The right to education and the will to learn: a social reading to guide the future

Derecho a la educación y anhelo de aprender: una lectura social para orientar al futuro

Farnaz Farahi
Ricercatrice in Pedagogia Generale e Sociale (PAED/01-A), Università eCampus.
farnaz.farahi@uniecampus.it

ABSTRACT
The right of early childhood to receive an adequate education is affirmed in numerous international directives, documents, and treaties. Since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, children have been recognized – also at the normative level – as subjects with their own inalienable rights, equal to those of adults, both in the educational and instructional spheres. Analyzing the evolution of regulatory frameworks, this contribution highlights how the right to education – and all educational practice aimed at children and beyond – must be protected from religious and political interference to fully and effectively fulfil its formative and emancipatory functions. In this regard, the case of Iran offers a concrete example that illustrates these approaches.

Keywords: "Human rights", "Right to education", "Education", "Childhood"

RESUMEN
El derecho de la primera infancia a recibir una educación adecuada está reconocido en numerosas directrices, documentos y tratados internacionales. la adopción de la Declaración Universal de Derechos Humanos en 1948, los niños han sido reconocidos, también a nivel normativo, como titulares de sus propios derechos inalienables, iguales a los de los adultos, tanto en el ámbito educativo como en el educativo.
Analizando la evolución de los marcos normativos, esta contribución destaca cómo el derecho de los niños a la educación –y, con él, toda la práctica pedagógica dirigida a la infancia, y más allá– debe salvaguardarse de las injerencias religiosas y políticas para cumplir plena y eficazmente sus funciones formativas y emancipadoras.
En este sentido, el caso de Irán proporciona un ejemplo concreto que abarca estos puntos.

Palabras clave: "Derechos humanos", "Derecho a la educación", "Educación", "Infancia"

INTRODUCTION

In the introductory section, it is first necessary to recall that Article 1 of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* states, 'All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood' (ONU, 1948).

In this regard, the Council of Europe defines

> human rights as armour because they protect you; they are like rules and tell you how to behave; and they are like judges because you can appeal to them. They are abstract like emotions; like feelings, they belong to everyone and exist no matter what happens. They are like nature because they can be violated, and like the spirit because they cannot be destroyed. Like time, they treat us all the same – rich and poor, old and young, black and white, tall and short. They offer us respect and charge us with treating others with respect. As with goodness, truth and justice, we may not agree on their definition, but we know them when we see them (Council of Europe, n.d., https://www.coe.int/it/web/compass/what-are-human-rights-).

The above excerpts constitute the essential basis for any reflection on the relationship between education and children's rights. The objective of this research is to critically examine how contemporary regulatory frameworks protect – or fail to protect – the right to education in early childhood from ideological, political, and religious interference. Through a comprehensive review of the relevant literature and legal–normative sources, the study investigates the specific conditions under which the right to education in early childhood can effectively support children's formative, developmental, and emancipatory processes. In this context, the case of Iran serves as an illustrative example for analyzing the tensions between normative principles and state-driven ideological influences on early childhood education.

HUMAN RIGHTS, EDUCATION AND CHILDREN

In international law, the first reference to education dates to 1948, specifically to Article 26 of *the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*:

> 1. Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.
>
> Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to strengthening respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations to maintain peace. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education they should give their children (ONU, 1948, Art. 26).

As can be seen, Article 26 of *the Universal Declaration of Human Rights* does not refer to the term 'education' but to 'instruction', which has a different connotation (Franceschini, 2022; Campagnoli, 2019).

'Education' refers explicitly to something that has to do with the formation and development of the individual's mental (Ravaglioli, 1988) and moral functions (Manganaro & Vimercati, 2017). The verb 'to educate' itself implies 'bringing to the surface', understood as a maieutic process of research, understanding, extraction and enhancement of personal qualities and skills. The focus is primarily on the subjectivity of the individual who is learning and not on the notion that is transmitted and, therefore, acquired (Dewey, 1916; Franceschini, 2022). With the term 'instruction', on the other hand, the focus is on the transmission of knowledge and skills, and therefore on the learning of concepts or new abilities (Franceschini, 2022).

The tendency of international law to focus on instruction rather than education is confirmed by the 1966 *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. In it, echoing the wording of *the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,* no mention is made of the right to education in the strict sense, but, once again, the focus is limited to instruction, ultimately flattening the former in favour of the latter (Campagnoli, 2019; ONU, 1966).

The *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women* (ONU, 1979) explicitly refers – for the first time at international regulatory level – to the right to education of minors. Article 10 of this *Convention* states that 'States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to eliminate discrimination against women' including, with regard to education, 'access to specific educational information designed to ensure health and family well- being, including information and advice on family planning' (ONU, 1979, Article 10).

However, the 1979 *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women* does not refer specifically to children but addresses the issue of education indirectly. This differs from the *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (ONU, 1989), which can be considered the first document containing a comprehensive approach to the right to education.

The 1989 *Convention on the Rights of the Child* states that every child has this right and that it is the duty of parents and all institutions or States Parties to guarantee it (Articles 18, 24 and 28). Article 18, for example, states:

> 1. States Parties shall use their best efforts to ensure recognition of the principle that both parents have common responsibilities for the upbringing and development of the child. [...]
>
> 2. [...] States Parties shall provide appropriate assistance to parents and legal guardians in the performance of their child-rearing responsibilities and shall ensure that institutions, organisations and services are provided for the care and well-being of children.
>
> 3. States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that children whose parents work have the right to benefit from childcare facilities and services for which they are eligible (ONU, 1989, Art. 18).

Furthermore, Article 24 emphasises that the right to education contributes to the enjoyment of 'the highest attainable standard of health and to facilities for the treatment of illness and rehabilitation' so that the States Parties to *the Convention on the Rights of the Child* endeavour to 'ensure that no child is deprived of the right of access to such services' (ONU, 1989, Art. 24).

The right to education is further emphasised in Article 28, which states that States must recognise this right through appropriate measures aimed at ensuring equality of opportunity. Specifically, States must:

- make primary education compulsory and free for all;
- encourage the organisation of various forms of secondary education, both general and vocational, which shall be open and accessible to every child, and take appropriate measures such as making education free and providing financial assistance in case of need;
- ensure that everyone has access to higher education by every appropriate means, in accordance with their abilities;
- ensure that vocational guidance and information are available to all children;
- take all measures to promote regular attendance and attendance at school with a view to reducing the dropout rate (UN, 1989, Art. 28).

According to the *Convention on the Rights of the Child,* the right to education must ultimately have the following specific objectives:

a) to promote the development of the child's personality and the development of his mental and physical abilities and talents to their fullest potential;

b) to instil in the child respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and for the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter;

c) to instil in the child respect for his or her parents, his or her own cultural identity, language and values, as well as for the national values of the country in which he or she lives, the country from which he or she may originate, and civilisations different from his or her own;

d) to prepare children to assume the responsibilities of life in a free society, in a spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality between the sexes, and friendship among all peoples and ethnic, national, and religious groups, including those of indigenous origin;

e) to instil in children respect for the natural environment (ONU, 1989, Art. 29).

The reference to education is clear, but it is broader than in previous ratifications and covers both the pre-school and school periods, in the pedagogical and instructional sense of the terms. What the *Convention on the Rights of the Child* emphasises is the universality of the right to education that children must enjoy, regardless of their social and cultural background.

The UNESCO *Delors Report "Learning: The Treasure Within"* (1996) subsequently identified the four fundamental pillars that the right to education must guarantee children. Firstly, "learning to know": not just acquiring knowledge, but above all developing a love of understanding, discovering and building solid and critical knowledge.

Secondly, 'learning to do': applying knowledge in practical contexts, increasing professional skills and the ability to work in teams, adapting to changes in the world of work. Thirdly, 'learning to live together', i.e. cultivating understanding, tolerance and cooperation between individuals and peoples, valuing diversity and the culture of peace. Finally, 'learning to be': developing one's personality, independence of mind, sense of responsibility and ability to achieve personal fulfilment (UNESCO, 1996).

Over the decades, there has been a shift away from a view of the right to education as simply schooling towards a more specific interpretation: guaranteeing an integrated process of personal development capable of forming future citizens who are aware, critical and able to contribute to the common good (Cerini, 2019; Bobbio, 2020). These aspects were also highlighted in *the Education for All report 'Reaching the Marginalised'* published by UNESCO in 2010, which focused on the difficulty of guaranteeing the right to education in developing countries (Campagnoli, 2019).

A final mention must be made of *the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training* (ONU, 2011). This *Declaration* brings education as a right of children more directly into contact with the broader issue of human rights, expressly referring to the principles enshrined in *the Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (ONU, 1948). Echoing the *Delors Report 'A Treasure in Education'* (UNESCO, 1996), the 2011 *Declaration* highlights the fact that education should not only be the transmission of knowledge, but also the acquisition of moral and citizenship skills that contribute to the creation of a more democratic society through an equally ethical and social curriculum (Cerini, 2019; Baldacci, 2020).

The guidelines contained in international references have been incorporated into the national legislation of many countries that have ratified the Declaration. In the case of Italy, for example, the Constitution itself, in Articles 2 and 3, refers to the development and full realisation of the individual – and therefore to the sphere of education – without ever explicitly mentioning the right to education, but rather to instruction (in Articles 33 and 34), in line with the 1948 *Universal Declaration*.

An explicit reference to the right to education is found in Article 147 of the Civil Code, which states that both spouses have 'the duty to maintain, educate, instruct and morally assist their children, in accordance with their abilities, natural inclinations and aspirations', as in Article 2048 of the same Code, which refers to parental responsibility with regard to the obligation to ensure that children receive an adequate education (Campagnoli, 2019).

At the legislative level, on the other hand, it is worth mentioning Law No. 107 of 13 July 2015, *Reform of the national education and training system and delegation for the reorganisation of existing legislative provisions,* and the related Legislative Decree No. 65 of 13 April 2017, *Establishment of an integrated education and training system from birth to six years of age,* which, for educational purposes, aim to reorganise pedagogical coordination at national level in order to comply with European objectives, with explicit references to the educational rights of minors. These legislative measures,

at least in the intentions with which the legislator conceived them: on the one hand, promote greater consistency between the Italian education system and European recommendations on inclusion and quality of education; on the other hand, they reinforce the principle that education must be guaranteed as a universal, accessible and high-quality right, in line with Italy's commitments under international human rights treaties (Campagnoli, 2019).

NOT JUST LEGISLATION: NEW RIGHTS FOR CHILDREN

Guaranteeing the so-called *best interests of the child* – a legal expression that indicates the priority interest, both material and moral, to be attributed to each child in every decision, action or policy that affects them (Lenti, 2010) – is not, however, the only objective of pedagogy. An educator – like a teacher – must go beyond the regulations and, while respecting them, understand the new rights of the child, which consist in guaranteeing the right to education in the legislative sense of the term, but with full respect for experiential characteristics, as well as individual needs and potential (Bobbio, 2020; Foti, 1990; Dewey, 1938). We must not deny the needs of children – primarily relational and experiential – on the basis of technical and regulatory considerations, however important, but start from concrete subjective needs (Bobbio, 2020).

As Bobbio (2020) states,

> the debate on children's rights has shifted from a prescriptive and abstractly definitional ethic to one of idealising children's rights. There is a danger that a model of compulsory 'obliteration' towards children will become established, a model to be used in a narcissistic way with mystifying and guilt-inducing effects (Bobbio, 2020, p. 193).

In other words, the risk is that, by maintaining reference to rigid and technocratic standards of education, love for children will tend

> become, not a precious potential to be developed realistically in tolerance of our own and others' ambivalences, but rather an attitude to be displayed, an ideal model on the basis of which to judge without genuine love, on the basis of which to condemn oneself and others without genuine understanding (Foti, 1990, p. 5).

It follows that, today, the pedagogical necessity regarding the child's right to education consists in first and foremost building an authentic relational alliance between adults and learners (Winnicott, 1975; Bobbio, 2020). Children must enjoy educational rights, but also and above all concrete pedagogical opportunities – i.e. implemented in a personalised manner by educators – which, at the same time, allow them to 'realise and expand all their potential by enhancing their ability to socialise, gathering affection and trust and satisfying their needs and desires to learn' (Malaguzzi, 1995, p. 63).

Combining the right to education with a pedagogical approach that focuses on the real needs of children means, for example, paying attention to the rights to play, rest and leisure (also referred to in Article 31 of the 1989 *Convention on the Rights of the*

Child). Play, in turn, refers to the right to artistic education, culture and the enjoyment of an original creative dimension (Speraggi, 1998).

The importance of these aspects lies in the fact that

> while understanding conventional communication requires only knowledge of the language and a substantially passive attitude towards the sender, in the case of artistic communication, the receiver must have an active attitude, i.e. they must, at least in part, construct the meaning of what is being communicated to them; this is precisely because what is being communicated is ambiguous and therefore subject to different interpretations: different meanings can be attributed to what has been formulated (Dallari, 1988, p. 45).

Guaranteeing the right to play and art, within the more general right to education, also has an important symbolic role because it connects meaning and significance in the child's mind, as has been amply demonstrated in the literature (Vygotsky, 1978; Piaget, 1962; Winnicott, 1971).

Play and art are not the only aspects that fall within the more general right to childhood education. Especially in the contemporary era, languages are now multimedia, synesthetic and multimodal. Children therefore have the right to access all the opportunities offered by the complex digital universe and, consequently, to receive adequate *media education* (Cambi, 2010).

This is an educational approach aimed at developing in young children the skills necessary to analyse, understand, evaluate and use critically and consciously the various means of communication, such as television, radio, the internet, social media, the press and other forms of digital and traditional communication (Cambi, 2010; Di Bari & Mariani, 2018). A right to education which, in this respect, also takes the form of a right to *media education* in a complex and hyperconnected world (Morin, 1990; 1999) that can no longer do without such knowledge (Di Bari & Mariani, 2018).

From an educational perspective, the right to *media education* helps to give children a new image of themselves, more in line with modern times:

> The significant increase in symbolisation, problematisation and virtualisation processes triggered by the media makes it urgent to rethink the self. It is a question of being part of this phenomenon, of accepting it as a challenge for both epistemology and lived behaviour. Those who practise cyberspace find the dimensions of masking, the theatricalisation of unstable parts of the self, simulation, the multiplication of identities and the integration between the human and the technological (Maragliano, 1998, p. 22) to be natural.

To quote Bobbio (2020), it is a question of guaranteeing an innovative 'space for education' (Bobbio, 2020, p. 224), i.e. a right to an education that is ecologically sustainable but situated in relation to the contemporary needs of society and the environment. A set of educational spaces that include the right of children to be active protagonists of their own decisions and their own future. A broader and more dynamic vision of childhood, which recognises children not only as passive subjects of protection, but as citizens in the making with a voice and a role in the society in which they live and act (Amadini, 2012; Cerini, 2019).

In this context, education must become a vehicle for empowerment, promoting critical skills, democratic participation and sensitivity to issues such as sustainability, social inclusion and the protection of human rights, including from an intercultural perspective (Bobbio, 2020; Scurati, 1998). Ultimately, guaranteeing education means guaranteeing the following elements:

> Current organisation of spaces; balance between children's initiative and controlled, curricular planning; specific attention to emotional and affective aspects; use of stimulating language; fundamental educational needs taken into consideration; differentiation of activities to address all dimensions of child development; stable routine activities; diversified and multipurpose teaching materials; individualised attention to each child; assessment and observation system that allows for educational individualisation at both the individual and group levels; educational work carried out in continuity with fathers, mothers and the social context (open school) (Zabalza, 1996, p. 49).

EDUCATION AS AN INDEPENDENT FUNCTION

Given the above, it is clear that education, as a right, must be elevated to a collective practice, as it involves both educational agencies and society as a whole (Cuppari, 2022). The right to education, however, remains independent 'from the object and specific action' while being 'transferable to all contexts of existence' (Rigamonti & Formenti, 2020, p. 117). What education must guarantee is the drive towards self-determination in children – future citizens – which can be traced back to the possibility of decision-making and choice (Cottini, 2016; Sasanelli, 2022).

It follows that education is a function that must be distinguished, in the first instance, from political action (Dessardo, 2022). According to Sturzo (1956), it must therefore be limited, in order to guarantee the right to education, the interference of the state in educational matters. It is appropriate to limit the violence of power, from childhood to adulthood, because if the state had the prerogative over educational decisions, 'from primary school to university, it would not be enough to practise sentimental conformism; complete intellectual and moral submission, confident enthusiasm and the mystical ardour of a religion would be required' (Sturzo, 1956, p. 25). According to Mosse's studies (1975), it is relatively easy for a state (even a democratic one and, at the most extreme level, a totalitarian one) to interfere in educational matters, because education is a fundamental tool for shaping values, behaviours and social identities as it sees fit (Mosse, 1975; Dessardo, 2022).

Political intervention in education would compromise the maieutic process that characterizes it (Dewey, 1888). According to Dewey (1888; 1916; Pezzano, 2021), what makes education universal is individual respect for everyone's right to actively participate in their own educational path. Educating – and exploiting the right to receive education – must therefore mean promoting the personal initiative and adaptability of each child-future citizen (Cerini, 2019), according to their own ways and

procedures. Education understood in this way must necessarily be free from any external interference (Dewey, 1888; 1916; Pezzano, 2021).

Religious interference must also be avoided (Farahi, 2024; 2024b).

Education that is designed according to dogmas of any kind ends up being repressive, hindering any relational openness not only between children and adults, but also reducing the former to a condition of passivity towards the latter (Loiodice & Ulivieri, 2016). According to Pinto Minerva (2013), if education is not understood as an entity independent of religion, the logic of otherness and dialectic would disappear, to be replaced by education to difference.

It goes without saying that guaranteeing the right to education means moving away from fundamentalist and totalitarian logics, as this would reduce pedagogical contexts to dogmatic practices, depriving them of critical openness and pluralism (Farahi, 2024).

The right to education cannot therefore be separated from the concepts of social equity and democracy (Dewey, 1916; 1938), nor from the set of intercultural factors – such as dialogue, listening and respect for otherness – that promote justice and inclusion at multiple levels (Baldacci, 2017; Fiorucci, 2020). These are elements which, as noted in the ratifications cited in this paper, inevitably intersect with the issue of education (Farahi, 2024).

> The task to be accomplished in order to guarantee the right to education is therefore give every individual who is born the opportunity to develop in the way that is most congenial to them, regardless of their gender. [...] No one can say how much energy and how many qualities are destroyed in the process of forcing children of both sexes into male- female patterns as conceived by our culture. No one will ever be able to tell us what a girl could have become if she had not encountered so many insurmountable obstacles in her development, placed there solely because of her sex (Gianini Belotti, 1973, pp. 8-9).

WHEN RELIGION AND POLITICS MERGE IN EDUCATION: THE CASE OF IRAN

Iran is a prime example of what we are talking about. It is a country where human rights are in direct conflict with religious and political influences, ultimately shaping the education system and individual freedoms (Farahi, 2024b).

Since the Khomeini Revolution of 1979, when Ayatollah Khomeini succeeded Mohammad Pahlavi's regime and put an end to the Pahlavi dynasty by founding the Islamic Republic (Sabahi, 2020), education in Iran has always been linked to *Sharia law* (Farahi, 2024; 2024b).

Sharia is the Islamic legal system that encompasses all the laws, principles and norms derived from the Quran and the Sunnah (which, in turn, encompasses all the teachings and practices of the Prophet Muhammad) (Sabahi, 2020; Swarup, 1994). Sharia law, in particular, covers various aspects of life, including morality, ethics, marriage, trade, and even social relations and how women should behave. Since 1979,

the Islamic Republic, interpreting Sharia and the dictates of the Koran in a patriarchal sense, has, for example, forced women to wear the veil, banned homosexuals, alcoholic beverages, gambling and prostitution from all contexts, and forced women to devote themselves solely to the home and the education of their children (Haddad & Esposito, 1998; Mernissi, 1991; Esposito, 2001). However, literature does not exhaust the complexity of reality, in which women also actively participate in education and work.

Leaving aside the complex issue of women in Iran – although it is of great importance, it would distract us from the subject of this article and has been discussed elsewhere (Farahi, 2024; 2024b) – and focusing solely on children's right to education, in such a socio-cultural context, for over forty years, society, politics and, above all, education have been influenced by religious dogmas that inevitably compromise their effectiveness (Farahi, 2024b). Education is repressed by the ideological politics of those in power and, with it, children's rights (Farahi, 2024). Every educational agency, in order to comply with Sharia law, but above all with the government of the Islamic Republic is strictly controlled and oriented towards promoting an ideological vision in line with the principles of the Revolution (Farahi, 2024b). Those who do not comply with these dictates, in the educational context as in all social levels, can even be sentenced to death (Sabahi, 2020).

In other words, due to a selective and rigid interpretation of the precepts of the Koran adopted by Khomeini since the beginning of the Republic, a patriarchal view has spread in Iran which considers women inferior to men and children passive beings dependent on adults (Kung, 2005; Wadud, 2011)This is in stark contrast to the Islamic Holy Scriptures, which provide no justification for differential treatment between genders or individuals (Farahi, 2024b; Kung, 2005). This view also contrasts sharply with scientific, academic and pedagogical advances in the field of childhood, which recognise children as subjects with their own inalienable rights. These interpretative errors ideologically exonerate the constant and, at the same time, unjustified interference of the political-religious sphere in Iranian educational matters (Farahi, 2024; 2024b).

Control over the right to education and the ways in which it is to be implemented results in strictly censored school curricula, in which freedom of critical thinking and cultural pluralism are severely restricted. Ultimately, this is what education should never be if it is to truly be recognized as a right and a duty, applicable to both educators and learners (Kung, 2005; Farahi, 2024; 2024b).

Many children's rights in Iran, such as free, inclusive and diversity-respecting education, are thus inevitably compromised (Sgrena, 2022). Iranian education – whether preschool, school or academic – is not intended as means of emancipation and a maieutic process, but rather as a tool for conformity and political-religious control (Loiodice & Ulivieri, 2016; Farahi, 2024b).

IN CONCLUSION: WHAT RIGHT TO EDUCATION IN THE FUTURE?

The analysis carried out through a review of the literature and the relevant legal-normative frameworks shows that the right to education in early childhood cannot be effectively realised in contexts where political and religious hegemonies penetrate educational institutions. As highlighted by Baldacci (2017) and echoed in Gramsci's theorization of hegemony (1932; 1975), ideological control exercised through education contributes to the reproduction of social inequalities and compromises children's educational rights from the earliest stages of life.

Gramsci's reflections on hegemony as a pedagogical relationship extending across society (Gramsci, 1932, Q10, II, 44) reveal how the shaping of norms, values, and identities is deeply affected when political-religious power structures dominate the educational sphere. This mechanism is clearly visible in the Iranian context, where, as Farahi (2024b) notes, gender stereotypes, rigid pedagogical models, and limited openness to diversity hinder the development of inclusive and equitable educational environments. Similar dynamics – albeit with different intensities – can also be traced in Western democracies.

Consequently, when early childhood education is subjected to dominant ideological or dogmatic narratives, the right to education becomes merely formal: children may have access to schooling, yet the conditions necessary for their full formative and emancipatory development are lacking. Such conditions include the recognition of the child as an active subject, capable of regulating and co-constructing their own learning pathways—a perspective emphasized by Alba (2018) – and the integration of diversity, multiculturalism, and otherness as resources rather than threats, as argued by Morin (1990; 1999) and Portera (2006; 2019).

Based on the Iranian example and in relation to the broader international normative frameworks examined, guaranteeing the right to education in early childhood today finally requires:

a) overcoming stereotypical and rigid educational models that restrict children's exposure to diversity and perpetuate hierarchical representations (Farahi, 2024b);
b) promoting the vision of the child as an active, competent, relational subject who builds self-esteem and agency through meaningful interactions (Alba, 2018);
c) recognizing multiculturalism, difference, and otherness as fundamental drivers for transforming educational practices and empowering early childhood education (Morin, 1990; 1999; Portera, 2006; 2019).

Only by ensuring protection from political-religious interference and fostering pluralistic, inclusive, and democratic educational conditions can the right to education in

early childhood fully realize its formative and emancipatory potential, in accordance with both international directives and contemporary pedagogical research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alba, F., (2018), "Diritti umani universali e sfide educative interculturali nella tarda epoca della modernità", *Quaderni di Intercultura*, vol. X, 132-143, doi: https://doi.org/103271/.

Amadini, M., (2012), *Crescere nella città. Infanzia e educazione,* Brescia, La Scuola.

Baldacci, M., (2017), *Oltre la subalternità. Praxis e educazione in Gramsci*, Roma, Carocci.

Baldacci, M., (2020), *Un curricolo di educazione etico-sociale,* Roma, Carocci.

Bobbio, A., (2020), *Pedagogia dell'infanzia. Processi culturali e orizzonti formativi,* Brescia, Scholé.

Cambi, F., (Ed.) (2010), *Media education tra formazione e scuola. Principi, modelli, esperienze,* Pisa, ETS.

Campagnoli, M.N., (2019), "Diritto all'educazione e nuove tecnologie. Sulla necessità di un approccio consapevole", *Dirittifondamentali.it*, vol. 2, 1-14.

Cerini, G., (2019), *Competenza è cittadinanza. Idee, fonti, proposte operative,* Sant'Arcangelo di Romagna, Maggioli Editore.

Concilio d'Europa, (s.d.), *Cosa sono i diritti umani?,* https://www.coe.int/it/web/compass/what-are-human-rights-.

Cottini, L., (2016), *L'autodeterminazione nelle persone con disabilità*, Trento, Erickson.

Cuppari, A., (2022), "Rileggere la complessità del lavoro sociale alla luce della pedagogia freiriana". In M. Fiorucci & A. Vaccarelli (Eds.), *Pedagogia e politica in occasione dei 100 anni dalla nascita di Paulo Freire,* Milano, Franco Angeli.

Dallari, M., (1988), *Pastrocchi, macchie, scarabocchi,* Firenze, La Nuova Italia.

Dessardo, A., (2022), "Antistatalismo e libertà della scuola nel pensiero di don Luigi Sturzo". In M. Fiorucci & A. Vaccarelli (Eds.), *Pedagogia e politica in occasione dei 100 anni dalla nascita di Paulo Freire,* Milano, Franco Angeli.

Dewey, J. (1888), "The Ethics of Democracy". In J.A. Boydston (Ed.), *The Early Works of John Dewey*, 227-252, Carbondale and Edwardsville, SIUP, 1969.

Dewey, J., (1916), "Democracy and Education". In J.A. Boydston (Ed.), *The Middle Works of John Dewey*, 1-402, Carbondale and Edwardsville, SIUP, 1980.

Dewey, J., (1938), *Experience and education,* New York, Macmillan.

Di Bari, C., & Mariani, A., (Eds.) (2018), *Media Education 0-6. Le tecnologie digitali nella prima infanzia tra critica e creatività,* Roma, Anicia.

D. Lgs. 13 aprile 2017, n. 65, *Istituzione del sistema integrato di educazione e di istruzione dalla nascita sino a sei anni.*

Esposito, J.L., (2001), *Women in Muslim family law*, Syracuse, Syracuse University Press.

Farahi, F., (2024), "Iran, the veil and women: a gender and intercultural pedagogical perspective", *Women & Education*, vol. 2 n°4, 46-51.

Farahi, F., (2024b), *Iran, realtà sociale e questione femminile. Modelli pedagogici e spunti autobiografici,* Pisa, ETS.

Fiorucci, M., (2020), *Educazione, formazione e pedagogia in prospettiva interculturale*, Milano, Franco Angeli.

Foti, C., (1990), "Etica e infanzia", *Il Bambino Incompiuto,* vol. 3, 5-19.

Franceschini, G., (2022), "Didattica per l'educazione o didattica per l'istruzione? Il dilemma dell'educazione contemporanea", *Studi sulla Formazione*, vol. 25, 199-209, doi: https://doi.org/10.13128/ssf-13808.

Gianini Belotti, E., (1973), *Dalla parte delle bambine. L'influenza dei condizionamenti sociali nella formazione del ruolo femminile nei primi anni di vita*, Milano, Feltrinelli.

Gramsci, A., (1932), Q10, II, 44, in "Storia della classe dominante e storia delle classi subalterne", *Quaderni dal carcere* (1975), Torino, Einaudi.

Gramsci, A., (1975), "Storia della classe dominante e storia delle classi subalterne", in *Quaderni dal carcere*, Torino, Einaudi.

Haddad, Y.Y., & Esposito, J.L., (Eds.) (1998), *Islam, gender, and social change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Kung, H., (2005), *Islam. Passato, presente e futuro*, Milano, Rizzoli.

Legge del 29 maggio 2017, n. 71, *Disposizioni a tutela dei minori per la prevenzione ed il contrasto del fenomeno del cyberbullismo.*

Lenti, L., (2010), "Best interests of the child o best interests of children?", *Nuova Giurisprudenza Civile Commentata,* vol. 3, 157-165.

Loiodice, I., & Ulivieri, S., (Eds.) (2016), *Per un nuovo patto di solidarietà. Il ruolo della pedagogia nella costruzione di percorsi identitari, spazi di cittadinanza e dialoghi interculturali*, Bari, Progedit.

Malaguzzi, L., (1995), "Una carta per i bambini e le bambine". In AA.VV., *In Viaggio con i diritti dei bambini e delle bambine,* Reggio Emilia, Reggio Children.

Manganaro, P., & Vimercati, E., (Eds.) (2017), *Formare e tras-formare l'uomo. Per una storia della filosofia come paideia*, Pisa, ETS.

Maragliano, R., (1998), "Ripensare la formazione dentro la multimedialità", *Tecnologie Didattiche,* vol. XIII n° 1, 18-26.

Mernissi, F., (1991), *The Veil and the Male Elite: A Feminist Interpretation of Women's Rights in Islam*, New York, Basic Books.

Morin, E., (1990), *Les défis de la complexité*, Parigi, Éditions du Seuil.

Morin, E., (1999), *Les sept savoirs nécessaires à l'éducation du futur*, Paris, Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'éducation.

Mosse, G., (1975), *La nazionalizzazione delle masse. Simbolismo politico e movimenti di massa in Germania (1812-1933)*, Bologna, Il Mulino.

ONU, (1948), *Dichiarazione Universale dei Diritti dell'Uomo.*

ONU, (1966), *Patto Internazionale sui Diritti Economici, Sociali e Culturali.*

ONU, (1979), *Convenzione sull'eliminazione di tutte le forme di discriminazione nei confronti delle donne,* 18 dicembre 1979, New York.

ONU, (1989), *Convenzione sui diritti del fanciullo*, 20 novembre 1989, New York.

ONU, (2011), *Dichiarazione delle Nazioni Unite sull'educazione e la formazione ai diritti umani.*

Pezzano, T., (2021), "Etica, educazione e democrazia in Dewey", *Pedagogia più Didattica*, vol. 7 n° 1, 48-62, doi: 10.14605/PD712104.

Piaget, J., (1962), *Play, dreams and imitation in childhood*, New York, Norton & Company.

Pinto Minerva, F., (2013), "Corpi feriti. La violenza sulle donne". In A. Cagnolati, F. Pinto Minerva, S. Ulivieri (eds.), *Le frontiere del corpo. Mutamenti e metamorfosi*, Pisa, ETS.

Portera, A., (2006), *Globalizzazione e pedagogia interculturale*, Trento, Erickson.

Portera, A., (2019), "Dal multiculturalismo all'educazione e alle competenze (realmente) interculturali", *Educazione Interculturale. Teorie, Ricerche, Pratiche*, vol. 17 n° 2, 1-18, doi: 10.14605/EI1721901.

Ravaglioli, F., (1988), *Educazione occidentale. Storia, problemi e documenti,* Roma, Armando Editore.

Rigamonti, A., & Formenti, L. (2020), "Polifonie incorporate. Formare alla riflessività sistemica nella comunità per minorenni", *Rivista Italiana di Educazione Familiare,* vol. 2, 113-132, doi: https://doi.org/10.13128/rief-9450

Sabahi, F., (2020), *Storia dell'Iran 1890-2020*, Milano, Il Saggiatore.

Sasanelli, L.D., (2022), "Disabilità, autodeterminazione, inclusione: l'eredità pedagogica di P. Freire e le potenzialità del Capability Approach". In M. Fiorucci & A. Vaccarelli, *Pedagogia e politica in occasione dei 100 anni dalla nascita di Paulo Freire,* Milano, Franco Angeli.

Scurati, C., (1998), *Realtà umana e cultura formativa. Riflessioni e ricerche tra pedagogia e scienze dell'educazione,* Brescia, La Scuola.

Sgrena, G., (2022), *Donne ingannate. Il velo come religione, identità e libertà*, Milano, Il Saggiatore.

Speraggi, M., (Ed.) (1988), *Arte & Bambini,* Torino, Atti dell'Incontro di Studio, 21 novembre 1998.

Sturzo, L., (1956), *Politica e morale,* Bologna, Zanichelli.

Swarup, R., (1994), *Woman in Islam*, New Delhi, Voice of India.

UNESCO, (1996), *Rapporto Delors "Nell'educazione un tesoro"*.

UNESCO, (2010), *Rapporto Education for All "Reaching the Marginalized"*.

Vygotskij, L.S., (1978), *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Wadud, A., (2011), *Il Corano e la donna. Rileggere il Testo Sacro da una prospettiva di genere*, Torino, Effatà.

Winnicott, D.W., (1971), *Playing and reality*, London, Tavistock Publications.

Winnicott, D.W., (1975), *Dalla pediatria alla psicoanalisi,* Firenze, Martinelli.

Zabalza, M.A., (Ed.) (1996), *Calidad en la educación,* Madrid, Narcea.