

quences of judgments from authors such as Aronson, Derrida and Baudrillard – following from their perception as it is formed by their philosophical concepts – are their clear critical formulations of a repudiation of different naïve expectations of a »better world« after the end of the cold war era. In other words: the post-cold war globalization restructured and to an extent changed the very fields, where differences gain shape of confrontations (of values, cultures, interests, and so forth). The disarmament should be probably the crucial aim of all activities to get humanity rid of wars. UNESCO World Congress on Disarmament Education in June 1980 actually did make the problem of disarmament a focus of peace education. Some evidence that the worthy goals of the disarmament education could not »make it« can be found in a collection of texts, edited by Magnus Haavelsrud and published in 1993. Still, education remains a tool of hope, especially, when we agree on the international levels what next generations should be taught about. In such a view discourse of peace is a science of hope. There is a point of a key difference in understanding the concept of citizenship education, which subsequently determines the form of a particular curriculum and a corresponding practice of teaching and learning. The »key difference« is a signifier under which one direction of formulation of the notion of citizenship education leads towards a vision of an autonomous individual and the other direction of formulation of the notion that leads towards a vision, which advocates a primacy of a community over individuals' rights and needs. This difference displays itself as a difference between a »traditional« approach to the problem, which solves the question of socialisation of young people in a form of the typical »civics« and a »post-modern« approach, which tries to rely on a reflexive and open concept invested with diversity, multiculturalism, etc. The first tendency relies on a more fixed idea of truth, the other relies on an assumption that the truth depends on being recognised as such by an individual, making the notion of truth much more a matter of a cognitive process within a social practice. However, it is probably difficult to find one or the other notion in any educational reality in a »pure« form – let us say, as a definitive »model« of a curriculum and/or an educational practice. Two points of difference mainly broadly shape a discursive space in which, we can watch a struggle for a definition of the citizenship education within each country and on the international scale. The concept of citizenship education has its roots in the universalistic ideas of the European enlightenment period. Obviously in many countries, that haven't yet embraced fully the »Western democracy,« they take citizenship education as much more »cultural« than as a political notion.