Education for sustainable inequality? A postcolonial analysis of materials for Development Education in Germany

Daniel Bendix, Chandra-Milena Danielzik, Timo Kiesel
glokal e.V., Germany

Abstract

The central objective of this paper is to explore in how far Development Education (DE) material in Germany broaches or neglects postcolonial power relations. The analysis is based on materials for DE in Germany dating from 2007 to 2012 which are publicly accessible and used by NGOs, teachers and multipliers as guidance for their educational work. The analysis evidences that the material "disremembers" colonialism in various ways. Furthermore it reproduces hegemonic eurocentric development imaginary. With the absence of a critical, postcolonial perspective on the interconnectedness of colonialism, capitalism and 'development', the bifurcation of the world persists: on the one hand people and societies which need to be 'developed', and helpers on the other. In addition, the material does not do justice to an inclusive pedagogy in a society of migration: Not all potential participants with their different societal positions are included and addressed; instead, learning takes place based on, and at the expense of, the 'Other'. The paper argues that instead of questioning historically developed relations of power and domination, German DE in its current orientation contributes to stabilising inequality at the social, political, and economic level.

Introduction

What is discussed under the label of Global Citizen Education in the Anglo-American context, is most commonly referred to as Education for Sustainable Development and Global Learning in Germany. Even though these two approaches have different histories and, at times, use different focal points, they mostly evidence congruence and are thus merged here under the term Development Education (DE). DE in Germany aims at encouraging the shaping of a more just and sustainable world marked by solidarity (BMZ & KMK, 2007). It is supposed to enhance levels of knowledge, to invigorate and turn people into responsible members of society as well as responsible global citizens. Yet, DE may also facilitate the perpetuation of existing hierarchies and the strengthening of certain societal or global spectra at the expense of others (Andreotti, 2006a; Andreotti & de Souza, 2012). The objective of this paper is to explore in how far, and to what effect, German DE material broaches or neglects postcolonial power relations. We provide insight into dominant narratives and omissions and find that DE in Germany in its current orientation tends to contribute to stabilising colonial and racialised relations of inequality at the national and global level.

In addition to general deliberations on how and why postcolonial theory can be fruitfully applied to the field of development (Kapoor, 2008; McEwan, 2009), scholars have explored the continuation of colonial-era relationships between donor and recipient countries (Biccum, 2005; Slater & Bell, 2002), the impact of racialisation in development (Kothari, 2006a; Wilson, 2012), the intertwining of gender and "race" (Syed & Ali, 2011; White, 2006), subjectivities of

development workers (Eriksson Baaz, 2005; Heron, 2007), and geographical imaginations and practices (Noxolo, 2006; Wainwright, 2008). Postcolonial examinations of development to date have focused on activities by British (Biccum, 2005; Kothari, 2006b; Noxolo, 2006; Slater & Bell, 2002), and to a lesser degree Canadian (Heron, 2007) and Scandinavian (Eriksson Baaz, 2005) development practices. The colonial present in German development remains largely under-researched. Previous analyses inspired by postcolonial theory have examined charity advertisements (Kiesel & Bendix, 2010), development volunteer programmes (Kontzi, im Erscheinen), reproductive health and population policy (Bendix, 2014; Deuser, 2010), and school books (Marmer & Ziai, 2013) as well as school partnerships (Steinwachs, 2012; KATE e. V., 2013). German DE material is yet to come under scrutiny.

Analysing DE material in Germany for the potential proliferation of colonial-racist ideas and practices is indispensable for tackling postcolonial power relations in the global context as well as within Germany. As Development Education was not intended to foster dialogue between the Global North and South, but rather constituted an intra-societal Northern soliloquy to legitimise international development policy (McCollum, 1996), an examination of the legacy of DE's Eurocentrism and self-interestedness is crucial. Studies in school contexts in Germany have ascertained a direct link between the portrayal of the Global South in education material and, quite worryingly, the prevalence of racism from White German students and teachers towards Black students (Marmer, Marmer, Hitomi, & Sow, 2010). Today's participants of DE – especially in light of the target group being mainly bourgeois or well-off – are tomorrow's decision-makers with regards to foreign policy, migration and asylum policy, education etc. Focusing on Germany not only seems timely because of its colonial history, but also of its place in the world today. It is the European Union's largest, and the world's second largest, aid donor (Global Humanitarian Assistance, 2012), and of all the OECD countries, Germany's spending on DE is the highest in absolute numbers (World University Service, 2014). As a reflection of its financial contribution, German DE in general and its materials in particular serve as a point of reference for other German-speaking countries such as Austria and Switzerland, but also for several East European countries.

This paper is based on an extensive analysis of DE materials which we have conducted in order to initiate a debate in Germany in terms of content, fundamental concepts, and pitfalls of the material used in this field (glokal e. V., 2013). The initial documentation of our examination caused lively and controversial discussions amongst DE stakeholders in Germany. At presentations at international conferences we were asked to provide translations into English, French and Czech as scholars identified similar situation in other country contexts (Bryan & Bracken, 2011; Martin, forthcoming). Our analysis draws on materials for DE in Germany which are accessible as printed method booklets, as websites or as downloads, which are applied by NGOs, teachers and multipliers as guidance for their own educational work. From a wealth of material, we selected and analysed over a hundred sources and core documents dating from 2007 (in some cases, from 2002) to 2012. In addition, we included the indicative framework for DE in Germany (BMZ & KMK, 2007) – developed and published by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder in the Federal Republic of Germany (KMK). As development is a fundamentally textual arena, postcolonial development scholars commonly resort to publications to understand the knowledge represented and produced, the practices proposed and undertaken, and the agents constructed and invoked (Biccum, 2005;

Noxolo, 2006). In line with such approaches we employ

> the post-colonial as a critical mode of enquiry [...] to pose a series of questions concerning [DE materials, authors' note] as 'sites of enunciation': For example, who are the agents of knowledge, where are they located, for whom do they speak, how do they conceptualize, where are the analytical silences, who is being empowered and who is being marginalized? (Slater & Bell, 2002, p. 339).

The paper proceeds as follows: First we examine how DE in Germany deals with the history of colonialism and its repercussions in present-day North-South relations. Then we provide an analysis of how the central concept of development is conveyed in the materials. Finally, we analyse whether postcolonial inequalities in the classroom setting are addressed. We argue for a transformative pedagogy that is uncomfortable, destabilising, and encompasses un-learning as crucial to education.

Disremembering colonialism

In this section, we argue that contemporary DE in Germany naturalises and thus stabilises the Global North's global position of power by "disremembering" (Raghuram, Madge, & Noxolo, 2009, p. 10) history in general and the colonial past in particular and thus denying the impact of colonialism in the present. Three omissions and narratives are discernible in the material: (1) Colonialism is not mentioned at all or only seen as having impacted the colonised territories and not the colonisers; (2) colonial aggression is legitimised *ex post* as necessary for 'development' in the Global South; (3) and, finally, colonial violence is played down.

Eloquent silence and colonialism without colonisers

Immediately clear is that very few materials take a historical approach: The history of North-South relations does not seem to play a central role in German DE, and if at all, the focus tends to be on the most recent history since about 1990 (for an exception, see Informationsbüro Nicaragua, 2011a). When topics such as globalisation are broached, the only information that is given regarding the history of North-South relations are the founding of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in the Post-Second World War era (Weber, 2003, p. 7). The effect of a de-historicised approach is that the contemporary set up of international institutions and programmes as well as power relations between the Global North and the Global South seem to be naturally given. What is most conspicuous is the general silence regarding colonialism. For example, whole 52-page long manuals provide materials to discuss issues such as global food crises (Landeszentrale für politische Bildung Baden-Württemberg, 2011) or globalisation more generally (Landeszentrale für politische Bildung Baden-Württemberg, 2003) without even mentioning colonialism and its repercussions.

The silence with regard to the Global North's and Global South's shared history of colonialism should be understood as an eloquent silence. It creates a clear separation between two eras: one of colonialism, and a second of development. Thus, development interventions can be marked as philanthropic endeavours that have nothing to do with the too often cruel realities of colonialism (Kothari, 2011, p. 66). However, various scholars have examined "the way development as a framework of ideas and practices emerged out of efforts to manage the social,

economic, and ecological crises of the late colonial world" (Hodge, 2007, p. 2) and thus refute the assumption that development as theory and practice began sometime in the decade following the Second World War (see also Cowen & Shenton, 1996; Koponen, 1994). April Biccum has suggested to grasp disregarding the colonial context of development as "operative and enabling": "It is for this reason that we can exist in a reorganised colonial world whose relations and structuring are directly related to the old colonial order but whose discourses and rhetoric work vigorously to mask the relation" (2002, p. 46-7).

If colonialism is mentioned at all in the materials, it is with regard to Africa. Here, it is telling that the booklet "Learning to understand Africa" (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 2007, p. 148; all translations are our own) published by the German Federal Agency for Civic Education, a federal public authority "providing citizenship education and information on political issues to all people in Germany" (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 2014), mentions that examining the colonial legacy is necessary for understanding present conditions in Africa, but does not apply this logic to Germany or other former colonising nations in Europe. Their present situation seems to be understandable without considering colonial involvement and its legacy. This is not merely an elision, but crucial for upholding the West's self-image as superior. "[S]ituating colonialism outside Europe and the North Atlantic enables a division of the world into modern/developed and traditional/under-developed societies" (Gutiérrez Rodríguez, 2010, p. 53), rather than understanding the exploitation of the Global South as constitutive for the Global North's modernity, development and general position of global power (Rodney, 2012; Dussel, 1995).

Colonisation as precondition for 'development'

Alongside the prevalent strategy to disregard colonialism altogether or to locate it outside the West, we find instances of legitimising colonialism *ex post*. In the above mentioned material by the Federal Agency for Civic Education, the following quote can be found – referring to the textbook "Post-colonial Africa" by eminent German scholars Rainer Tetzlaff und Cord Jakobeit, and introducing it as an attempt at an "honest evaluation" of colonialism:

> Accordingly, next to indubitable atrocities, societal destructions, economic structural changes and mental traumatisation, we find changes without which any development would have been impossible, such as the installation of school and health systems, infrastructures and the intrusion of the 'European mind'. (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 2007, p. 148)

In addition to a problematic, eurocentric notion of development which we return to in the next section, the quote evidences the colonial-racist argument that Africa or the Global South in general did not undergo any development prior to colonialism and that it would not have "progressed" had it not been for the benevolence of the European colonial powers.

This narrative echoes colonial-era legitimisations of colonialism according to which colonialism was supposed to be guided by a so-called dual mandate: colonisers were thought to have the task of exploiting the colonised territories' resources for colonial benefit as well as to contribute to the 'development' of occupied lands and the welfare of its people (Lugard, 1923). To weigh negative – "yes, there were massacres" (Adichie, 2011) – and positive aspects – "but roads were built" (Adichie, 2011) – against one another with regard to colonialism has since long been

denounced as "an act of the most brazen fraud" (Rodney, 2012, p. 206). Such a "balancing-out strategy" "frees Europe of responsibility, of a significant and traceable connection to the African present and allows it the glow of charity" (Adichie, 2007). Apart from the cynicism evident in such a profit and loss calculation, the function of colonial education, health and infrastructure are hardly ever taken into account. Infrastructure, hospitals, and schools were first and foremost installed to further colonial interests (Rodney, 2012). Education, similarly, was not "designed to give young people confidence and pride as members of African societies, but one which sought to instil a sense of deference towards all that was European and capitalist" (Rodney, 2012, p. 240–1). Such an "education for subordination [and] exploitation" continues to stifle emancipatory processes in the Global South and has been characterised as ongoing colonisation of the mind (Rodney, 2012, p. 241; Nandy, 1983; Thiong'o, 1986).

Denying the violence of colonialism

The third aspect evident in the treatment of colonialism in materials of German DE is the downplaying of violence. This is, for example, evident in an example dealing with the history of chocolate:

> Since Columbus had shown little interest in cocoa at his arrival in Central America
> in 1502, it was up to Hernando Cortez after the conquest of the Aztec empire and
> his return to Europe to bring back the first cocoa (Infozentrum Schokolade, 2009).

While this seems to be true factually, it presents the conquest and exploitation of the Americas as a matter of course and as devoid of violence. Not even Columbus himself portrayed his encounters in such a sterile, nonviolent way:

> As soon as I arrived in the Indies, on the first Island which I found, I took some of
> the natives by force in order that they might learn and might give me information
> of whatever there is in these parts. (Columbus, 1930)

While the colonial origin of the global trade in products such as cocoa, bananas, sugar, coffee, tea and so forth is at times mentioned in the context of education on "fair trade", global production networks, and consumerism, they are not connected to colonialism as a system of violence and oppression. Consequentially, the history of these products as structurally important for the 'development' of the Global North and the 'underdevelopment' of the Global South is also not taken into account. The violence of colonialism is thus not only played down in development materials, connections between the Global South and North are de-politicised as such.

The lack of acknowledging colonialism as a violent system of oppression and exploitation is perhaps most vividly evident in one particular exercise we found, which addresses the participants as follows:

> [...] 2. Think of characteristics according to which you can choose which country
> you would like to colonise. 3. Agree on an appropriate country. 4. How do you
> manage to get the things you want from this country? How do you assure the
> cooperation of the people there? (WeltGarten Witzenhausen, 2010)

This exercise invites school children to re-enact violence and subjugation from the perspective of the oppressor. Or to put it more bluntly, school children are asked to decide which (African) country they would like to conquer, which people they would like to murder, enslave, rape, de-humanise, and exploit. Here, colonialism is presented as natural course of history. Instead of trying to make children understand the great injustices that took place and how people resisted colonialism to the death, colonisation is portrayed as a legitimate form of doing politics in which strategic thinking matters.

All in all, the absence of (a serious treatment of) colonialism within the curriculum of DE means to disregard it as a crucial structuring moment that continues to shape North-South relations. If colonialism is brought back into the equation, the concept of development is unveiled as historically interwoven with colonialism and racism (Dussel, 1995), and its contemporary effect as supportive of a racist classificatory system becomes evident (Kothari, 2006a; Wilson, 2012). Furthermore, the fact of stark global inequalities, exploitation, and impoverishment is portrayed as normal and quasi natural in DE material. However, if the history and present of (neo-)colonial exploitation is acknowledged, students in the Global North turn out to be implicated. This may lead to a sense of insecurity as privileges and entanglements in power relations become apparent (cf. Jensen, 2005, p. 52–58). In our view, remembering colonialism in such a way may prevent "disintegration and denial" and thus lead to "responsible and 'care-full' agency" (Raghuram et al., 2009, p. 10).

Hegemonising 'development'

The categorisation of the world in developed and less-developed regions, societies, and people is critical to DE's self-conception. This section concentrates on the conceptualisation of 'development' evident in the materials by highlighting three interrelated aspects. (1) First, even though 'sustainable development' is the dominant catch-word, issues in DE tend to stick to notions of linear, teleological development. (2) Second, dominant understandings of 'development' are depoliticised and not marked as ideological. (3) Finally, we find that DE in Germany continues to be a tool for legitimising 'development' interventions by the Global North in the Global South. All in all, we argue in this section that German DE has not rid itself of a eurocentric, colonial-racist conceptualisation of 'development' and relations between Global South and North.

Persistence of linear, teleological 'development' thinking

The indicative framework for DE in Germany places 'sustainable development' at the centre of its approach. 'Sustainable development' itself is broken down into four objectives: "social, economic, ecological and political development" (BMZ & KMK, 2007, p. 28). In the examined materials, the actual term 'development' is seldom explicitly invoked, but they typically convey that the Global South does not fare well: no social justice, lack of economic performance, lack of ecological sustainability, not enough democracy and good governance, etc.

When the accomplishments in terms of 'development' are mentioned, the benchmark against which societies of the Global South are measured becomes evident:

> On the other hand, one has to mention certain, meagre process with regards to Sub-Saharan Africa. Thus, child mortality [...] has gone down. The number of literate adults was 5% higher than in 1990 [...]. Furthermore, the number of people with access to clean water is rising. [...] Some countries in Africa have now also become exporters of industrial products. […] Exports, too, have clearly increased […]. The number of internet users has risen drastically. (Gemeinsam für Afrika, 2009, p. 12)

The existence of a particular norm is evident in this quote, as "Sub-Saharan Africa" is characterised as "on-its-way" but "not-there-yet". The Global North obviously serves as the norm: low child mortality, literacy, access to clean water, export-orientated industrialisation, and internet usage are commonly associated with 'modernity' and the West. There is a tendency to perceive all phenomena in the Global South in terms of the history of the Global North (cf. Eriksson Baaz, 2005; Kothari, 2011). DE in Germany seems to assume that societies 'develop' in a linear and teleological manner, that the West constitutes the epitome of 'development', and that other societies lag behind (Dussel, 1995). Diagnosing a lack of 'development' in such a way quasi-automatically implies the prescription of "'development' in the form of modernisation, transfer of technology and capital investments (in order to stimulate economic growth)" (Ziai, 2007a, p. 43).

Depoliticising 'development'

One of the central criticisms of the dominant discourse on 'sustainable development' has been its function to obscure the inherent contradiction between the preservation of nature and a capitalist economic system based on growth (Eblinghaus & Stickler, 1996; Ziai, 2007a). This is also observable in DE in Germany:

> Permanent economic performance as one of the objectives of sustainable development could be defined as economic activity that both safeguards the natural capital stock in the long term and creates new possibilities for socially and ecologically sound income generation through investments. [...] There is more or less consent in economics that at the end of the day economic growth is necessary for that (BMZ & KMK, 2007, p. 191).

The quote evidences that economic development is equated with capitalist economic growth. This is not marked as ideological: Capitalism is not characterised as a particular, potentially problematic economic system, but as quasi-natural law and without alternative. The alleged universality of capitalist 'development' is underlined by the reference to "economics", which serves as scientific legitimiser. Rather than discussing the pros and cons of capitalism with regard to sustainability which some exceptional materials undertake (Informationsbüro Nicaragua, 2011b), capitalist economic growth is put forward as the solution to ecological issues.

A lack of structural and/or political perspectives on 'sustainable development' is also evident in the way DE critically examines 'our' consumption and way of life:

> Imagine ... You have flown to the paradise of your dreams and you are being pampered by people who like their job. Because they earn enough money to live

> off and are themselves able to once in a while go on holidays. Culture and nature in this paradise are protected. Delicious regional dishes of high quality are available. Flying is more or less free from emissions, and, additionally, trees are planted to curb the effects… (Entwicklungspolitisches Bildungs- und Informationszentrum Berlin, 2011, p. 1)

The quote highlights that consumerism is not criticised as a political issue: wealth and poverty are not seen as related, deeply entrenched, global power relations and clashes of interest seem non-existent. Instead the material exhibits a fantasy of sustainability according to which 'our' present privileged lifestyle can be preserved without trade-offs, and can even be extended to those far-away 'others' who are to date being excluded and exploited. Critical debates on climate economisation or on neoliberal practices of sustainability and green capitalism are ignored (Peripherie, 2008). At the same time, and tellingly, the global division of labour remains untouched in this example of a sustainable tourism industry. The fantasy of an omnipotence of the privileged runs through the materials. Rather than suggesting humbleness in light of the historical and present responsibility of wealthy societies and people in terms of ecological destruction and human exploitation, German students are addressed as "climate savers" (aej, BUNDjugend, Brot für die Welt, & EED, 2010, p. 4) and therefore supplied with the power to act in the name of 'sustainable development'.

It is noticeable that the materials see the concept of 'sustainable development' as beyond debate and unquestionably positive. Even when critical debates are encouraged, 'sustainable development' remains the *sine-qua-non*. Thus, participants are, for instance, asked

> to position themselves through critical reflection with regard to questions of globalisation and development, while orientating themselves at the international consensus, the overall concept of sustainable development and human rights. (BMZ & KMK, 2007, p. 77)

Given that sustainable development is presented as an international consensus, there is no critical debate on the concept as such, nor are students invited to find out about the disputes that accompanied the formulation of this so-called consensus (Eblinghaus & Stickler, 1996). Perspectives that fundamentally question the dominant conceptualisation of 'sustainability' because "the visions associated with the concept did not break with the hegemonic norms of economic growth and a capitalist property order" (BUKO, n.d.) or with patriarchal structures (Bauhardt, 2011; Hofmeister, Mölders, & Karsten, 2003), are commonly not mentioned.

Consequently, "different ways of seeing the future, in non-developmental ways, not in quantitative ways, but other ways of caring for life, human life and all life on the planet" (Santos, 2012) – e.g. *buenvivir*, degrowth, deglobalisation, eco-feminism, eco-socialism, food sovereignty, solidarity economy, commons etc. – are only rarely touched upon in the material (for a laudable exception, see FairBindung & Konzeptwerk Neue Ökonomie, 2013). DE hence not only tends to ignore activist discussions and practices on these questions, but also the academic debates on the limitations and pitfalls of discourses on sustainability and development more widely (Eblinghaus & Stickler, 1996; Ziai, 2007b). Instead, it contributes to stifling critical thought process by stressing the universal validity of sustainable development as an "obligation under international law" (Deutscher Entwicklungsdienst, 2006, p. 9), thereby selling the

dominant, capitalist notion as objective truth which is in our – taken for granted, of course – common interest. Instead of suggesting that "[w]e are all equally interconnected, we all want the same thing, we can all do the same thing", critical DE should discuss "asymmetrical globalisation, unequal power relations, [and] Northern and Southern elites imposing [their] own assumptions as universal" (Andreotti, 2006b, p. 6).

Limited, apolitical courses of action

The propagation of an elitist perspective on development should not come as a surprise, given that DE has from the outset been motivated by the "imperative for governments, international institutions, and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to ensure public approval for their development aid programmes" (InWEnt & BMZ, 2007, p. 8). Thus, many of the analysed materials try to convince the target group that 'development corporation' is the way to go by highlighting its successes:

> The achievements of successful projects and programmes that provided the people with new prospects should not be forgotten. [...] What is pleasing about the described success? How many people benefit from the success? (Gemeinsam für Afrika, 2009, p. 17)

Even though the usefulness of 'development aid' has been cause for debate for decades (Escobar, 1994; Moyo, 2009), and its colonial legacy and eurocentrism has been criticised comprehensively (Eriksson Baaz, 2005; Heron, 2007), the materials often highlight its universal beneficence. It is also rarely discussed as related to military, political or economic interests or as just one way of approaching questions of 'development'.

As a consequence of this depoliticised approach to development, the materials propose rather limited courses for action. For example, VENRO, the umbrella organisation of development NGOs in Germany, suggests "school partnerships, charity runs, and information events, world music evenings and film screenings, international chats and online discussions, school-worldshops and climate schools as well as participation in various campaigns of development policy" (VENRO, 2010, p. 4). In our analysis of the materials, we found that three different approaches of participant activation are predominant. First of all, many materials evidence the strategic focus on collecting donations for development projects and programmes. The approach of mixing DE with fundraising inhibits critical educational perspectives. The second course for action proposed is to propagate the transformative potential of individual consumer choices, which is well summarised by the slogan "with chocolate against poverty" (Welthaus Bielefeld et al., 2012, p. 16). This focus tends to individualise the problem, to consolidate classist prejudices because only well-off people can afford them, and to divert focus away from structural issues of a racialised, gendered global division of labour. The detached representation of consumerism runs the danger of stabilising existing inequalities if it does not question global and local systems of property ownership and the seemingly natural order of some people working hard for the pleasure of others. The third tendency in DE is to propose activities that encompass getting to know the 'Other' in the Global South or in the vicinity (e.g. "foreign children in the class" (BMZ & KMK, 2007, p. 92)). In contrast, political approaches such as struggling for equal opportunities or standing up against structural and everyday racism are hardly ever suggested as useful courses

for action. Nor is practical advice given on how to conceptualise, mobilise for, and facilitate political actions such as a campaign or demonstration.

In sum, we found that the analysed materials tend to reproduce a particular euro- and capital-centric notion of (sustainable) 'development' by positing it as universal and by "de-naming" its connectedness with colonial-era relations of power. No room is provided for students to question dominant narratives, concepts and policy forms and to get to know alternatives. Such depoliticisation is also evident in the proposed options for action. The absence of postcolonial perspectives in DE in Germany contributes to the manifestation of existing hierarchical power relations: on the one hand those who need to be 'developed' and on the other hand helpers, saviours of the world, and responsible cosmopolitans. Rather than destabilising the "superiority complex" of White people and elites in Global North and South, it is thus consolidated (cf. Fanon, 2008). At the same time, the status quo of material inequality is legitimised as natural. The propagation of a certain idea of 'development' means that assistance and aid, rather than exploitation and oppression (or solidarity), are constructed as central to the relationship between Global North and South.

Empowering the already empowered

In this final section we examine whether and how inequalities in the classroom setting are taken into account. While students in Germany generally profit from the legacy of colonialism and ongoing colonial relations of exploitation on a global scale, they inhabit different positionalities within Germany society. As bell hooks (1994) as well as scholars working on the German context (Malter & Hotait, 2012; Marmer et al., 2010; Mecheril, Varela, Dirim, Kalpaka, & Melter, 2010) point out, the classroom is a place where inequalities of race, gender, class are replicated. With this perspective in hand, the analysed materials show three tendencies: (1) In terms of methodology, the materials are at times exclusionary as they do not fully acknowledge the diversity of potential participants. (2) Second, a tendency is observable to implicitly question citizen rights of non-White participants. (3) Finally, exclusionary processes of Othering are decipherable which place Germans of Color, Black Germans and participants without German citizenship outside of an imagined White German society. All in all, this section argues that the analysed materials do not comply with the requirements of an inclusive pedagogy in a society of migration as they contribute to experiences of exclusion and discrimination.

Germany = White?

Many exercises clearly evidence the assumption on the part of the authors that the primary target group is White:

> To see people with a different skin colour than one's own – most of the time a
> light colour – in school is not an everyday experience for many students, despite
> the high proportion of foreigners in the German population. (Lensing, 2006, p. 8)

The author puts herself in the position of the target group of her educational materials and speaks of White or light skin colour as "one's own" skin colour. She thus clearly imagines her target group to be White. The quote also evidences the assumption that 'normal' Germans necessarily have to be White or light-skinned. Whoever does not show these phenotypic

characteristics consequently belongs to the group of 'foreigners'. It is quite striking in this context that to be a 'foreigner' is not related to the question of citizenship and passport, but explicitly related to bodily or external characteristics. To only imagine White students as participants leads to exclusion of Germans of Color, Black Germans, and non-White groups in general.

Denial of students of Color's right of existence

However, it not only means that these students are not included as worthy addressees of DE, but can have other dramatic consequences for students of Color. The research project "Image of Africa in Education" (IMAFREDU) found that Afro-German students are not thought of as targets of education in schools in the city of Hamburg. Africa is often portrayed as deficient in school materials and teaching, which gets directly associated with students who are thought of as African, and has emotional as well as physical consequences for these students (Marmer et al., 2010). They are connected to poverty, hunger, and war by their fellow students, who themselves are convinced to be part of an intellectually and materially superior 'culture'.

DE materials do not seem to fare better, as the example of the following excerpt suggests. It provides argumentative assistance to teachers to incite interest in Africa:

> If we affirm that we want a political future for our world in which wars and violence do not dominate the agenda, if we want to prevent the pandemic Aids from becoming a deadly threat to everybody and that more and more Africans without a future flood into Europe, then interference is a necessity. […] If we become active here – as a State or individually –, we act in our own best interest. Of course there are also other, immediate, and emotional motivations for an interest in Africa. The enthusiasm for Africa's people, for their joie de vivre und courage to face life, for music, dance and outstanding sportive qualities can be part of that. However, Africa always also remains a moral challenge, even though most people would prefer not to be faced with this unease. (Gemeinsam für Afrika, 2009, p. 22–3)

In this material, Afro-German or African students are obviously not envisaged as potential participants since they might have very different motivations for their interest in the continent. What is more, they run the danger of being associated with problems on the one hand (Marmer et al., 2010), and of being used as objects of exoticisation on the other (Danielzik & Bendix, 2010). Ultimately, their mere existence is turned into a moral challenge. What must go on inside a child or teenager whose family migrated to Germany from Africa to hear that it is in 'true' Germans' best interest to prevent such migration from taking place. While such materials explicitly or implicitly question equal citizen rights or rights of belonging of non-White participants, White students profit as the myth of European, White superiority is upheld.

Exclusionary Othering and disregard for students of Color's learning needs

Not only does learning with regard to the global sphere take place from a dominant perspective, the same applies to education on Germany's society of migration. Participants are often given the task to put themselves in the position of those constructed as racialised others. To give an example, an exercise asks the participants to "close your eyes now and put yourself in the

position of the black person" (Deutscher Entwicklungsdienst, 2006, p. 34; see also Mohio, 2011). The material provides a cartoon in which a Black person tries to get in contact with two White people who look as if they are afraid of the Black person. The objective of this exercise is for the participants to develop empathy with the Black person. The increase in social and emotional competence is thus only intended for White participants which is, however, not stated as such by the authors of this material. It is not taken into account that participants of Color might themselves experience such racist situations on a daily basis and thus do not need to develop empathy, but rather are in need of empowerment to deal with such discrimination. They might too be put into the situation of serving as an object of learning for White participants, who would likely be in a majority. None of the materials we examined showed sensitivity to the question of different (learning) needs depending on social positioning and lived experiences of the participants, or even of the educators themselves.

To summarise, DE in Germany in its current form does not do justice to an inclusive pedagogy in the German society of migration. Not only is the target group very often assumed to be White, but some materials contribute to experiences of exclusion and discrimination because they foster pedagogical settings in which learning takes place on the basis of, and at the expense of, students of Color. The classroom is *per se* not a secure space, as 'many students, especially students of Color, may not feel at all 'safe' in what appears to be a neutral setting" (hooks, 1994, p. 39). The classroom can only be made more secure if inequalities are acknowledged and educators explicitly deal with different needs and counter existing power structures with regard to race, but of course also with regard to gender, class, ability, and other intersecting systems of domination. This means, for example, that students of Colour need to be empowered to recognise racism, to develop counter-strategies, and to value themselves; and that racism by White students and instructors is made visible and worked against, for example, through acquiring the ability to "retrace the itinerary of [...] prejudices and learning habits" (Kapoor cit. in Andreotti, 2006a). If classrooms are seen as neutral settings, we run the danger of silencing marginalised students and empowering those who are already sufficiently empowered.

Conclusion

It is evident that the analysed material of DE in Germany reproduces hegemonic eurocentric historiography and disremembers colonialism. Either colonialism is not mentioned at all or, when mention is made, the effects of colonialism are played down, presented as merely having had impact on the colonised societies, or they are considered only as positive. What is more, the interconnectedness of colonialism, capitalism, modernity and dominant understandings of 'development' tend to be ignored, which leads to a depoliticisation of development issues as beyond power relations. Thus, the bifurcation of the world into people who need and people who have and give 'development' persists. In addition, the material does not do justice to an inclusive pedagogy: Not all potential participants with their different societal positions and learning needs are addressed; instead, learning takes place on the basis of, and at the expense of, the 'Others'; 'non-White' participants which are not regarded as 'legitimate' or 'equal' citizens of Germany, or participants in its society. It is observable that historically developed relations of power and domination are not fundamentally questioned – neither with regard to the German society of migration nor with regard to the global context. Rather, DE in its current orientation contributes to the perpetuation of unequal relations between North and South, self and Other.

Given the fact that DE in its current form tends to contribute to stabilising relations of inequality at the global and societal level, we contend that DE needs to focus on destabilizing and un-learning myths of Northern supremacy by turning its gaze towards the history and present of the coloniality-modernity-development nexus. In addition, DE should not shy away from addressing inequalities within the classroom setting. Only this uncomfortable task can introduce the potential that DE might contribute to global and societal transformation. Having provided insight into dominant narratives and omissions in the field of DE in Germany, this paper points to the importance of a postcolonial perspective. The consequent implementation of such a perspective

> provides directions that point to a move beyond ethnocentrism and its claims of cultural supremacy, towards 'planetary citizenship' [...] based on a deep understanding of interdependence (in 'material' and cultural terms) and causal responsibility towards the South. It offers both an outline for an educational agenda and powerful and necessary triggers for an internal critique of [DE] (Andreotti, 2006a).

Further entrenchment and discussion within the field is thus crucial. However, amending the content of DE is only one necessary building block for a truly postcolonial agenda, and dependent on the transformation of the whole field. Such transformation necessarily has to entail a postcolonial perspective on and change of institutional and political frameworks.

Acknowledgements

References

Adichie, C. N. (2007). *Presentation at the Christopher Okigbo Conference*. Barker Center, Harvard University. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NlelreqrfQ4

Adichie, C. N. (2011). *Narratives of Europe. Stories that matter*. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-YEWg1vIOyw

aej, BUNDjugend, Brot für die Welt, & EED. (2010). *Mach mal Zukunft! Eine Aktionsmappe für die Jugendarbeit zur Studie 'Zukunftsfähiges Deutschland in einer globalisierten Welt'* (Vol. 3).

Andreotti, V. (2006a). The contributions of postcolonial theory to development education. *Development Education Journal*, *12*(3), 7–10.

Andreotti, V. (2006b). Soft versus Critical Citizenship Education. Retrieved April 3, 2014, from www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue3-focus4?page=show

Andreotti, V., & de Souza, L. T. M. (2012). *Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education*. London: Routledge. Retrieved June 16, 2014, from http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415884969/

Bauhardt, C. (2011). Gesellschaftliche Naturverhältnisse und globale Umweltpolitik - Ökofeminismus, Queer Ecologies, (Re)Produktivität und das Konzept 'Ressourcenpolitik'.

In B. Rendtorff, C. Mahs, & V. Wecker (Eds.), *Geschlechterforschung, Einführende Texte* (pp. 44–58). Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag.

Bendix, D. (2014). Resistance or damp squibs? Challenges to colonial power in contemporary German development interventions in the area of reproductive health in Tanzania. *Austrian Journal of Development Studies*, *XXIX*(1), 30–45.

Biccum, A. (2002). Interrupting the discourse of development: on a collision course with postcolonial theory. *Culture, Theory and Critique*, *43*, 33–50.

Biccum, A. (2005). Development and the 'new' imperialism: a reinvention of colonial discourse in DFID promotional literature. *Third World Quarterly*, *26*(6), 1005–20.

BMZ, & KMK (Eds.). (2007). *Orientierungsrahmen für den Lernbereich Globale Entwicklung im Rahmen einer Bildung für nachhaltige Entwicklung*. Bonn-Berlin: Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung and Ständige Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der BRD. Retrieved June 30, 2013, from http://www.ewik.de/coremedia/generator/ewik/de/Downloads/Dokumente/Orientierungsrah men_20f_C3_BCr_20Globales_20Lernen.pdf

Bryan, A., & Bracken, M. (2011). Teaching and Learning about Global Citizenship and International Development in Post-Primary Schools. Irish Aid. Retrieved from http://www.ubuntu.ie/media/bryan-learning-to-read-the-world.pdf

BUKO. (n.d.). BUKO - Wer wir sind. Retrieved January 10, 2013, from www.buko.info/wer-wir-sind/buko-positionen/nachhaltigkeitskritik

Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. (2007). *Afrika verstehen lernen. 12 Bausteine für Unterricht und Projekttage*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.

Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. (2014, May 20). About. Retrieved from http://www.bpb.de/die-bpb/138852/the-federal-agency-for-civic-education

Columbus, C. (1930). *The Voyages of Christopher Columbus, Being the Journals of his First and Third, and the Letters Concerning his First and Last Voyages, to which is Added the Account of his Second Voyage Written by Andres Bernaldez*. London: The Argonaut Press. Retrieved from http://mith.umd.edu/eada/html/display.php?docs=columbus_santangel.xml&action=show

Cowen, M., & Shenton, R. (1996). *Doctrines of Development*. London: Routledge.

Danielzik, C.-M., & Bendix, D. (2010). Exotismus. 'Get into the mystery ...' *ROSA – Die Zeitschrift für Geschlechterforschung*, *40*, 4–7.

Deuser, P. (2010). Genderspezifische Entwicklungspolitiken und Bevölkerungsdiskurse. Das Konzept der „Sexuellen und Reproduktiven Gesundheit und Rechte" aus postkolonialer Perspektive. *Peripherie*, *30*(120), 427–51.

Deutscher Entwicklungsdienst. (2006). *Globales Lernen Arbeitsblätter für die entwicklungspolitische Bildungsarbeit* (2. revised.).

Dussel, E. (1995). *The Invention of the Americas. Eclipse of 'the Other' and the Myth of Modernity*. New York: Continuum. Retrieved January 14, 2014, from http://bibliotecavirtual.clacso.org.ar/ar/libros/dussel/1492in/1492in.html

Eblinghaus, H., & Stickler, A. (1996). *Nachhaltigkeit und Macht. Zur Kritik von Sustainable Development*. Frankfurt/Main: IKO.

Entwicklungspolitisches Bildungs- und Informationszentrum Berlin. (2011). *G+ Schöne Ferien für Tourismuskaufleute*.

Eriksson Baaz, M. (2005). *The Paternalism of Partnership. A Postcolonial Reading of Development Politics*. London-New York: Zed Books.

Escobar, A. (1994). *Encountering Development. The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

FairBindung, & Konzeptwerk Neue Ökonomie. (2013). *Endlich Wachstum! Wirtschaftswachstum – Grenzen – Alternativen*. Berlin: FairBindung.

Fanon, F. (2008). *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press.

Gemeinsam für Afrika. (2009). *Ein anderes Bild von Afrika. Anregungen für den Unterricht in den Sekundarstufen I und II.*

Global Humanitarian Assistance. (2012). The 2011 decrease in aid from DAC donors: a new era? Retrieved July 1, 2012, from http://www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org/the-2011-decrease-in-aid-from-dac-donors-a-new-era-3568.html

glokal e. V. (2013). *Bildung für nachhaltige Ungleichheit? Eine postkoloniale Analyse von Materialien der entwicklungspolitischen Bildungsarbeit in Deutschland*. Berlin: glokal e. V. Retrieved June 30, 2013, from http://www.glokal.org/publikationen/bildung-fuer-nachhaltige-ungleichheit/

Gutiérrez Rodríguez, E. (2010). *Migration, Domestic Work and Affect. A Decolonial Approach on Value and the Feminization of Labour*. London-New York: Routledge.

Heron, B. (2007). *Desire for Development. Whiteness, Gender, and the Helping Imperative*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Hodge, J. M. (2007). *Triumph of the Expert. Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism*. Athens: Ohio University Press.

Hofmeister, S., Mölders, T., & Karsten, M. E. (Eds.). (2003). *Zwischentöne gestalten. Dialoge zur Verbindung von Geschlechterverhältnissen und Nachhaltigkeit* (Auflage: 1., Aufl.). Bielefeld: USP Publishing Kleine Verlag.

hooks, bell. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress. Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Informationsbüro Nicaragua. (2011a). *Fokuscafé Lateinamerika - Von der Kolonialzeit zur Unabhängigkeit in die Gegenwart - Werkheft zum Modul Geschichte und Klischees*. Wuppertal: Informationsbüro Lateinamerika.

Informationsbüro Nicaragua (Ed.). (2011b). *Fokuscafé Lateinamerika - Wenn der Lohn zum Überleben nicht reicht - Werkheft zum Modul Ökonomie*. Wuppertal: Informationsbüro Lateinamerika.

Infozentrum Schokolade. (2009). Geschichte der Schokolade.

InWEnt, & BMZ. (2007). *Förderprogramme Entwicklungspolitische Bildungsarbeit BMZ/InWEnt*. Retrieved March 20, 2013, from www.ewik.de/coremedia/generator/ewik/de/Externe_20Links/Referenten_2C_20Finanzierung/F_C3_B6rderprogramme_20ep_20Bildung.pdf

Jensen, R. (2005). *The Heart of Whiteness. Confronting Race, Racism, and White Privilege*. San Francisco: City Lights.

Kapoor, I. (2008). *The Postcolonial Politics of Development*. Oxon: Routledge.

KATE e. V. (2013). *Zusammen Wachsen. Vier Perspektiven auf Süd-Nord-Schulpartnerschaften*. Berlin: Kontaktstelle für Umwelt und Entwicklung (KATE) e. V. Retrieved June 16, 2014, from http://www.kate-berlin.de/media/usermedia/files/Awareness%20for%20Fairness/ZUSAMMENWACHSEN_CRECIENDO%20JUNTOS.pdf

Kiesel, T., & Bendix, D. (2010). White Charity: Eine postkoloniale, rassismuskritische Analyse der entwicklungspolitischen Plakatwerbung in Deutschland. *PERIPHERIE*, *30*(120), 482–95.

Kontzi, K. (2014). *Gemeinsam für die 'Eine Welt'? Subjektpositionierungen im entwicklungspolitischen Freiwilligendienst weltwärts*. PhD Thesis, Leuphana Universität Lüneburg, Lüneburg.

Koponen, J. (1994). *Development for Exploitation. German Colonial Policies in Mainland Tanzania, 1884-1914*. Hamburg: LIT.

Kothari, U. (2006a). An agenda for thinking about 'race' in development. *Progress in Development Studies*, *6*(1), 9–23.

Kothari, U. (2006b). From colonialism to development: reflections of former colonial officers. *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, *44*(1), 118–36.

Kothari, U. (2011). Commentary: history, time and temporality in development discourse. In C. Bayly, V. Rao, S. Szreter, & M. Woolcock (Eds.), *History, Historians and Development Policy. A Necessary Dialogue* (pp. 65–70). Manchester-New York: Manchester University Press.

Landeszentrale für politische Bildung Baden-Württemberg. (2003). Globalisierung. Aspekte einer Welt ohne Grenzen. *Politik & Unterricht*, *29*(4).

Landeszentrale für politische Bildung Baden-Württemberg (Ed.). (2011). Weltweite Ernährungskrisen. Ursachen und Konsequenzen. *Politik & Unterricht*, *37*(1).

Lensing, M. (2006). Deine Handflächen sind ja ganz weiß. Menschen aus anderen Kontinenten als Referenten in der Schule. In Deutscher Entwicklungsdienst (Ed.), *Bildung trifft Entwicklung. Rückkehrer in der entwicklungspolitischen Bildung*.

Lugard, F. J. D. (1923). *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh-London: William Blackwood and Sons.

Malter, B., & Hotait, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Was bildet ihr uns ein?: Eine Generation fordert die Bildungsrevolution* (Auflage: 1.). Berlin: Vergangenheitsverlag.

Marmer, E., Marmer, D., Hitomi, L., & Sow, P. (2010). Racism and the Image of Africa in German Schools and Textbooks. *International Journal of Diversity in Organizations, Communities and Nations*, *10*(5), 1–12.

Marmer, E., & Ziai, A. (2013). Racism in the teaching of 'development' in German secondary school textbooks. Presented at the CERES Conference Racism and Anti-Racism in Education and Community Practice, Edinburgh.

Martin, F. (forthcoming). *Transforming Intercultural Learning: Learning to Live with Difference*. Routledge.

McCollum, A. (1996). *On the Margins? An Analysis of theory and practice of development education in the 1990s* (Ph.d Thesis). Open University.

McEwan, C. (2009). *Postcolonialism and Development*. New York: Routledge.

Mecheril, P., Varela, M. do M. C., Dirim, I., Kalpaka, A., & Melter, C. (2010). *Bachelor | Master: Migrationspädagogik* (Auflage: 1.). Weinheim: Beltz.

Mohio. (2011). 'Das Boot ist voll' und 10 weitere Dialoge zu Ethik und Globalisierung mit Kaiser und König, Einleitung. Retrieved January 23, 2013, from http://boot.kaiser-und-koenig.de

Moyo, D. (2009). *Dead Aid. Why Aid is not Working and how there is Another Way for Africa*. London: Allen.

Nandy, A. (1983). *The Intimate Enemy. Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Noxolo, P. (2006). Claims: A postcolonial geographical critique of 'partnership' in Britain's development discourse. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, *27*(3), 254–69.

Peripherie. (2008). *PERIPHERIE 112: Klima - Politik und Profit* (Auflage: 1., Aufl.). Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Raghuram, P., Madge, C., & Noxolo, P. (2009). Rethinking responsibility and care for a postcolonial world. *Geoforum*, *40*(1), 5–13.

Rodney, W. (2012). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Cape Town: Pambazuka.

Santos, B. D. S. (2012, April 21). The world is changing in a more progressive way, and it's taking place here. Retrieved July 10, 2014, from http://www.democracynow.org/2010/4/21/the_world_is_changing_in_a

Slater, D., & Bell, M. (2002). Aid and the geopolitics of the post-colonial: critical reflections on New Labour's Overseas Development Strategy. *Development and Change*, *33*(2), 335–60.

Steinwachs, L. (2012). *Zitat: 'Arm, aber glücklich'. Persönliche Begegnungen in Schulpartnerschaften*. Berlin: Berlin Postkolonial e.V. Retrieved June 16, 2014, from http://berlin-postkolonial.de/cms/images/dokumente/partnerschaftentwickleln/steinwachs_2012_zitat_arm_aber_gluecklich_schuelerbegegnungen.pdf

Syed, J., & Ali, F. (2011). The white woman's burden: from colonial civilisation to Third World development. *Third World Quarterly*, *32*(2), 349–65.

Thiong'o, N. wa. (1986). *Decolonising the Mind. The Politics of Language in African Literature*. New Hampshire: Heinemann.

VENRO. (2010). Globales Lernen trifft neue Lernkultur. VENRO Arbeitspapier 19.

Wainwright, J. (2008). *Decolonizing Development. Colonial Power and the Maya*. Antipode Book Series. Oxford: Blackwell.

Weber, R. (2003). Globalisierung: Aspekte einer Welt ohne Grenzen – Einleitung. *Politik & Unterricht. Zeitschrift für die Praxis der politischen Bildung*, *29*(4), 3–7.

WeltGarten Witzenhausen. (2010). *So nah und doch so fern – als Entdecker auf kolonialen Spuren, Witzenhausen*. Witzenhausen: WeltGarten Witzenhausen.

Welthaus Bielefeld, Stadt Bielefeld, Bildung trifft Entwicklung, Brot für die Welt, Deutsche Lepra- und Tuberkulosehilfe, Stiftung Entwicklungszusammenarbeit Baden-Württemberg, Unicef, et al. (2012). *Die Welt braucht dich. Ein Heft für Schülerinnen und Schüler (ab Klasse 8)*.

White, S. (2006). The 'gender lens': a racial blinder? *Progress in Development Studies*, *6*(1), 55–67.

Wilson, K. (2012). *Race, Racism and Development*. London: Zed Books.

World University Service. (2014). Ausgaben von Industriestaaten für Informations- und Bildungsarbeit im Bereich der Entwicklungszusammenarbei. WUS-Informationsstelle Bildungsauftrag Nord-Süd. Retrieved November 5, 2014, from http://www.kooperation-international.de/uploads/media/OECD_Flyer_2014_Ausgaben_2012.pdf

Ziai, A. (2007a). *Globale Strukturpolitik? Die Nord-Süd-Politik der BRD und das Dispositiv der Entwicklung im Zeitalter von neoliberaler Globalisierung und neuer Weltordnung*. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Ziai, A. (2007b). *Exploring Post-Development. Theory and Practice, Problems and Perspectives*. London - New York: Routledge.