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Abstract: This article attempts to critically analyze the current political situation in the world, highlighting the role that intercultural education for social justice can play. Over the last thirty years or so, political parties and movements around the globe have managed to impose their agenda on the public debate and contribute to an increase in racism, classism, sexism, nativism, xenophobia, antisemitism, Islamophobia, transphobia, anti-environmentalism, anti-indigeneity, as well as anti-intellectualism, irrationality, and belief in conspiracy theories in many countries.

Intercultural Education for Social Justice opposes to these directions and fights against the ways schools contribute to maintain social inequities and unequal distribution of power. It also challenges injustice that “different” or “other” students experience in school and society and fights for the equality of all students not only in access to educational structures, but also in educational outcomes, with the ultimate goal of a better society.
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Introduction

The long-term economic crisis, to which the problems raised by the covid-19 pandemic and Russia's invasion of Ukraine have added, has had a decisive impact on social and political life in the economically developed countries of the West. Taking advantage of this crisis, political organizations, parties, movement, and populist demagogues most often (but not solely) belonging to the far / alternative right cultivate and reinforce in a systematic way the phobias and prejudices of the people. More in detail, on an ideological level these individuals and groups spread fake news and conspiracy theories, such as The Great Replacement Theory (Ekman, 2022), according to which people who do not belong to the white race or who have a religion other than Christianity "invade" Western countries in order to replace the old inhabitants with more obedient people or with people who serve a dark plan of a global elite (which in many cases is vaguely identified with the Jews).

Refugees and immigrants are the main target of this campaign. Far right parties use social media, but they also have the support of many Mass Media, in order to exaggerate the number of “intruders” and magnifies every negative episode in which "others" are involved, emphasizing the different national origins or religion of the perpetrators. Furthermore, they willingly spread unfounded rumors and fake news about the cultural characteristics of refugees and immigrants to dehumanize them. In this way, they contribute to the proliferation of negative stereotypes, prejudices, and feelings about any “different” individual or group. We underline that, far right and

---

1 We refer to Western countries because they invoke individual and human rights and freedoms.
2 Quotation marks here, as in other corresponding cases in this text, indicate our opposition or reservation to the (each) specific term. Due to lack of space, we cannot be more detailed about each case where we use quotation marks.
populist parties have also engaged in a struggle against people belonging to the LGBQ+ community, ethnic minorities and where appropriate women and people with disabilities. More generally, they are positioned against all "other" people, as well as human and civil rights.

From a rhetorical standpoint, the slogans far / alternative right use, they are simplistic and aim to cultivate fear, discord, and hatred. For example: "the good Christian - the bad Muslim", "our good compatriot - the bad immigrant", "immigrants are taking our jobs and hospital beds", "our nation first", "immigrants go back where you came from” and “we must take back control of our country”.

Far / alternative right activist action has on its agenda a ban on the entry of any refugee or migrant and the expulsion of those already in the country, the building of border walls with lethal wires, the ban on the construction of mosques, as well as the attacks on institutions like universities and associations like Non-Governmental Organizations supporting social diversity, human rights, and civil freedoms.

The strategy and the long-term action of the far / alternative right has been successful, as shown by the electoral results, polls on issues of social diversity, but also by the fact that they have managed to impose their agenda on the political scene of many Western countries. As a result, there is a rise in racism, classism, sexism, nativism, xenophobia, antisemitism, Islamophobia, transphobia, anti-environmentalism, anti-indigeneity, as well as anti-intellectualism, irrationality, and belief in conspiracy theories.

At this point we should emphasize that the situation in question becomes even more dangerous, if we consider that during the last twenty years there is a growing number of states across the globe that are moving away from the liberal democratic model and are governed in an authoritarian manner. The danger now comes not only from the threat of nuclear war or of a nuclear accident, but also from climate change, the existence of which far-right parties and populist demagogues strongly deny.
In our opinion, if humanity wants to reverse this course, collective action by all those who understand the problem is essential. So does progressive leadership, as well as systematic intervention of institutions such as public administration, criminal justice, and education. We stress that there is still time to take such initiatives, since rhetoric, but also political directions and actions of most Western countries and of European Union, legislation, as well as mainstream political and scientific concepts like social exclusion and intercultural education are aimed at a more diverse, inclusive, democratic and ultimately to a better society.

In the following subchapters of our paper, we will explore the role that education can play in the current circumstances, and more specifically, how intercultural education for social justice can encourage educational, social, and political action which aims to reverse this disastrous course.

**Historical Development of Intercultural Education**

Historically, education was one of the Ideological State Apparatuses that contributed to the dominance of the ideology of the bourgeois classes (Althusser, 2006). Schools have provided and continue to provide a set of knowledge, attitudes and skills that promotes the interests of the bourgeoisie, by presenting its worldview as universal, economic, and social inequalities as natural, as well as training students to respect social hierarchies. In addition, the school reinforces nationalism, presents a monolithic national identity, helping to spread, propagate and enforce national languages, religions, myths, and symbols. By highlighting and projecting the experiences and life performances of specific social groups, schools have refused and to a certain extent
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3 See for example the anti-racism action plan (European Commission, 2020).
4 See for example (European Parliament, 2022).
continue to refuse to treat other groups of students in the same way. Thus, schools contribute to exclusion and school failure of the “different” students. In other words, for many years schools, by not considering the economic and social differences that affect learning and performance in the exams, have contributed to the invisibility and failure of “other” students.

This role of education caused the reaction of people like academics, theorists, and educators, who supported equality, and fight for an open, democratic, and inclusive school. A school which will help all students equally, regardless of their social class, gender, ethnicity, nationality, culture, religion, language, sexual orientation, and abilities/disabilities.

The ground for social equality among all people became more fertile after the Second World War and the lessons that humanity seemed to have learned from it. More specifically, in the period that followed the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948), a series of liberation movements took place all over the world. These movement challenged colonialism and every other form of oppression and social hierarchies. It is in this context that multicultural education was formed in the United States of America, during the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s that is the struggle for justice and equality for African Americans.

Multicultural education was precisely the contribution of educationists to it (Bennett, 2001), a proposal to revise curricula and pedagogical practices in primary and secondary schools (Leistyna, 1998). Later, other minority groups (national, ethnic, and cultural groups) were added to the interest of multicultural education, as well as inequalities related to social class, gender, religion, language, sexual orientation, abilities/disabilities (Sleeter & Grant, 2014) elderly students, and students from single parent families (Chapman & Grant, 2010). As a result, the term Multicultural Education became an umbrella, under which many forms of social diversities are included (Ladson-Billings, 2004; Ngo, 2010).
In Western Europe, multicultural education was developed first in the United Kingdom and later in countries such as the Netherlands, France, and Germany, having at its inception the aim of educational integration of refugees and migrant. A decisive event in the development of this reformist educational movement in Europe was the adoption of its objectives and principles by the European Union (Faas, Hajisoteriou, & Angelides, 2014). We underline that in Europe, already since the 1980s, it had been proposed to change the term of the movement, from Multicultural to Intercultural Education (Coulby, 2006, 246). This change was sealed in the early years of the new millennium, when politicians such as UK Prime Minister Cameron, French President Sarkozi and German Chancellor Merkel spoke of the end of multiculturalism (Jura, 2012). During this period, various journalists and politicians accused multiculturalism of encouraging ethnic differences and interests at the expense of national ones, and that by overemphasizing particularities, it contributes to the economic, political, and social marginalization of minority groups (Awad, 2011, 40). The aforementioned politicians attempted to attribute the failure to integrate their ethnically diverse inhabitants to the multicultural policies. We underline that the politicians who condemned multiculturalism belonged most of the times to the parties that proposed and implemented its specific form.

To fill this gap, theorists such as Ted Cantle (2006, 2011) proposed to establish and strengthen the concepts of interculturality and intercultural education, renouncing with the new term cultural relativism and setting as their main goal to break the isolation of minorities, through interaction and communication between different groups.

Our assessment is that the differences between multicultural and intercultural education are not great, at least not as great as the differences within the two approaches (Zachos, 2022). That is why we use the two terms as synonymous. The term Intercultural education, like the term Multicultural education, refers to a theoretical movement, in national policies, as well as in school practices, that aim at an
overall reform of education, so that it becomes more democratic and inclusive. The theoretical production of these two traditions, as well as of anti-racist education, are part of a scientific area (discipline), which aims to improve the living conditions of historically disadvantaged groups. This discipline includes in its subject matter modules related to economics, politics and diplomacy, social solidarity and cohesion, demography, history, democracy, individual and social rights, gender rights, national identity, patriotism, globalization, cosmopolitanism, etc. (Zachos, 2023). We underline that what multicultural, intercultural, and anti-racist education have in common is that they try to obstruct the spread of hatred and discord among people. That is why they are being challenged by political forces and public figures who are pushing for an education oriented towards the preservation of economic and social hierarchies and injustices, nationalism, nativism, and racism.

Dimensions of Intercultural Education
Intercultural Education was built on the ideals of freedom, justice, equality, equity, and human dignity (National Association of Multicultural Education, 2011). However, on the exact definition of the concept, as for other concepts in the social sciences, there is no consensus among its theorists. Each of them defines it according to his or her political and philosophical position. Nevertheless, a common element among those who advocate intercultural education is that they consider it to be related to changes that should be done in schools, so that the needs of all students are better met. Which categories of students are affected by these changes and therefore from Intercultural education, is a critical issue on which there are differences between those who support it. In the following analysis we explore the dimensions of intercultural education based on the answer to this question, as well as to the question concerning which society
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In a first category, we include theoretical and research studies, as well as educational policies and school practices of Intercultural education, in which cultural refers only to "racial", national, and ethnic characteristics. Based on this definition of cultural, "race" and different ethnic groups are the main goal of intercultural education, not only for those who support it, but also for its opponents, since all of them do not perceive as cultural the differences that arise from gender, social class, physical ability, or religion (Rodriguez, 2000, 154).

In this category we distinguish two sub-groups: In the first one, we include those who believe that the integration of nationally or ethnically different children in school is an issue that concerns only these children and their families. The consequence of such an approach is that the interventions, actions, and activities proposed by intercultural education’s theorists are exclusively addressed to children from ethnically, and culturally diverse groups. In this context, intercultural education refers to the way in which the school should organize the reception and integration of “different” students, while the teachers should be prepared and organize to deal with the issues arising from those students’ presence in schools. Such an approach creates concern for teachers, since as they expect immigrant students to be different and to pose challenges, if not problems (Holm & Londen, 2010, 114). As it concerns the specific educational objectives of such an approach, they focus on learning of the language of the “host country” as a second language, as well as the students’ cultural assimilation.

The perception according to which intercultural / multicultural education is only relevant to “other” / “different” students is "strong and vivid in the public imagination as well as in the hearts and minds of many teachers and administrators" (Banks, 1999, 6).

In our view, this perception is conservative, since it defends the preservation of
existing socioeconomic structures. It is also mono-cultural, often giving culture a narrow, essentialist interpretation, according to which people are defined by their cultural characteristics. Finally, it is assimilationist, since those who support it believe that cultural homogeneity is necessary for the unity of the nation and therefore, “different” people should adapt individually to the new environment. In this way group identities, which play an important role in shaping individual ones, are not taken into account. Likewise, the voices and perspectives of “different” people are also not considered, since their perceptions are not valued (Kanpol, 1994).

Among those theorists and researchers who consider only "racial", national, and ethnic differences to be cultural, there is a second group, whose members claim that the inclusion of ethnically or racially different pupils in school concerns all students. And this is because:

Firstly, from an ethical point of view, people are different but equal and everyone's environment, stories and voices should be respected and recognized by the school and wider society. Secondly, in terms of everyday educational realities, schools should operate in a way that ensures harmonious coexistence and the best chances of success for all its members. This approach is based on the belief of its proponents that the role of multiculturalism is to enhance social diversity and promote good interpersonal activities among people of different cultural backgrounds (Becirevic, 2012). Children must respect all their classmates, regardless of the national, ethnic, or cultural group they belong to. Integration will succeed when the members of the dominant group contribute to it. The "others" may do their best to adapt to their new environment, but the members of the "dominant" group must also accept them. Just as a person cannot enter a house whose door is closed; he / she cannot enter a group that does not want him/her. Schools, therefore, should help the children of the 'majority' group to accept newcomers and in general the "different" people as equal members of the school
community and wider society.

Thirdly, from an economic perspective, all students should develop the knowledge, skills and attitudes that will help them to adapt to the global economic environment. "Multicultural skills are needed for 'managing diversity' in the workforce, improving creativity and innovation in transnational corporations, and increasing global business performance" (Resnik, 2009, 218).

What is important for the fulfilment of the objectives mentioned above is to create such an environment in the classroom and in the school, in which nationally, ethnically, and culturally "different" students feel comfortable. To do this, schools and teachers need to make a series of interventions in the school curriculum, so that it includes elements from the culture and social environment of all the students. With these additions, advocates expect that: First, minority students will feel proud of the environment they come from. Secondly, students of the majority group will meet the world of their minority classmates, which will help them to break down any stereotypes and prejudices they had about the latter, but also to accept and recognize their culture. A second field of interventions concerns everyday school practices. Teachers in classrooms should use all methods that can bring together students from minority groups with their classmates from the majority group. Examples of such methods and strategies are teamwork, restorative justice, drama games such as roleplaying, or mime, and, on a more general level, the emphasis on the democratic functioning of the classroom.

This liberal approach to intercultural education recognizes human rights and individual freedoms. Its implementation brings about some improvements for "different" students, as it promotes tolerance, appreciation of different cultures and social diversities. However it aims to change perceptions, attitudes and behaviors of individuals and ignores the acute economic and social problems, as well as the unequal distribution of power created by social class and by the unequal status of members of (different)
“racial”, national, or cultural groups. In other words, those who support the liberal conception of intercultural education seem not to consider poverty and economic inequalities as major problems. In addition, they probably don't give racism in the “host society” the importance it deserves.

Theory, policies, and educational practices, according to which intercultural education addresses only “racially”, ethnically, and culturally diverse students, seem to be the most widespread. As a result, a large part of the programs and interventions made in the name of intercultural education tends to mark an emphasis on teaching the official language as a second language for minority children, as well as some additions about heroes, national and religious feasts, and customs of "different" students in the curriculum. It also means school festivals, which emphasize food, music, and dances from around the world. As Ladson-Billings & Tate (1995, 61) characteristically state, intercultural education often results in "trivial examples and artifacts of cultures, such as eating ethnic or cultural foods, singing or dancing, [and/or] reading folktales". We stress that even these limited changes may be introduced one year and abandoned the next, for example because there are no "different" children in the school or because the teacher who promoted them left the school or because many parents complain.

These fragmentary additions to the traditional curriculum and school life do not help students to become aware of the roots of social variations, historical reality, as well as the contemporary political, social, and economic conditions. Traditional curricula, hidden curricula and school practices create in a - probably large - part of the student population the belief that what they learn in school is beyond question, and that social hierarchies and inequalities are natural. In this way, in the traditional school, students are not trained to question, to make informed criticism and to assert themselves.

Furthermore, all children do not have the opportunity to understand the structures that lead to poverty and to acute economic and social inequalities. Two examples: First, children growing up in a racially influenced environment do not have the opportunity
to learn in school about the structure of racist narratives and they may contribute to the perpetuation of racism (Cordes & Sabzalian, 2020). Second, if (intercultural) education do not deconstruct the concept of meritocracy, most students may believe that the exclusion of a proportion of people of Roma origins from school is due to their diversity and especially to their culture. So, they learn to ignore or overlook the social, cultural, political, and economic conditions that prevent students of Roma origins from realizing their potential. In other words, students and tomorrow's citizens do not acquire the tools to understand the racism that people of Roma origin have been suffering nor the many years that they have been living on the margins of society. A reality that led them to a dire financial situation and has greatly limited their opportunities for social advancement. A reality that led to the very low esteem that members of other ethnic groups have for people or Roma origins.

At this point we should stress that despite their inadequacy, even these -in our opinion- incomplete, fragmented, and ineffective interventions and practices of intercultural education have been and are still being strongly questioned. As early as the 1990s, when efforts were made in the United States of America to make school curricula more multicultural, conservative theorists (Bloom, 1989; D'Souza, 1991; Ravitch, 1990; Schlesinger, 1992) have argued that this reduces the emphasis on the Western Canon (Banks, 1993), i.e. the greatest works of Western culture (literature, philosophy, music, art). More analytically, according to its' opponents (Onleck, 2000):

First, the “recognition” and teaching of different languages leads to the devaluation of the official language. This is an obstacle to schools' efforts to help the poor acquire an elaborate language code and succeed in school and in society.

Second, education in an intercultural classroom degrades children's ability to read, write and reason.
Third, changes in the curriculum degrade the quality and value of academic knowledge. The curriculum should not glorify the values of non-dominant cultures but should focus on Western civilization. The pursuit of fulfilling social goals works to the detriment of acquiring an adequate body of knowledge and analytical thinking.

"The above perceptions: First, they contradict well-established scientific stances, such as those concerning the role of the first language in the learning and cultivation of the second. Second, they demonize the coexistence of students from different cultural backgrounds. Third, they start from an apparent or latent hierarchy of cultures, on the basis of which the curriculum should be drawn up. Such a conception promotes the values and beliefs of the bourgeoisie, ignores those of the working class and “different” groups, and clearly reinforces the maintenance of the current distribution of economic, political, and social power" (Zachos, 2014, 152-153).

In the years that followed, attacks on multiculturalism and intercultural education increased. Multiculturalism has been accused that by recognizing and celebrating ethnic differences, it promotes and reinforces minority identities at the expense of national one. Thus, multiculturalism strengthening the demands of minorities for autonomy and at the same time the isolation of “different” groups. As a result, multiculturalism prevents members of a nation from focusing on what they have in common and building a common path. We underline that the issues related to intercultural education have had and still have a great impact on a non-specialist audience, and that nowadays they are used by right-wing and conservative pundits, publicists, journalists, and politicians as a dog whistle, i.e. as a coded message understood by a particular group of people. These public figures have been successful in convincing people dissatisfied with the economic and political reality that "different" people are the cause of the suffering they face. This has resulted in hostile attitudes towards non-members of the dominant group ("outgroup hostility"), since a -
perhaps significant - part of the population of economically developed Western countries believes that the emphasis on diversity social differentiation and the corresponding educational policies that fund and promote programs for the poor, refugees and migrants deprive them and their children of economic resources and life opportunities.

In the last twenty years or so, intercultural education has been degraded, at least at the level of applied policies and everyday educational practice. This degradation is closely related to the electoral prevalence of conservative and far / alternative right parties which are hostile to "different" people. A second reason for this deterioration is the almost universal prevalence of the market ideology, which promotes excellence at the expense of diversity. Market ideology has signaled and continues to signify the intensification of students’ and schools’ evaluation through standardized tests, a process that absorbs all school activity and leaves little room for socio-emotional learning and remedial policies.

**Intercultural education for social justice**

Those theoretical and research efforts and educational practices, which are usually limited to the "recognition of difference" have been and continue to be criticized by academics and educational practitioners who believe that intercultural education should be “a means for educational and social change” (Martin, 2014 110). According to them, the aim of intercultural education is to help address socioeconomic inequalities and power imbalances, as well as to combat racism and cultural domination. They also argue that intercultural education is addressed to all pupils, in every classroom, regardless of whether it has children from 'different' groups or not. The changes intercultural education proposes concern all subjects and are not
exhausted to a single lesson or a project of limited hours or days. We call this approach intercultural education for social justice (Zachos, 2022, 2023).

Intercultural education for social justice supports the acceptance of all students' identities and backgrounds, challenges racism, discrimination, and injustice, and seeks equality among all people. Therefore, through its theoretical elaborations and practical applications, it aims to contribute to remove the structural limitations that support inequalities and eliminate the educational and life chances of "different" students.

For those of us who support intercultural education for social justice, the fight against the factors that generate socio-economic inequalities and unequal distribution of power requires that we recognize their social dimensions and not attribute them to endogenous characteristics of individuals. We consider that the interaction of characteristics such as social class, ethnicity, ethnic origin, language, religion, gender, sexual orientation, and age can benefit or disadvantage members of certain social groups. Therefore, we believe that understanding social diversity also means understanding their diversity of thought, action, and circumstances in relation to oppressive social and institutional power structures, i.e. understanding the thinking of people from low economic classes, people of different skin color, homosexuals, older people, people with disabilities, newly arrived immigrants, and gender groups (Weil, 1992, 68).

In more detail, Intercultural Education for Social Justice is a theoretical area, a set of educational policies and school practice that aims:

A) to contribute to the fight against economic inequalities, the unequal distribution of power, racism, oppression, sexism, nationalism, xenophobia, as well as any category of discrimination against groups or individuals.

B) that poor and “different” students to have the best teachers and are taught by the best teaching methods and means.
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C) to create those conditions (safe and creative school and classroom environment) in which students, regardless of social class, gender, ethnic origin, culture, religion, language, and sexual orientation can be empowered to reach their full potential. In addition, "different" students enjoy a "challenging" curriculum, which: First, it helps them not to passively accept social inequalities and injustices and to embrace the values of equality and social justice. Second, it commits them to addressing real and contentious social and political issues. Third, it exercises them to respect and cooperate with each other, as well as with every human being, but also to live and succeed in a different society from their own. Fourth, it pushes them to operate with intellectual rigor and to develop the ability to question, analyze, synthesize, judge, and think critically, to free themselves from the stereotypes and prejudices they may hold. Fifth, it teaches them to think and act in terms of what is right and not in their (narrow) own interests. Sixth, it encourages them to reassess their positions and reconsider their actions. Seventh, it trains them to make decisions about their future and to be willing to contribute to the creation of a better society.

In lieu of an epilogue

Intercultural education has become both a popular catchphrase and an obsolete descriptor within educational settings (Castagno, 2009). The fact that "scholars have found ways to construe it as a part of the dominant paradigm" (Ladson- Billings, 2004, 53), offers intercultural education influence and some recognition, at least in Western countries. Furthermore, intercultural education has become a significant force for school reform over the past four decades, giving rise to new theories and research at all educational levels (Ramsey, 2008, 206). This well- established position of intercultural education, both in educational theory and in everyday school life,
indicates its usefulness in the struggle for a better education and a better society. This is supported by the fact that intercultural education can have an impact upon every school function, like curriculum, didactics, disciplinary policies, as well as student, parent, and community involvement (Nieto, 1992).

As we have already mentioned, in recent years, especially since the financial crisis manifested itself with the collapse of Leaman Brothers (Mieszala, 2019), there are political forces that are strongly opposed to intercultural education and are pushing for a re-folding of education, so that it aims to consolidate economic and social inequalities, the entrenchment of the (respective) nation-state, its values and identities, as well as towards the exclusion of "others" and the devaluation of democratic values.5

On the other hand, liberals argue that intercultural education helps to make a nation's identity more inclusive. Anti-discrimination measures, affirmative action and legal exemptions for minority groups help them to feel better and integrate into the national community. Liberals believe that when citizenship is linked to political elements, such as the constitution, laws and institutions, national identity ceases to be identified with (supposed) ethnic origin and becomes political and inclusive. Such an approach of citizenship makes life easier for many “different” people who have been experienced “othering”, discrimination, and marginalization.

We believe that the contribution of the liberal dimension of intercultural education is

5 It is typical of the effects of an education of these orientations that the number of young people who are not bothered by non-democratic forms of governance is increasing [for example, in the US young people aged 16 to 24 years old believe that democracy is a "bad" or "very bad" way of governance, while about 70% of millennials do not believe that it is necessary to live in a country governed by a democratic rule of law (Westheimer, 2019). We also emphasize the role played by misuse of the internet, as many students use far-right sites to write assignments related to, for example, immigration, refugees, and citizenship.
valuable in the struggle for the rights and freedoms of oppressed and marginalized groups. Any partial victories, such as the recognition of differences and the institutional registration of the rights of “different” groups, like women and people of different sexual orientation, are indeed important. Important for moral and symbolic reasons, but also important to the lives of people belonging to these groups. Furthermore, these victories are important for society and for the common good, since a number of those empowered individuals can now, from a more favorable position, to show solidarity with the poor, the economically weaker and the excluded groups and contribute to the struggle for a better society. However, our belief is that a society of equality and justice can only emerge when all economic and social inequalities, as well as the unequal distribution of power, are combated. The acute economic inequalities, the burning issues of racism, nationalism, sexism, antisemitism, islamophobia, and discrimination against people with different sexual orientation show that intercultural education for social justice is now, more than ever before necessary.
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