential and make them ‘fully human’” (ibid., p. 58). Member States recognised that education was a human right, something with intrinsic rather than instrumental value, directed, in the words of the United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to “the full development of the human personality” (UN 1948, Article 26), and committed to providing “full and equal opportunities for education for all” (UNESCO 1945). UNESCO’s constitution notes that

the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfil in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern (ibid.).

The UNESCO Institute of Education (UIE) was formed to deliver against this commitment. Its creation in 1952 was a significant milestone in UNESCO’s promotion of international understanding and peace. The institute was conceived by UNESCO not only to contribute to social renewal in post-war Germany, but also, from its unique base in what was then West Germany, to function as mediator between Western and Eastern countries during the Cold War (Elfert 2013). UIE would help overcome Germany’s intellectual isolation and contribute to its democratisation, while supporting intellectual understanding and cooperation across physical and political borders, between East and West. UIL’s location in Hamburg was therefore not merely a matter of geographical convenience or political expedience; it was a quite deliberate attempt to contribute to and help shape the process of renewal in its host country in line with its emancipatory, humanistic vision of “education for all”. The extension of UNESCO’s work into Germany was therefore a priority for the organisation, albeit one strongly opposed by some of the Member States that suffered most in the war (ibid.). The mandate of the institute was defined as: “establishing contacts between educators in Germany and other countries … without prejudice arising from national, racial or cultural differences”, and “to participate in the work of UNESCO … to maintain peace in the world and to carry out educational programmes for international understanding” (UIE 1952, cited in Elfert 2013, p. 269).

Equally important to the emerging character of the new institute was its early attention to the education of adults, though it was not for some years that this would become the distinctive focus of the institute, giving way, eventually, to lifelong learning, which it did much to conceptualise (in fact, as Elfert notes, it was IRE founder and UIE Governing Board member Friedrich Schneider who “anticipated lifelong learning when he suggested that the institute should be
concerned with all age groups and that boundaries between different fields of education should be avoided altogether” [Elfert 2013, p. 268]). However, these areas of focus – which for some time jostled for the attention of the institute with early years education, languages and psychology, among other themes – were not what gave UIE its distinctive early focus. As Maria Montessori noted in a speech before the first meeting of UIE’s Governing Board in 1951:

If the Institute is justified in existing, then it is only in pioneering a new path for education, that is to say one for education as a support to the inner life of man [sic] … the school should not be the objective of this Institute but people, the whole person, and this person begins at birth (Montessori 1992 [1951], cited in Elfert 2013, p. 268).

This focus on the intrinsic value and development of the human being was what the institute’s founders emphasised. Its later prioritising of adult education and lifelong learning, and the ways in which these terms were understood, were manifestations of this overarching commitment, which might be termed a kind of aspirational golden thread running through all its work, and indeed that of UNESCO.

IRE was established as the International Education Review (Internationale Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft in German, Revue Internationale de Pédagogie in French) in 1931 as a forum of international comparative education at a moment when there was not a single chair of comparative education at any university in Germany (McIntosh 2002). Friedrich Schneider was a pioneer, the leading German comparativist of his time (Epstein 2018), who saw himself as creating “a systematic basis for the new discipline” of comparative education (McIntosh 2002, p. 1). Following the dark period of co-option by the Nazi regime, during which its content became steadily more propagandistic and less international in focus (though, for a time, Bäumler sought to retain its credibility and reputation, maintaining Monroe as co-editor), Schneider returned as editor in 1947, disowning the issues published between 1935 and 1943. Convinced of the need to “bring the world back to religion” to prevent a return to war, Schneider prioritised articles with a Christian orientation (ibid., p. 8). The journal published until 1951 when it temporarily disappeared from circulation.

It re-emerged in 1955, under the aegis of UNESCO and UIE, which included Schneider among its Governing Board members (he was also co-editor of the revived journal). The editorial of the revived journal’s first issue promised to “provide a meeting-place for men and women from every country whose thoughts and actions deserve the attention of educationists throughout the world” and undertook to “inform readers as to educational theory and practice in various countries” and “to explore the extent to which such ideas and activities have elements of validity that transcend national boundaries” (Bigelow et al. 1955, quoted in McIntosh, p. 9). It has continued to publish ever since, latterly adjusting its focus to prioritise articles on lifelong learning (acquiring a new subtitle – Journal of Lifelong Learning – in the process), in line with the new focus of the institute, which became the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning in 2006, one of seven fully-fledged UNESCO Category 1 institutes of education.
The change in name reflected the institute’s long-standing focus on adult and non-formal education. Since the publication of the Faure report in 1972 (Faure et al. 1972), the emphasis of the institute’s work had shifted markedly to what was initially referred to as “lifelong education”. Interest in adult education and lifelong learning has fluctuated a great deal in those 50 years, with the term “lifelong learning” successfully co-opted by people and organisations with a quite different set of values to those traditionally espoused by UNESCO and UIL. As Gert Biesta notes, Faure’s explicitly humanistic and democratic approach to education … is hardly recognisable in contemporary discussions, in which the right to permanent education … seems to have been replaced by the duty to continue to learn throughout one’s life (Biesta 2021, n.p.; italics added),
the main purpose of which “is for individuals to keep themselves employable in fast-changing labour markets” (ibid.).

It is fair to say that the humanistic, rights-based vision of education and lifelong learning has lost significant ground over recent decades and that, in some respects, the process of retrenchment continues. As Elfert argues, it has been difficult to resist the predominant economistic narrative of the value and purposes of lifelong learning, now pervasive in national education policy discourse almost everywhere in the world. While the language of “lifelong learning” and “the right to education” continue to be invoked, they have seemed, at times, “to have been reduced to empty catchphrases that have lost their meaning” (Elfert 2018, p. 10). Learning for purposes other than employability or economic advancement has been marginalised to the point where it appears in policy documents as an afterthought, a dutiful recognition that learning has other functions, even if we do not choose to support them directly.

There are, however, some positive signs of resistance and even of an attempted resurrection of the “utopian” humanistic understanding of education and lifelong learning promulgated by UNESCO. The United Nations’ Secretary-General’s report, Our Common Agenda (UN 2021), for example, calls on the world to “re-embrace global solidarity and find new ways to work together for the common good” (ibid., p. 3), including by forging a new “social contract anchored in human rights” between governments and people and within society (ibid., p. 6). This social contract, the report argues, should include the protection of the “global commons” and “formal recognition of a universal entitlement to lifelong learning and reskilling, translated into practice through legislation, policy and effective lifelong learning systems” (ibid., p. 28). Similarly, the final report of UNESCO’s Futures of Education initiative, Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education (ICFE 2021), demands

a new social contract for education to repair injustices while transforming the future … grounded in human rights and based on principles of non-discrimination, social justice, respect for life, human dignity, and cultural diversity. It must encompass an ethic of care, reciprocity, and solidarity. It must strengthen education as a public endeavour and a common good (ibid., p. iii; italics added).
The golden thread and the common treasury

The report was acknowledged in the vision statement (Guterres 2022) of the United Nations’ Transforming Education Summit (TES) held in New York a few weeks ago, which reiterated its call for a “truly transformative education” able to “promote the holistic development of all learners throughout their lives, supporting them to realize their aspirations and to contribute to their families, communities, and societies”, to instil curiosity, creativity and the capacity for critical thinking, and to “nurture social and emotional skills, empathy, and kindness” (ibid., p. 2). These reports deploy a distinctive moral vocabulary that largely eschews the language of private benefits, competition, economic development and markets in favour of a richer lexicon that values solidarity, cooperation, equity and inclusion, community, public value and the common good.

This welcome change in language is, of course, precipitated by the crisis in education and the wider crises of the COVID-19 pandemic and the climate emergency. As the TES statement (Guterres 2022) argues, the pandemic crisis has only confirmed what we already knew: education systems are no longer fit for purpose. It has become obvious that we cannot continue as we are. Business as usual just means things getting worse. The Futures of Education report (ICFE 2021) notes that the co-option of the language of education and lifelong learning by the forces of neoliberalism has been “to the detriment of solidarity, understanding our interdependencies, and caring for each other and the planet” (ibid., p. 11). We have come to accept, as Biesta puts it, that the dynamics of global capitalism are “facts of nature”, a hegemonic “common sense” in which some things are sayable and others are not (Biesta 2021, n.p.). In recent decades we have witnessed a kind of enclosure of knowledge and language – the intellectual and educational equivalent of the privatisation of vast swathes of common land begun in post-medieval Europe and exported to the rest of the world through colonial conquest and enslavement. Education has been commercialised and corporatised, with institutions at every level persuaded to behave like businesses in competition with each other. Students meanwhile have been encouraged to think of themselves as customers in a marketplace. Decades of neoliberal hegemonic advance have left us with a meagre toolbox of ideas – markets, competition, employability, skills, league tables and performance targets – hopelessly unequal and ill-fitted to the challenges of our times. Yet, they seemed, for a long time, to be all we had. It was as if we had forgotten why, really, we did what we did, whether as learners or teachers, or how to connect authentically with our supposed core values of cooperation, democracy, equity, inclusion and solidarity.

These recent reports attempt to restore this wider, more holistic sensibility to our thinking about education. They reframe education not as a private benefit with purely or primarily instrumental value, but as a public good with intrinsic value that should be available to all on an equitable basis. We should not be under any illusions about what this means. Reclaiming education in this way would be a radical political act, akin, we might say, to the resistance of the Diggers of the seventeenth century (one of numerous radical political movements to emerge from the English Civil War) who rejected the enclosure of property and the loss of the commons and sought to cultivate waste ground near London, land they believed to be common. The land, their leader Gerrard Winstanley argued, was a part of the “common treasury”, which, he said, belonged to all, “beasts, birds, fishes, and man” (they did
not limit their ethical concern to humans) and not just “one branch of mankind” to whom the rest of us were obliged to rent ourselves out (Winstanley 1649).

In contemporary terms, we might think of the commons – our common treasury – as a protected space for natural and cultural resources that are essential to human life and community (the common good) and should be accessible to all, where exclusion and the operation of market forces and profit-making are illegitimate (these are resources that cannot be turned into commodities). Rather than petition parliament, the Diggers took direct steps, implementing their vision of a fairer, more just social settlement through their actions. Like modern-day advocates of commoning and the commons, they saw this shared, collectively cared-for space, accessible to anyone on the basis of need rather than wealth, as a way of transforming social relationships, fostering cooperation and liberating people from their dependency on employers and the state, while deepening their relationship with the land (as custodians rather than owners). One of the criticisms of the interventions of international organisations is that they offer no roadmap or guide as to how transformation can be achieved, or even how political will, for the most part deeply inimical to radical change of this sort, can be galvanised or redirected. The gap between the idealistic vision statements of international organisations and the reality of implementation can be so wide as to give those who read them a sense not of hope but of despair.

Nevertheless, the reports offer a serious rebuke to the privatisation of the educational space, proclaiming education to be a “common good”, a “public endeavour” which is essential to our daily lives and should be cooperatively run by and for the community as part, if you like, of an enlarged commons. These aspirations are welcome, but it remains to be seen how or whether they will be delivered and in what form. It is important that we see the world differently – but how do we begin to remake it? How do we move from the vision to the creation of a new, reframed commons that includes not only habitable land, breathable air, clean water, electricity and so on, but other resources currently subject to the rules of the market such as lifelong learning and education, cultural and intellectual resources (the knowledge commons), health and social care, and digital tools and resources (the digital commons)? Will reports like Reimagining our futures together (ICFE 2021) and events like TES suffer the same fate as the Faure report and, indeed, the Diggers: monuments of hope and resistance remembered principally for their failure to turn the tide?

It is easy for national governments to pay lip service to ideas of solidarity and cooperation and the common good in education, while in practice embracing economism, instrumentalism and market logic in their policies. I suspect that real change, if it comes at all, will come from elsewhere. But it remains to be seen how the gap between these high-level interventions and the activists and grassroots educators who are accomplishing change on the ground can be bridged. There is little prospect of governments leading change unless people are prepared to demand it, and perhaps do more than simply demand it. When it comes to moving political will, it is the only form of accountability that really matters.

The response to the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated that rapid change is possible. Our work, educational and social lives were transformed almost overnight. And while, in some parts of the world, we seem to be sleepwalking back to
normality, the potential benefits of some of these changes to people’s lives and to the environment should give us pause. The picture, however, is complex. Change must be inclusive and deliver on the international community’s promise to “leave no one behind”. The first two articles of this issue show how the COVID-19 pandemic has shaken things up in education, while highlighting the need to do some things differently and in a more equitable, sustainable way.

“The COVID-19 pandemic, the Sustainable Development Goals on health and education and ‘least developed countries’ such as Nepal”, written by Kapil Dev Regmi, considers how the pandemic has affected the public health and education sectors of the world’s poorest 46 countries (the so-called “least-developed countries” or LDCs). Placing his considerations in the context of the pandemic’s impact on the world’s pursuit of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’s 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the author explores the historical, political and economic causes of the long-standing underdevelopment of LDCs’ public health and education sectors, before examining how the international support mechanisms created for the achievement of the SDGs have been affected by the pandemic, especially in the areas of health (SDG 3) and education (SDG 4).

Taking Nepal as an example, Regmi finds that three main factors have hampered sustainable development, both before and during the pandemic: (1) the privatisation of health and education; (2) a lack of governmental accountability; and (3) dysfunctional international support mechanisms. He argues that “market fundamentalism” – the belief that social and economic problems can be solved most effectively and efficiently by the free market – has been one of the key factors responsible for the failure (a) of health and education systems in LDCs to respond adequately and inclusively to the crisis, and (b) of the international community to collaborate effectively in ensuring fairness and preventing vaccine capitalism. Despite these failings, he writes, market fundamentalism continues to be seen as “key to the success of international collaboration”, while strong democratic governance is perceived as a threat. The article concludes with an appeal for more egalitarian global collaboration and full accountability of LDC governments for the well-being of their citizens in the joint effort to achieve a sustainable recovery from the pandemic.

The second item in this issue is a research note entitled “Educational inequalities in France: A survey on parenting practices during the first COVID-19 lockdown”. Its author Romain Delès also highlights how the pandemic has exposed and exacerbated existing inequalities in education. He describes how parental support practices during lockdown in France differed strongly depending on social background. Using a survey and a series of interviews conducted during France’s first two-month lockdown in spring 2020, the author argues that limiting explanations for social inequalities in homeschooling to a digital divide is simplistic. The pedagogical dimensions of social inequalities in children’s educational achievements must also be considered. While the survey indicated that parents spent roughly similar amounts of time each day on school support, irrespective of social class (in fact, working-class parents spent slightly more time than did their middle-class and upper-class counterparts), working-class families made less use of techniques for structuring school time. They were also less likely to set their children complex exercises that required skills acquired in
other subjects, or to use alternative learning materials to those proposed by teachers. Deleès concludes that working-class parents tended to follow the instructions of teachers more closely, while middle- and upper-class parents were “more active in creating their own activities”. This strongly suggests that inequalities broadly attributed to a digital divide are in part due to differences in educational support.

The next article examines another important dimension of inequality. In “Examining barriers to participation in further and continuing education in Germany: Why a regional perspective is (still) important”, Thomas Howard Morris, Bastian Steinmüller and Matthias Rohs consider a peripheral region of Rhineland-Palatinate in western Germany. This area’s annual participation rate in continuing education is low compared to other geographic areas in Germany, despite a need to raise the population’s general level of education to meet the local economy’s demand for skilled workers. The authors designed a quantitative study to understand: (1) To what extent do adult learners engage in continuing education within their habitual lifelong learning process? (2) Which circumstantial factors influence their participation in continuing education? and (3) What are the barriers hindering their participation? They found that, for two-thirds of adult learners, a precondition for their enrolment in a continuing education course was the satisfaction of both work-related factors, such as support and flexibility in terms of time or funding, and private life-related factors, such as flexible starting points and split curricula. The authors’ findings point to the need for flexible study programmes which learners can fit to the demands of both their work and their personal life.

The fourth article in this issue, “School attainment, family background and non-curricular activities: Reproduction of or compensation for social inequality?”, written by Rafael Merino, Albert Sánchez-Gelabert and Arnau Palou, focuses on social inequalities in non-curricular activities (NCAs) at school and the impact these have on young people’s school performance. Based on research conducted in Barcelona with 2,156 10th-graders (students aged between 16 and 19), the authors consider the association of participation in NCAs with academic outcomes in the context of social stratification. As well as showing how the choice of NCAs differs according to gender, immigrant background and family education level, their findings indicate that these activities have an impact on academic performance, and that this effect is amplified when the family educational level variable is introduced. The biggest impact occurs among students whose parents’ highest level of education is compulsory education. If students in this social group do not participate in NCAs, their grade point average is associated with the worst performance among young people in Barcelona. On the other hand, if they take part in sports or artistic activities, their grade point average is the highest in their social group. NCAs offered by schools therefore have the potential to compensate for the inequality gap, the authors argue. The article concludes with recommendations for socio-political and educational intervention, at the level of schools and the educational community, as well as for policymakers.

Our final article considers the impact of the acquisition of improved cultural competence on professional development in the health care sector. In “Designing narrative for professional development: A programme for improving international health care practitioners’ cultural competence”, Alison Short reports on a
purpose-designed narrative scenario-based professional development programme targeting experienced practitioners of Guided Imagery and Music (GIM) therapy. The programme focuses on these therapists’ cultural competency in terms of their ability to effectively deliver health care services that meet the social, cultural, and linguistic needs of their patients. Continuing professional development is increasingly required across all health fields, and particularly for established clinicians who can find it challenging. The growing focus on person-centred health care, which engages patients’ active participation in their therapy, can require practitioners to change ingrained practices and approaches to achieve improved health outcomes. This article describes how the author developed and delivered the workshop, using the pedagogy of continuing education, scenario-based learning and narrative-based learning materials to engage and challenge a community of practitioners. To capture participants’ reactions and evidence of applied new thinking, she used Brookfield’s Critical Incident Questionnaire (CIQ). Her analysis of the data, which provided feedback on the training scenario and the group discussion materials, found that the workshop was effective in challenging clinicians to think differently and to approach cultural issues in new ways, as well as to plan the application of their newly acquired knowledge to their everyday practice. Participants noted the importance of sharing stories and learning collaboratively, with some remarking an “inner shift” in their understandings of themselves and others.

This last article offers an interesting reflection on the use of some of the principles of adult education in promoting reflective practice and critical thinking. This is important and valuable work. The promotion of critical thinking has long been identified as a core part of adult education practice and we need it now more than ever. It is important because it provides the basis for activism, advocacy, solidarity, democracy, active citizenship, political engagement and collective action – all of which are essential requirements of transformation.

The vision of the United Nations’ recent Transforming Education Summit, like that of the numerous “transformative” visions that have preceded it, will inspire many stakeholders, but its successful implementation ultimately depends on the actions of the nation states to which it is addressed. The focus on national governments is understandable, of course, and, in a way, necessary, but it seems to me, increasingly, that change will not come from here. Nation states have, after all, had decades to fashion an adequate response to the climate crisis, but have failed, quite miserably. Politicians have become practised at making the right noises, but, for the most part, they are compromised by their own short-term interests, by lobbyists, donors, ideology, the media, and a welter of other things that matter far, far less than the existential crisis we are now facing.

UNESCO’s emancipatory, humanistic message is still relevant, even in the context of the Anthropocene. It is right that education should prioritise human dignity and flourishing and that it should be seen as having an important role in fostering citizenship and democratic values, within a wider context of care for the planet. However, its apparent re-emergence can only be a start. It is critical now that these messages are heard beyond the high-powered lobbyists and high-level officials. They need to inspire and inform the right people – the modern-day Diggers, those disrupters, activists and change agents who are using education to empower communities, resist the logic of free-market expansionism, and drive transformation in their own places and spaces.
rather than simply asking politicians to make better policy. These are the people who will foster the kind of change the planet needs, if such change is to come at all. In UNESCO’s emancipatory tradition, we should see education as a means of empowering them to embody the kind of change they want to see in the world, rather than the change demanded by the wealthy and powerful.
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