

## EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

# Towards religious education for peace

Robert Jackson<sup>a\*</sup> and Satoko Fujiwara<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*University of Warwick, UK;* <sup>b</sup>*Taisho University, Japan*

### International Association for the History of Religions

This publication has developed from the session on 'Religion and Education', which was one of the highlights of the 19th World Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions (IAHR) held in Tokyo, Japan, in March 2005, attracting delegates from over 60 countries.<sup>1</sup> The session on 'Religion and Education' was intended to tackle directly the general theme of the 19th IAHR Congress, 'Religion—Conflict and Peace', one of the most urgent issues of our time. It was considered to be essential to reflect upon forms of religious education practised in different parts of the world (both within faith-based education, and publicly funded general education) which contribute to shaping the views of religion among the younger generation. The session also represented another widely shared concern of the conference, namely: what public roles can scholars of religion possibly play? The participants attempted not only to deepen theoretical discussions but also to find practical solutions to religious, ethnic and other conflicts and tensions in societies.

The 'Religion and Education' session turned out to gather a truly international audience. As with the plenary sessions, open to all participants, the session was highly successful in terms of the diversity of participants and audience. It was apparent that religious education was of keen interest to an international audience of academics, and that scholars in the field of religion are increasingly interested in educational issues at all levels.

The result of the IAHR session is this first publication in the study of religious education that includes both East Asian and western writers, from Korea, Japan, Indonesia, Israel, Germany, Spain, UK and the USA. So, what are the values of this new collaboration? In what ways can western and Asian discussions inform each other? What can Asian perspectives and examples bring in to on-going discussions of religious education?

To these questions, we would say, firstly, that this publication helps to redress a naïve assumption that religions exist harmoniously in Asia. This assumption can be seen both in the West and in the East. Many Japanese students, for example, believe

---

\*Corresponding author. Warwick Religions and Education Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK. Email: r.jackson@warwick.ac.uk

that contemporary religious conflicts take place only among monotheistic religions (in particular, Christianity, Judaism and Islam) and, therefore, are relatively remote from themselves. Similarly, westerners tend to over-generalize the Gandhian spirit of non-violence when looking at the East. Against such an assumption, our Asian contributors demonstrate that there are serious conflicts relating to religions in their respective countries. Even more importantly, they show that the types of conflicts and their causes are different from one country to another, even though they are all customarily categorized as 'Asian' or 'Eastern' or 'Oriental'. The assumption itself is a product of an us/them mentality, one of the causes of long-standing prejudice. Secondly, the Asian contributors, in particular the Korean and Japanese, also present cases which are relatively ethnically homogeneous yet religiously plural, in contrast to western discussions on religious education in which 'inter-religious' tends to coincide or overlap with 'intercultural' and 'interethnic'.

There may be, however, a more fundamental question. Considering differences in cultural and social settings, is it really profitable to know the situations of other countries (or even those of other regions of the same country, if legally different)? Is it not more often the case that solutions for one country's education do not work for another's? Whilst agreeing with Friedrich Schweitzer's advice about the pitfalls of comparative research (Schweitzer, 2006), we would argue that knowing other cases always helps in being critical of one's own presumptions about religious education. In addition, it is better for both educators and researchers to know how religions are taught (about) in other places of the world since generic issues related to plurality and globalization surface in every case. Also, intercultural education is not truly intercultural without an eye to diversities both inside and outside a country. Religious education, as a contributor to intercultural education for tolerance, needs to be in close dialogue with education for world peace, which can never be achieved by a single state.

Before turning to some of the themes raised by our contributors, we will give an outline of developments in the field of peace education, and of some of the pioneering work at the interface between education for peace and religious education.

### **The nature of peace education**

Peace education, or education for peace, is a broad, interdisciplinary field, a values-related dimension of the curriculum and of educational life rather than a discrete 'form of knowledge' (Hirst, 1965) or 'realm of meaning' (Phenix, 1964). While the theme of education for peace has been central to the pedagogy of some educational thinkers (Maria Montessori is a notable example), peace education, post Second World War, became closely associated with the work of the United Nations, initially aiming to eliminate the possibility of global extinction through nuclear war (a view still emphasized in Japanese peace education), but broadening its objectives over time to address the wider concern of establishing a culture of peace. In the words of one Council of Europe document: 'The culture of peace is considered to resist violence through the promotion of human freedom and dignity, equality and respect for life

and by introducing the learner to non-violent strategies, dialogue, mediation and non-prejudiced perception of others' (Duerr *et al.*, 2000, p. 40).

Central to developing a culture of peace was the exploration of UN statements such as the United Nations Charter and human rights codes, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the World Declaration on Education for All.<sup>2</sup> However, as the above quotation indicates, peace education is as much about self-understanding and interpersonal relationships as it is about dealing with issues of peace and justice in society or globally; personal and social issues are seen as interrelated.

Some educators in the field have concentrated on key concepts, skills and attitudes in promoting a culture of peace, combining self-awareness and personal skills with attention to key issues. Thus, the work of Dave Hicks (1988), influential in Britain, concentrated on concepts such as peace, conflict and war in relation to the value of justice, exploring issues such as power in relation to gender, race and ecological issues, with developing skills of critical thinking, co-operation, assertiveness and conflict resolution and with promoting attitudes of self-respect and respect for others, open-mindedness, ecological concern and commitment to justice.

Since 2004, an international academic journal dedicated to the field, the *Journal of Peace Education*, has been available. This publication sees peace education as aiming to achieve a non-violent, ecologically sustainable, just and participatory society. It invites contributions from areas such as education for or about conflict resolution, global issues, disarmament, environmental care, ecological sustainability, indigenous peoples, gender equality, anti-racism, educational social movements, civic responsibility, human rights, cultural diversity, intercultural understanding and social futures.<sup>3</sup>

### **Peace education and citizenship**

With the growth of interest internationally in citizenship education in recent years, peace education increasingly has been related to this field, regarded as an 'implicit' element (Gearon, 2003) or as in other ways related to it (Heater, 2001). A major Council of Europe project represents peace education as one of five dimensions of education for democratic citizenship, along with civic, intercultural, human rights and global (or world affairs) education (Duerr *et al.*, 2000, pp. 35–42; Jackson, 2007). Moreover, while considering them to be highly important elements of the school curriculum, proponents of peace education and citizenship education do not confine these areas to the classroom, regarding them as integral to school procedures, school ethos and out-of-school activities, and to relationships with parents and external bodies (Duerr *et al.*, 2000, pp. 42–3). These fields are also not confined to schooling, but are regarded as vital elements of education at all stages, and of educational governance (Duerr *et al.*, 2000; Bäckman & Trafford, 2006). This broader concern is reflected in some of the contributions to this publication, especially in relation to the procedures of higher education.

### **Peace education and religious education**

Education for peace has often been (and continues to be) a priority of religious and spiritual bodies (e.g. Tyrrell, 1995; Arweck *et al.*, 2005a,b; Harris & Morris, 2003; Nesbitt & Henderson, 2003; Said & Funk, 2003; Werner, 2005)<sup>4</sup> and for some individual specialists in religious education (notably the German theologian and educator Karl Ernst Nipkow, [e.g. Nipkow, 2003]). At the group level, one especially important contribution is Johannes Lähnemann's Nuremberg Forum, which links religious and inter-religious education, education towards violence-free communication and conflict resolution, environmental education and education for socio-economic development, all under the umbrella of peace education. The forum brings together NGOs such as the Peace Education Standing Commission,<sup>5</sup> a branch of the World Conference on Religions for Peace. Using the spiritual and ethical teachings of students' own religious traditions as a resource, peace educators help students to develop a new understanding of, and respect for, people of other faiths and backgrounds. Publications from the Forum include Lähnemann (2005).

While referring directly to peace studies or peace education only occasionally (e.g. Leganger-Krogstad, 2003, pp. 169–71; Tobler, 2003, p. 135), an international symposium on citizenship, education and religious diversity discusses many of the themes central to the concerns of peace education, including the relationship between values and identity issues at individual and social levels, participation in the democratic process and the agency and empowerment of students, gender issues, issues of environmentalism and globalization, the ideological manipulation of educational processes and the use of dialogue as a pedagogical tool (Jackson, 2003).

Education for religious tolerance is also closely associated with peace education. Here the work of the Oslo Coalition on Freedom of Religion or Belief is important, especially through its ongoing project on Teaching for Tolerance and Freedom of Religion or Belief (Larsen & Plesner, 2002; Jackson & McKenna, 2005).<sup>6</sup> Of course, the concept of tolerance needs critical attention. Fortunately, there are some helpful published discussions on some key questions. Is tolerance a fundamentally positive or negative idea in which 'those who are in a strong position tolerate those who are in a weaker one' (see Diez de Velasco's contribution to this publication)? Are there different 'weak' and 'strong' (Milot, in Council of Europe, 2006), or 'thin' and 'thick' (Walzer, 1994) varieties of tolerance? What are the sources for our ideas of tolerance (Afdal, 2006)? And what are the limits of tolerance (Gearon, 2006a; Moran, 2006a)? We now turn to the contributions in the present publication.

### **The ambiguity of 'religious education'**

By way of a preamble, some clarification is needed on the use of 'religious education' and related terms. This discussion of terminology is directly relevant to the theme of peace education, since several contributors see aspects of the political and organizational arrangements for religious education in their own countries as inhibiting or even precluding education for peace and justice. In England and Wales, 'religious

education' refers usually to the subject taught in state-funded community schools. This is not concerned with the transmission of religious culture from one generation to the next. Rather, its key goals are to promote knowledge and understanding of different religious traditions for all pupils in the common school, together with some reflection by pupils on what they have learned (QCA, 2004). Writers from England and Norway, for example, tend to use the term 'religious education' in this way while, in the new system of education in South Africa, to take an example from the southern hemisphere, the term is specifically avoided in the context of a pluralistic study of religions in schools, conducted according to human rights principles. Instead, the term 'religion education' is employed to avoid overtones of nurture, instruction or indoctrination (Chidester, 2006). Similarly, advocates of the study of religion in public schools in the USA point out that 'religious education', a term used principally in the private religious schools sector, would not be acceptable to describe the field (Grelle, 2006). French scholars, writing of the current debate about religion in schools in France, use expressions such as 'teaching about religion' instead of 'religious education' for similar reasons (Estivalezes, 2006). The contributors to the present publication write from education systems in different parts of the world. Writing in English, they all use the term 'religious education', but they operate with different, yet overlapping, ideas of the field.

### **Confessional and non-confessional religious education**

In the English-speaking literature, especially that from the United Kingdom, the distinction has often been made between 'confessional' and 'non-confessional' religious education, with 'non-confessional' corresponding to the kind of approach adopted in English state-funded community schools. The defining feature of confessional religious education is its assumption that the goal of the subject is to nurture faith and that its contents, and the development of curricula and teaching materials, are mainly the responsibility of religious communities as distinct from the state. The term 'confessional' is used differently in Germany, where it refers to systems of education in which the sponsoring organization (in collaboration with the state or a subdivision of the state—the *Länder* in Germany) is a religious body. It is important to make the distinction between these two meanings, since it is possible, as with some German *Länder*, to have a confessional education system but non-confessional religious education, in the sense of offering considered choice, rather than the intention of a particular outcome (Schweitzer, 2006).

Our contributors operate within various confessional and non-confessional contexts. However, an analysis of their views about religious education shows various shared or overlapping views. The simple binary confessional/non-confessional distinction, covering only one dimension, proves alone to be inadequate to distinguish sharply between different approaches to religious education. Other dimensions, implicit or explicit in the contributions to this publication, include views about the nature of childhood and the person (especially in relation to age and gender), individual and collective identity, local traditions and universal human

rights, and agency and autonomy as they relate to authority—whether of texts, leaders or traditions. Thus, it is possible to have a confessional approach in which religious education is taught from within a faith-based setting, and yet grants autonomy and agency to pupils. It is equally possible to have a non-confessional approach which includes dialogue between pupils, students or trainee teachers with different religious and secular outlooks. Views on the nature of childhood and the person determine what is possible pedagogically, especially in terms of whether young people are given a voice and in relation to the role of the teacher. For example, the views of Nelly van Doorn-Harder, in this publication, on dialogue within a confessional context in American higher education, have many features in common with Julia Ipgrave's (2003) work on dialogue in the context of non-confessional religious education in English community primary schools.

Our view is that all children should have the opportunity to learn about and engage with a plurality of religious traditions, including their own (if they have a religious background), as part of public education. Nevertheless, we join our contributors in recognizing the need for the development of more sophisticated ways of analysing different approaches to religious education, which transcend the simple distinction between confessional and non-confessional. As Gabriel Moran, an authority on religious education within the Catholic sector in the USA, has remarked:

I think there is a lot of good religious education being practised, most of it outside the spotlight. One can find examples in every continent, at every school level, in religiously affiliated institutions and secular education. The biggest need is to break down some of the categories which encapsulate these efforts and which prevent people from finding partners in trying to help people live intelligent, free, peaceful, faithful, loving lives. I am not surprised that we are still only at the beginning of religious education; its importance is still only emerging. In the future, religious education has to be inter-religious and international if it is to make sense of ordinary experience. Political leaders are going to need basic training in religious education to carry on the duties of national office. (Moran, 2006b, p. 48)

### **Peace education and the structures of religious education**

As noted above, several contributors see the structural and political arrangements for religious education in their own countries as militating against education for justice and peace. Criticisms are made of the operation of both confessional and non-confessional systems. For example, Satoko Fujiwara draws attention to the ideological use of 'teaching about religion' in Japan. She shows how an avowedly non-confessional programme can, in reality, be politically loaded. Fujiwara's analysis of the Japanese situation, in relation to what she argues to be the cryptic promotion of Shinto ethnocentrism, is one example of the ideological use of a supposedly non-confessional approach to the study of religion in schools (see also Fujiwara, 2005).

Similarly, in writing of the situation in Indonesia, the world's most populous Muslim-majority nation, Zakiyuddin Baidhawiy points out the government's apparent liberalism in including four official religions in religious education (Islam, Christianity, Buddhism and Hinduism), which cover most of the faiths of the nation. He explains, however, that this marginalizes Confucianism, excluded for its assumed

association with communism. Baidhawry thus argues that true religious freedom has not yet been achieved in Indonesian religious education, despite the Constitution's guarantee of religious freedom for all.

In discussing religious education in the Republic of Korea, Chongsuh Kim illustrates how a non-confessional, inter-religious approach's structural and organizational weaknesses allow subversion of the system. We might compare these examples with Joachim Willems' analysis of the subject 'Culture of Religions' in schools in the Russian Federation, where a supposed non-confessional subject can be used to promote nationalism and traditional Orthodox belief (Willems, forthcoming) or with James Nelson's account of the manipulation of choices within religious education in Northern Ireland (Nelson, 2004). Fujiwara and Kim, like Willems, also refer to issues of bias within textbooks in their countries, a particular expression of ideological manipulation at the level of schooling.

### **Tradition, authority and dialogue**

Our contributors share the view that students need to have knowledge and understanding of traditions other than their own. However, to do this, they need to deepen their understanding of their own background traditions, as well as learning to interpret the meanings of others. Contributors share the view that religious traditions themselves are plural, offering a range of spiritual and moral resources, expressed through traditional concepts, and that an understanding of plurality is a condition for overcoming stereotypes. Thus, Zakiyuddin Baidhawry, writing as a Muslim from Indonesia, argues that Islam, on the basis of its own cultural diversity, should develop a multiculturalist theology ready to respect religious differences within educational practice. Religious education, in the context of plurality, should emphasize dialogue and be supported by materials reflecting and supporting pupils' and teachers' diverse religious beliefs and practices.

Satoko Fujiwara, writing about Japan, reminds us that stereotypes, including essentialist views of culture and religion, as encountered in nationalist and Orientalist agendas, for example, are a major source of conflict and misunderstanding. Her appeal for education based upon a 'critical multiculturalism', which acknowledges the diverse, organic and fuzzy-edged nature of religious and cultural expression, is an important counter to the policies of governments who see multiculturalism one-dimensionally, as the affirmation of separate clear and distinct cultures within one society.

Writing from a very different geo-political situation, an Orthodox Jewish context in Israel, Deborah Weissman argues that children need to revisit their own tradition in order to uncover concepts and values that promote a more open and compassionate attitude to other human beings, thus aiding education for peace. In particular, she advocates the use of traditional stories, parables, aphorisms and songs, in order to 'inculcate a language of discourse about peace', and she notes that the other major faith traditions have resources from which they can draw in developing such an approach.

Friedrich Schweitzer is also concerned with tradition, being especially concerned to assist young people who have formed an eclectic religious or spiritual identity to engage in dialogue with others. In the German context, he observes that religious individualization, which has been taking place among young people, has lowered the barriers between most religious traditions, but not between Christianity and Islam. His empirical research shows that, despite their eclecticism, such young people tend to be intolerant and ignorant of Islam. For Schweitzer, the creation of a dialogue between these young people and Islam, in order to promote understanding and harmony, requires a deepening of their understanding of, and engagement with, their own background Christian tradition. Within the German system of religious education, Schweitzer suggests that this could be fostered by teachers who are able to relate young people's eclecticism to their own more focused and informed position. In Schweitzer's view, a dialogue between postmodern young people and teachers with a more mainstream Christian stance becomes an aid to pupils' dialogue with Islam. Schweitzer's practical solution should not be mistaken for a form of religious indoctrination, but it does raise questions about pupil autonomy, identity, the nature of dialogue and the interpretation of tradition, themes explored in the work of the Dutch scholar Wilna Meijer (2006).

The issue of authority in relation to religious education is a theme running through the contributions. The issue of who decides the content and processes of religious education is especially a key question. Chongsuh Kim notes that, in the South Korean situation, inter-religious dialogue has tended to be in the hands of religious leaders. However, recent developments in Korea have empowered and enthused teachers from different religious and spiritual backgrounds, who have been enabled to meet one another during professional training, and learn at a personal level about each other's traditions and values. Kim speaks of 'profound inter-religious dialogues' occurring during retraining courses for teachers. Kim also approves of such dialogue in the classroom, echoing the research and practice of European writers such as the Norwegian educator Heid Leganger-Krogstad (2003), Wolfram Weisse from Germany (2003) and Julia Ipgrave from England (2003), all of whom emphasize participative learning that gives agency to students (see also Jackson, 2004, Chapter 7).

Dialogue is also a key theme for Nelly van Doorn-Harder. Against a background of increasing polarization between adherents of different religions, she argues that information about religious traditions is inadequate to develop a genuine engagement with the beliefs and values of others. In developing her approach to religious education in a Christian higher education institution, she synthesizes ideas from inter-faith dialogue, peace education and human rights studies. Drawing on Wesley Ariarajah's views on dialogue as having the potential to build a 'community of conversation' or a 'community of heart and mind' she aims to enable students to transcend racial, ethnic and religious barriers and develop an understanding and acceptance of 'otherness'. As with Weissman, she sees the importance of students being well informed about their own traditions, but emphasizes equally the importance of gaining an empathetic understanding of others and the capacity to work collaboratively at the practical level.

In achieving all of this, she deals sequentially with human rights issues, which raise issues of freedom of religion or belief on a global scale, and then inter-religious issues, since a consideration of these facilitates communication within and across religions. The two taken together demand attention to issues of peace, so an exploration of concepts from peace studies (especially peace building) represents the final part of the sequence. Her emphasis is on student participation and developing ideas at the grass-roots level, and her students take the issues beyond the seminar room into and beyond the social and political life of their institution. She observes that her interdisciplinary approach can transform academic learning about religions and is especially suitable for use in confessional institutions. We would add that van Doorn-Harder's approach, suitably modified, has much to commend it for use in 'secular' schools and colleges.

While van Doorn-Harder, Fujiwara and Ursula King (in her response to the other contributions) rightly refer to human rights principles as a yardstick for appropriate policy and action (see also Gearon, 2006b), Francisco Diez de Velasco reminds us that such codes are, in effect, summaries of past, long deliberation. While being vitally important reference points, their conclusions need to be tested against more local traditional statements of value. Diez de Velasco's multireligious approach gives equal consideration to different expressions of religion, encouraging students to weigh local traditions and universal human rights against each other. In treating religious education as a 'laboratory for an education for peace', Diez de Velasco does not shy away from tackling difficult issues, and expects the subject to yield more long-lasting solutions to moral conflicts at the levels of religion and culture than by using human rights codes as unexamined sources of authority.

### Conclusions

Our contributors, both Asian and western, share with many specialists in peace education and citizenship education hermeneutical approaches that encourage children to develop a healthy sense of self-esteem, without denigrating the other, that link personal concerns of students to broader social and political issues at local, national and global levels, and help them to compare and contrast their own concepts and values with those of others. Many contributors, like their counterparts in peace education and citizenship education (Deakin Crick, 2005), wish to give students more agency and autonomy in exploring issues of value, in learning how to listen to others and to engage with difference. All object to the ideological manipulation of religious education by those operating in their own interests, rather than in the interests of children and young people. All wish to break stereotypes by representing religions in their diversity and complexity of cultural expression. Collectively the contributions illustrate the poverty of simplistic analyses that explain religious conflict in terms of a 'clash of civilizations'.

In our view, forms of religious education that exhibit these qualities, developing an understanding of religious plurality and giving students an opportunity to engage with religious values—including the values of peace—should be available to all in public

education. Where it is possible within the legal framework of 'state' education, approaches that encourage various forms of dialogue should be extended to 'secular' schools and colleges, where young people from any or no religious background can interact with one another (Ipgrave, 2003; Jackson, 2004).

Recently, the political philosopher Jürgen Habermas has advocated a reasoned engagement with religious language in the public sphere, arguing that religious people have a right to apply their beliefs and values to moral, social and political issues within the public arena, and that 'secular' people might learn from reflecting and deliberating on values and insights from religions, just as religious people might learn from a dialogue with the secular (Habermas, 2006). At the time of writing (October 2006), experience of the debate about 'multiculturalism' in Britain, characterized by a poor level of analysis by government ministers<sup>7</sup> together with injudicious remarks from national politicians and by reports in tabloid newspapers which reinforce stereotypes and foster an atmosphere of deep intolerance,<sup>8</sup> illustrates how difficult it is in practice to conduct such a public discussion in an informed, reflective and sustained way. However, our schools and colleges, at least in some education systems, offer one area of public space where such communication can take place in a civilized manner. Religious education can be a field for the exploration of human values in relation to the languages of religion or, as Diez de Velasco suggests, can become 'a laboratory for peace education'.

Such approaches to religious education, of course, require teachers who are well versed in the study of religions. Thus, it is gratifying that international bodies concerned with the academic study of religions have turned their attention to broader issues of religious education. The meeting of the IAHR in Durban in 2000 was the first to include religious education as a panel theme. The American Academy of Religion has also moved in the same direction and now has a task force dealing with religion and schools.<sup>9</sup> The community of scholars in the religious studies field continues to supply graduates who train to become teachers of religious education, and researchers who teach in universities. It is a positive step to find religious studies scholars taking a more direct interest in issues concerning religious education, especially as it relates to issues such as peace and conflict, in different contexts and at different levels. We would echo Ursula King's view of the relationship between religious studies and education for peace:

As scholars of religion interested in the relationship between religious education and peace, we have a responsibility to make available and share the results of our specialised research on the different religions of the world so that a wide range of objective information can be drawn upon to encourage and strengthen active peace efforts in different religions, societies and cultures. (King, this publication)

In conclusion, we reiterate that this publication is the first to bring together East Asian and western contributions specifically to the debate about religious education and peace education. We hope that it will stimulate more international debate and discussion, and especially will encourage more research and scholarship in exploring the relationship between the two fields.

## Notes

1. The idea of the session was initially suggested both by Susumu Shimazono, president of the Congress Secretariat, and by Hans J. A. van Ginkel, United Nations Under-Secretary-General and Rector of the United Nations University located in Tokyo, who supported the conference. Satoko Fujiwara, a member of the Tokyo Congress's executive committee co-ordinated the session, in collaboration with Robert Jackson, who was also planning a panel on religious education for the conference.
2. For the relevant web pages see (<http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/ch-cont.htm>), (<http://www.unhchr.ch/udhr/index.htm>), (<http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/e1cedaw.htm>), (<http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm>), and ([http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/JOMTIE\\_E.PDF#search=%22World%20Declaration%20on%20Education%20for%20All%22](http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/JOMTIE_E.PDF#search=%22World%20Declaration%20on%20Education%20for%20All%22)).
3. The *Journal of Peace Education* is sponsored by the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association. Details can be found at: (<http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/journal.asp?issn=1740-0201&linktype=1>).
4. See also the special issue of the American journal *Religious Education* on Religious Education for Peace and Justice (101 [3], 2006), the Australian *Journal of Religious Education* special issue on Religious Education for Tolerance (54 [3] 2006) and the issue of *World Religions in Education* (journal of the UK-based Shap Working Party on World Religions in Education (<http://www.shap.org/>)) on Human Rights and Responsibilities (2006/7). The 14th session of the International Seminar on Religious Education and Values, held in Villanova, Pennsylvania, USA in July 2004 was on 'Religion and Violence: The Role of Religious Education and Values' (see <http://www.isrcv.org/>). Selected papers from the conference are published in Astley, Francis & Robbins (2006).
5. See (<http://www.evrel.ewf.uni-erlangen.de/pesc/pesc.ppt#2>).
6. See ([http://www.oslocoalition.org/html/project\\_school\\_education/index.html](http://www.oslocoalition.org/html/project_school_education/index.html)).
7. The crude distinction between 'multiculturalism' and 'integration' made by the Prime Minister, Tony Blair, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Ruth Kelly, and others, takes a simplistic view of cultures as separate and bounded entities and ignores years of research and scholarship on different meanings and uses of the terms 'multicultural' and 'multiculturalism' (e.g. Leicester, 1992; Jackson, 1997, 2004; Modood & Werbner, 1997; Baumann, 1999; May, 1999; Rattansi, 1999; Parekh, 2000; Runnymede Trust, 2000; Modood *et al.*, 2006). The stated shift in policy away from 'multiculturalism' to 'integration' has been widely interpreted, especially in many parts of the media, as a statement of disapproval towards difference within society and as an appeal for cultural assimilation.
8. See, for example, 'Ban it!', *Daily Express*, 21 October, 2006.
9. See *Religion & Education*, 32 (1), 2005 for papers from the 2004 American Academy of Religion symposium on religious education held at the AAR meeting in San Antonio, Texas (<http://fp.uni.edu/jrae/Spring%202005/Spring%202005%20Issue%20Contents.htm>).

## References

- Afdal, G. (2006) *Tolerance and Curriculum* (Münster, Waxmann).
- Arweck, E., Nesbitt, E. & Jackson, R. (2005a) Common values for the common school? Using two values education programmes to promote 'spiritual and moral development', *Journal of Moral Education*, 34(3), 325–42.
- Arweck, E., Nesbitt, E. & Jackson, R. (2005b) Educating the next generation in universal values? Hindu-related new religious movements and values education in the common school. *Scriptura: International Journal for Bible, Religion and Theology in Southern Africa*, 89, 328–337.