The challenge of Teaching Intl Law in the Era of Globalization:
Make the *Jonasian Ethos* a reality to convert the classical opposition understanding / learning into a process to build up a genuine Global Citizenship

Challenges implied by teaching Intl Law in the Era of Globalization assert three main problems:

1-Lack of interest among Intl Law

   a- The *out-of-date* distinction between Intl Relations (IR) i.e. Political Sciences vs. Law – Since the 2001 and 2009 crisis, Politics and Economics are much more attractive for students compared to Intl Law. Moreover, studying Intl Law does not assure anymore an “employment” in the future.

   b- The « YOLO - IMO » syndrom - According to the American Bar Association (ABA), the number of law school applicants has been shrinking for several years thus the Gen-Z is synonym of revolution of values and principles. From now on, students want a fast and cloud learning process: the priority is mobility.

2- A loss of Sacred and, thus, a search of Beliefs – *Knock-on-effect* of terrorism and fanaticism as a reaction to crisis.

3-The Ever-growing Sustainable Development (SD) dimension and the need to urge a new approach of Intl Law considering environmental issues.

Hence, the question arises: is it possible to consider teaching Intl Law as a way to really adjust values of our world? If yes, how?

The crisis we face introduce the need for new considerations, not only political but also ethical. As though, the *Jonasian* approach, which tends to be a statement in the Brundtland Report, provides an answer. It is necessary to deconstruct the confused conception of *rights to feed a new ontology*. From now on, it is essential to elaborate a framework to determine how teaching Intl Law can be an instrument to build up “The future we want”.

The need for a new ontology is based on the fact that the scope of human being action is different from the one we get used to. The dichotomy between understanding and learning can no longer be an issue. The concept of Global Citizenship implemented by the UNESCO-MGIEP offers a pathway to elaborate a new paradigm: we must convey values, nor so knowledge. Intl Law should be considered as a device that enables students to achieve a suitable and significant manner to enhance an Ethos. To this end, we, lecturers must make responsibility a key-process of our teaching task. To settle it, I propose to implement a method *à part* which is a synthesis of 6 mains pedagogical methods (Cartesian, Aristotelician, Socratic, Scholastic, Freinet-Piaget, The MGIEP proposal). This scheme, entitled the Ethos one, aims to make students responsible in a *Jonasian* way.
**Methods – Teaching INTL LAW**

**-FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL –**

THE DIFFERENT EPSTEMOLOGIES BELOW SHARED A KEY-COMMON POINT IN ORDER TO DEVELOP MY OWN PROPOSAL:
- The pursuit of Truth
- The intent to reflect Reality.
Hence, in some cases, the method followed is a transposition of the logic to the teaching process and NOT a prescription for teaching clearly given by author himself.

I propose to focus on the advantages and limits of the main pedagogical methods in order to present my own vision and practice of teaching Intl Law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN FOCUS</th>
<th>ASPECTS TO IMPLEMENT</th>
<th>LIMITS IE ASPECTS TO CORRECT</th>
<th>ADVANTAGES IE ASPECTS TO IMPROVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Socratic** | - Comprehension objective of subjective concepts (Justice…)  
- The Professor is not the one who knows, he is the one who guides (Maieutique) | - **Dialogue** ie Dialogue that includes contradiction  
- Ironical Thought  
- Doubt as a key process to understand concepts | - **Moral** Dimension. Not Ethical | - Dialectical Dimension |
| **Scholastic** | - Beliefs is Understanding  
- Intellectual Speculation  
- Priority given to the own reflexion of the student BEFORE the lessons | - *lectio*: to explain / coment a text  
*questio*: Chairman  
*disputatio*: thematic debate based on a pure intellectual speculation results of the lectio. | - Hard link to Faith, even though if it is not necessarily in the sense of Religion.  
- Highy speculative | - The Lectio that implies an analysis of textual support  
- The disputatio, which implies a debate in order to stimulates the intellect and thus the knowledge. |
| **Cartesian** | - Intuition = construction of a reference considered as an obviousness  
- Rigor  
- Observation of the world around us to build our own thought | - Transposition of Mathematics  
- "logic“ to be fully applied to a Human Science such as Intl Law | - The structure and the rigor of the thoughts |
### Methods – Teaching INTL LAW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Aristotelian –</strong> Syllogism</th>
<th><strong>Post and Neo-Hegelian Theories –</strong></th>
<th><strong>Liberal (Montessori / Freinet) – The Scandinavian Way</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Deduction ie Logical Thought based on the obviousness’s observed to elaborate a Rule / Principle.</td>
<td>- Redefinition of the Role of the State and its relations with civil society to elaborate norms</td>
<td>- The Professor is just an arbiter / facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Practice of the Rules of 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1-Observation</td>
<td>- Normativity</td>
<td>- Experimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2-Analysis</td>
<td>- Subject of Law</td>
<td>- Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3-Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Free Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4-Verification</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Project Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Innovative – The MGIEP Way</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>The Thiel Proposal –</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Implement the Idea of Challenge ‘N’ the Ambassadorial one</td>
<td>- Sectorial Programs</td>
<td>1-To Awake – Make students realize that our response has been inadequate until now i.e. THINK responsibly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus on Peace and Sustainability</td>
<td>- Organization of “contemporary events” including intercultural dialogues, forums, music concerts, art shows, and seminars ie</td>
<td>Make the jonasian ethos a reality…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Close to OMD</td>
<td>- Institutional ie have to be generalized and applied</td>
<td>To be developed during the TRILA Conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Difficulty to make the distinction between Law and Facts.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Difficulty inherent to philosophy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Prospective Role of students</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The logic itself ie give the opportunity to think Intl Law as a solving matter and not only as a factual matter such as IR for instance</td>
<td>- Too much autonomy</td>
<td>- Participation and Inclusion into the Learning Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Absence of Dialogue</td>
<td>- The possibility to use any support to teach efficiently (ie videos, pictures…).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Thiel Proposal –**

1-To Awake – Make students realize that our response has been inadequate until now i.e. THINK responsibly.

- To be developed during the TRILA Conference

- To be developed during the TRILA Conference
In order to Teach Intl Law to implement the Global Citizenship, I propose to focus on:

**I** - The objective: WHAT IS A RESPONSIBLE STUDENT? HOW A PROFESSOR CAN ACHIEVE IT?

**II** - The conceptual framework: The Jonasian Ethos that implies:

1. To Act for the future of the Planet
2. To Act for the Future of Humanity
3. To Accept authoritarian forms of Power i.e challenge the occidental view of Democracy.
4. To Reorient practices and conceptions of capitalism to make the economy a real medium to develop a sustainable development.

**III** - The Elaboration of a Method using a mix of the ones above I propose to develop a method corresponding to this triptych:

1. To Awake – Make students realize that our response has been inadequate until now i.e. THINK responsibly.
2. To Guide – Give students the keys to perceive the world through the legal prism i.e. BE responsible.
3. To Stimulate and Empower – Make students ACT responsibly.