

Regional Programming on Human Rights Education

Jefferson R. Plantilla

MORE THAN SIX MONTHS after formal opening in December 1994, the Asia-Pacific Human Rights Information Center had not yet launched a regional program. It had a formal mandate to promote human rights in the Asia-Pacific region. And it was envisioned to contribute to the preparation of the region for the establishment of a regional human rights mechanism.

People behind the establishment of the Asia-Pacific Human Rights Information Center, also known as HURIGHTS OSAKA, wanted to establish a regional program on human rights education. They saw the opportunity offered by the results of the 1993 World Conference on Human Rights, and the subsequent adoption of a Decade for Human Rights Education by the United Nations General Assembly in December 1994.

Finally, in mid-1995, HURIGHTS OSAKA started the groundwork of linking with Asian institutions that eventually led to the development of a regional program on human rights education.

The Context

In the early 1980s, there were discussions in the United Nations about the need to have a regional human rights mechanism in the vast Asia-Pacific region. Since there were already regional human rights mechanisms in the Americas, Africa and Europe, why could not there be such mechanism in the Asia-Pacific? The first United Nations-sponsored Asian regional workshop on human rights held in Colombo, Sri Lanka in 1982 discussed this issue. There was no consensus for or against the proposal to establish a regional human rights mechanism in the Asia-Pacific. The government representatives could only agree to further discuss the issue.¹ But they all agreed that human rights should be promoted in Asia.

A year after this major human rights event in the region, in 1983, the then United Nations officer Yo Kubota raised the idea of Japan helping in the process of establishing a regional human rights mechanism in the Asia-

Pacific. He exhorted his fellow Japanese to help realize the idea by setting up a center that would do the task on the strength of the local people and local governments in Japan.

The local social movement in Osaka² started to lobby the Osaka prefectural and city governments to support the establishment of such a center. A decade-long work succeeded in the establishment of a local-government and civil-society-supported Asia-Pacific Human Rights Information Center in 1994.

In early 1990s, with the successful lobbying for the adoption of a United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education (UN Decade), those who were involved in the lobby work at the regional and national levels continued their tasks by pursuing human rights education activities under the banner of the UN Decade.

The UN Decade played the role of a rallying point for all educational activities related in one way or another to human rights. Various types of organizations saw the need to use the UN Decade in promoting human rights education, or their version of it. There was relatively positive support for human rights education at the national level, particularly the governments in several Asian countries.

The Bangkok-based Asian Regional Resource Center for Human Rights Education (ARRC)³ promoted the UN Decade at the regional level. It tried to link the various activities related to human rights education in the different countries in Asia to the UN Decade. It came out with directory of institutions related to human rights education (two editions), a research report on human rights education situation, training materials on human rights education, and list of materials on human rights education (two editions). It had a quarterly newsletter (*ARRC Post*) that reported on human rights education initiatives in the region, as well as occasional journal on human rights education. It held numerous training and other workshops from early 1990s involving educators from many Asian countries.

ARRC focused mainly on the non-formal education system. It networked with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that provided various types of non-formal education activities ranging from paralegal training to workshops on using theater to promote human rights.

There was also hardly any other regional program or project that focused solely on human rights education in the early 1990s. Other regional initiatives in the mid-1990s had human rights education component in their

programs as shown in a meeting of regional NGOs hosted by HURIGHTS OSAKA in 1995 in Bangkok.⁴ They undertook human rights education in relation to specific issues or fields of education.

Considering this context, HURIGHTS OSAKA saw the need to fill a gap at the regional level and decided to focus on the formal education system.

First Stage

HURIGHTS OSAKA launched its regional human rights education program in early 1996. As the first stage of the regional program, HURIGHTS OSAKA initiated a research on cultural values and human rights. The research dealt with the generally unexplored area of the dynamic links between human rights and the varied cultures existing in several countries in Asia, and defined the human rights education implications of this issue at the national level.

The research results were presented in a regional meeting of representatives of non-governmental and governmental institutions in ten Asian countries in 1997. The participants in this meeting endorsed the use of the cultural values-human rights framework in human rights education in the school systems.⁵



Regional Conference (Bangkok, 1997)

Contemplating the second stage of the regional human rights education program, and considering the results of the 1997 regional meeting in Bangkok, HURIGHTS OSAKA decided that its activities should:

- a. Focus on the formal education sector
- b. Involve NGOs that work on human rights education in the school system
- c. Continue the collaboration with the national human rights institutions
- d. Find ways and means of promoting human rights education in the school systems in Asia.

The initial activities under the regional human rights education program of HURIGHTS OSAKA provided an opportunity for people and institutions in several countries in the region to link up and share information on the development of human rights curriculum or in the teaching of subjects with human rights content.

The subsequent activities of HURIGHTS OSAKA consisted of several tasks. The first major task was to understand these unrelated human rights education initiatives in the region. The 1997 regional meeting in Bangkok showed both the existing experiences in several countries in the region on human rights education in the formal education system, and the potential for more extensive development of the field. The second major task was to find a common thread among these initiatives that might help make human rights education more acceptable among the many uninvolved schools and government agencies in the region. This involved clarifying the meaning of human rights, the effects of learning human rights, and the methods in teaching human rights. The Bangkok regional meeting discussed the various reasons behind the resistance to human rights education in the school system that generally arose from a misunderstanding of the very concept of human rights education.

There was also the significant element of mainstreaming human rights education in the formal education system by relating it, among other roots, to positive local cultures. Thus the third task referred to the use of a framework (cultural values-human rights framework) on which human rights education might have a better chance of getting attention and support.

Second Stage (1998-1999)

The second stage of the regional human rights education program of HURIGHTS OSAKA built on the work of the first stage. The second stage was mainly devoted to understanding the existing experiences on human rights education in the school systems in the region, the best practices, and the areas for further development.

To be able to achieve this goal, several workshops were held at both sub-regional and regional levels.

The sub-regional workshops were held during the May-September 1998 period covering Southeast, South and Northeast Asia. The subregional workshops had by and large the following objectives:

1. To review the basic linkages between culture and human rights, and trends in human rights education in general;
2. To share experiences and materials on human rights education in the school system;
3. To discuss areas that require further improvement and propose concrete measures in addressing them;
4. To draft suggested teaching modules or program on the issue of cultural values and human rights that would form a manual for human rights education in the school system; and
5. To draw up possible plans for regional-level implementation of the suggested teaching modules or program.



Southeast Asian Consultation Workshop (Surabaya, 1998)



Northeast Asian Consultation Workshop (Seoul, 1998)



South Asian Consultation Workshop (New Delhi, 1998)

The series of workshops ended with a regional workshop, held in November 1998, that had the following objectives:

1. To review the results of the sub-regional workshops including the draft manual on human rights education in schools;
2. To discuss and propose measures to resolve problems encountered or to be encountered in promoting human rights education in schools; and
3. To explore further areas of work (such as training program) among the participating groups.

The participants in both sub-regional and regional workshops were representatives of NGOs involved in human rights education in the school system, private and public schools, government agencies (such as the Ministry of Education), and national human rights institutions. Two to three representatives from each country in each sub-region were invited to participate in the sub-regional workshops, while at least one representative from each of these countries participated in the regional workshop.

Since the whole regional program was presented as a concrete effort in implementing the UN Decade for Human Rights Education in the region, the promotion of the concept of human rights culture was given much emphasis.

As reported in the *Schools, Human Rights and Society - Report of the 1998 Workshops on Human Rights Education in Schools (1999)*, the second stage of the regional human rights education program identified commonalities among the varied country experiences such as issues and problems they encountered.⁶

Some of the commonalities refer to the following issues:

- a. Starting point of the teaching of human rights – values or moral education subjects as starting points for human rights education
- b. Integration and Separate Subject approaches – two approaches are being employed: teaching human rights in whatever subjects in the school curriculum and having a specific human rights subject (or activity).
- c. Materials developed – several types of teaching and learning materials on human rights have been developed but their wide dissemination depended on institutions involved (NGOs have generally much limited capacity to produce and disseminate such materials).

- d. Cooperation between government education agencies and NGOs – this cooperation existed in many of the programs discussed in the workshop
- e. Governmental mandate on human rights education – some governments have adopted either human rights or other policies that support human rights education
- f. Teacher training program – there are existing teacher training programs in several countries on the teaching of human rights in the school system
- g. Human rights issues – many programs on human rights education focus on the rights of the child.

The problems encountered refer to three major areas - government, schools, society:

a. In relation to the government

1. There is bias against human rights education as shown in the national ideology, and the influence of the political party in power. In cases where legal sanction for human rights education in school system exists, absence of political will hinders the full implementation of programs;
2. There is lack of knowledge on human rights by government personnel; and
3. There is also lack of recognition of problems in schools by the government.

b. In relation to the schools

1. There is tension between the pedagogical process being employed in schools and the human rights education program;
2. There is weak motivation among teachers on teaching human rights . They also exhibit bias against human rights/human rights education;
3. There is a large number of students per class, and short class hours;
4. School teachers receive low pay;
5. Knowledge-centered education negates the importance of understanding relations with other people and with society;
6. Teachers and students have communication gap since students are restricted in expressing their own opinions;

7. The paternalistic education system fosters one-way teaching methodology where the teachers demand that the students simply listen to their lectures;
8. Students develop conformist behavior that affects their individuality;
9. There is contradiction between the ideas learned in school and the experiences at home;
10. The use of the positivist paradigm of teaching in schools weakens the teaching of human rights since critical thinking becomes less important in the learning process. Human rights education occupies a very low position in the priorities of the schools because it is not included in the examinations for higher level studies. Many view competitive, examination-oriented education system as oppressive to the students;
11. There is a shortage of materials (e.g., teaching modules, teaching aids, reference materials, funding, among others) for human rights education, and of teachers who have appropriate training to teach human rights;
12. There is an overloading of teaching tasks that prevents the introduction of new subjects or other activities in the school. The teaching of human rights is seen therefore as an additional burden, and cannot be accommodated within the existing school curriculum;
13. There are school regulations violating human rights principles (such as on punishment of students) that continue to be implemented.

c. In relation to the society in general

1. The parents have weak motivation in supporting human rights education;
2. The general populace may be passive, cynical, or have a negative view of human rights. There is a mistaken notion about the purpose of human rights education especially in relation to the role of citizens in the society;
3. Although human rights education is officially recognized by governments, it still suffers from restrictive political situations that prevent full development of the programs as far as content and methodology are concerned.

These problems more or less reflect the situation of the teaching and learning of human rights within the school system in South, Southeast and Northeast Asia during much of the decade of the 1990s. And yet, many of these problems were still raised in the following decade of the 2000s.

HURIGHTS OSAKA's response to the situation, no matter how limited, had to relate to these problems as well as opportunities existing at the end of the 1990s decade.

Third Stage (2000 – present)

The third stage of the regional human rights education program started with another round of meetings with educators from the different countries in the region. The meetings focused on three areas: research, material development, and teacher training.

HURIGHTS OSAKA regarded 2001 as the year for the review of the past activities and the identification of its future regional activities to support the further development of human rights education in the school system. In this light, HURIGHTS OSAKA held consultation meetings on three key areas with educators from Japan and other Asian countries.

Prior to the meetings, HURIGHTS OSAKA undertook a mini-survey of people related to human rights education on the three areas. The compiled responses were discussed in the consultation meetings. The consultation meeting on research, held on 16-18 September 2001, discussed the current perceived needs for research related to human rights education in the school system; research activities in support of human rights education in the school system such as those regarding curriculum development, culture and human rights, etc.; the possible research partners for specific research activities; and the resources and timetable for the research activities. The meeting participants agreed on the feasibility of a comparative study or multi-country survey that would provide an independent and critical review of the existing state of human rights education in the school system in several Asian countries. The study would review the policy framework (relating to human rights issues and human rights education), the human rights curriculum, the degree of human rights awareness of students and teachers, the problems (teacher skills and materials) being encountered, and the follow-up measures (role of parents and society). There was also discussion on the methodology, partners, financial support, and steps to take, etc. in undertaking the suggested research project.



Consultation Meeting on Research (Osaka, 2001)

The second meeting focusing on training, held on 18-20 October 2001, discussed a possible training program, and identified training objectives, course content, criteria for participants, resource persons, course materials, duration of the course, etc. The meeting participants suggested that the training program should have the following general goals: to sharpen/deepen consciousness of teachers on human rights; to facilitate teacher empowerment by helping develop knowledge, skills and attitude on human rights education; to enable teachers to develop more democratic learning environment; and to enable teachers to develop a networking system with other institutions and groups. They suggested the use of interactive and participatory methodology in the training such as lecture-discussion sessions, role-play, case study, games, etc. They also discussed and identified the basic contents, participants, partners and implementation mechanism for training. They agreed that the materials that would be developed and used in the training program should be based on the experiences of different countries.

Finally, the third meeting focusing on material development, held on 15-17 December 2001, discussed the current state of, and needs for, materials for human rights education in the school system; the development of materials based on the existing materials in the region; and the process of selecting type, content, users, and writers of the materials. The suggestions for the types of materials that could be produced included: supplementary text-



Consultation Meeting on Training (Osaka, 2001)

book (to help students' understanding on both domestic and foreign human rights issues), exercise materials (ready-to-use materials that include stories and illustrations as well as information on human rights), information sheet (containing materials for human rights education including new learning/teaching methods, and different approaches to human rights education), sample curricular framework on human rights (for teachers to integrate human rights into curricular subjects), and materials for basic understanding of human rights (questions and answers on human rights concept, and illustrative ways of understanding the concepts). The meeting participants also discussed the possible partners for material development.



Consultation Meeting on Material Development (Osaka, 2001)

HURIGHTS OSAKA adopted the results of the consultation meetings as guide in developing projects under the regional human rights education program. During the 2003-2012 period, HURIGHTS OSAKA implemented projects at both subregional and regional levels that corresponded by and large to the results of the consultation meetings, while also implementing agreements made in the 1998 subregional consultation workshops.

Research Projects

The experience of the first regional research project (focusing on cultural values and human rights) provided an important guide to the subsequent research projects that were implemented after the 2001 consultation meeting on research.

These subsequent research projects focused more exclusively on human rights education in the school system. They probed on specific issues affecting human rights education, and provided information on areas that require further development as well as opportunities for future activities.

The first research project implemented in 2003 followed to a large extent the recommendations of the 2001 consultation meeting on research. The project was conceptualized in a meeting with invited research partners in Bangkok in 2003. The research partners agreed on a research on the two ends of the educational spectrum: educational policy and human rights awareness, and one middle component – the school curriculum.

The research project coincided with the ending of the UN Decade in 2004. It thus responded to the need to find out how governments supported the UN Decade, and what impact did the government support make on the human rights awareness of the students (and also teachers).

The original idea was to cover many countries in South, Southeast and Northeast Asia. But both financial limitation and difficulty of finding research partners restricted the coverage of the research project to four countries: two from South (India and Sri Lanka), one from Southeast (Philippines) and another one in Northeast Asia (Japan) subregions.

The research project was meant to be an indicative survey using sampling method and involving respondents who represented the characteristics (gender, ethnic, economic status, rural-urban divide, etc.) of the countries involved (India, Japan, Philippines and Sri Lanka).

The general objective of the research project was to provide an independent and critical review of the existing state of human rights education in the school system in several Asian countries. Specifically, this research project was meant

- To clarify governments' support for human rights education in the school system
- To clarify problem areas in implementing human rights education in the school system
- To identify measures for effective human rights education in the school system (such as support for teachers - empowerment)

The research project examined three major components: educational framework, school curriculum, and human rights awareness of students and teachers. Each component considered the following subjects:

a. Educational framework

1. Laws, policies, and guidelines (memorandums, executive orders, memorandums of understanding, etc.)
2. Items covered by laws, policies, and guidelines
 - schools – public and private
 - institutions/agencies – Ministry of Education
 - contents
 - vision, mission, objectives
 - human rights
3. Implementation measures provided for in the laws, policies, and guidelines
4. Support provided for the implementation of the laws, policies, and guidelines
 - funds
 - development of curriculum
 - development of teaching/learning materials
 - teacher training program
 - partnership with other institutions (local, national, regional, international)
 - human rights expertise
5. Co/extra-curricular activities provided for in the laws, policies, and guidelines.

b. Human rights curriculum

1. Curricular objectives
2. Contents: human rights concepts and practice
3. Presentation of human rights
 - issues covered (women, children, culture and religion, etc.)
 - emphasis (international human rights standards, or domestic laws)
4. “Exercise of rights” (respecting the rights of others, conflict resolution skills)
5. Teaching/learning methodologies (teacher–centered versus student-centered, classroom versus field/out of class work)
6. Evaluation system on
 - School ethos – systems, rules, hierarchy
 - Teaching/learning materials
 - Extra/co-curricular activities

c. Field survey

1. Respondents
 - students – two thousand respondents per country, with an average age of fourteen years (two classes per school – eighty students/ average number of respondents) at the secondary school level
 - teachers – fifty respondents per country from twenty public/private schools – two teacher-respondents per school
2. Methods
 - questionnaire survey
 - focused group discussions (FGD)
 - five schools chosen for the FGD
 - participants – from schools with most articulate students
 - fifty students (ten students per group per school)
 - ten teachers (two teachers per group per school)
3. Survey contents:
 - sources of knowledge of human rights – school, media, family, community, neighborhood
 - clusters of questions
 - subject areas – knowledge, attitude, behavior
 - process of learning/teaching
 - materials

- school ethos
 - practice
4. Data analysis - use of common computer program
 5. Survey administrators – national core groups.



Research Partners Meeting (Bangkok, 2003)

The field survey was undertaken during the 2004-2005 period in each of the countries involved. Prior to this, the research partners prepared a common survey questionnaire that was later on translated into different languages (five Indian languages and in Japanese language). Due to differences in the situations of the countries involved, the survey questions were adapted to the specific country context in terms of words and examples used. The Indian and Philippine surveys covered different parts of the two countries, which contributed to the longer period of administering the survey questionnaires. The Japanese survey, however, covered only one city (Osaka city) in view of the difficulty of administering such survey in Japanese schools in different parts of the country.⁷

The summary of the results of the research project has two parts: essay for the analyses of the educational policies and school curriculums, and explanation of the statistical results of the human rights awareness survey.⁸ The



Research Partners Meeting (Delhi, 2005)

full report, entitled *The Educational Policies and Human Rights Awareness - Japan, India, the Philippines and Sri Lanka* was published in New Delhi, India in 2008. Two country reports were published separately in New Delhi (*Human Rights Education in Indian Schools, 2007*)⁹ and in Manila (*Human Rights Education in Philippine Schools, 2006*).¹⁰

The educational policy research was continued with a research project for Southeast Asia that started in 2006 under the “Regional mapping, collection of best practices and coordination of initiatives to promote human rights education in South-East Asian school systems” project of the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and UNESCO Asia-Pacific Education Bureau. This was meant to help implement the first phase plan of action of the UN World Programme for Human Rights Education (WPHRE). An Advisory Panel composed of representatives of OHCHR and UNESCO decided on the Southeast Asian countries covered by the research project, namely, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, and Thailand. A fifth country (Vietnam) could have been included but the government concerned failed to give a response to the invitation of the Advisory Panel to join the research project. The decision on countries to be covered by the research project was based on the following considerations:

- a. Existence of UN projects in the country, which can provide support for, or somehow get linked to, the project. UNESCO projects on human rights education can be promoted through the project
- b. Existence of national institutions that can host the implementation of the project. These institutions can be the Ministries of Education, the

national human rights institutions, or government-sponsored human rights centers

- c. Existence of various of types of schools - public or private, secular or faith-based schools
- d. Existence of program regarding the school curriculum - such as the curriculum reform projects
- e. Existence of projects involving teacher education institutions.

The National Teams for Human Rights Education (NTHREs) formed in the four countries covered by the project undertook the national-level research. HURIGHTS OSAKA coordinated the research project implementation.¹¹

The representatives of the NTHREs, the Advisory Panel, and HURIGHTS OSAKA met to review the research work done. HURIGHTS OSAKA monitored the research work through direct communication with the NTHREs and visit to the countries involved. A Southeast Asian conference was held in August 2008 in Bangkok to present the research reports.



Conference on WPHRE Research in Southeast Asia (Bangkok, 2008)

The Lao (*Both Lay Ngan - Sithi Manout Nay Kansiuksa*, in Lao language) and Indonesian (*Pendidikan Hak Asasi Manusia Pada Sekolah-Sekolah Di Indonesia: Sebuah Tinjauan Awal*, in Bahasa Indonesia language) research

reports were published in 2008 in Vientiane and Jakarta respectively, while the publication of the full research report entitled *Human Rights Education in the School Systems in Southeast Asia - Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR and Thailand*, was published in 2009. The preparation of the final research report benefited from the prior research project of HURIGHTS OSAKA on educational policy and human rights education. The full research report was published in Bangkok, Thailand in cooperation with the Office of Human Rights Studies and Social Development in Mahidol University.¹²

The latest research project under the regional human rights education program was a research on educational policies and school curriculum in the Northeast Asia subregion. The planning for this research project was held in a meeting of Northeast Asian educators on 11-13 March 2008 that discussed the following:

1. Review of the current situation of human rights education in Northeast Asian schools
2. Identification of feasible suggestions for a Northeast Asian program or project in response to the current (and projected) situation in the subregion
3. Agreement on steps toward a Northeast Asian human rights education network (as part of proposed Asian network).



Meeting on Northeast Asian Research Project (Osaka, 2008)

HURIGHTS OSAKA subsequently adopted the research project plan with the long-term objective of helping institutionalize human rights education within the school systems in Northeast Asia. In the short term, the research project aimed to have a concrete presentation of the current challenges and opportunities relating to human rights education within the school systems in Northeast Asia by a) providing detailed discussion on the challenges and opportunities common as well as unique among the countries in the subregion; b) providing detailed presentation on concrete experiences that address the challenges and make use of the opportunities; c) creating a network among Northeast Asian educators that continues the exchange of information on the development of human rights education in the different school systems.

Individual researchers from Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Mongolia and Taiwan implemented the research project during the 2009-2010 period. A final research report entitled *The State of Human Rights Education in Northeast Asian School Systems: Obstacles, Challenges, Opportunities* was published in 2010.

The Northeast Asian research project completed the series of research on educational policies and school curriculums of HURIGHTS OSAKA. The research projects covered India and Sri Lanka in South Asia; Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, the Philippines, and Thailand in Southeast Asia; and Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Mongolia and Taiwan in Northeast Asia. But since many countries in Asia have not been covered by the research on educational policies and school curriculum, there is a possibility of continuing the research in the future.

In the meantime, the research results should be used in promoting human rights education in the school systems in Asia and the Pacific. The opportunities for the use of the research results arise from the two other components of the regional human rights education program: material development and training.

Material Development Projects

HURIGHTS OSAKA adopted a subregional approach in developing teaching and learning materials on human rights. It started with the Southeast Asia project on developing lesson plans in 2003, followed by a South Asian re-

source material project in 2009, and another resource material project for Northeast Asia in 2011.

The development of such materials was mainly collaborative in character with the participation of educators from the subregions ensured from the start till the end of the production process.

HURIGHTS OSAKA, the Philippine Department of Education and the Philippine Commission on Human Rights jointly organized the ASEAN Writing Workshop on 19-27 June 2001.¹³ This Writing Workshop or Writeshop was a follow-up activity to the Southeast Asia Pilot Teacher Training Workshop held in Bali, Indonesia in 1999. The Writeshop produced forty-eight lesson plans from twenty-six participants composed of teachers, education researchers, curriculum developers and NGO workers from Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. The nine-day Writeshop had the following objectives:

a. General Objectives:

It aimed at developing human rights teaching guides for Southeast Asian schools. Participants were expected to draft sample teaching guides for primary and secondary school levels focusing on basic concepts and principles of human rights and contextualized in each country's cultures, beliefs and practices. In this regard, the principle of universality of human rights was emphasized. The Writeshop also aimed to serve as a venue for Southeast Asian human rights educators to share and exchange experiences in teaching human rights in the formal education system.

b. Specific Objectives:

1. To formulate ASEAN Human Rights Education Vision and Mission;
2. To review human rights standards and principles in order to identify core human rights concepts for basic education;
3. To reexamine linkages between human rights and Southeast Asian cultures in order to help translate human rights concepts into educational materials;
4. To train on how to relate human rights lesson plans to the existing school curriculum;
5. To identify various strategies for infusion of human rights in the formal education curriculum;

6. To identify programs for extra and co-curricular activities and/or community-based human rights activities;
7. To prepare an action plan regarding strategy in regional lobby for human rights education; and
8. To strengthen linkages among educators in Southeast Asia involved in human rights education in the school system.

The nine-day Writeshop program comprised of the following major components:

1. Review of human rights education programs, human rights principles, human rights education approaches, strategies and methods; and formulation of ASEAN Human Rights Education Vision and Mission;
2. Writing of human rights teaching guides;
3. Teaching demonstration using the teaching guides developed; and
4. Planning for follow-up activities.

In writing the lesson plans, the Writeshop participants considered the following factors:

1. School curriculums were already established and could not be easily amended to accommodate human rights education as a separate subject;
2. A review of the curriculums and teaching materials was needed to find out how human rights concepts could be discussed within the existing subject areas;
3. Using a common framework in developing materials was preferred for a better understanding by the participants of the materials developed;
4. Testing of the drafted materials could be done in the respective countries to determine how they suited the existing school curriculums.

The Writeshop also produced a common human rights curricular framework that included the relevant human rights issues affecting people at various levels - personal, community, country, regional and international levels; the core values to be taught per subject and year level; and the human rights concepts that relate to the core values. The development of a

human rights curricular framework helped the Writeshop participants organize their thoughts on the content (relevant core values based on existing curriculums and appropriate human rights), subjects and year levels of the drafted lesson plans.



Southeast Asian Writing Workshop (Tagaytay, 2001)

A common format for lesson plans was also adopted. This format, while following standard lesson plan format, had elements that discussed human rights concepts.¹⁴

All participants reviewed the draft lesson plans, while a panel of educators commented on the objectives, materials for use by the teachers and students, the procedure for teaching, and the core values and human rights concepts involved. Each member of the panel was later on assigned to assist a country delegation in improving the drafted lesson plans.

In order to test the lesson plans, the participants demonstrated the teaching of the lesson plans in primary and secondary schools in Manila. All participants appreciated the teaching demonstration experience. They were happy in finding the students enthusiastic in discussing human rights. They also realized that human rights, as a subject matter, were not new to the students.



Teaching Demonstration (Manila, 2001)

The schools involved (Aurora Quezon Elementary School and Manila Science High School) were “effective” or highly rated public schools. The participants found the students smart and able to easily interact with them.

Subsequent to the Writeshop, HURIGHTS OSAKA formed a Review Team in 2002 composed of representatives from each of the countries represented in the Writeshop. The Review Team decided on the lesson plans for primary and secondary levels to be included in a final set of lesson plans that would be published. It also edited the lesson plans based on the following agreed guidelines:¹⁵

1. The specific problems or issues as identified in the table of lesson plans adopted by the Review Team should be those within the experience of the students;
2. The lesson plans should have general applicability to the Southeast Asian context and flexibility for adaptation to national curriculums, and other national educational conditions. Statements should be written in a general sense to make the lesson plans easily adaptable to any of the countries in Southeast Asia;
3. Notes for the teachers in each lesson plan should be added to explain the topics and the related human rights concepts;
4. Each lesson plan should be appropriate for forty to fifty-minute session, but could be adjusted to longer session period;
5. The lesson plans should use simple language;

6. A single specific human right should be the content for each lesson plan;
7. There should be consistency among the different parts of the lesson plan (from objectives to application).

The edited lesson plans were subsequently published in one book, *Human Rights Lesson Plans for Southeast Asian Schools*, in 2003 in Bangkok, Thailand. The pdf file of the book was uploaded on a number of websites including those of HURIGHTS OSAKA and the supporting institutions (Friedrich Naumann Foundation and the UNESCO Asia-Pacific Bureau).¹⁶

The *Human Rights Lesson Plans for Southeast Asian Schools* was also translated into Bahasa Indonesia, Bahasa Malaysia, Khmer, and Vietnamese languages.¹⁷

The holding of the Writeshop and the formation of a Review Team reflected the collaborative nature of HURIGHTS OSAKA's project implementation system. They were based on the experiences in Southeast Asia (the Writeshop idea came from the Philippine experience of developing lesson plans with the participation of representatives of various stakeholders [government offices, NGOs, and schools] as lesson plan writers; the teaching demonstration component repeated the experience in the 1999 Southeast Asia Pilot Teacher Training Workshop in Bali where participants actively interacted with students despite apprehension about language; and the Review Team consisted of the leading participants¹⁸ in the Writeshop) that strengthened ownership of the lesson plans by the Southeast Asian educators.

The material for South Asia developed after the second South Asian training workshop organized by HURIGHTS OSAKA in December 2005 in New Delhi, India.¹⁹ From among the key participants and resource persons in the training workshop, a training material drafting team was formed to plan and prepare a South Asian training material.

While the Southeast Asian lesson plans publication was explicitly supportive of the UN Decade, the South Asian lesson plans publication supported the first phase plan of action²⁰ of the WPHRE.

The project partners met in Osaka in 2006 and in Bangkok in 2007 to discuss the contents and mechanism for developing the South Asian material. Unlike the Southeast Asian lesson plans publication, the South Asian lesson plans publication did not involve the writing and editing of lesson plans. Instead, the South Asian publication used existing materials on discussions

of human rights principles and standards, the human rights situation in the sub-region, and human rights lesson plans. These contents differentiated the Southeast Asian publication from its South Asian counterpart.

The publication, entitled *South Asian Teachers and Human Rights Education – Resource Training Material* was printed in New Delhi in 2009. It was described in the following manner:

This teacher training resource material uses the WPHRE's first phase plan of action as its main framework. It presents in a contextualised way human rights and the practice of human rights education. It provides teachers with basic information on the content of human rights education and the means by which human rights education is put into practice. It draws much from the experiences in South Asia on the different aspects of human rights education in the school system. It is meant to be a complementary material to any training programme on human rights/human rights education for teachers as well as other officials in the formal education system.

The South Asian lesson plans publication, similar to the Southeast Asian lesson plans publication, was meant to be used by teachers inside the classroom as well as by trainers in teacher training programs. The lesson plans included in the South Asian publication had different formats and were taken from existing South Asian human rights education publications. The publication showed the diversity of human rights education materials in South Asia.

The Northeast Asian material was the latest material developed under the regional human rights education program. The publication of the research report on the review of the state of human rights education in Northeast Asia in 2010, prepared the ground for the development of a human rights education material for Northeast Asia.

In September 2011, HURIGHTS OSAKA held a meeting with educators from China, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Mongolia and Taiwan to discuss a project for the development of a human rights education material for Northeast Asia. The plan for the project was agreed upon in this meeting.

The invited educators agreed to contribute lesson plans based on existing materials in the subregion. They also agreed to use the lesson plan format of the *Human Rights Lesson Plans for Southeast Asian Schools*, which meant adapting existing lesson plans to that format. As a guide on the col-



Meeting on Northeast Asian Material Development Project (Osaka, 2011)

lection of lesson plans, a human rights curricular framework based on the Southeast Asian publication was also adopted.

A meeting of the contributors as well as other educators reviewed the draft lesson plans submitted. They gave comments and suggestions on how to improve the draft lesson plans. The second meeting was held in September 2012. HURIGHTS OSAKA did the final edit of the lesson plans.

The output, a publication, consisted of four main parts: human rights standards and mechanisms, human rights education situation in Northeast Asia, human rights curricular framework, and the lesson plans. The publication was printed with the title *Human Rights Education in Northeast Asian School Systems – Resource Material* in 2013.

As a resource material, it has sets of information that are considered important for the teachers and education officials to know to be able to support human rights education within the school system. Thus the discussion on human rights standards and mechanisms is complemented by the discussion on actual programs and opportunities that exist in Northeast Asia through which the human rights standards are being put into use.

The resource material is designed as a practical material, not a “heavy” discussion of concepts that might not appeal to teachers. It is meant to raise interest among the teachers who have not taught human rights before and thus encourage them to further study the human rights standards and explore the existing programs/structures/mechanisms/resources on human

rights at national and local levels in teaching human rights. In this sense, human rights are understood not in academic sense but more as practical measures that already exist in different countries in one way or another.

The resource material for Northeast Asia followed the paths of the previous materials for Southeast and South Asia, and improved on them to some extent. Paraphrasing the explanation in the introduction of the *Human Rights Education in Northeast Asian School Systems – Resource Material*, there are common characteristics among the three materials:

- a) They are contextualized in each subregion
- b) They are composed as much as possible of some of the best teaching and learning materials for human rights education that are available in the subregions (particularly for South and Northeast Asian materials; the Southeast Asian material mainly used lesson plans that were developed in a workshop)
- c) They embody the perspectives and experiences of the human rights educators in the subregions (particularly those that relate to the challenges of teaching/learning human rights within the school systems in Northeast Asia)
- d) They promote the international human rights standards through their concrete application as lesson plans content, teaching/learning process, school rules and regulations, teachers' guides, and school-community relations
- e) They are appropriate materials for teaching and learning as well as teacher-training, and
- f) They are supportive of networking among Asian educators that facilitates exchange of information on the development of human rights education in the different school systems.

Training Activities

HURIGHTS OSAKA's training activities were planned through a mixture of its own internal planning and in response to the results of other activities. Thus there were workshops that were planned straight from the discussions during the 1998 consultation workshops stage, and workshops that were planned due to the program approach taken by HURIGHTS OSAKA (namely, the 2001 consultation meetings).

The first training workshop organized by HURIGHTS OSAKA was the Southeast Pilot Teacher Training Workshop held in 1999 in Bali, Indonesia.²¹ It had the the following elements:

- a. An ASEAN focus
 - dealing with experiences of various institutions in the subregion;
 - situating human rights education programs within the realities of the subregion;
 - discussing the issue of culture and human rights in the context of the subregion; and
 - developing a vision for human rights education in the subregion.

b. Networking among human rights educators as well as relevant institutions in the subregion.

c. Using participant-centered methodology, which requires participants' involvement in activities such as small group discussion sessions that have no resource persons and whose facilitators provide minimal input.



Pilot Southeast Asian Training Workshop (Bali, 1999)

These elements were translated into the following training objectives:

- To explicitly identify and integrate human rights in the school curriculum and teacher training programs

- To demonstrate knowledge, attitudes, and skills in promoting human rights in schools in various capacities (as teacher trainers and curriculum developers, for example)
- To use participant-centered methodology
- To develop skills in designing teacher-training programs and action plans for dissemination, evaluation, and monitoring of human rights education
- To develop a support system for national activities through networking
- To develop an understanding of the various human rights education experiences in Southeast Asia.

Educators from Cambodia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam who attended the workshop came under the following categories:

- teacher trainers
- teaching-material developers
- curriculum developers
- officers of teachers' colleges and education faculties of universities, and
- school heads.



Pilot Southeast Asian Training Workshop (Bali, 1999)

The participants discussed the human rights and human rights education situation in their respective countries, including the culture-human rights relationship. These discussions became the framework of the training.

The participants also discussed the following matters:

- Inhibiting Factors, Supporting Factors, and Feasible Measures in Human Rights Education – analysis of the current situation in the countries represented
- Profile of Human Rights Advocates (as Teachers and as Students) – discussion of desirable characteristics of teachers and students who engage in the human rights education process
- Curriculum Development – analysis of existing school curriculum to determine areas/topics/subjects where human rights can be taught
- Lesson Planning – development of teaching guides appropriate for current school curriculums
- Teaching Demonstration – testing of the lesson plans developed inside the classrooms of a secondary school in Bali (with English as the medium of instruction)
- Evaluating Human Rights Education Programs – discussion of various ways of assessing the teaching and learning of human rights
- Country Visions – an exercise in defining a desirable situation of the country in the future as far as human rights education is concerned
- Proposals for Follow-up Activities – discussion on suggested activities as next steps after the pilot training workshop
- Workshop Evaluation.

The main suggestions as next steps were the following:

1. Hold a writing workshop (writeshop) for facilitators
2. Develop human rights education modules for facilitators and teachers
3. Undertake country-level research on local cultures and traditions (on rice culture, for example, and including the negative aspects) for teaching-material development
4. Strengthen the partnership between schools.

The first and second suggestions led to the holding of “a workshop on developing human rights lesson plans for Southeast Asian educators (SEA Writeshop)” in 2001 in the Philippines.²²

The second training workshop of HURIGHTS OSAKA was organized in Bangkok in 2000²³ as a follow-up to the consultation workshop for South Asia in 1998 in New Delhi. In consideration of the then existing resource persons for the training, some of the activities in the Bali pilot training workshop were not held in the South Asian workshop such as developing lesson plans, teaching demonstration, evaluation of human rights education program, and visioning of the future exercise.



First South Asian Training Workshop (Bangkok, 2000)

This was followed by another training workshop for South Asia held in 2005 in New Delhi in cooperation with the Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution of the Jamia Millia Islamia.²⁴ This workshop was different from the previous training workshops due to the focus on curriculum developers and other educators from the Ministries of Education and government education institutes in India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. Most participants and resource persons, therefore, were from government agencies. The main reason for this arrangement was the need to concentrate the impact of the training on the school curriculum, through the educators within the government system.



Second South Asian Training Workshop (New Delhi, 2005)

The objectives of the training workshop were limited to the following:

- To review international human rights standards, focusing on basic human rights documents including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child
- To review experiences in India, Japan and the Philippines on integrating human rights education into the school curriculum
- To undertake practical exercises on integrating human rights education into the school curriculum.

Much of the activities in the training workshop were mainly divided into discussion on human rights standards, school curriculum and exercise on integration of human rights education into the curriculums. It must be noted, however, that there was a sharing of experience between South and Southeast Asians with the presentation of the Philippine experience in human rights education in the school system as well as the results of the survey on human rights awareness of students. The results of the survey of the human rights awareness of Indian students were likewise presented in the training workshop.

One concrete result of the training workshop was the planning for the development of a resource material on human rights education for South Asia.

The final training workshop in the series of subregional training workshops held by HURIGHTS OSAKA was a Southeast Asian training workshop that focused on the *Human Rights Lesson Plans for Southeast Asian*

Schools and its version in Bahasa Indonesia, Bahasa Malaysia, Khmer, and Vietnamese languages. This workshop was held in 2005 in Manila with the participation of educators from Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, the Philippines, Timor Leste and Vietnam.



Second Southeast Asian Training Workshop (Manila, 2005)

The Southeast Asian workshop was held with the following objectives:

1. To orient the participants on the *Human Rights Lesson Plans for Southeast Asian Schools*; and
2. To train them on the use of the ideas in the publication for teacher training.

To achieve these purposes, the workshop program consisted of the following major components:

1. Discussion on basic human rights principles
2. Discussion on components of the publication, namely, human rights curricular framework and the human rights lesson plans
3. Discussion on the use of the publication as a teacher training material in the different countries represented.

This training workshop was specifically devoted to training other educators in the subregion on the use of the Southeast Asian lesson plans publication. The publication (in original English version and versions in languages in Southeast Asia) was launched during the training workshop. The members of the Regional Review Team from Cambodia, Indonesia,

Malaysia, the Philippines, and Vietnam acted as resource persons in the training workshop.

It is notable that of the many training workshops held by HURIGHTS OSAKA, none was done in Northeast Asia. This is partly explained by the length of time it took to finish projects in Southeast and South Asian subregions. Educators and partner-institutions in these two subregions also provided much needed support for the holding of activities that in turn encouraged HURIGHTS OSAKA to continue focusing its projects in these subregions.

Publications

Simultaneous with the implementation of projects on research, material development and training are the publications that came out either as regular, annual publications or as results of the activities (particularly the research and material development activities).

In preparing the publications, HURIGHTS OSAKA adhered to several intertwining approaches in gathering materials. These approaches are discussed below.

a. Lazaric approach

There is a story of a man named Lazarus who died, was entombed and then brought back to life. This story mirrors the approach taken by HURIGHTS OSAKA in gathering materials for its regular English publications, including those devoted to human rights education.

In the human rights field, people take much effort in writing petitions, reports, and many other types of documents on a wide range of human rights-related issues. However, many of these documents do not survive beyond the networks of the institutions involved, or the activities where the documents were presented, or the special institutions they were submitted to for consideration.

Whenever good documents come to the notice of HURIGHTS OSAKA, it engages in Lazarus-like effort of getting them revived and giving them the chance to be disseminated beyond their circles. This is the Lazaric approach that HURIGHTS OSAKA takes in collecting materials for the publications on human rights education. Several types of documents are taken into consideration in this regard. In the case of United Nations-sponsored activities (seminars, workshops), some papers written for circulation to the

participants provide good discussion on human rights education programs or activities as well as critical review of human rights education experiences. These papers do not form part of the United Nations official report on the activities. Only the official documentations of the activities are included in the United Nations reports. They can take the form of the declarations of the member-states represented in the activities that were adopted after a discussion within an official drafting group and voted upon at the plenary sessions. Proceedings report can appear as annex of the report on the activities involved by the United Nations Secretary General to the General Assembly. All other documents that are being circulated in the activities are mainly meant for participants' use. They likely end up in the shelves of the participants and the United Nations staff involved. Such papers are wasted if they did not get disseminated beyond the people who attended the activities. Whenever HURIGHTS OSAKA has the opportunity to get these papers, they are considered for publication. They may be edited to fit the purpose of the publication.

There are also papers prepared for United Nations human rights treaty monitoring bodies that are circulated online by the authors, normally by institutions or networks of institutions. In some cases, the United Nations website includes them as documents submitted to the specific sessions of the human rights treaty monitoring bodies. They may provide comprehensive discussion of particular issues or programs. And in cases of reports prepared by networks of institutions, they can be very long documents. From a practical viewpoint, long reports might not be the most appropriate form of expressing concerns to members of the human rights treaty monitoring bodies. Their detailed discussion of issues, complete with facts and figures, may not be given as much attention by the members of the treaty bodies who have the enormous task of sifting through piles of documents. For their own purposes, they would need short documents that clearly state the core issues and concerns. But for HURIGHTS OSAKA, these comprehensively written reports are important documents that deserved to be published. Sections of these reports or detailed summaries can be prepared for publication.

In the same way, papers that have been written about human rights education that have no prospect of getting further dissemination other than to few people who received them are possible candidates for HURIGHTS OSAKA's publications. They may be papers written as a result of research on particular issues or activities. They can be the initial research papers of stu-

dents in graduate studies, masteral or doctorate courses. As students, their papers may not have the avenue for publication within the rigid and also limited academic community. And precisely because these papers are not for academic journals that they qualify best for HURIGHTS OSAKA's English publications. Theoretical discussions are important, but they have limited audience among field workers, or people who are looking for ideas on how to implement or even support programs.

In using the Lazaric approach, HURIGHTS OSAKA saves many good papers from being hidden within the limited confines of the shelves of United Nations staff or the archives of the networks of institutions. Instead, they are given another chance of being made available in print as well as online to a wider audience.

b. Research approach

In line with HURIGHTS OSAKA's mandate as a human rights center, gathering of information for eventual dissemination took the form of research. The first regional activity on human rights education of HURIGHTS OSAKA was a research project, and the research output became its first book publication in the English language.

Several publications of HURIGHTS OSAKA arose from a number of research projects on human rights education.²⁵

HURIGHTS OSAKA started its English publications on human rights education with the publication of a research on culture and human rights in 1997. The research project was initially conceived in 1995 as a survey of the existing initiatives on human rights education in the formal education system in Asia. But funding was a problem, and thus HURIGHTS OSAKA had to seek funding support elsewhere. It sought funding for the project from a Japanese foundation, which was not known for supporting human rights or human rights education projects. However, it was very much supportive of culture-related projects involving Asian countries. HURIGHTS OSAKA revised its project plan and incorporated the culture component in order to receive funding support. Thus the publication turned out to be a research report on Asian cultural values and human rights, with a specific section on human rights education initiatives in the formal education system. This is the publication entitled *Human Rights in Asian Cultures – Continuity and Change*²⁶ that was published in New Delhi in 1997.

While the decision to include culture in the research project was necessary to get funding support, the relationship between culture and human rights was a very important issue for human rights in general and human rights education in particular. Then, and even at present, human rights educators faced the problem of linking human rights to local cultures. In many cases, educators found a contradiction between human rights and local cultures. Thus the publication pointed to aspects of cultures (cultural values in particular) that support human rights. This is significant from the human rights education perspective.²⁷

Two years later, in 1999, HURIGHTS OSAKA published the proceedings report of its series of subregional consultation workshops held in Surabaya, Indonesia for Southeast Asia, New Delhi, India for South Asia and Seoul, Korea for Northeast Asia in 1998, and the regional workshop held in November 1998 in Osaka, Japan. The report, entitled *Schools, Human Rights and Society - Report of the 1998 Workshops on Human Rights Education in Schools*, provided an overview of the situation of the human rights teaching and learning existing during the late 1990s in the three Asian subregions. It discussed the initiatives of government and non-governmental institutions, the commonalities and differences among these initiatives, and the challenges faced. The significance of the report lies in the integration of perspectives of educators who either belong to the formal education system (as officials of the Ministry of Education or schools) and the non-formal education field who implemented non-governmental programs in schools. To a large extent, their views were similar with regard to the many facets of human rights education in the school system.

Several other research projects on human rights education resulted in the publication of research reports.

c. Documentation approach

As a human rights center, HURIGHTS OSAKA has limited capacity to gather and disseminate human rights information. Similar to any regional institution or initiative, it had to choose a particular area of work to enable it to create a sufficient database that could be shared with the Asia-Pacific region.

HURIGHTS OSAKA's main regional intervention is in the form of human rights education program. In implementing this regional program, it undertakes several types of activities ranging from organizing workshops,

meetings and conferences, to developing teaching/learning materials, to preparing publications. And one type of publication that has been started since mid-1990s is the one based on the documentation approach. This approach can be defined as a continued gathering of information on a specific area of interest over a long period of time in order to build a comprehensive and substantial information base. Thus, the information base on human rights education of HURIGHTS OSAKA is a collection of various types of edited reports from different institutions in different countries in Asia and the Pacific. Taken as a whole, the reports and other materials (such as teaching/learning materials that have been separately collected) provide a broad picture of the state of the art of human rights education in the region. And since the field continuously evolves, the gathering work likewise continues.

HURIGHTS OSAKA has adopted the documentation approach in its publications on human rights education. This is the approach taken in its annual human rights education publications.

The regional human rights education meeting organized by HURIGHTS OSAKA in 1997 in Bangkok, Thailand yielded a number of papers that could form a single publication.²⁸ Thus a conference proceedings report was planned that would include these papers. In view, however, of the existence of several materials on human rights education, the publication plan expanded to cover other papers related to human rights education in the school system. The publication that came out in 1998 was entitled *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools* to reflect the focus of HURIGHTS OSAKA's regional program.

Having seen the value of the publication of a collection of papers devoted to a specific area of human rights education, a new set of papers was collected in the following year and published as volume two of the *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*. Thus an annual publication on human rights education in the school system in Asia was born.

Institutions involved in human rights education in the school system were sought and requested to submit documentations of their activities. Majority of the documents received discussed institutional programs - how they started (i.e., the story behind the development of the programs), how the educational program fitted the main institutional program (which did not necessarily have an educational character), what activities were undertaken, what materials were used, who implemented the activities, how they worked with schools (or even with teachers and their organizations), what

problems were encountered, what results were obtained, and what impact if any came about in relation to the students, teachers, the school, and even the surrounding local community.

Many NGOs, doing programs in the non-formal education field and working with poor and dis-advantaged communities, have also been requested to send documentations. Some NGOs provided direct services (such as legal assistance to poor and dis-advantaged communities) that were complemented by educational intervention as part of their empowerment objective. A significant number of these NGOs worked with schools, bridging a gap among programs that were largely divided into non-formal and formal education systems.

A few university-based institutions such as the human rights centers that have human rights education programs have also been invited to provide reports of their activities that HURIGHTS OSAKA eventually published in the different volumes of *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*.

There were also educational research institutions and individual researchers, who probed on the different aspects of human rights education in the formal education system, contributing to the publication. Some research activities focused on evaluation of human rights education programs (such as the development of teaching/learning materials, teacher training, programs on particular areas such as anti-discrimination program), others looked into educational policies (such as laws and national action plans that support human rights education, education reform in general and curriculum reform in particular), some analyzed attitudes toward human rights among students, teachers, school and education officials. There were also research activities that looked into the teaching of particular human rights instrument such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. There were also research projects on policy changes that led to the restriction of human rights education, sometimes in favor of other internationally-sanctioned programs such as values education or education for sustainable development, or on policy changes that give more emphasis on good behavior and discipline by strengthening moral education (and weakening human rights education as a result). Reports on research on the impact of human rights education on students have also been submitted and published by HURIGHTS OSAKA.

The variety of reports published in the *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools* shows the complex system within which human rights education operates. And this can be seen both as a problem and an opportunity. On one hand, this means that human rights education is at the mercy of the huge formal education system that is largely beyond the control of human rights educators. On the other hand, the complexity of the system provides human rights education with various opportunities to exist despite the tendency of official educational policies to be unconcerned with human rights education.

Human Rights Education in Asian Schools also indicated the sad reality of cessation of programs and even closure of institutions that support human rights education. In such cases, what mattered were the experiences expressed that could guide other educators in developing and implementing human rights education programs.

Under the documentation approach, all types of developments in the field of human rights education in the school system are published year after year. Each report is seen as an essential building block in the broad human rights education structure in Asia.

HURIGHTS OSAKA published twelve volumes of *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools* covering a period of twelve years (1998 to 2009). While the publication has been discontinued, the documentation of human rights education in the school system experiences continues. This time, the relevant reports are published under a more general human rights education publication – *Human Rights Education in Asia-Pacific*. *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools* has performed well in its documentation role, it²⁹

yielded more than two hundred articles from almost two hundred contributors in more than twenty countries in Asia and beyond. Individuals and various types of institutions contributed articles on mainly ground-level experiences on the teaching and learning of human rights.

d. Appeal-for-documentation approach

Related to the documentation approach is an approach that essentially appeals to institutions to document their experiences. This is true of institutions that do not properly document their activities. By presenting the op-

portunity to disseminate their experiences to a wider audience, HURIGHTS OSAKA requests these institutions to make the appropriate reports.

In many cases, preparing appropriate reports on activities is not an institutional habit. Though reports exist, they are not necessarily fit for publication. They can consist of reports to institutions that provide support to their programs (financially or otherwise), or ad hoc activity reports that have narrow focus and likely incomplete information.

HURIGHTS OSAKA promotes the importance of documentation for a number of reasons, namely, such reports provide the institutions the opportunity to gather all necessary information on activities held or programs implemented and take stock of their experiences; to initiate a system of documenting activities that support regular in-house evaluation and program development exercises; to have appropriate materials for the promotion of their programs to other institutions (not only to funding agencies but also to other institutions that are searching for human rights education ideas based on actual experiences); and to network with other institutions doing the same programs.

The request for reports therefore is also an appeal for an initial step towards institutionalized documentation of program implementation among institutions.

Networking and Crossing Borders

At the start of the regional program on human rights education of HURIGHTS OSAKA, a question arose on the kind of institutions that should be involved in the program. It was easy to choose the NGOs as the main participants in the program. But it was not right to confine the program to NGOs because there were other institutions that were involved in human rights education. There were governmental as well as institutions established by law that had mandates on human rights education. Their participation in the program should be appropriate. Thus they were included in the program being developed in mid-1990s.

But one question was intriguing: Was HURIGHTS OSAKA capable of inviting government institutions to take part in its activities?

From a bureaucratic mindset, probably the answer should be in the negative. Indeed that proved to be true when, years later, an invitation regarding participation in an international activity extended to a local government of-

office in Osaka was rejected. The basic argument was that such an invitation for an international activity must be coursed through Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This was probably technically right, but it was also an overly narrow and uninformed perspective of a bureaucrat. Local governments in Japan have their respective international activities that likely never go through the vetting of the national agencies concerned.

But considering the reality that many government agencies in Asia were willing to get support for their programs through international activities, inviting them to join regional activities such as those of HURIGHTS OSAKA should be welcomed. This was proven true in many countries covered by the regional program of HURIGHTS OSAKA when it started implementing a series of consultation workshops on human rights education in South, Southeast and Northeast Asia. Education officials from a number of countries joined the regional activities of HURIGHTS OSAKA. Some government institutions even went further by becoming HURIGHTS OSAKA's project partners.

A basic argument supporting the invitation to relevant government agencies to join the regional activities was the fact that HURIGHTS OSAKA had support from the Osaka city and prefectural governments. It used this facet of its institutional character, during the 1990s and 2000s at least, to show that HURIGHTS OSAKA was an institution that worked with government institutions in Japan. To a large extent, this character of HURIGHTS OSAKA provided an assurance to the government agencies in other countries that the program being implemented was not meant to be anti-government exercise. Despite the changes in perception about human rights from late 1990s, government agencies tended to be wary about human rights programs and institutions. They probably feared being involved in criticizing governments' failure to take appropriate measures in addressing human rights violations. Thus it was necessary for HURIGHTS OSAKA to assuage such concerns by emphasizing its local government link, and the promotion of human rights being the sole objective of the activities.

The same line of thinking was used in relation to the national human rights institutions. During the late 1990s, several national human rights institutions already existed in South and Southeast Asia. HURIGHTS OSAKA saw a great opportunity in getting their support in the implementation of the regional program on human rights education. Since these institutions had human rights education mandate, the invitation for them to join the activities of HURIGHTS OSAKA was received very well. In both South and

Southeast Asian workshops in late 1990s, the national human rights institutions were HURIGHTS OSAKA partners, providing substantial support to the activities.

Government agencies are important players in mainstreaming human rights education, in terms of capacity to sustain programs and the existence of infrastructures (such as schools and training centers) and personnel to implement programs.

National human rights institutions, on the other hand, have the proper access to the governments as much as the legal status to influence them. They also have resources (though limited) to implement programs.

In some countries, the national human rights institutions have engaged government agencies in human rights education projects ranging from training personnel to developing materials to undertaking joint public human rights awareness activities. HURIGHTS OSAKA benefited from these existing relationships.

The work with government agencies extended to the engagement with the UN through the OHCHR and UNESCO. The projects undertaken with the OHCHR and UNESCO strengthened even more the work of HURIGHTS OSAKA with governments in a number of countries in Asia.

HURIGHTS OSAKA worked with the OHCHR and UNESCO in implementing in Asia the two major human rights education programs of the UN: the UN Decade and the first phase plan of action of the World Programme for Human Rights Education (WPHRE). In 1999, HURIGHTS OSAKA assisted the OHCHR in organizing the Subregional Training Workshop on Human Rights Education in Northeast Asia in Seoul, Korea.³⁰ The training workshop was actually originally planned by HURIGHTS OSAKA, the Korean National Commission for UNESCO, and Korean educators as a follow-up to the 1998 Northeast Asian consultation workshop held in Seoul, Korea. These institutions worked together in lobbying the Korean Ministry of Education and the OHCHR to support the Northeast Asian workshop plan. It was also the first training workshop in Northeast Asia on human rights education that involved China, Korea, Japan³¹ and Mongolia.

This project started the series of activities of the OHCHR on human rights education in Asia that involved HURIGHTS OSAKA.

In 2003, UNESCO Asia-Pacific Bureau of Education supported the translation and printing of several human rights education materials (including the *Human Rights Lesson Plan for Southeast Asian Schools*).

In 2005, OHCHR provided support for the holding of the training workshops in Southeast and South Asia. HURIGHTS OSAKA also received support from UNESCO Asia-Pacific Bureau of Education for the Southeast Asian training workshop.³²

In 2006, OHCHR, UNESCO Asia-Pacific Bureau of Education and HURIGHTS OSAKA jointly implemented a project surveying the state of human rights education in the school systems of several Southeast Asian countries.³³

HURIGHTS OSAKA also worked with the OHCHR on the translation human rights education materials into Chinese language, a study tour to the Philippines of a delegation from China, and the human rights education seminar in China and workshop in Iran.

The funding for the projects and activities of HURIGHTS OSAKA is partly sourced from foundations and UN agencies. HURIGHTS OSAKA received fund grants from the Japan Foundation for its initial research project on culture and human rights in 1996, Ford Foundation for the South Asian consultation workshop in New Delhi in 1998, and Friedrich Naumann Foundation for the development and printing of the Southeast Asian lesson plans. The 1998 Southeast Asian consultation workshop in Surabaya, the 1999 pilot training workshop in Bali, and the 2001 writeshop in Manila received support from SEAFILD/CIDA³⁴ but the fund was given to the partners (Center for Human Rights Studies of Surabaya University and the Philippine Commission on Human Rights) of HURIGHTS OSAKA in the projects.

Below is a summary of the type of institutions that HURIGHTS OSAKA has networked with from the start of its regional human rights education program:

Institution	Project	Country/Subregion
Ministries of Education (including their special institutes)	Southeast, South and Northeast Asian workshops; Southeast Asian research on human rights education; Southeast Asian material development	Cambodia, Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Korea
National Human Rights Institutions	Southeast and South Asian workshops; Southeast and Northeast Asian material development	Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, India, Mongolia
University-based human rights centers	Southeast and South Asian workshops and research; Northeast Asian material development	Indonesia, Thailand, India, China

Non-governmental organizations	Aside from ARRC, other NGOs were always invited to join the workshops and other activities held by HURIGHTS OSAKA. Publication of books (Indian Social Institute – Delhi), Northeast Asian material development (Hong Kong Human Rights Monitor)	Southeast, South and Northeast Asia
Regional institutions	Workshops and conferences (ARRC and APCEU)	Thailand, Korea
Intergovernmental organizations	Material development in Southeast Asia (UNESCO); research on human rights education in Southeast Asia (UNESCO, OHCHR), study tour (OHCHR)	Southeast and Northeast Asia
Foundations	Southeast Asian material development (Friedrich Naumann Foundation); research on culture and human rights (Japan Foundation); South Asian consultation workshop (Ford Foundation)	Southeast, South and Northeast Asia
Schools	School teachers and administrators have been invited to join the activities	Southeast, South and Northeast Asia
Other institutions	Regional training workshop on human rights and Northeast Asian workshop (Korean National Commission for UNESCO)	Asia, and Northeast Asia

HURIGHTS OSAKA has networked with many human rights centers, NGOs, national human rights institutions, and other institutions (such as schools) in relation to human rights education activities. In doing so, HURIGHTS OSAKA crossed the undefined borders that separated these institutions.

Challenges

Given that HURIGHTS OSAKA did not have sufficient resources to support regional activities, it relied to a significant extent on partnership with other institutions in implementing many activities.

The other institutions that worked with HURIGHTS OSAKA, however, faced a number of challenges of their own:

a. Human rights education policy and/or program change – government agencies, national human rights institutions, UN agencies, and other institutions have their respective policies and programs on human rights

education to follow. Once change in their policies and programs occur, support for activities to follow-up on past activities is likely affected.

b. Staff change – change of staff in the institutions involved also means possible change in the plans of such institutions that may affect the continuation of projects that have been started.

c. Funding policies – there is also a general policy in funding programs that limit financial support to a particular institution and/or project. The need to provide financial support to other institutions or projects is a justified basis for this funding policy. The funding mechanisms themselves have limited funds to disburse to qualified institutions and projects, and thus the necessity of spreading the limited resources to as many institutions and projects as possible.

The educational policy environment in several countries has also posed a challenge to HURIGHTS OSAKA. The policy change can be caused by the change of leadership in government, which in turn change priorities in relation to education matters. In the case of Japan, while a national action plan and a law on human rights education have existed since 1990s and early 2000s, the Japanese Ministry of Education, Technology and Science has recently pursued the strengthening of the basic subjects (language, science, mathematics) in terms of content and time allotment, and the weakening of other subjects (such as the Synthetic Learning subject) that have been identified as places for human rights education. There has also been more stress on moral education, and hardly a mention on human rights education. The message being sent out is that there is a need for more discipline among students as well as harmonious relationship among people, and the school curriculum must respond to that need.

At the regional level, human rights education has lost its “popularity” with the ending of the UN Decade. Many initiatives on human rights education lost a “global banner” that the UN Decade provided earlier. In this light, there seemed to be a weakening of national programs on human rights education in the school system. And while the UN Decade was ending, other UN education initiatives came about particularly the education for sustainable development (ESD) that had more government support than the UN Decade. And while human rights are included in the concept of sustainable development, many ESD initiatives fail to cover human rights, and focus more on environmental issues.

While the first phase plan of the WPHRE focused on human rights education in the school system, it did not make as much impact as the UN Decade. The process leading to the adoption of the WPHRE by the UN was not as widely supported as that of the UN Decade, which was recognized by many NGOs as a major step in the international recognition of the significance of human rights education. In this context, HURIGHTS OSAKA has to pursue its program in the school system with less supportive national and regional environment.

HURIGHTS OSAKA also faces the challenge of building up the subsequent or follow-up program that maximizes the activities that have been completed. Is it appropriate to have more training as the next step? Or, considering the weakened momentum for human rights education in the school system, is it better to rebuild the support structure by revisiting previous partners and planning new projects to promote human rights education in the school system? Or, considering the WPHRE, would it be wise to shift support to the focus(es) of its next phase(s)?

Concluding Notes

A little over five years after its formal opening, HURIGHTS OSAKA received an honorable mention award in the UNESCO Prize for Human Rights Education 2000. The award recognized the human rights education work that HURIGHTS OSAKA had been doing in the first five years of its existence. This encouraged HURIGHTS OSAKA to continue to improve what it had started.

HURIGHTS OSAKA has adhered to a consultative and collaborative process as a major component in developing and implementing its regional human rights education program.

In the process of implementing the regional program, it established relations with many institutions (non-governmental and governmental) in the region that were related to human rights work. It was able to tap the participation of institutions that had not been actively involved in many regional initiatives on human rights. It was able to find a niche in the regional human rights education field that complemented the existing national programs on human rights education.

By following the policy of encouraging meaningful work relationships with non-governmental institutions, private and public schools, education

agencies of governments, and national human rights institutions, the regional program of HURIGHTS OSAKA facilitated greater exchange of ideas on human rights education in the formal education system. It helped draw out the rich experiences from these institutions. More significantly, such experiences being rooted in the realities of the countries in the region provided the necessary guide in promoting relevant and practical human rights education.

But HURIGHTS OSAKA has to face its own reality that affected its regional program in the past, and will continue to do so in the future.

HURIGHTS OSAKA is a local institution despite its name and its previous objectives.³⁵ Being a local institution, it devotes much of its resources (materials, facilities, staff and funds) to local activities. The regional program (human rights education, publications, networking, etc.) receives a small percentage of HURIGHTS OSAKA resources.

The lobbying done by the local civil society on the Osaka local governments to support the establishment of a human rights center that would serve Asia-Pacific was unique in the history of human rights movement in the region. It was unprecedented during that period of the 1980s. At the conception of HURIGHTS OSAKA, the stress was obviously on the service to the Asia-Pacific region in terms of human rights promotion. But this was not maintained to a large extent when the operations of HURIGHTS OSAKA started.

In 2014, HURIGHTS OSAKA will celebrate its 20th anniversary. It should be able to take stock of its experience in the past two decades, and define what it should do in the future. While the regional human rights education program yielded many activities and outputs, there still lies the challenge of doing more to continue pursuing the objective of promoting human rights in the Asia-Pacific.

Annex A**HURIGHTS OSAKA publications (1997-2013)
related to human rights education**

<p>Human Rights Education in Asia-Pacific (2010-present)</p> 	<p>Human Rights Education in Asian Schools (1998-2009 - 12 volumes)</p> 	<p>Human Rights Lesson Plans for Southeast Asian Schools (2003)¹</p> 	<p>South Asian Teachers and Human Rights Education - A Training Resource Material (2010)</p> 
<p>Human Rights Education in Northeast Asian School Systems – Resource Material (2013)</p> 	<p>Human Rights Education in Indian Schools (2007)</p> 	<p>Educational Policies and Human Rights Awareness - Japan, India, the Philippines and Sri Lanka (2008)</p> 	<p>Human Rights Education in the School Systems in Southeast Asia - Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR and Thailand (2009)</p> 
<p>Human Rights Education in Philippine Schools (2006)</p> 	<p>The State of Human Rights Education in Northeast Asian School Systems: Obstacles, Challenges, Opportunities (2010)</p> 	<p>Schools, Human Rights and Society (1998)</p> 	<p>Human Rights in Asian Cultures - Continuity and Change (1997)</p> 

¹ This publication has Bahasa Indonesia, Bahasa Melayu, Khmer, and Vietnamese versions. Visit www.hurights.or.jp/english/publication.html for more information

Endnotes

¹ See “Seminar on National, Local and Regional Arrangements for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Asian Region”, United Nations, New York, 1982.

² This social movement was led by the anti-Buraku discrimination movement and included groups working on other issues.

³ The name of ARRC was slightly changed in 2001 by adding “Pacific,” Asia-Pacific Regional Resource Center for Human Rights Education.

⁴ See Jefferson R. Plantilla, “Regional Human Rights Education Initiatives,” *FOCUS Asia-Pacific*, vol. 2, November 1995, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/focus/section2/1995/11/regional-human-rights-education-initiatives.html. See also Jefferson R. Plantilla, “Human Rights Education in Asia-Pacific: A Brief Review,” *Human Rights Education in Asia-Pacific*, vol. 1, 262-283, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/asia-pacific/section1/2010/10/volume-one-1.html; and www.academia.edu/536593/Human_Rights_Education_in_Asia-Pacific_A_Brief_Review.

⁵ See summary of the meeting discussions in “Human Rights, Culture and the Schools,” *FOCUS Asia-Pacific*, vol. 10, December 1997, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/focus/section2/1997/12/human-rights-culture-and-the-schools.html.

⁶ “Human Rights Education in Asian Schools: Achievements, Problems and Prospects,” chapter one of the *Schools, Human Rights and Society - Report of the 1998 Workshops on Human Rights Education in Schools*, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/other_publications/human-rights-education-in-asian-schools-achievements-problems-and-prospects.html.

⁷ The survey questionnaire for the Osaka schools was also shortened due to the comments of the Osaka Board of Education officials before granting permission to undertake the survey.

⁸ Due to technical problems, the results of the survey of human rights awareness in Sri Lanka were not included in the final research report.

⁹ A commercial printing company (Academic Excellence in New Delhi) published the book.

¹⁰ The Philippine Normal University, whose official headed the Philippine research, published the book.

¹¹ A Regional Project Team, which officially monitored the national-level research work and also undertook research on relevant human rights education practices in the school system in Asia, was formed composed of the author and Ms. Bencharat Sae Chua of the then Office of Human Rights Studies and Social Development of Mahidol University.

¹² The name of the center was changed in 2011 to Institute of Human Rights and Peace Studies (IHRP). See profile of IHRP in the second edition of *Directory of Asia-Pacific Human Rights Centers* (Osaka: HURIGHTS OSAKA, 2013), pages 138-139.

¹³ See “ASEAN Writeshop,” *FOCUS Asia-Pacific*, vol. 25, 2001, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/focus/section2/2001/09/asean-writeshop.html, and also “SEA Writeshop: Developing Human Rights Lesson Plans,” *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*, vol. 5, pages 79-90, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/hu

man_rights_education_in_asian_schools/section2/2002/03/sea-writeshop-developing-human-rights-lesson-plans.html.

¹⁴ See pages 6–11 of the *Human Rights Lesson Plans for Southeast Asian Schools* (Bangkok: HURIGHTS OSAKA, 2003) for the explanation on the lesson plan format and contents.

¹⁵ See “Southeast Asian Human Rights Lesson Plans,” *FOCUS Asia-Pacific*, vol 29, 2002, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/focus/section2/2002/09/southeast-asian-human-rights-lesson-plans.html.

¹⁶ The whole file of the *Human Rights Lesson Plans for Southeast Asian Schools* can be downloaded from the following websites:

1. UNESCO Asia-Pacific Bureau of Education

www.unescobkk.org/index.php?id=3125

2. Friedrich Naumann Foundation Manila Office

www.fnf.org.ph/news/human-rights-lesson-plans.htm

3. University of Minnesota

www1.umn.edu/humanrts/edumat/

www1.umn.edu/humanrts/edumat/SoutheastAsianHRE.pdf

www.wfrrt.org/humanrts/edumat/

4. Human Rights Education Associates (HREA)

www.hrea.org/erc/Library/display.php?doc_id=2971&category_id=18&category_type=3

5. Amnesty International Australia

http://action.amnesty.org.au/hre/comments/lesson_plans/6.

6. HURIGHTS OSAKA

www.hurights.or.jp/education_e.html#5

Additional listings:

1. UNESCO-Pakistan

<http://islamic.saintanthonysft.com/Unesco/manuals.html>

<http://unesco.org.pk/education/teachereducation/manuals.html>

2. United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)

www.unhchr.ch/hredu.nsf/LookupAllMATen/EAoC4AC93BEF53E6C1256DE300542987?OpenDocument

3. Applied Learning Teaching Resources (Australia)

<http://appliedlearning.pbworks.com/w/page/13470699/Human-rights-Lesson-plans> (disabled as of 23 May 2013 visit)

4. Broadcast Pdf Documents

http://beepdf.com/doc/2731/human_rights_lesson_plans.html

5. Marksw eb of Books and Manuals

www.imarksw eb.net/book/lesson+plan+in+technology+livelihood+education/ (disabled as of 23 May 2013 visit)

6. Commons - Open Educational Resources

www.oercommons.org/courses/human-rights-lesson-plans-for-southeast-asian-schools

www.oerrecommender.org/resources/66855?details=true

7. PDFMoo.com

www.pdfmoo.com/politics-files/8933/human-rights-lesson-plans.html (linked to UMN)

8. TWBN Groups

<http://groups.teacherswithoutborders.org/en/education-h-rights/node/10849>

9. Joey Davila

www.joeydavila.com/lu/free+philippine+format+lesson+plans/ (linked to UMN) (disabled as of 23 May 2013 visit)

10. SEAPYrAMID Mega Search

www.seapyramid.net/rt/lesson-plan-for-grade-2-makabayan/11 (disabled as of 23 May 2013 visit)

11. SavedPDF.org

www.savepdf.org/more-human-rights-lesson-plans-169013.html (disabled as of 23 May 2013 visit)

12. HUMAN RIGHTS RESOURCE CENTER MALAYSIA

<http://wordpress.com/?ref=footer>

<http://hrforall.wordpress.com/page/18/>

¹⁷ The lesson plans were also translated into Japanese, Chinese and Farsi languages under separate projects. With the exception of the Farsi version, the translated versions are available at the HURIGHTS OSAKA website, www.hurights.or.jp/english/publication.html.

¹⁸ One member of the Review Team representing Malaysia was not in the Writeshop. She was the Commissioner in charge of human rights education at the National Human Rights Commission of Malaysia.

¹⁹ See HURIGHTS OSAKA, "South Asia Workshop on Human Rights Education in Schools," *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*, vol. 9, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/human_rights_education_in_asian_schools/section2/2006/03/south-asia-workshop-on-human-rights-education-in-schools.html.

²⁰ Initially set for a three-year period, the first phase plan of action of the WPHRE was extended to five years (2005-2009). See United Nations Human Rights Council resolution (A/HRC/6/L.16).

²¹ See HURIGHTS OSAKA, "Southeast Asia Pilot Teacher Training Workshop on Human Rights Education in Schools," *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*, vol. 3, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/human_rights_education_in_asian_schools/section2/2000/03/southeast-asia-pilot-teacher-training-workshop-on-human-rights-education-in-schools.html.

²² "SEA Writeshop: Developing Human Rights Lesson Plans," *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*, vol. 5, 79-90, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/human_rights_education_in_asian_schools/section2/2002/03/sea-writeshop-developing-human-rights-lesson-plans.html.

²³ See "South Asia Training Workshop on Human Rights Education in Schools," *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*, vol. 4, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/human_rights_education_in_asian_schools/section2/2001/03/south-asia-training-workshop-on-human-rights-education-in-schools.html.

²⁴ HURIGHTS OSAKA, "South Asia Workshop on Human Rights Education in Schools," *FOCUS Asia-Pacific*, vol. 42, 2005, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/focus/section2/2005/12/south-asia-workshop-on-human-rights-education-in-

schools.html. For more detailed discussion of the proceedings of the training workshop see HURIGHTS OSAKA, "South Asia Workshop on Human Rights Education in Schools," *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*, vol. 9, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/human_rights_education_in_asian_schools/section2/2006/03/south-asia-workshop-on-human-rights-education-in-schools.html.

²⁵ HURIGHTS OSAKA has other research projects with publications as output such as the research on social development and human rights with two monographs (*Development and Democracy: Philippines' Quest for the Next Century* and *Social Development and Human Rights in Indonesia*, both published in 1998), research on human rights centers in Asia-Pacific that resulted in the publication of two editions of the *Directory of Asia-Pacific Human Rights Centers* (2008 and 2013), and research on law, jurisprudence and human rights that led to the publication of *Law, Jurisprudence and Human Rights in Asia* (2011).

²⁶ This book was co-edited by the author and one of the research partners, Sebasti L. Raj, S.J., whose institution, the Indian Social Institute – Delhi, published the whole research report.

²⁷ This is also significant in light of the persistent assertion that human rights contradict "Asian values," despite the fact that the existence of "Asian values" in the vast Asian region has largely been disputed. Values upheld in many countries in Asia are similar to those values upheld in other regions.

²⁸ This was the Regional Meeting on Human Rights Education held on 23-25 September 1997 in Bangkok and organized in cooperation with the Asian Regional Resource Center for Human Rights Education (ARRC) and Child Rights Asianet. The documents circulated at the meeting were the following:

I. Experiences in HRE in Schools

1. The United Nations and Human Rights Education in School, Ms. Valai na Pombejr
2. Notes on Human Rights Education in Schools, Commissioner Saparinah Sadli (National Commission on Human Rights, Indonesia)
3. Human Rights Education in Kunijima High School, Toru Sasaki (Osaka, Japan)
4. What motivated the Movement for the Defence of Democratic Rights (M.D.D.R.) to workout a Human Rights Education Program in schools?, H.M. Chitral Perera (Colombo, Sri Lanka)
5. Human Rights Education in Schools - Some Aspects of Sri Lanka Experience, Laksiri Fernando (Sri Lanka Foundation)
6. The National Initiative In Human Rights Education In Schools and The Role of National Human Rights Commission, Lakshmi Singh (National Human Rights Commission, India)
7. Inroads to the Philippine Formal Education System - The Jose W. Diokno Foundation Experience, Janet Atutubo (J.W. Diokno Foundation, Manila, Philippines)
8. Teaching of Mathematics and Human Rights, Mavic Villena (Manila, Philippines)
9. Human Rights Education in Cambodian Schools - the Experience of the Last Three Years, Ms. Mengho Leang (Phnom Penh, Cambodia)

10. Human Rights Modules for Year IV (Prototype Materials), Commission on Human Rights and the Department of Education, Culture and Sports (Manila, Philippines)

II. Papers on Cultural Values and Human Rights

1. Indian Cultural Values and The Promotion of Human Rights, Sebasti L. Raj and Bansidhar Pradhan (Indian Social Institute, New Delhi, India)
2. Asia's Cultural Values and Human Rights, The Philippine Perspective : Diego G. Quejada II and Romelino Obinario (Quezon City, Philippines)
3. Human Rights and Javanese Ethics, Johan Ferdinand (Jakarta, Indonesia)
4. Japan and Cultural Development in East Asia - Possibilities of a New Human Rights Culture, Kinhide Mushakoji (Meiji Gakuin University, Tokyo, Japan)
5. Articulating Modern Notions of Human Rights in Sri Lanka in the Context of the Paradigmatic Positions of Buddhist Ethics: A Brief Comment on Problems and Concerns, Sasanka Perera (University of Colombo, Colombo)
6. Cultural Values and Human Rights in the light of Korean Perspective: Byung-Sun Oh, (Sogang University, Seoul)
7. Cultural Values and Human Rights: Siddhartha (Bangalore, India)

III. Other Papers

1. Opening Speech of Prof. Borwornsak Uwanno, Dean of Faculty of Law, Chulalongkorn University
2. Welcome Remarks of Prof. Dong-hoon Kim, Director, HURIGHTS OSAKA
3. Annual Report 1996, Cambodian Institute of Human Rights
4. Regional Newsletter in Asia and the Pacific (UNESCO Associated Schools Project)
5. Asia-Pacific Network for International Education and Values Education (UNESCO APNIEVE: UNESCO Principal Regional Office) brochure
6. Report of the Asian Regional Study Session on Human Rights, Forum-Asia
7. Some Writings on the Wall, HURIGHTS OSAKA
8. BATINGAW, official publication of the Commission on Human Rights (Manila, Philippines)
9. DOWA EDUCATION: Educational Challenge Toward A Discrimination-Free Japan, Buraku Liberation Research Institute
10. Shattering the Myth of the Homogenous Society: Minority Issues and Movements in Japan - JPRN MONOGRAPH SERIES
11. Asia Pacific NGO Human Rights Congress (New Delhi, December 1996) report
12. Preliminary Report on the GO-NGO-ACADEME National Consultation Workshop on Human Rights Education, February 3-5, 1997 (Commission on Human Rights, Philippines)
12. Dignity, Democracy and Diversity: An Educational Model for Co-existence Between Minority and Majority, Wichai Srirat (Child Rights Asianet, Bangkok,, Thailand)
13. *FOCUS Asia-Pacific* (June and September 1997 vols. 8 & 9), HURIGHTS OSAKA.

²⁹ Taken from the Foreword by Osamu Shiraishi, Director of HURIGHTS OSAKA, in the first volume of *Human Rights Education in Asia-Pacific*, available at www.hurights.or.jp/archives/asia-pacific/.

³⁰ This is based on the agreement between OHCHR and HURIGHTS OSAKA nominated as RAS/99/AH/15 - Enhancing national capacities for human rights education in Northeast Asian schools. The subregional training workshop was held on 1-4 December 1999 in Seoul, Korea.

³¹ There was no official delegation from Japan for this training workshop. A junior staff of the Japanese consulate in Seoul briefly attended the training workshop to deliver a report on the state of human rights education in Japan.

³² This is Project RAS/04/AH/10 - Implementation of the Two-Year Programme of Action for the Framework on Regional Cooperation for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Asia-Pacific Region Capacity Building for Human Rights Education in Schools: Southeast and South Asia -2005-2006.

³³ This is GLO/06/HC/01-RRDB - Activity code 1U11, World Programme for Human Rights Education 2006-2008 - Regional mapping, collection of best practices and coordination of initiatives to promote human rights education in South-East Asian school systems.

³⁴ Southeast Asia Fund for Institutional and Legal Development (SEAFILD) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)

³⁵ The first three original objectives of HURIGHTS OSAKA have regional character: 1) To promote human rights in the Asia-Pacific region; 2) To convey Asia-Pacific perspectives on human rights to the international community; 3) To ensure inclusion of human rights principles in Japanese international cooperation activities. When HURIGHTS OSAKA was registered as a foundation in 2012, the first objective was “1) To engender popular understanding in Osaka of the international human rights standards.” The two other objectives are the following: “2) To support international exchange between Osaka and countries in Asia-Pacific through collection and dissemination of information and materials on human rights; 3) To promote human rights in Asia-Pacific in cooperation with national and regional institutions as well as the United Nations.” Considering the first two objectives, emphasis seemed to be more on the domestic needs.